

Memorandum

Large
and
ASSOCIATES

Consulting Engineers The Gatehouse 1-2 Repository Road Ha Ha Rd London SE18 4BQ ☎ 44[0]20 8317 2860 fax [0]20 8317 2859
largeassociates@largeassociates.com

To: **Glen Bridge** NII Information Officer M3185-A34
From: **John H Large** 19 January 2010
Cc: David Hoadley – SCANS
Subject: **SOTONSAFE – 4TH REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

I refer to your e-mail of 18 December 2009 (Ref 2009110149) and to the enclosed report Health & Safety Executive Nuclear Directorate Assessment Report ND Div.3A AE No. 35/08, Trim Folder 4.4.1.356, File Reference 2008/616012.

- 1) The report includes a number of redactions throughout the text and, particularly, to the table of page 6. Excepting that the names of individuals have been redacted, which I accept that the names of individuals might be redacted, please confirm or otherwise that for the remaining text and table redactions:
 - a) qualified exemption or exemptions that have been engaged in justifying the redactions;
 - b) if, for each qualified exemption so engaged, a public interest test has been undertaken; and
 - c) if the balance of for public interest test(s) has properly determined that the information so redacted should have been redacted.
- 2) In paragraph 3 of Section 2, page 4, the author of the report states and apparently relies upon his or her own technical knowledge of the submarine plant “. . . *My technical knowledge of the submarine plant was used to question and challenge the assessment findings to ensure that a comprehensive review had been undertaken* . . .”. Accordingly, please provide:
 - d) the basis of the author’s ‘*technical knowledge*’ of submarine nuclear propulsion plant (ie was he a Mechanical Engineering Officer serving on board a nuclear powered submarine, was he or she previously engaged in the maintenance and/or design of submarine nuclear plant, or engaged at the nuclear plant testing station HMS *Vulcan*, and so on);
 - e) the *Class* or *Classes* of submarine to which this ‘*technical experience*’ specifically relates; and
 - f) what, if any, other sources of information about the design and performance of naval nuclear plant was provided to the author in questioning and challenging the assessment findings.

- 3) Please note that related to item f) above, I am still awaiting a response to items a) to g) of my earlier request M3185-A26 of 9 December 2009 – noting that 26 or so working days have passed since your receipt of my request, please state whether you are seeking additional time to test for Qualified Exemptions in this request?

In your response, please refer to my order of itemisation above.