

Issues HSE wishes to be raised with witnesses not attending.

Gordon Bell - witness 9 on the Index

Paragraph 33 - The witness discusses quotations for new pipework in the period prior to explosion. Further detail on this would be helpful. Does Mr Bell know what was to be replaced?

(Relevance - this relates directly to ICL considering a requirement to replace the pipework in the period prior to explosion). This issue could also usefully be put to William Masterton.

Paragraphs 40-44

The witness comments on the use of the basement. These comments appear to be contradictory clarification would be helpful. What was the valve in the basement? When did that situation end? When did the new tank referred to arrive (para 44).

(Relevance - at the time of the explosion LPG collected within the basement and the previous use of the basement is of interest. Further, it shows that the use of the basement appears to be related to the use of LPG.

Paragraph 56 - The witness talks in his statement about using an on/off switch in the basement - this is unclear and needs further explanation.

(Relevance - this relates to the use of the LPG oven and it is relevant to how the LPG was used)

Witness James McGoldrick (witness 8) gives evidence of the gas cylinders being present but says they were never used. Can this witness be asked about the cylinders and the frequency of their use, and how they came to be there?

(Relevance - the cylinders were another source of LPG on site and have so far been unexplored.)

Can this witness be asked about the "putrid" or "rotten egg" smell, as well as the rusted pipework mentioned by witness Ian Mavers? *(see below)*.

Can this witness be asked about the evidence given by James Smith in relation to the smell and the difficulties which were apparently present in the LPG system? *(see below)*

(Relevance - both of these points are important in terms of his knowledge of the LPG system.)

James McGoldrick - witness 8 on the Index

Paragraph 31 - the witness refers to "corroded pipework" at paragraph 33 - can this be clarified and expanded. How long was the corrosion present and where exactly does he recall there being corrosion?

(Relevance - corroded pipework resulted in a leak and it is important to know what this witness' evidence is)

Paragraphs 32 -33 - the witness refers to the "two cylinders" beside the tank. Can the use of the cylinders be expanded upon.

(Relevance - cylinders bring another source of LPG on site and as such need to be explained)

Paragraphs 34 - 35 - the witness discusses workload when he comments he would have to check he had enough supply for a particular job. Did the overtime and late working occur in the period just prior to the explosion?

(Relevance - this may go some way to explain the volume of gas being used. Further explanation of when this occurred and how often would allow the Inquiry to have a full picture of the work done on site and, in particular, work using LPG.)

In the statement given to the police this witness referred to pipework being replaced. This is not replicated in his Inquiry statement and we would like to understand his position on that.

(Relevance - what pipework was being considered for replacement and why?)

James Baxter - witness 14 on the Index

Paragraphs 11 - 14 This witness discusses "hissing" from a gas cylinder. What does he mean?

(Relevance - hissing would normally signify a leak and this does not appear to be normal otherwise.)

Paragraphs 9 - 13 The witness refers to a "Jimmy". Who is that? We would wish to ask "Jimmy" why the hissing was seen as normal.

(Relevance - as above)

Ian Mavers - witness 13 on the index

Paragraphs 23 - 25. - This witness comments on a "smell" present on the Thursday prior to the explosion. The smell is described as putrid and as "a rotten egg" smell. The stanching agent in the LPG was Ethyl Mercaptan which typically has a sulphurous smell. Who/what did he advise about this and what was done?

(Relevance - if the stanching agent was indeed present the week prior to the explosion this may have represented a lost opportunity to prevent the explosion.)

Paragraph 23 - the witness refers in his statement to "Peter" and "Stewart". Can he confirm who they are?

(Relevance - they seem to have looked for a source to the smell referred to above. It will, in due course, be relevant to ask them what they found.)

Paragraph 46 - the witness talks of pipes being replaced. What does he mean and could we have clarified what they were and whether quotes were obtained. This question could also be addressed to William Masterton and to Ian Mavers.

(Relevance - this shows the ICL attitude to and knowledge of the pipes to the LPG oven.)

James Smith - witness 11 on the Index

Paragraph 14 - Can he clarify this? He is referring to difficulties with the LPG system but has not detailed those.

(Relevance - these difficulties point to knowledge of issues with the pipework and LPG system.)

Paragraph 28 - The witness talks of complaints made by Jim aitken on the mezzanine floor - who is he and why has he not been called? Can we have information about him?

(Relevance - he has information about gas leaks in the period prior to the explosion.)

Andrew Galloway - witness 12 on the index

Paragraph 27 - what is meant by "ground floor". Which valve is he referring to?

(Relevance - it is important to understand what he is describing in terms of the LPG system. Currently the evidence is confused).

Paragraph 29 - Reference is made to J MacNicols. Who is this? Is it a person or a firm?

(Relevance - it is important to know who had access to the LPG system, what they saw, what they reported and what cognisance ICL took of that information. It may have a bearing on the knowledge of the deterioration of the pipework.)

Paragraph 48 - this evidence is linked to the evidence of a "smell" given by Ian Mavers (above). The witness should be asked for clarification as to the smell of the sealant, and as to enquiries made of him by others.

Relevance - this evidence will assist in distinguishing the smell on the roof from the "putrid" smell, if indeed there was a difference. It will also go to show the efforts made by those on behalf of ICL as to their efforts to establish the source of the "putrid" smell in the few days prior to the explosion.

Paragraph 68 - this witness discusses two LPG cylinders appearing. He should be asked for clarification of this. Why were they needed? How often were they used?

Relevance - this is another source of LPG on site and it is important to the Inquiry to know how often these cylinders are utilised.

Paragraph 69 - Can he clarify this any further? What was tested, exactly?

Relevance - why was this done? Did it signify difficulties with the LPG system? Or doubts over the integrity of the system? This is an important point to consider in relation to the terms of reference.

<p>supply of LPG and install a new tank</p>	<p>(is this to be read out?)</p> <p>Betts</p>	<p>pipe work? (Irons para 53)</p> <p>Maurice Colville's statement contains no information how Calor ensured that the compromise, once agreed with HSE would be implemented and in particular how the employee exchanging the tanks would know to perform the pressure test and examination of the riser pipe. How was that communicated to the fitter?</p> <p>Keith Young states, when shown Colville's letter that "this is the standard Calor response, although I would expect HSE to respond." Did Calor have a standard approach in responding to HSE or customer when the integrity of buried pipework carrying LPG was raised by the HSE?</p> <p>How would pressure test be carried out if there is no isolation valve? Irons says at para 15 there was none at ICL, yet Doyle states at para 17 that the supply would normally be turned off at the isolation valve</p>
<p>Throughout the period 1969 - 2004 what training on safety standards was given the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales staff • The fitters • The delivery drivers, <p>How was compliance with that training monitored?</p>	<p>Young</p> <p>Irons</p> <p>Inglis</p> <p>Elliott</p>	<p>Witnesses speak to policies and procedures which Calor had in place but provide no information about training given to drivers, fitters and salesmen nor about monitoring and review of compliance with the policies and procedures</p>

