

**Minutes of the Forty Second Depleted Uranium Environmental Review
Committee (DUFERC) Meeting held at INM Alverstoke on the 8th February 2006**

Present:

██████████	██████████ (Acting Chairman
██████████	and Secretary)
██████████	For ██████████
██████████	SO2 RAD (CESO A)
██████████	DSTL QQ RPA
██████████	DSTL RPA
██████████	MOD DTEG
██████████	MOD Commandant KTA

Apologies: ██████████ ██████████

1. Introduction

- 1.1 ██████████ welcomed the committee to Alverstoke and introduced ██████████ as his replacement, as he is to retire in June of this year. He went on to give the rationale behind ██████████'s selection as his replacement, explaining that ██████████ had considerable expertise in the field of DU, as he had previously been a member of the MOD DU Working Group (DUWG)
- 1.2 ██████████ gave a short presentation of the work that he had carried out as a member of the DUWG. Of particular interest to the DUFERC was his knowledge of the DU Oversight Board and the results from the MoD's DU in urine sampling programme. ██████████ asked ██████████ if the analysis was sensitive enough to be able to detect the presence of uranium after several years had elapsed since exposure. ██████████ confirmed that if the magnitude of the exposure was great enough to have an impact on health, the analysis could accurately detect uranium in urine, even twenty years after exposure. ██████████ went on to explain that he had been approached by the occupational health department at BAE, who had an employee who had concerns about his exposure during the development of DU munitions. ██████████ said he would ensure that the service would be made available to BAE if they could give him contact details for the individual.

2. Previous minutes and Matters arising

2.1 Actions

- 41/2 ██████████ to include ██████████ onto the DUFERC minutes distribution.

Action Complete

- 41/3 ██████████ and ██████████ was to ensure that PR and Radiation Safety and Environmental issues are discussed and addressed at the planning stage for future proof firings of DU.

confirmed that such a dialogue was now in place.

asked if this was to be a similar exercise to that carried out at Kirkcudbright in 2002.

There was some general discussion about the differences in requirement between that planned and that had been carried out in 2002

stated that it had yet been decided if the firing was to be carried out by Eskmeals (QQ) or the Army. If it were the Army, who would be carrying out the Environmental and Health Physics aspects of the work?

commented that it was important that this support activity was included, as it gave the local authorities confidence in the MODs commitment to safety.

Action on going

41/4 to pass copy of Environmental Presentation to

Action Complete

41/5 to invite of Fort Halstead to attend the DUFERC

This action had not yet been completed. However felt that his appointment to the DUFERC would fulfil the same role as he too was closely involved with the MOD DU Research Programme. added that the future of the programme was yet to be decided and felt this could be addressed at the next DUFERC and therefore after the Tidworth DU Forum where the results and findings of the programme would be presented and its future discussed.

Action Closed

41/6 to report on the status of the outstanding Environmental Reports for Eskmeals.

reported that the reports for 1999 to 2005 had suffered from problems with technical review. These had now been overcome and a single report was to be produced. The task of producing the compendium report had been allocated and was on track. There was some discussion regarding the circulation of the report and it was decided that it would be as follows

- Eskmeals 3 copies
- QQ Corporate 2 copies
- DTEG MOD 1 copy
- Army RSO 3 Copies (to be forwarded KTA and House of Commons)

asked if the DSTL reports for KTA contained data that would be of use for future safety cases.

replied that that they did.

went on to ask if there were any outstanding reports for KTA.

said that samples for 2005 were now in the Alverstoke labs.

████ asked if the results from the deer kidney could be included with the 2005 report
████ said that he would see if this would be possible.
████ went on to ask if it was known whether the remainder of the culled deer had gone into the food chain.
████ stated that he thought this was very likely.
████ asked for conformation that the kidney was the target organ for DU.
████ confirmed this but added that DU would also lodge in the skeleton.
████ agreed with this but added that analysis of DU in bone was extremely difficult, as there was no known standard for natural uranium in bone.

Action Complete

41/7 **Action for █████ and █████ to request funding for Kirkcudbright Environmental Scoping Survey from DU Working Group**

████ had approached the DUWG at its last meeting. Unfortunately no funds were available.

████ pointed out the VPU could not fund non military work. However surely Defence Estates should be responsible for land Quality issues on MOD property.

████ stated that he thought there were some desk top surveys and took an action to approach Defence Estates regarding land quality assessments for MOD ranges

Action Complete

Action 42/1 █████ to approach Defence Estates on the subject of Land Quality Surveys for MOD Ranges

3. **Kirkcudbright Report. Presented by █████**

3.1 █████ reported that the DSTL annual marine survey for this year had been carried out but was incomplete due to bad weather.

████ of Oxford University had been in contact with him and had notified him that the NERC environmental survey was due to start in May 2006.

In addition to this, the Local Authority were also due to carry out their survey on the Training Area.

Regarding the DSTL proposals for future environmental monitoring set out in █████ presentation, he considered that they were broadly acceptable but he could foresee PR issues related to the taking of bovine/milk samples, as the farmers might perceive this change of protocol as an indication that there was a cause for concern

████ agreed with this concern and stated that he felt that there was no justification for this sampling, because there was no evidence from the existing protocol to suggest that livestock might be grazing on contaminated pasture.

████ agreed and added that he felt game was a more realistic target for sampling, as livestock was kept away from the contaminated areas, whereas wild animals roamed freely over the range

████ Stated that he considered that this too was unnecessary, as there was no evidence of any DU contamination of grass at Kirkcudbright.

████ Agreed that this was the case but still considered that sampling from game would provide good reassurance

█████ disagreed and said that it was too random to have any scientific basis
█████ asked if there were any more reliable indicators such as fungus, but █████
said not.
█████ stated that he felt that game sampling would have a good reassurance
value.
█████ commented that the public perception of a broader approach would be
positive.
█████ stated that, from the corporate standpoint, he did not want to see any
inclusion of farm stock sampling but was not against some sampling of game,
as game was being culled in any case.
█████ agreed and suggested that it would be sensible to defer this discussion
until we had the results from the deer kidney that was currently with the
laboratory.
█████ supported this and it was agreed by the committee.
█████ added, as an aside, that it would make an interesting study to graze
sheep on the contaminated areas and carry out a controlled sampling of their
uptake, if any.

- 3.2 █████ Finished with a reference to a recent television programme, written by a
neighbour, of the Kirkcudbright training area concerning an alleged cover up
of DU exposure in the Gulf.

4. **Eskmeals Report.** █████

█████ Gave the committee an update concerning the projects being undertaken
at Eskmeals

- 4.1 █████ asked what methodology had been adopted regarding the assessment of
DU in waste arising from the dismantling of DU contaminated vehicles.
█████ replied that at present there were no arisings, as the work had not yet
started, however the proposed method was to use simple direct monitoring
based assessment.
█████ added that the overall assessment (i.e. total DU to be consigned to the
Drigg LLW repository) could be simply based on the principle that the DU
content of the vehicle, pre-destruction, was known and that the activity of the
ammunition removed was also known. The difference between the two could
therefore be taken to equate to the waste arisings.
█████ thanked █████ for that but pointed out that that only held true for the heavy
armoured vehicle, so how would it be calculated for the light armoured
vehicle?
█████ replied that was yet to be addressed.

5. **DSTL Report**

█████ felt that this had been covered under Paragraph 2 Previous ref 41/6

6. **Any other business**

█████ drew the committees notice to █████ forthcoming
retirement and stated that he wondered if the DUFERC would like to join him
in thanking █████ for his considerable contribution to the work of the
committee. The committee was in full agreement with █████ thanking █████ and
wishing him a long and happy retirement.

7. **Date of next meeting**

The next DUFERC meeting will therefore be held at 10:00, on Wednesday, 14th June 2006, at Kirkcudbright Training Area.

Summary of outstanding actions

Action 41/3. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are to ensure that Radiation Safety and Environmental issues are addressed with regard to future firings of DU at KTA

Action 42/1. [REDACTED] approach Defence Estates on the subject of future (DU) land quality surveys for MOD ranges

Distribution:

All present+

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

File ESK/327/001

[REDACTED]
16/03/06