

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT CLEATOR MOOR CIVIC AND MASONIC CENTRE
ON THURSDAY 7th JANUARY 2010**

Present:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Mr D Humphreys | - | Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning |
| Dr I Hudson | - | Nuclear Decommissioning Authority |
| Mr W G Poulson | - | Sellafield Limited |
| Mr P Shawcross | - | Prospect Union |
| Mr R Raaz | - | LLWR |
| Mr R Hargreaves | - | Community representative |
| Mr P Kane | - | GMB |
| Mr L Naylor | - | Civil Nuclear Constabulary |
| Dr P McKenna | - | Isle of Man Government |
| Mr D Weatherburn | - | Nuclear Decommissioning Authority |
| Mr M McMullen | - | Studsvik UK |
| Mr P Mann | - | Sellafield Ltd |
| Mr David Moore | - | Chairman |
| Mr Ranald Stewart | - | Ponsonby Parish Council |
| Lindsay Gray | - | Churches Forum |
| Mr W A Anderton | - | NMP |
| Cllr N Clarkson | - | Cumbria County Council |
| Mr P Daley | - | Allerdale Borough Council |
| Cllr M Davidson | - | Allerdale Borough Council |
| Mr P Tyson | - | Whitehaven & District Trades Council |
| Mr B Hamilton | - | NDA |
| Ms S Williams | - | WCSSG Secretariat |
| Cllr T Knowles | - | Cumbria County Council |
| Cllr E Woodburn | - | Copeland Borough Council |
| Cllr A Holliday | - | Copeland Borough Council |
| Ms F Wilson | - | Sellafield Ltd |
| Ms J Forman | - | INS |

Presenters:

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| Nancy Lawton | - | EA |
| Dave Loudon | - | Sellafield Ltd – (representing West Cumbria Vision) |

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and wished everyone a happy New Year which he predicted was going to be another very busy year.

2. He explained that due to the adverse weather conditions there were several changes to the agenda. There was only two of the three presentations, unfortunately the NII based in Liverpool took the decision that it was unsuitable to travel. The secretariat had contacted the other two presenters who had endeavoured to make the meeting so the decision was taken to continue with the meeting in its shortened format.
3. The Chairman explained the safety procedures for the building, there were no planned fire drills, in the event of the alarm sounding members were to make their way to the exits to the assembly point in the car park.
4. He went on to explain that the theme for the meeting was 'new build', he thought it was appropriate that the committee look at new build now as the Government consultation is underway. He mentioned that there were public meetings scheduled to take place in the next two weeks throughout Copeland. Copeland is the only authority that has three nominated sites within its boundaries so it is quite a challenge for the West Cumbrian communities to respond to three sites, with most areas wondering how they are going to cope with the consultation process for one site. The Chairman explained that the aim was to try and give people as much information as possible, hence the agenda incorporating the ideas from Westlakes Renaissance on the energy coast and how it fits with new build. NII obviously has a big role to play but unfortunately were unable to attend. He re-iterated that the public meetings for people to attend were at the Visitors Centre that same week, the following week Monday to Wednesday, the Civic Hall and the week after down in the Millom area for the Kirksanton site.
5. Before moving to the agenda the Chairman explained to the committee that Martin Forwood has sent some questions to the meeting as he was unable to attend due to the weather.
6. The Chairman explained that Mr Forwood wished his questions to be posted in the public domain. He proposed that the questions be sent to the British Energy Coast team for response following which they will be posted onto the WCSSG website and appended to the minutes as well as being sent to Mr Forwood.
7. The Chairman invited David Loudon to give his presentation

AGENDA ITEM 1 – ENERGY COAST MASTER PLAN – ‘NEW BUILD PROJECT’

8. Mr Loudon began by saying that Sellafield Ltd is contracted to Westlakes Renaissance, West Cumbria Vision to provide support initially to the new build nomination project that was completed late last year and to the Energy Coast Master Plan project.

9. Mr Loudon had provided an input into the nomination package for the NDA land adjacent to the Sellafield site so could speak very comfortably about the nomination process. He had an overview of the Energy Coast Master Plan but some of the more detailed questions about the way forward on the Energy Coast Master Plan he was probably not best placed to answer at the meeting but he was quite happy to take any questions throughout his presentation and what he couldn't answer, he would take note of and provide answers at a later date.
10. He reported that the presentation he was giving goes through the new build process in general but specifically for West Cumbria and some of the other high level opportunities associated with the Energy Coast Master Plan.
11. In terms of the Energy challenge for the UK, the UK and climate change has emerged as one of the biggest environmental challenges that society is seeing at the moment. The UK is committed to meeting its part in the reduction of green house gas and meeting the climate change challenge and there are targets set within the UK to reduce the green house gas output by 80% by 2050.
12. As part of that it is estimated that there is a need for increasing generation of power by about 45GW by 2020 to replace the coal and oil fired stations which will be closing due to the inability to meet the carbon dioxide emissions and the nuclear stations as they come to the end of their operational lives. Clearly alternatives are needed. Of the 45GW demand that is anticipated, Government is expecting that 20GW of that will come from renewable energy sources primarily wind, but also others and about 25GW from thermal, such as nuclear, clean coal if feasible and clean gas.
13. Mr Loudon continued that during 2008/09, the Government undertook a strategic siting assessment process, which was effectively a high level consultative process designed to assess sites against a potential suitability for the development of new nuclear by 2025.
14. The sites were assessed against a fairly wide range of exclusionary and discretionary criteria and in total there were 11 sites nominated mostly either at or on or adjacent to existing nuclear facilities roughly a 50/50 split between North and South.
15. Of the 11 sites that were nominated and went into the draft nuclear national policy statement, only 10 made it through into the final draft. The Dungeness site was excluded by Government from the initial nomination process, essentially due to the proximity to sites of ecological importance, there is a SSI (Site of Special Interest) location and a natural nature reserve.
16. Talking about the Sellafield site specifically or the NDA land adjacent to the Sellafield site, Mr Loudon explained that when the nomination process was put forward it was decided to nominate almost all of the NDA owned land to the West of the Sellafield Site, this site being approximately 270 hectares almost the same size in terms of area as the existing Sellafield site with more than enough scope and area for the development of new nuclear.

17. He explained that when the land went up for sale by the NDA it was split into four separate lots, the intention being that initially the developer would look to assess the lots and decide which two of them would be suitable for development and hand the two remaining lots back to the NDA.
18. The site essentially is tenanted farmland although to the North of the site it does include the area that the Sellafield site uses for the Yottenfews car park and part of the main access road to the site and obviously depending on where developments would occur some arrangements would need to be made to account for that.
19. The sites also have the advantage that to the Western side of the site there is an old railway cutting which was part of an old railway system, the embankment is still there, the railway has gone but there is potential to utilise that as a railway siding should the new build project go ahead and developers decide that they want to bring materials in by rail rather than road.
20. In terms of the timeline, Mr Loudon explained that Sellafield Ltd worked on the nomination case along with Westlakes Renaissance and a number of other companies and submitted the nomination case on 31st March 2009. DECC (Department of Energy and Climate Change) then published that on the website and sought initial consultation from members of the public. The draft policy statement is subject to a schedule of public consultations being held for the Sellafield site and the Braystones and Kirksanton sites.
21. Mr Loudon continued that running in parallel to the process, the NII and the Environment Agency have been undertaking a generic design assessment process which is effectively looking at the two designs that have been put forward for the UK by Westinghouse and Areva with a view to assessing them against license ability for the UK. That process is ongoing and is on target to complete approximately June 2011.
22. To expedite the planning process for new build and for other large infrastructure planning projects, the Government is putting together the infrastructure planning commission. The commission has been formed and should be ready to accept proposals later on this year, effectively the planning commission has been established as an independent body to take the planning decisions on what they deem as applications of nationally significant infrastructure projects, so there will be an infrastructure planning commission for nuclear and for other power generation schemes, large power plants, airports, railway stations, large wind farms.
23. The idea behind that is not to remove the requirements of local planning but to avoid local planning issues clogging up some of the large national strategically important projects.
24. In terms of the time line for nuclear itself, Mr Loudon commented that some developers are anticipating starting early 2013 to build with an operation phase round about 2018. Currently Hinkley is the favourite site to become operational first.

25. Moving on to talk about the new build reactor types, Mr Loudon explained that there are two types put forward through the generic design assessment process, there is the Westinghouse AP1000 reactor and the Areva EPR reactor. They are essentially similar reactors overall with a few major differences. In terms of viability for the development of a site, the developers consider that they would need to generate about 3GW electricity per site to make the sites viable. That has an impact in terms of the power output, the Westinghouse reactor roughly puts out about 1.1GW electrical power, the Areva puts out about 1.6GW electrical power. So if a developer chose a Westinghouse design it would be three reactors and if it chose an Ariva design it would be two reactors.
26. The other key difference between the two reactors is how they are constructed, the Westinghouse is designed in a much more modular fashion, each reactor has about 275 modules which are brought to site and sampled on site. The Areva reactor has about six or seven, but very large modules, so there is a slight difference in the way they are designed.
27. Mr Loudon reported that there are examples of both reactors currently being constructed around the world, there are four AP1000 reactors in China and Areva is building an EPR in France and Finland.
28. Mr Loudon showed a couple of images to highlight the scale of the new reactors. In a AP1000 in China, he pointed out a cooling water tower being placed and explained it was actually between a four and six metre diameter cooling water tower, he reported that the new generation of reactors with a high thermal output have a quite high cooling demand.
29. Next he showed an image of the construction of the reactor island pressure vessel to give an idea that they have had to go to quite a depth to hit bedrock so there are issues about how much spoil will be generated and how much concrete will be needed to be brought onto site, he commented that it is those sorts of factors that are obviously going to have an impact on the infrastructure surrounding the site.
30. Mr Loudon showed another slide, an example of construction of modules on a site.
31. Mr Loudon continued that in terms of the infrastructure for Cumbria, any new nuclear development in Cumbria at any of the three sites is going to raise a number of issues associated with the infrastructure. He highlighted the fragility of some of the infrastructure in West Cumbria, particularly the road infrastructure, that coupled with the floods just prior to Christmas brings it into focus the infrastructure as it stands at the moment is not particularly robust. Certainly in terms of getting materials and equipment to the area, the port of Workington and the port of Barrow are ideally equipped, they can handle this kind of infrastructure. Getting it from there to either of the development sites could pose potential issues. Rail isn't an option given the size of the modules you could not get them loaded onto the current West Coast rail line. Road, coming South or coming North from Barrow would be

difficult and going South from Workington will probably be challenging also, so there are issues over infrastructure.

32. He explained that there is an option of beach landing some of the modules, as an example he referred to the plans to beach land the replacement evaporator for the Sellafield site. He explained that the reactor modules would be very large modules of a similar size to the evaporator modules coming in and the number of beach landings required would be quite expensive with quite specialised equipment required.
33. In terms of the national grid Mr Loudon explained that Cumbria currently has a 132 KV electrical ring. As part of the work for the nomination package, Westlakes Renaissance commissioned national grid to undertake a feasibility study based on some work that was carried out in the 1990's for BNFL when BNFL did some exploratory work looking at a new reactor. Showing another diagram, Mr Loudon explained that the blue line shows a diagrammatic representation of what national grid would consider to be potentially an optimum route for upgrading the grid. This was done as a feasibility study. Currently at the moment, as part of the nomination process Braystones, Sellafield and the Kirksanton sites all applied for grid connections of 3GW each as part of the process. Following that the national grid are now putting together a project team to look at this in detail in terms of defining what the optimum route is and what is the most effective way to get the power out.
34. Mr Loudon explained that one of the issues with replacing the national grid is when you go from a 132 to a 400 KV is the difference in the towers, the current towers on the 132 are about 25-30 metres in height. Some of the towers for a 400 KV system could be 50 metres tall which has a significantly different visual impact. There are 35 metre towers but although it is lower it has a much wider span to keep the cables separate.
35. He continued that there is an option to underground cables, the national grid would do this only as a last resort if they couldn't put towers for other environmental sensitive reasons or other reasons, the main reason for that is that under grounding cables does cause quite a lot of disruption. Mr Loudon showed another image which gave a scale of the kind of width of land that would need to be used to put in underground cables and it is estimated that to support the new build they actually need to be slightly wider than the slide shown so there would be significant disruption.
36. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Has there been any consideration to undersea?
37. **A: Dave Loudon:** We have looked at undersea cabling and there are specific issues that do prevent it at this stage, Mr Loudon explained that he was covering that aspect later in the presentation and would re-visit the question then.
38. The other primary issue why the national grid only undergrounds as a last resort is cost, typically a kilometre of overhead cabling is about £1 million

when you begin to underground the cabling it costs between £12million and £17million per kilometre.

39. The national grid itself goes through their planning process which is quite a detailed planning process requiring optioneering routing studies, detailed design and land negotiations, this would come under the IPC, the Infrastructure Planning Commission. That process itself takes about four years just to get from starting to look at it to actually getting an approved plan.
40. Once the plan is approved they are estimating that to upgrade the grid within Cumbria would take about 4 years. The last major grid upgrade somewhere in the North East took 13 years to plan and build.
41. In terms of the new build requirements as well as infrastructure impacts, there are other indirect impacts. The number of construction workers involved in constructing a nuclear power plant is estimated between four and a half to six thousand construction workers during the build phase and that build phase could take twelve years or longer. Once operational 300 operational workers per reactor and that brings into focus the housing, transport and welfare services, Mr Loudon referred to the week of the meeting where a lot of the back roads were closed all the traffic going to Sellafield was forced onto the main roads causing a lot of tailbacks, so clearly if new build comes on the horizon we would need to investigate and look at what alternative access arrangements are there for the site, is it a park and ride scheme is it improved bus and rail services, do we look at taking non essential staff away from the sites as much as possible.
42. In terms of the housing, where do you house four and a half to six thousand construction workers, bearing in mind it is for a temporary period albeit for 12 years or 15 years, what is the plan for that housing afterwards, does it become low cost housing, is it designed to be dismantled and taken away, how does it impact on the health service, doctors, hospitals etc. A whole host of things need to be taken into account as the development goes forward.
43. Mr Loudon briefly touched on the consortium of companies that were successful in getting the bid for the land adjacent to Sellafield. The consortium consists of three companies, Iberdrola, Gdf-suez and Scottish and Southern power. Iberdrola and Gdf already had a working consortium in Europe and a working joint venture with a 50/50 split to look at developing new power. That joint venture has a 75% share in the UK consortium with the remaining 25% made up of Scottish and Southern power.
44. The plan at the moment is that the consortium is looking at setting up a head office in the UK which is probably going to be London for ease of access from Europe, and they are also looking at a regional office in West Cumbria and they are looking at Westlakes as a possible location for a regional office. The consortium anticipate having a project team ready to start the initial phase of work in April 2010 and along with that they are looking at what

work streams they need to begin, for example, environmental walk downs, hydro geological surveys etc.

45. Mr Loudon explained that in terms of future opportunities, the next part of the presentation was a high level overview of some of the work that the energy coast project has been looking at in terms of defining a vision and what opportunities could be there over the next 30 years.
46. The figure £149 billion has been speculated as potential opportunities for Cumbria as part of the energy coast master plan. Roughly split into nuclear opportunity and non nuclear opportunity.
47. Going through the nuclear opportunities Mr Loudon reported that £90 billion amongst the current existing decommissioning programme, potential new repository, the potential nuclear build and some additional potential associated with fuel manufacturing and reprocessing.
48. The current nuclear decommissioning programme is estimated at £40 billion over the next 30 years or so, focused purely within this 30 year timescale on the nuclear legacy, legacy ponds and silos remediation.
49. In terms of new build, depending on the location, number and type of reactors, there is potential there of up to £20 billion.
50. Another opportunity here is the national geological repository and Mr Loudon explained it was on the slide purely for presentation purposes recognising that there is only Cumbria, Allerdale and Copeland that has expressed an interest in hosting a repository, it was decided to put it in the slide for presentational purposes as one of the locations on the original NIREX plan, so it is just there for presentational purposes.
51. With regard to reprocessing there is a potential that when Thorp comes to the end of its current life that there is an opportunity there to refurbish it if there is a mind to or a will to with a view to attracting additional reprocessing. Mr Loudon reported that he thought there is an issue with reprocessing in Japan and they may have a surplus of fuel requiring reprocessing that they can't manage so there are potential opportunities there.
52. Mr Loudon continued that later on this year the Government will go out to consultation in terms of its Plutonium disposition plans. One of the proposed options could be to convert that material into MOX fuel, so there are potential opportunities there. If the existing MOX plant couldn't handle that quantity of Plutonium then there is an opportunity there to build a new MOX plant to deal with that legacy of Plutonium,
53. Nuclear business park or nuclear enterprise park was an idea that has been muted in the development of an enterprise technology type park that could host a range of technologies to support current decommissioning plans such as additional waste management capability, recycling or waste product storage, those kinds of things.

54. In summary, £90 billion potential opportunity associated with nuclear.
55. In terms of non-nuclear opportunities, there are infrastructure, renewable projects, the national grid, some issues with gas, the nuclear submarine programmes and a range of others; this has been estimated at £59 billion opportunity again over the same 30 year vision timescale.
56. In terms of the infrastructure, issues with the current road infrastructure and what the additional burden of new build may bring. There is potential opportunity there to look at road improvements to the A595 North and South of the current site and the A66.
57. With regards to West Coast Rail, there has been an attempt to try and restore the Penrith to Keswick rail line with a view to encouraging tourists from Penrith into the Lake District, that is a potential opportunity as well as extending that onto Workington. One of the key aspects is that without a robust infrastructure it makes the rest of the development and the opportunity for Energy Coast very difficult to realise.
58. As far as renewables are concerned, Mr Loudon commented that Cumbria has a reasonable number of on shore wind farms, it currently has two off shore wind farms, Robin Rigg off the coast of Workington and Walney Island, further South. Robin Rigg currently has approximately 60 turbines at the moment and a planned expansion is being muted. If that expansion goes ahead it would have to land the cables to bring the power ashore on the Scottish side because the current grid is just about at capacity on the English side. Tomorrow (8th January 2010), the Crown Estates will announce the winners of the bidders against the third tranche of off shore wind farm locations.
59. There was a bidding process carried out by Crown Estates to sell off areas of the off shore coast line for wind farm development with a view to developing 25GW of power from off shore wind.
60. In terms of the national grid, Mr Loudon showed a slide showing a very simplified routing of the current 132 KV line and explained that upgrading the grid is essential whether it is nuclear or anything else. The current grid is almost up to capacity.
61. Referring to the questions asked earlier about the use of sub sea cabling, Mr Loudon explained that the first station developed would have to be hard wired into the grid, the issue with the sub sea connection is that it needs to go through a rectifier to be converted into a direct current. Because of the failure rates of the rectifiers even if it is only a millisecond or two, that can actually take the whole grid out so we would need a much bigger spin in reserve on the grid to do that. So in terms of stability they have to have the first station hard wired in. Subsequent stations could go with a sub sea grid.
62. Currently the limits on the HVDC (High Voltage Direct Current) connection on sub sea is about 1GW so the chances are that the limit is increasing all the time as technology is improving, so by the time it comes to needing to it

could be a more feasible option, but national grid's opinion is that the first one needs to be hard wired to provide that stability.

63. Moving onto Gas terminals or gas re-injection, Mr Loudon reported that Centrica down in Barrow is looking at a couple of projects both involving gas supplies and clean gas. Some of the gas fields down in Barrow are starting to become depleted and they are looking at a scheme involving gas re-injection which essentially involves building an off shore gas terminal that can accept liquified petroleum gas from Nigeria in tankers and they would off load that gas, pump it back into the existing gas wells, re-pressurising the wells and that would actually service two functions, it would increase the storage capacity and the increase in pressure would allow a process called gas sequestration which allows the extraction of more viable gas from those wells than could have been obtained.
64. As part of a carbon capturing storage scheme they are looking at a process of capturing CO₂ from gas combustion and re-injecting that into empty gas wells. Other companies across the world are looking at that but there is a potential scheme off the coast of Barrow that could be used.
65. Moving onto the submarine programme, Mr Loudon commented that BAE has got a very good capability in terms of its nuclear engineering capability and is currently contracted to do something like four astute submarines, there is also an opportunity there as the astute submarines come into service, some of the older submarines are obviously going to need decommissioning and there is a potential opportunity there to establish that area as a decommissioning area.
66. In terms of civil nuclear support this is a general consultancy engineering technical support type function provided to the civil nuclear industry covering things like environmental cases, safety case, site condition monitoring, infrastructure etc. it could potentially be located anywhere but West Cumbria has quite a good nuclear heritage it would be an ideal place.
67. There is an idea been muted for the development of an energy park. The energy park is aimed at getting Cumbria from the back foot to the front foot in terms of establishing a world leading centre of expertise and technology for the development of alternative energies, renewable energies whether it is tidal, wind, batteries, small scale generation or hydrogen generation.
68. Another project that is being muted is tidal barrages; Solway Firth and the Irish Sea is probably one of the highest tidal ranges and tidal flow areas on coastal UK and potentially makes it ideal for the development of tidal barrages. There was some work carried out in the 1990's on the Duddon Estuary and that is currently being reviewed by Liverpool University, potentially the Duddon Estuary could become the test bed for the UK in the tidal barrage technology.
69. Referring to the Manufacturing industry, Mr Loudon reported that new build development could give rise to a support in the manufacturing industry. Nuclear manufacturing capability in the UK has declined since the

construction of Sizewell, the last plant that was constructed. Certainly Barrow with its current expertise in nuclear submarines has an engineering capability there is potential capability as a spin off from the current nuclear programmes and Barrow and Workington having ports and good areas of land suitable for development it could become an area of engineering development to support the nuclear industry and that would also tie into things like the nuclear skills academy and apprentice training.

70. Summarising Mr Loudon reported that there is £59 billion pounds worth of potential opportunities associated with non-nuclear.
71. In terms of a time-line, nuclear decommissioning is ongoing, new build is potentially starting, the Ibadrola consortium have said that they plan to start construction around about 2015 with a three year construction programme, Mr Loudon commented that he had yet to see a reactor build in three years but they are getting close, some of the Chinese ones are expected to be about three and a half to four years in terms of build.
72. The time-line for storage and the national geological repository, obviously there is quite a long period of dialogue in terms of assessing site suitability, finding a host community etc. The slide Mr Loudon was showing showed an optimistic schedule in terms of the build programme, He thought the NDA's intention was to try and have it available by 2040 and if that can be brought forward, it does save in longer term storage costs or hotel costs of storing the wastes in facilities.
73. The existing Thorp programme is roughly running to 2020 if it was decided to continue and refurbish that it could be getting on to 2025 similarly with MOX the existing commitment and the new build and the enterprise park.
74. In terms of non-nuclear time-lines, Mr Loudon reported that the infrastructure is probably the biggest challenge and particularly in terms of how you fund some of those developments, whether you tie that into other developments such as the repository and planning gain type issues, it's quite a challenging programme.
75. In conclusion Mr Loudon reported that the UK has a significant energy challenge to meet in terms of maximising its contribution to reduction in green house gases and meeting that short fall in energy.
76. The energy coast master plan project are working quite hard behind the scenes to look at how this can be optimised, what the synergies are, how they can be tied together and essentially West Cumbria could be a leading player in this and it just really needs the commitment and the buy in of stakeholders need to decide what it is they want out of the Energy Coast project.
77. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Right at the start and then right at the end you quoted the numbers for generation by conventional or solid generation and renewables and the two added up to the amount that we need to generate. However, renewables as far as we know and we've only got really wind at the moment but wave would be just the same because it is low energy

density which means you need big structures to make it, it is intermittent and at maximum it has an efficiency of about 30%. At the Rheged conference on the energy coast about a year ago the national grid's presentation pointed out that if you put something like 20 – 30 GW of renewable energy into the mix you have to go from a back up of 25% of available power to something like 75% which means that you have really almost got to double the amount of conventional energy generation. Take last week for instance when it was bitterly cold without any wind so you don't get any power, that means that you are really looking at building far more power stations than we need if we are going to have anything like energy security?

78. **A: Dave Loudon:** I was at that presentation, it was quite a surprising statistic a lot of people don't realise that the national grid maintains a spinning reserve running constantly all the time to essentially plug in any gaps in any electricity shortfall and as the reliance on wind power increases then that spinning reserve needs to increase, maybe not in proportion to what it currently is, I think the spinning reserve gets less in proportion, but it is an issue that needs addressed.
79. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** It means you've got to spend about another £100 billion if you are going to insist on having that amount of renewable energy in the mix?
80. **A: Dave Loudon:** They were Government targets that we were quoting they're in the Government White Paper.
81. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Where are we going to put them, we are here now to talk about the plans - those six or nine that you talk about will be less than half of the quantity required, probably only about a third if you cut out coal fired power stations?
82. **A: Dave Loudon:** Yes it depends on developments in technology for coal if they can get to clean coal, how they can get to some super critical coal fire stations to try and look at or at least capture the CO2.
83. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** The only point I am trying to make is that you need more nuclear or solid generation for say 75% or 80% factors plus if you are going to go to that large fraction of renewable energy.
84. **Q: Norman Clarkson:** The whole of the West coast particularly Copeland and indeed Allerdale are fighting for economic survival at the moment. I only see one action that would bring economy to this part of the world and that is not just necessarily building hundreds of wind farms which I think everybody knows I am totally opposed, they are a nuisance and an eyesore and as my colleague here says they are not producing anything. However, push that to one side, the only thing that will develop this area is not just necessarily nuclear build which I support and I support the whole of the nuclear industry but a road coming up from Barrow area that connects up to the main infrastructure eventually the M6 coming up into West Cumbria. Copeland Council in particular are wanting to diversify and get away from nuclear, that just happens to be something that is here, a legacy that we still

get a very good income from but we do need more income. The only way we are going to get that is to get a road.

85. This is the fifth time that I have seen this presentation, I was invited by Rosie Matheson to come up and see Barry and Paul and I was invited with two other colleagues with my National Park hat on, what would I think if they were going over the bootle part and around black coombe, that's the national park that comes into Copeland, what would I think if they were putting pylons down there and I said I could only speak for myself but knowing what the park are like that would not be acceptable. We eventually talked about, if we are going to put cables underground, why couldn't we take the chance on building a new road, obviously a new A595 and Paul and Barry said at the time that they were meeting national grid next week and would talk about it.
86. Cutting a long story short it started to look very feasible that we could actually get a road going right the way down from Sellafield South of Calderbridge over the Duddon by putting in what you have just mentioned now he said Liverpool University are now looking at it and then connect up eventually into Morecambe Bay now I wouldn't want to push just the Morecambe Bay at this stage but I would certainly want to push it over Duddon and then connect up to the A590 down to Barrow, which then starts to bring something more like an economic lifeline from Barrow area, the A590 up onto the A595 and we get a good road work cover. We are probably talking about a dual carriageway but the problem is, this is the one and only chance now that we could get a road. I've seen this presentation I think going back to July now and it's the fifth one I've seen I've had it taken up to the County Council they are not moving fast enough for me and we just seem to be talking about it still that you talking about the new build coming here in 2013 and 2014, we must get on with the infrastructure certainly coming through Copeland because if we don't it is going to be absolute mayhem around here for traffic.
87. Yesterday I heard there was a traffic jam from the top of Inkerman Terrace to the Sellafield gate, I think the reason for that is that they can't go on the outside roads through St Bees, over Cold Fell and all this traffic is feeding into the A595, I think our infrastructure cannot take more new build until we get a decent road. I would like to see some action and push it forward and let's start to concentrate on the feasibility of getting all these pots of money put into this new road build for us and for the life line for Copeland particularly and Allerdale as well, I think it is essential.
88. **A: Dave Loudon:** I think the energy coast project will agree with you and they are doing what they can to expedite this. Just for members of the audience, (showing a slide) that shows a dual carriageway running up that area and the dotted area just next to the Kirksanton site just below Seascale that shows the boundary of the Lake District National Park because the boundary actually comes down to the coast line, if there was an issue and you couldn't put an overhead cable in there with 50 metre pylons, then as the gentleman said there is an opportunity for undergrounding the cables that is a temporary road that the national grid put in while they are doing the

construction one of the ideas being muted is that if there is a temporary road in there why not just expand it and make it into a dual carriageway or into a more permanent road. There are issues that need to be addressed and I agree with you there is a certain timeline as to how these things need to be addressed. I'm standing in for the energy coast project today I can't answer on their behalf, I do know that it is close to their hearts and they are pushing this, but they need to get stakeholders, county wide and wider areas on board with this also.

89. **Q: Norman Clarkson:** If I just may say one thing, that is that when I first saw the presentation it all appeared to be kept very quiet and we didn't go away and tell everybody but now it is slowly coming out into the public domain, I would like to see it become a very serious thing and I did ask that both the management at Sellafield, Copeland Council and the County Council really get behind it and push it to the powers that be down in London because it is something that we are absolutely crying out for. They want new nuclear processing they also want a repository, yes they may well get it certainly on the reprocessing. I don't want to speak on the repository because that is a big debate and we'll have to wait and see but if the Government is wanting it whoever is in power if they are wanting that we certainly want something, its pay back time now and I'd like to see people get behind this and really push for it.
90. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** You use the word quite a few times in your presentation about opportunities and I think it is an absolutely fantastic presentation and like Norman I have seen it a couple of times now. I do think it is a fantastic opportunity for all of West Cumbria, I don't get hung up whether it's Copeland or Allerdale or wherever for all of West Cumbria and all of West Cumbria people it's a fine opportunity. I wanted to ask you a couple of things. One where do you see the delays coming from, because past experience has led me down a road of I watch arguments being portrayed in local newspapers, councils and lack of agreement and decision making with planning permission etc and talking jobs down, so do you see that as a big problem to delivering this. Also and Norman mentioned it and maybe it's a question for the councils or maybe its my lack of understanding of councillors and their roles, but I thought it was the councillors to deliver the infrastructure and the roads to us rather than them asking whoever to deliver them, I'm unsure of that I just wondered what their involvement has been in trying to improve and deliver the infrastructure that we need to do this?
91. **A: Dave Loudon:** Certainly in terms of the planning aspects of it a lot of these large road infrastructures, new build and grid infrastructure they will be captured under the new infrastructure planning commission which, I don't claim to be an expert on how this will work, my understanding of it is that they will take some of the decision making responsibility away from local or county planners, some of the members of the audience might correct me on that, but they still do have to take local cognisance and cognisance of local issues but the idea behind the infrastructure planning commission is that it expedites that process and it stops it getting mired in local politics.

92. In issues like new build as an example there is a very good high level of support in terms of new build. The road planning issues I think is more of a county visual planning issue or a highways planning issue which is in some respects outside the scope of local council, is my understanding and one of the things that the energy coast master plan project is doing, is getting this presentation around as many of the key stakeholders as they can and essentially just trying to line them all up, just purely with that process in mind just to try and expedite it. That's the best answer I can give you from my perspective.
93. **Chairman:** I thought such a visionary programme would have definitely inspired a lot more questions than that, I think clearly though what we've heard is a little bit of what is fact and a little bit of what is vision but to deliver the vision is as important and everybody, politicians, the industry and our politicians down in London, we need to get them all behind this, we have the opportunities coming up, there are the presentations as we know for each of the local sites and we also have the select committees from the North West that clearly has infrastructure as part of what it is looking at, I understand they are going to be up here next week having a look around, but anyone that does get the opportunity to speak to them or give evidence then hopefully we can sell this message that if we all work together, that is the only way that you deliver vision and there was some clear visions there and hopefully we can get everybody behind that and I think there is no dissenters from the last public meeting that we had where we had nearly 500 people to look at new build, what we seen there was a massive support even those that weren't fully supporting it were supporters of the nuclear new build just weren't as keen on having it next to their houses in perhaps Kirksanton and Braystones but I think there is a full support in West Cumbria to get behind new build, but it can't just be the new build we have to have the infrastructure that comes with it and it has to be there hopefully before hand.
94. **Q: Chairman:** the only other question I really had, when you talked about the start date of around 2015 one of the problems would probably be. I did see this presentation once before and they talked about the actual reactor shortage, that they are already committed to building reactors at places like China, they would not even be able to deliver a start of 2015 even if the utilities wanted to.
95. **A: Dave Loudon:** Certainly when we started the new build process that seemed to be the case in terms of the world wide supply chain particularly for the large forgings for some of the pressure vessels, I think a couple of years ago there was only one maybe two companies in the world that could actually forge the forgings large enough to accommodate the pressure vessels, I think since that time they are looking at bringing up increasing capacity and capability in places like Korea in some of the large steel works over there but you are right a couple of years ago when we first started on this it was a case of if you didn't have a reactor in your order books now there were almost fully committed up until about 2018, I think things have moved a little bit since then, maybe not all the way but a little bit since then.

96. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Mr Loudon for his presentation. Prior to handing over to Nancy Lawton he wished to raise the fact that there was a meeting of the Emergency Planning sub committee scheduled for the 28th January 2010, which was going to look at how the emergency plans would link into new build. He felt it was an important issue to discuss and he was sure the issue of infrastructure would be discussed along with the issues of emergency planning and how an emergency plan would have to be put together for those sites that aren't adjacent to Sellafield and the complications that the two other sites would cause.
97. The Chairman thanked Nancy for standing in for Andy Mayall and coming along to give an explanation on the radioactive substances authorisation.
98. **AGENDA ITEM 2 – EXPLANATION ON THE CONSULTATION ON RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES AUTHORISATION.**
99. Ms Lawton began by giving Andy Mayall's apologies, the weather had stopped his attendance at the meeting.
100. Ms Lawton reported that there is currently an authorisation owned by Sellafield Ltd, which is often referred to as the Sellafield authorisation, however its full title is the Sellafield and Windscale authorisation, because when Sellafield Ltd took over the operation of the Windscale site it was decided at that time to move to one RSA authorisation, so there are two nuclear licensed sites but one RSA authorisation.
101. For the purposes of the presentation today Ms Lawton asked the committee that rather than her saying Sellafield and Windscale every time just to accept that everything she says relates to an authorisation which covers both sites.
102. Continuing, she explained that the RSA authorisation which is held by Sellafield Ltd places strict controls on disposals of radioactive waste. Within it there are a lot of conditions, stating what the site can and cannot do and then there are also the limits on discharges and disposals.
103. The authorisation has been in a 'multi media' (covering all three media ie: air, water and land) format for a number of years now and the Act that set up the NDA introduced a requirement on the EA to conduct periodic reviews of RSA authorisations. EA has taken it upon themselves to do an annual review of the Sellafield authorisation, so each October Sellafield Ltd provide EA with a report detailing their issues with the authorisation and things that Sellafield Ltd think need to be addressed. Some years the EA agree there are no significant issues in the authorisation. The authorisation includes the top level certificate and beneath that there are the Compilation of Environment Agency Requirements (CEAR) and sometimes only they need changing. Therefore, there need not be a variation each year, so far this will be the third variation since the new authorisation was issued in 2004, so for two years the EA has not done one.
104. The EA has a procedure to follow for varying authorisations. Depending on the nature of the changes proposed, different levels of consultation required.

If only quite small changes are proposed then EA needs to consult statutory consultees, which includes the Health and Safety Executives, Nuclear Installations Inspectorate, Food Standards Agency and then local councils etc and EA has to inform DECC and Department of Health.

105. This year because of the proposal to increase a site limit (ie: Antimony limit to air) the EA is carrying out a wider public consultation. The consultation pack was sent out on the 7th December to a wide range of people including parish councillors, adverts were also placed in the Whitehaven News the Workington News and Star and the Southampton Daily Echo on the 17th December advertising the consultation. Copies of the consultation packages can also be found at a number of local libraries.
106. Ms Lawton reported that the EA received a comment from a parish council about the amount and detail of the consultation package. The parish council asked whether the EA could produce a more user friendly summary which the EA agreed was a good idea. The summary package Ms Lawton had with her at the meeting is available on the West Cumbria Sites stakeholder group website and she reported that for future consultations the EA would consider producing a similar summary.
107. Summarising the main proposals, in addition to the increase in the site Antimony discharge limit to air, Ms Lawton reported that the proposal was a decrease in six site limits for aerial and liquid discharges and a decrease in 20 facility or plant limits. She explained that in terms of the authorisation there are a number of limits at the site level which dictate what 'the site as a whole must not exceed' and then basically to ensure that there is control at a more local level there are also plant limits for various key facilities across the site.
108. In determining the decreases, and in discussions with Sellafield Ltd, the EA looked at the site's discharges and how they compare to the current limits and in some cases the discharges were well below the limits, Therefore there is a raft of limits that can be reduced, so generally the decreases are reducing what is termed as headroom, which is the gap between actual discharges and the limit.
109. There is an increase, which is the reason for the public consultation, in the site limit for Antimony 125 in aerial discharges. Giving some background Ms Lawton explained that the EA cannot increase a site limit before the EU's Article 37 Group has approved that discharge limit increase. The UK has had to make a submission to the Article 37 Group requesting an increase in the Antimony discharge envelope; so Article 37 experts are busy currently working on what is the impact of that increase on member states.
110. In terms of timeline, the submission was made on 17th September, the Article 37 Group should respond with an opinion within six months, but if the Article 37 experts require further information they 'stop the clock', get the information and then they 'start the clock' again, so with no interruptions then there should be a decision from the Article 37 Group on 17th March and

the aim would then be to get the new authorisation in for about the start of the new financial year.

111. To date there have been no interruptions as far as the Article 37 Group is concerned so EA is hopeful the 17th March date can be achieved by them.
112. The EA is planning on removing two plant limits where due to a slight change in processes, limits for those radionuclide for those individual plants are no longer required. The EA is also proposing to remove the throughput related aerial tritium limits for Thorp because that was a danger of unduly constraining reprocessing scheduling in a way that was not helpful and those throughput limits were originally put in place during commissioning and it is now considered that they need adjusting.
113. Ms Lawton continued that the proposals with potential to cause a lot of interest are the new disposal routes, firstly for high volume very low level waste to the Lillyhall landfill, that route will not be enabled until there is an RSA authorisation for the Lillyhall landfill, and also for low level waste oils to the Hythe incinerator operated by Tradebe in Hampshire, hence the advert in the Southampton Daily Echo.
114. Ms Lawton showed the committee a slide of all the discharges from Sellafield, which she felt the committee would be very aware of many of them, she explained them as the gaseous waste to atmosphere, liquid waste to the Irish sea; on the solid waste side there is the deposit on the on-site landfill, the new route recently to the MRF facility at Lillyhall (metals recycling facility), there is disposal of Low Level Waste to the LLWR at Drigg, there is a route to Winfrith for treatment at Winfrith prior to disposal at LLWR, Ms Lawton was not aware of that route having ever been used but it is available, the transfrontier shipment route, and then the new routes that are being looked at are LLW oils to incinerate at Hythe and solid waste HV-VLLW to Lillyhall.
115. The main changes to the liquid discharges are four site limit decreases and 10 plant limit decreases, Ms Lawton explained that the reason behind this is the reduced future rates of reprocessing means that future discharges will be reduced so the limits can be reduced. The radiation exposure of the public from liquid discharges from Sellafield is already well below legal limits and if the limits are reduced then the critical group dose that would result from discharges at the new limits, would be a reduction of about 5% compared to the critical group dose that would result from discharges at the current discharge limits.
116. Moving onto the aerial discharges, Ms Lawton reported that there is the one site limit increase which she had already mentioned for antimony-125, a decrease in two site limits and a decrease in 10 plant limits, the reason for the increase in the antimony-125 discharge limit is to avoid undue constraint on Magnox reprocessing which will cause greater impacts. She reported that Sellafield Ltd has been in a lot of discussion with the Environment Agency over the last 18 months or so about antimony discharges. It is recognised that to avoid increasing the antimony limit Sellafield Ltd would have to

delay reprocessing of Magnox fuel, if reprocessing is delayed that means that the fuel is going to be in the fuel storage ponds for longer and if this happens then there will be more corrosion of the fuel cans, more corrosion of the fuel cans means that more of the radioactivity contained within the fuel can will get out into the pond and so that will challenge the downstream treatment plants at Sellafield and it will lead to increased discharges into the Irish Sea. The other problem that you have is that corroded fuel is harder to reprocess.

117. Therefore, not increasing the antimony limit would delay Magnox reprocessing and make the fuel harder to reprocess so Sellafield Ltd meeting the Magnox Operating Plan becomes much more of a challenge. The Environment Agency recognise that meeting the Magnox Operating Plan is a key part of Sellafield meeting the UK discharge strategy with respect to sea discharges and hence the UK meeting its OSPAR commitments.
118. Comparing all of these different factors the EA considers that to constrain the discharges of antimony to the current levels would be disproportionate in terms of the impact compared to increasing that limit and letting Magnox reprocessing continue.
119. In terms of impact, the radiation exposures to the public from aerial discharges are also well below legal limits, there is a potential reduction in the overall critical group exposure, again if discharges were at limits the reduction would be about 3% compared to the current dose impact from aerial discharges and the increase in the antimony -125 results in about a 0.4 % (less than half a percent increase) in the dose from current aerial discharge dose.
120. In terms of other main changes Ms Lawton reported that there is the proposal to transfer small volumes of trace radioactive oil to the Hythe incinerator and the transfer of HV-VLLW to Lillyhall landfill for disposal.
121. The Hythe incinerator has been operating for many years with a Radioactive Substances Act authorisation and it already treats radioactive oils from the nuclear industry. Practically all of the Magnox stations in the South of the country have an authorised route to send oil to Hythe. Tradebe, the operator of the incinerator is content to accept the oils from Sellafield and they have the capacity, so given that this is a currently viable option for Sellafield Ltd, they would like to make use of it.
122. Lillyhall landfill has applied to the EA for an authorisation to dispose of HV-VLLW, the consultation has actually finished on that authorisation application but no decision has been made yet. There is a delay due to discussions with DECC as to whether an Article 37 submission is required, this has also arisen over a proposed landfill in Northamptonshire.
123. Ms Lawton reported that the benefits here are that the capacity for storing oil at Sellafield is currently limited and there are decommissioning tasks that would result in more waste oil being produced which are being delayed because Sellafield Ltd do not have the storage capacity to put oil into, so the proposal is if Sellafield Ltd can transfer some of this oil to Hythe and

incinerate it there that will free up capacity to let other decommissioning projects go ahead.

124. The use of the Lillyhall landfill for HV-VLLW will allow higher activity waste to be disposed of at the on-site CLESA landfill and at the LLWR at Drigg so those sites can be used for the wastes that they were intended for and the EA felt the proximity of the Lillyhall landfill to Sellafield is also something to be taken into account, there is no the proposal that this waste will be sent down to the Augean site in Northamptonshire.
125. Putting the radiation exposure into context Ms Lawton explained that dose in microsieverts per year from natural exposure is about 2,200, the public dose limit is 1,000 microsieverts; the constraint for a single site is 500. The graph also shows the current critical group dose from Sellafield's discharges at limits, for liquid, gaseous and the actual critical group dose from actual discharges from Sellafield. Exposures from Sellafield are well below legal dose limits with discharges generally a lot lower than discharge limits.
126. Ms Lawton concluded that she hoped her presentation had put the consultation pack into context and maybe helped with understanding it, the process is that all comments need to be provided to the Environment Agency by 8th February and that can be done by e-mail by post or by fax and also if the committee have any questions to feel free to phone and someone would reply and try and explain anything that was not understood.
127. **Q: Tim Knowles:** I recognise that you are standing in a little bit in terms of this presentation so I will moderate my comments a bit. With regard to the disposal of HV-VLLW waste at Lillyhall there is a recognition that this has been carried out on a small scale basis for some time; effectively material within that sort of category has been sent there. I think you are pretty much aware of the County Councils position as the waste and minerals authority, we don't consider this to be a proximity disposal, the County Council is struggling to minimise landfill, we have just organised to reduce our landfill for domestic waste by 80% over the next few years to avoid Government tax, it seems perverse that the Environment Agency is actually condoning the use of landfill for this material in expanding existing facilities and the trucking of this material which has got to be a minimum 25 mile round trip with heavy vehicles when the County Council believes that this material can be dealt with on site at Sellafield within the existing NDA estate. Just to be clear we are completely opposed to any increase in the volumes going to Lillyhall the utilisation of the supply to deal with the NDA's problems by using more holes in the ground around West Cumbria and frankly badging West Cumbria even more solidly as a disposal for Sellafield and the national nuclear waste. There are other debates going on about nuclear waste and I suggest that your HV-VLLW proposals are not perhaps the most intelligent way of helping to solve the overall problem.
128. **A: Nancy Lawton:** The consultation on the use of the Lillyhall landfill for the use of HV VLLW is a separate consultation to this one and I'm sure you have made your views known in that consultation process. What I'm trying to say here is if that facility is authorised for radioactive waste, are people

content for Sellafield to make use of that facility. You might say that Lillyhall is a bit distant from Sellafield but if you think of the other proposed locations for HV LLW landfill on the one hand which are quite distant from Sellafield or the other nuclear licensed sites that might wish to send waste to a landfill are quite a distance from Lillyhall, then I feel that we can argue a proximity principle between the two compared to the other distances that we could be talking.

129. **Q: Tim Knowles:** We have actually zoned the site in our waste and mineral planning strategy adjacent to the Sellafield site so it isn't the only site close to Sellafield site.
130. **A: Nancy Lawton:** The other angle is that we are looking at what is currently available, I know that people think that Sellafield is a huge site and there must be the capacity for storage of all sorts of things, but actually Sellafield is incredibly compact and some disposal issues can be quite acute in terms of the storage capacity that they do have and so if there is an available route then certainly make use of that to a certain extent for a certain period with a view to closer facilities becoming available in the future.
131. **Q: Time Knowles:** I didn't object to the definitive amount what I objected to was the issue which appeared to be pushing HV LLW at Lillyhall as the sole solution to the problem.
132. **Nancy Lawton:** That might come across more in this presentation which is a very simplified presentation but the detailed considerations document does give more detail on how EA certainly, and the NDA and the like, are pushing Sellafield to explore other options, and Sellafield Ltd recognise this, they have a LLW strategy and it doesn't just have one option it has a number of different options and EA is saying you need to explore these, but having said that recognising that if it is considered that taking advantage of some of the currently available options maybe to a limited extent might be useful, while other options are worked up.
133. **Q: Norman Clarkson:** I didn't quite pick it up from Tim but I don't know whether he mentioned the word blight and that's one of the problems we have. I don't have a personal problem with burying the VLLW in the landfill sites wherever in Cumbria. What I do have a problem with, because we understand the Nuclear industry and its very much accepted in this part of the world, its not accepted in the rest of the Country they just don't understand it. Once we start talking about what ever level waste it is from the nuclear industry being buried outside the boundaries of Sellafield that starts to blight the area. We are already being blighted now by the wind turbines going all over the place and more going to come right the way down the West coast completely ruining the views across the Solway Firth across to Scotland, completely ruined it now so we are being blighted and probably being blighted more by burying this LLW, I know the radiation levels are very low that will be buried in the landfill site but it's the perception, what people outside Copeland and probably Cumbria in general what they think about it from the rest of the country and of course one of the diversifications that I talked about with David is our tourism and that is not going to help

when they see VLLW fencing around an area, it probably won't even be fenced I don't know but that's one of our problems that I think the EA should really think about and understand. It's not that we are frightened of that going down because I know it's so very very low it's hardly worth bothering about, but there was such a stink being brought up by some people in the Allerdale area around Lillyhall particularly by business when Studsvik got permission. Now I understood when I saw the presentation I was quite happy with that going there, I have no problem with it, I understand also if we can get some of it away from Drigg fine, I don't have a problem with that. What I have a problem with on behalf of people I represent is the blight problem and it will blight this area. People outside Copeland and the County don't understand radiation, that is my problem?

134. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** I wasn't intending to talk about this at all but having heard those last two contributions I get very worried about this word blight. We have Sellafield here, we've had it for 50 years now the relative quantities of radioactive material outside Sellafield which might come from Sellafield are so small as Norman says is to be trivial. I think it would be much more productive if we as a county attempted to correct misconceptions rather than accepting them and being frightened of them, it strikes me as incredible that the coal burning industry in this country freely releases into the environment 100 tonnes of Uranium a year and what does it do with it, it puts it in lagoons and if it can it sells it when it's settled and it sells it to make building blocks that we build people's houses from and when you work out the radiation dose that people get from that it's quite significant it's still very small but they don't put a blight on building blocks so I think we are still talking about radioactivity as though we were in the 19th century and I think we need to do some education and it seems to me the County is well placed to do that.
135. **Q: Mike Davidson:** Can I endorse what Tim was saying earlier about the Lillyhall site, but can I raise a rather different topic with you. You spoke about reducing the headroom and quite a number of the limits and you said this was because there was a strong potential in the reduction in the amount of material being reprocessed. My concern is like a lot of my colleagues, we would like to see reprocessing continue and perhaps even to be expanded and enhanced and because of that I worry about reducing that headroom and I worry even more about the difficulties there would be in expanding that headroom again should it be necessary to do so.
136. **A: Nancy Lawton:** I understand this question, but in terms of the reduced reprocessing rates, this is not something that the EA has requested or is trying to impose on Sellafield. Sellafield Ltd looking at their plant and its capability and their future plans have said these are the maximum reprocessing rates for Magnox and for Thorp for the foreseeable future and those are quite a bit lower than the reprocessing rates were at the time that the current 'multi media' authorisation was introduced and so it is working entirely with Sellafield Ltd's data and actually one of the challenges that Andy Mayall has made to me is, you must tell me to the best of your knowledge there is no way that any of these limits would need to go back up again and so we have worked very closely with Sellafield Ltd on this about

the reprocessing rate and that is our understanding. If you actually were to see how much we had reduced them compared to actual discharges there is still a reasonable amount of headroom. The limits have not been reduced to be very close to current discharges. EA sees this as a positive message in that the maximum discharges Sellafield Ltd will make will be lower. I don't necessarily think it will impact on the level of discharges, but what it is saying to the public is actually the limit that Sellafield Ltd can't discharge above is now considerably lower.

137. **Bill Poulson:** The numbers that were being reduced were historical and for rates achieved years ago. We don't want to lower them and then have to go back up that wouldn't be practical but the key thing is we are trying to get them more realistic to what we are doing at the same time we want to drive production as far as we can but looking at it realistically these seem to be in line with that and still giving us headroom. .
138. **Paul McKenna:** Thanks Nancy for your comment on the antimony issue, its quite difficult to explain I suppose, it's the lesser of two evils by altering the antimony to forego the damage that would be due to extended Magnox reprocessing, that's all well and good. A related question is how proactive is the Environment Agency when it talks with the NII the NDA and Sellafield Ltd about what they will be doing from now onwards. You are probably aware of the fact that there has been some speculation that there could be cut backs in the decommissioning programme. You talked about antimony and Magnox it is very much coming along after the event, is it the case that the NDA (and I know they may want to say something on this) and Sellafield Ltd will talk about what they are going to be doing over the next few years, then they hand it over to you to comment, how do you input while decisions are being made about budgets and what is going to happen at Sellafield over the next few years, because its all about how pro-active are you and obviously the NII must be in a similar position, are you allowed to comment on that?
139. **Q: Nancy Lawton:** The future plans for Sellafield what they are going to do over the next few years is captured in their life time plans and we as regulators get involved in the debates that go on around the construction of the life time plans. Sellafield Ltd each year comes up with its list of what it is going to do and without being too simplistic about it the Government via the NDA say how much funding is available, and actually that list of work exceeds the money available, so that list has now got to be reduced. Then you get into interesting debates about how, what the priorities are and how you prioritise the work that is to be done.
140. Over the course of the Summer there were a whole series of what are called assurance scrubs which were basically looking at the whole range of projects particularly on the legacy ponds and silos facilities, the projects that they wanted to do to see how robust they were and the prioritisation and what was going to be spent. My colleague who works on legacy ponds and silos was heavily involved in these assurance scrubs, that is how involved we get in these things he was there in all the sessions discussing it. We have also had Sellafield Ltd come over and present to us as a team to say this is the work

that's going on and each individual regulator gets involved in discussions on their patch about the plan, what are the funding implications and discussing with them regarding which projects are important to us. Within the life time plan there are regulatory milestones etc which are recognised milestones that are of concern to both the EA and the NII and those are flagged within the plans, so Sellafield Ltd know that if those aren't met then the regulators are going to be concerned about that and so that raises the profile of the particular issues/projects that we are concerned with.

141. The amount of work that will be done that will be funded, yes we would like there to be more work done and more work funded but then I probably think that everyone in this room would say that. So I couldn't sit here and say that the EA is entirely happy with what the scope is but I wouldn't say that we haven't been involved in discussions on it.

142. **Q: Ian Hudson:** I am the programme director for Sellafield, a couple of points really, in terms of making sure that we fund the right levels of activities at Sellafield, there is a requirement in the energy act to ensure we meet minimum safety and environmental standards and things like that, so there is quite a lot of protection and the energy act makes sure the NDA supports things appropriately and the regulators clearly regulate the Sellafield Site and they will tell us if they felt that we were actually going to a level that was not appropriate from a safety perspective and we are really very mindful of that responsibility.

143. In terms of the speculation, it was NDA engaging as a number of bodies are engaging in with Government in preparation for what might be a spending review round, the speculations was really rather immature and anticipation on the range of options that have been discussed. If you ask the question about funding to Sellafield, 2005 Sellafield was funded around £0.9 billion the outturn towards the end of this financial year will be of the order of £1.4 billion to £1.5 billion and just to give you a sense of what that means, NDA originally in the spending review last time we were given approval for around £1.2 billion for Sellafield, we've been given permission by Government to fund that additional £200 million from some of the funds that have been generated through things like land sales, through extra generating capacity, so even in a period of time that is quite difficult in terms of public finances, NDA Government has shown quite a commitment to Sellafield.

144. I'm not suggesting it won't be a difficult public round that we have to go through and it's hugely important that we engage with the regulators through the life time plan but also the regulators are very much engaged in the spending review activities as well, so they are absolutely at the table with Government in those discussions to make sure that safety and environmental issues are there as part of the agenda in that kind of decision making so I think there is a good demonstration of commitment, I think it is going to be tough going forward there is no doubt about it but absolutely the right people are at the table to make sure the right elements of the decision are considered when people are looking at funding limits.

145. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** With regards to the question about headroom, I think you answered that very well Nancy thank you. I think there is a longer term facet which really effects the country rather than us, it seems we are going to build what 20 – 30 GW of nuclear generation and those stations are likely going to last for 50 years, they are going to be developed, use a load of Uranium and it seems to be inevitable in the future that the country will come round to recycling and recycling has been going on in the nuclear industry for the last 50 years and I think that will happen.
146. I fully understand that Sellafield can't possibly get involved in that they have too much to worry about doing what they are doing and fair enough, but I don't know whether there is a much longer term view being generated between the agencies and the Government as to what the Country will do in the long term, will it reprocess, will it not, I know there is some talk about what is going to happen with the present Plutonium stocks for example and there is a consultation going on about that, but it seems to me there is a longer term problem that has got to be answered, it will have a vast impact on West Cumbria one way or the other but we probably can't even answer them here today its just the way it is.
147. The final point, Nancy on your presentation you showed the natural limit on doses what you get from living here and then the various bits that contribute but then on the bottom you didn't put numbers to it and I think it would help when you can actually see the numbers rather than say it's a jolly sight less than the limit?
148. **A: Nancy Lawton:** OK sorry yes the limits are in the explanatory document. What I have done in my document is summarised the dose impact from the changes which I will include in the shorter presentation.
149. **Chairman:** The Chairman re-iterated that the WCSSG had received a request from one of the Parish Councils saying that they did wish to try and respond to the consultation but found the consultation package a little bit outfacing for themselves as Parish Councillors having to do many other tasks. He was appreciative that Nancy and Andy Mayall managed to pull together a summary which they are quite happy with. As Nancy had already mentioned the document is now on the WCSSG website so any parish councils or people that want to get involved in the consultation can do so.
150. **Q: David Humphreys:** I was just disappointed that the NII was not here today because that was the presentation that I was particularly interested in. Just two requests, one is I don't know if NII will agree to it but if they have slides could be see them. The second one is, there is an emergency planning sub committee meeting about new build on the 18th would that be an occasion when the NII could present that presentation.
151. **A: Chairman:** The NII were disappointed that they couldn't come today but being in Liverpool we respect their view working for the HSE they felt it wasn't safe to set off so we respect that, I'm quite happy to have a word with them to see if that is the appropriate place to give that presentation. They do

want to give the presentation so it is up to ourselves to find the right place, so if they feel and we feel that is an appropriate place then I'm happy to ask.

152. Those of you that have now registered hopefully for the west Cumbria sites will now see that you receive web alerts when we put anything on the website so provided you have all registered if we get that added to it we will send out a web alert to inform members that it is going to take place at that meeting.
153. The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and wished them a safe journey home.