

**Minutes of the Thirty Sixth Depleted Uranium Environmental Review
Committee (DUFERC) Meeting held at MOD Neveravon on Thursday 17 June
2004**

Present:

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] (Chairman/Secy)
[REDACTED]	MoD RSO (DTEG) Eskmeals
[REDACTED]	SO2 RAD (CESO A)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	CESO(A)
[REDACTED]	GVIU
[REDACTED]	VPU MOD
[REDACTED]	Commandant (Kirkcudbright)
[REDACTED]	DRPS(DSTL)
[REDACTED]	DRPS(DSTL)
[REDACTED]	VPU MOD
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Apologies: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] DRPS

1. Opening remarks

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked [REDACTED] for making the arrangements. It was noted that this was the last meeting that [REDACTED] would be attending, as he will be retiring shortly. [REDACTED] has been an active member of the DUFERC since 1998. The current members expressed their appreciation to [REDACTED] for the many years that he has served on the committee and all wish him a long and happy retirement

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

With the exception of the second mis-spelling of [REDACTED] surname, the minutes were accepted as a true record.

3. Matters arising

3.1 Actions

35/1 Action completed

35/2 Disposal of DU Action on [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] of the GVIU has been working on the disposal issues and is going to give a presentation to the MOD DU Working Group on the 18th June 04. The broader issues were briefly discussed and it was stated that the British Embassy in Washington needs to see a clear commitment to dispose of this material using the US route if it is to progress the matter further. It was also stated that the disposal should include other surplus DU items held at Longtown and Fort Halstead.

[REDACTED] stated that DTEG need to be involved in these discussions. He was aware that [REDACTED] the interface between QinetiQ and DTEG has various concerns, particularly with regard to the forthcoming closure of the DU facility at Fort Halstead and the decommissioning of both that facility and the [REDACTED]

██████████ stated that ██████████ of DTEG would be present at the DUWG meeting on the 18th.

██████████ explained that QinetiQ's decision to close the Fort Halstead DU facility was based on the MODs decision to removed it from their strategic facilities list. As such it no longer has an MOD requirement or funding. QinetiQ has no business case to keep it so it will therefore close.

35/3 VJ Decommissioning Survey Progress. Action on ██████████

██████████ stated that he had been in contact with the project manager, ██████████. The funding issue was now resolved.

██████████ confirmed that this was the case however other MOD work requirements may mean that the survey is postponed further.
Action Closed

35/4 DU Fragments at Kirkcudbright. Action on ██████████

██████████ replied that in ██████████ absence he was unable to answer this question but would take an action to speak to his colleague and obtain the answer for the committee.

NB See final notes

4. **Eskmeals Report.** ██████████

4.1 For the benefit of new members of the committee T ██████████ and ██████████ gave an overview of the differences in previous DU firing requirement between Eskmeals and Kirkcudbright, they also went on to explain that Eskmeals/VJ is within the 25 year Long Term Partnering Arrangement contract between the MOD and QinetiQ as opposed to Kirkcudbright which is an Army Training Area, with the exception of the Electro Magnetic Launch Facility which is an MOD Strategic Facility operated by QinetiQ

4.2 ██████████ and ██████████ went on to explain that future DU proof firings could be carried out at the Kirkcudbright by the army with Health Physics support from QinetiQ.

4.3 ██████████ reported that very little other than routine controlled area maintenance had occurred at VJ Battery within the period since the last meeting however a proposal has been made to carry out work on behalf of the MOD. This work will not involve firing but could well interfere with the plan to carry out a pre decommissioning survey. It is likely that the survey will be postponed until after the MOD work is complete.

5. **Kirkcudbright Report.** ██████████

5.1 ██████████ reported that no firings had occurred since the last meeting and he was still awaiting the DRPS visit to the DU Garden.

5.2 He went on to say that there had been some press activity in which the reporter raised an observation that the army had issued DU information cards to service personnel in the Gulf but the civilian population surrounding Kirkcudbright Range had not received them.

- 5.3 [REDACTED] added that the previously raised concerns held by the media had been raised with the EC but the European Commission had stated that there was no scientific basis to the matters raised.
- 5.4 [REDACTED] asked if information was passed to the public. The committee was in agreement that it was. Through the published environmental reports and a policy of involvement with the local council.
- 5.5 [REDACTED] raised the issue of the approach to SEPA to reduce the current environmental sampling programme. Although it had been, apparently well received he reported that he had not heard anything further from them to date.
- 5.6 [REDACTED] stated that there could be a future problem with regard to firing into the sea as the OSPAR agreement stated now that it was illegal to dump waste into the sea. There was some discussion surrounding the wording and [REDACTED] stated that currently we worked to the D SEF Pol interpretation that the projectiles were placements not dumping.

6. DRPS Report. [REDACTED]

- 6.1 [REDACTED] stated that as he was not part of the DU research team he was not able to report on the research programme
- 6.2 On the subject of the VJ Decommissioning survey he felt that given the MOD requirement to use VJ the survey would be delayed by at least 18 months. With regard to the proposal to close the DU Facility at Fort Halstead he stated that DRPS had been approached to quote for the cost and likely timescale for a pre decommissioning survey of the storage facility, swaging workshop and polishing labs
- 6.3 [REDACTED] asked when the outstanding reports would be ready. [REDACTED] replied that they would be published very soon.
- 6.4 [REDACTED] asked for clarification regarding who would be responsible for the reports' distribution. He was advised that it had been agreed that this was DTEG's responsibility.
- 6.5 [REDACTED] asked if GVIU were on the circulation list and which reports were now outstanding. [REDACTED] took an action to report back to the GVIU

Action 36 .1 [REDACTED] to give GVIU sit rep on current status of the DU Environmental Reports.

- 6.6 [REDACTED] asked if the problems regarding getting the publication of these reports had been overcome.
- 6.7 [REDACTED] stated that DRPS had clarified the lines of responsibility and there should be no further significant problems.
- 6.8 [REDACTED] asked what the British Geological Surveys input was to the DU research programme.
- 6.9 [REDACTED] replied that they were contracted to DRPS
- 6.10 [REDACTED] agreed that he would supply information on the DU research programme.

Action 36.2. [REDACTED] to issue information pack on the DU Research Programme to the committee.

7. Any other business

7.1 [REDACTED] asked for clarification regarding the renewal of the RPA contract with DRPS

7.2 [REDACTED] replied that the new contract was to be streamlined to give better visibility of costs. This would be achieved by having a single contract managed by the [REDACTED] through a cost code for each activity.

8. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting will be on the 08/09/04 to be held at QinetiQ Farnborough commencing at 1030hrs.

Summary of outstanding actions

34/7 - suggestion that it would be prudent to invite a QinetiQ FHD representative to attend the next meeting. ✓

35/1 - Arrange meeting with DRPS/CESO ✓

35/2 - Removal of DU plates ✓

36/1 - Sit rep on Environmental reports to GVIU ✓ *action on me Talk to DTEC*

36/2 - DRPS to produce information pack on DU Research Programme - *Info From [REDACTED]*

Supplement

Following the meeting [REDACTED] supplied the following information from [REDACTED] DRPS

British Geological Survey (BGS) Checking the geology surrounding the DU gardens at Eskmeals and Kirkcudbright. This is important as the soil conditions will have a radical effect on the behaviour of the samples. The report is not yet complete

The collection of the DU samples has been deferred as it is not yet known what the National Environmental Research Council requirements for the sample are. The only impact that this will have on the research by extending the sampling time will be to improve the statistical accuracy of the information gained

The British Geological Survey task is to investigate the geology of the two sites and the effects of the corrosion on the environments surrounding the samples to gain a better understanding of the transportation of DU through that environment.

Distribution:

All present

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

File ESK/327/001

[REDACTED]

08/07/04