

**NOTES OF JOINT EMERGENCY PLANNING AND  
RISK ASSESSMENT WORK GROUP MEETING  
HELD AT TEBAY ON 17<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2001**

**ATTENDANCE:** K Raeburn - bp Chmicals Ltd  
R White - Fina  
N Jackson - Transco  
R McConnell - ICI Eutech  
K Thomas - Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Ltd  
R Ellis - Shell UK Ltd  
J Haswell - Transco - Chairman  
P.Jones - PIE - Secretary

1. **ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING – 13<sup>th</sup> March 2001**

(Note of Previous Meeting in brackets)

1.1 **UKOPA Position Statement on Public Awareness (2.1)**

A position statement on public awareness prepared by the EP WG was issued at the main UKOPA meeting. No comments had been received. It was confirmed this is now accepted as the UKOPA position.

1.2 **Lancaster University Report – Public Awareness (2.2)**

KT reported that he had viewed the document and considered that UKOPA's decision not to be involved in the study was correct. Several issues covered would have given pipeline operators problems. KT will issue a short note summarising the specific issues for pipelines.

**Action : K.Thomas**

1.3 **PERO Register (2.3)**

WPJ noted that KT had summarised numbers of attendees and course dates. KT to provide names for specific courses.

**Action : K.Thomas**

1.4 **Inclusion of PERO Course in UKOPA Competency Framework (2.4)**

JVH reported that the competency profile had been circulated as part of the UKOPA Competency Framework (UKOPA/01/0042). REllis raised the issue of reassessment / refresher training. Following discussion and

consideration of various suggestions, it was agreed that this could be achieved through a one day seminar which would revisit the original training agenda, consider changes in legislation etc. and review users' experiences. It was agreed this seminar would have to be advertised at long notice and possibly use one of the lecturers from the original training course. KT to raise with Jim Watson of the Fire Services College.

**Action: K.Thomas**

1.5 **Incident Definition (2.5)**

**Action outstanding – K.Thomas**

1.6 **UKOPA Response to HSE (N Briscoe) Paper to MHSC / ACDS (3.1)**

JVH reported this action is outstanding but will be progressed as a priority.

**Action outstanding – J Haswell**

Circulation of the paper to members

WPJ reported that this had been actioned.

Confirmation of ACDS decision re PSR Amendments

WPJ reported this had been confirmed at the previous UKOPA meeting.

Contact with Home Office / DTI / DETR

JVH reported this action was outstanding but would be progressed as a priority.

**Action outstanding – J Haswell**

1.7 **Costs of Testing of Emergency Plans (5)**

WPJ reported that the UKOPA emergency plan test cost estimates had been circulated to UKOPA members as UKOPA/01/0035. No further comments had been received and it was agreed that these would now represent the UKOPA cost estimates. JVH to submit to HSE. It was agreed that this submission should draw attention to the fact that UKOPA is aware of issues arising which are not specifically covered in the cost estimates, for example, the need for Local Authorities to carry out risk assessments for live play exercises.

**Action : J Haswell**

1.8 **London Emergency Services Liaison Panel(LESLP) (6)**

RE / WPJ recommended that this action be rolled into the discussion on the UKOPA influencing Strategy.

1.9 **Gasoline Pipelines (7)**

R White is now a member of the Work Group.

1.10 **Pipelines Valves (8)**

WPJ reported this action was ongoing.

**Action : P. Jones**

1.11 **AC Corrosion (9.2)**

Action completed.

All other actions were covered under main agenda items.

2. **UPDATE AND ACTIONS ON EMERGENCY PLANNING INFLUENCING STRATEGY**

Progress with the strategy outlined at the last meeting was reviewed. It was noted that all main actions were ongoing. It was agreed that the priority action was to influence the development of an ACoP. RW requested further background and an update on progress. JVH reported that at the last UKOPA meeting, A Thayne had stated that he was unaware of any developments within HSE but he had noted there were two ways to influence the development of an ACoP. The first was for an interested stakeholder group to produce a draft which could be reviewed through formal consultation. The second was for HSE to action a draft which again would be reviewed through consultation. It was agreed that UKOPA should take the initiative in the development of an ACoP.

KT suggested that the EP Work Group could request funding to place a contract to ensure the development was progressed, and recommended this would be a way of influencing the position of proactively influencing the position. RE confirmed agreement and stated that this route could attract additional funding from HSE. Consideration was given to a suitable person to progress the work in accordance with a tightly written specification / framework within a given timescale. NJ recommended that existing accepted documents be included in the work, for example the guidance document on COMAH, Emergency Plan Testing,

recently published Home Office Guidelines on Best Practice on Emergency Plan Testing, and the LESLP document. He recommended that these documents should be reviewed to extract what is relevant to pipelines to avoid the introduction of new thinking. This was agreed. NJ agreed to circulate the reference for the COMAH guidance document.

**Action : N.Jackson**

Regarding a contact to progress the work, KR suggested Mike Humphreys (ex BP) who was currently working under contract to prepare emergency plans for the *Forties* pipeline system. KR agreed to contact Mike Humphreys to discuss.

**Action : K. Raeburn**

JVH suggested that in order to develop the specification, a special meeting / workshop may be needed to distill the findings of a review and prepare the specification to the Work Group's requirements. This was agreed. WPJ was asked to carry out a review and draft a framework for the workshop.

**Action : P. Jones**

It was agreed the workshop would be held on Monday, 29<sup>th</sup> October at Ambergate. WPJ to organise.

**Action : P. Jones**

Other attendees to be invited would be HSE (A Thayne) and in addition P Williams, I Prestwich and M Dixon of Transco, all of whom were involved in the organisation of the pilot test.

**Action : J Haswell**

**3. UKOPA COSTS OF EMERGENCY PLAN TESTS**

The existing cost estimates have been agreed as the UKOPA position. The EP WG will review on an ongoing basis and include additional items (such as cost of risk assessments etc) as necessary.

**Action : All**

4. **IMPACT ON GASOLINE PIPELINES**

RW requested copies of notes of previous meetings of the EPWG.

**Action : P.Jones**

5. **SIESO WORKSHOP – 24<sup>TH</sup>/25<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

JVH circulated correspondence from Geoff Essery of SIESO regarding input to a joint SIESO / COMAH Competent Authorities Workshop to be held at Easingwold on 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> September 2001. G Essery was keen to obtain pipeline operator input and JVH had agreed to raise it with UKOPA. The outline agenda of the workshop was reviewed. Several Work Group Members were aware of the workshop and planned to attend. Following discussion, it was agreed that this workshop could form part of the UKOPA influencing strategy. RE proposed that JVH should present the key recommendations and influencing strategies of the UKOPA EP WG on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the seminar. This was agreed by the Group, and ratification will be sought at the UKOPA meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> September. JVH agreed to draft presentation material ready for review at the main meeting on 12<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup> September.

**Action : J.Haswell**

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS – EPWG**

6.1 **Emergency Plan Test Simulation**

NJ reported that Transco is looking at an IT internet based system to stimulate emergency plan tests. It is based on a chat room model with keyboard input replacing telephone contact and event injects. One of the advantages is that the input from all parties can be obtained from their current place of work and that a log of events is available at the end of the exercise. The initiative was discussed. Strong support and requests for further information were made by the Group. RE suggested that this would be ideal for testing the diagnostic period of an emergency. JVH asked whether Transco would be able to share more information with UKOPA. NJ agreed to investigate the possibility of giving a demonstration to UKOPA.

**Action : N. Jackson**

## 6.2 Terms of Reference

NJ referred to the terms of reference of the EPWG prepared prior to the main meeting. These were reviewed and it was agreed that all key items are being addressed. NJ suggested that in order to ensure the Group complies with its terms of reference, future agendas and minutes should reflect a format based on the terms of reference. This was agreed.

## 6.3 Chairman

JVH reported that Transco had agreed that she should continue as Chairman as representative of Transco. This was agreed as acceptable to all members. It was proposed that JVH's position on the Emergency Planning and Risk Assessment Work Group (as a non-pipeline operating company contractor) should be raised at the next Management Group Meeting. WPJ to check rules in the articles regarding input and contribution to Work Groups.

**Action : P. Jones**

## 7. MHSC PIPELINES SUB GROUP

JVH handed over to RMcI to lead discussions on the MHSC Pipelines Sub Group.

RMc reviewed the background to the RAWG. This was one of the original UKOPA Work groups. The original representation included Steve Hall of BP, Tony Gillard of Shell, Mike Brown of Transco and R McConnell of Huntsman. RMc referred to the terms of reference of the Group. It was agreed these terms of reference continued to be relevant and that the Work Group has made significant progress on key items. Current representation in the Group included RMc as Chairman, K Thomas on behalf of Huntsman, Phil Joyner on behalf of BP and JVH on behalf of Transco. RMc invited NJ to join the Group. NJ agreed.

RW suggested that Peter Davies, BPA should be considered as a member. This was agreed. RW to review with P Davies. This would enable representation of gasoline pipeline interests. NJ proposed that the EPWG and RAWG be held as back to back meetings on the same day in future as the majority of the membership of both groups was common. This was agreed. RW proposed to speak to P Davies on representation as P Davies had expressed specific interest in the membership of the RAWG as this deals with planning matters. He would agree single representation at both Work Groups with P Davies.

**Action : R. White**

RE commented that now that gasoline pipelines were to be progressed as MHAPs, all land use planning matters could be dealt with HSE through one UKOPA forum. JVH tabled papers received from K Allars regarding the proposal for the Pipelines Sub Group to MHSC (paper by N Briscoe) and a proposal that the Chairman be Gordon Walker of Stafford University and the Technical Secretary be Jane Haswell of UKOPA. This proposal has been formally accepted by the MHSC. JVH intends making contact with Gordon Walker to set up a briefing meeting (with RMc) and possibly N Briscoe.

**Action : J. Haswell**

It was noted that K Allars proposed that the first Pipelines Sub Group meeting should be held late September / early October. The current proposed membership list excludes the two Transco representatives previously suggested. JVH agreed to check the position regarding Transco representation (considered important as Transco has agreed to hand over all information on the joint programme of work with HSE to the Pipelines Sub Group) and, in addition, to confirm the funding of the secretariat.

**Action : J. Haswell**

Membership of the Pipelines Sub Group was summarised as follows:

Chairman: Dr Gordon Walker

Technical Secretary: Dr Jane Haswell

Membership:

HSE: N Briscoe  
R Turner

UKOPA: TD/1: P Siddals  
BS8010: M Harrison  
Gasoline: P Davies

Independents: R McConnell (Professor, Newcastle University)  
S Thomas or J Coppack  
(Technical representative – PIG)

RMc agreed to propose the above membership to HSE in response to an e-mail he had received from K Allars dated 6<sup>th</sup> July.

**Action : R. McConnell**

The strategy for involvement in the Pipelines Sub Group was considered. Proposals to run a mirror UKOPA Group were considered, however as it had been agreed to run the EPWG and RAWG as consecutive meetings, it was felt that this Group would provide the key interface. This Group would ensure that the Management Committee be properly informed of all issues. RMc went on to consider the agenda for the first meeting of the Pipelines Sub Group. To do this, he referred to the key objectives of the UKOPA Risk Assessment Work Group updated August 2001. These objectives were considered in detail.

Following a discussion, it was agreed that the UKOPA principles for the application of risk assessment to land use planning should be expanded to cover use of risk assessment generally. RMc agreed to produce a paper on this basis, supported by relevant reference documents and proposed that this paper should be submitted to the first meeting of the Pipelines Sub Group. This was agreed.

**Action : R. McConnell**

In order to support and progress discussion of difficult risk based issues through this Group, RMc suggested that an operational library of difficult planning issues, together with the outcome of discussions with HSE, should be kept as reference material for use by the Group. This was agreed. Transco, Shell and BP representatives to produce list and summary details of such cases.

**Action : N.Jackson / K.Raeburn / R. Ellis**

RMc requested whether any representatives had access to a mishap paper produced by M Bilo some time ago. He considered this was likely to be important in discussions with HSE at the Work Group. NJ and WPJ agreed to investigate.

**Action : N.Jackson /P.Jones**

RMc noted that UKOPA should seek to find out more detail of how HSE applies their internal procedure for dealing with planning applications referred to them under the Consult category. JVH to formally request this through HSE.

**Action : J.Haswell**

RMc to prepare the paper on the UKOPA principles for the use of risk assessment for circulation at the next UKOPA meeting.

**Action : R.McConnell**

RMc agreed to circulate a list of key papers for review by the Risk Assessment Work Group in preparation for input to the Pipelines Sub Group.

**Action : R.McConnell**

RMc to prepare a key list of who's who in HSE for reference by the Risk Assessment Work Group in dealings with the Pipelines Sub Group.

**Action : R.McConnell****8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS – RAWG****8.1 Additional Amendments to PSR**

NJ suggested that the RAWG should undertake to progress amendment of PSR, in particular where absolute duties as opposed to reasonably practicable duties apply. WPJ stated that UKOPA had raised this issue previously with HSE and agreed to write to N Briscoe to question progress.

**Action : P.Jones****8.2 MAPDs**

NJ suggested that it might be worth pipeline operators sharing the format of their MAPDs on a confidential basis so that best practice can be identified. He summarised some of the difficulties that Transco had experienced discussing its MAPD with HSE. Huntsman, BP and Shell representatives confirmed that their company approach was to develop umbrella documents which referred to company safety management procedures. Members to consider the value of sharing this information and, if interested, to forward a copy of the company MAPD on a confidential basis to JVH who agreed to review and present key factors to the Group.

**Action : J.Haswell****8.3 Pipeline Damage by Lightning**

KT referred to the incident highlighted by RMc involving a lightning strike to a pipeline. He noted ICI had had a previous example and requested whether other UK pipeline operators were aware of the possibility. WPJ noted that Transco had had significant experience of lightning strikes at installations but was not aware of any pipeline damage that had resulted. RMc to circulate reference details to members.

**Action : R.McConnell**

**9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that the workshop scheduled for 29<sup>th</sup> October would not enable sufficient time for joint meetings of the EPWG and RAWG. In this instance, it was therefore agreed that the RAWG would be held immediately after the Fault Data Management Group Meeting scheduled for 31<sup>st</sup> October at Loughborough.