

West Cumbria Site Stakeholder Group
Minutes of the 26th Meeting of the LLWR Sub-Committee
Wednesday 14th September 2011
Drigg Village Hall 14.00-16.00hrs

Attendees

Sue Brown, Chairman
Dick Raaz
Adrian Dalton
Jimmy Naylor
Cath Giel
Nigel Lister
Nicholas Blackburn
Alyson Armett
Andrew Fairhurst
Elaine Woodburn
Richard Evans
Marcus Swift
David Moore
Carole Woodman
Paul Pointon
Jonathan Evans
Donna Glasson

Cumbria County Council
Low Level Waste Repository Ltd
Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Low Level Waste Repository Ltd
Low Level Waste Repository Ltd
Office for Nuclear Regulation
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Environment Agency
Copeland Borough Council
Cumbria County Council
Prospect – Sellafield
WCSSG
Copeland Borough Council
Low Level Waste Repository Ltd
Low Level Waste Repository Ltd
Low Level Waste Repository Ltd

Apologies

Sue Brett
Keith Hitchen
Eileen Eastwood
Steve Nicholson

Cumbria County Council
Five Rivers
Copeland Borough Council
Prospect - Sellafield

Observers

David Rossiter
John Cain
Peter Morgan
James Dean
Bob Brown
Richard Cummings

Low Level Waste Repository Ltd
Copeland Borough Council
Member of the public
Member of the public
Member of the public
Low Level Waste Repository Ltd

1. Welcome/Introductions/Apologies

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance, she followed with apologies for the meeting. The chairman reminded all present to sign the attendance sheet located on the table by the front door.

2. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting held on the 8th June 2011

Cath Giel had received comments from Peter Morgan who had attended the June meeting, he had sent her an email on 14.09.2011 asking for amendments to be actioned. Due to the short timescale given to action any of the changes Cath covered Peters’ concerns verbally at the meeting and will amend the minutes to show the new additions as agreed. Peter was happy with the response. Cath stated that the minutes were not intended as a verbatim record, they provide a summary of key themes and capture actions.

Action LLWR/024/01 ongoing

LLWR/024/01	To update the committee on the strategy and break points in the LLWR Planning application	Cumbria County Council Planners
-------------	---	---------------------------------

Richard Evans commented on behalf of CCC that LLWR’s Planning Application had been received the first week in July. The application documents received were very large and will take a long time to review, the final decision will not be made until next summer but they are looking at aspects of the application. Three of the main points in principal are the Legacy of Waste, the radiological capacity of the site and coastal erosion. CCC has had some consultation replies but it is too early in the process to comment further.

3. General update on LLWR activities- Dick Raaz, LLWR

Dick Raaz welcomed everyone to the meeting and congratulated Drigg village on their recent success in the Cumbria in Bloom competition.

Dick reported that the Site Optimisation and Closure Works planning application had been submitted to CCC, and a number of briefing sessions had been arranged or conducted with CCC, CBC, Drigg & Carleton PC, Seascale PC and Gosforth PC. He added that LLWR would be happy to honour any requests for briefings on the planning application.

Dick apologised for the size of the planning application document, and said “this has to cover so many decades, the size is appropriate to give the full view of the repository”.

Dick went on to report on removal of Plutonium Contaminated Material (PCM) in the magazines saying “magazines 4, 9 and 10 are being actively worked, there will be no skyline changes with this current work as the decommissioning activity is internal to the structure. The plan is to demolish the magazines concurrent with the Final Cap,

and we can not work the cap until we have a new ESC signed off by the Environment Agency”.

Dick reminded the meeting that the Grouting Facility has been idle for sometime and has recently undergone an upgrade on the power supply(11Kv project). The plant is due to come back on line later in the month which means that deliveries of Portland cement to the site will resume.

Dick reported that the Environment Agency (EA) is reviewing the ESC. During the review period LLWR are working on the provisions of that scheme, which includes changes to the Conditions for Acceptance (CfA). CfA is the document used to determine whether or not to accept waste.

Dick highlighted LLWR’s intentions to be a “one stop shop” for waste treatments services with some treatment routes already available and others yet to come.

Dick notified the meeting that LLWR’s administrative staff currently based in Greengarth will be relocating to Pelham house near Calderbridge. This involves around 60 staff, and the moves will be completed before the end of December.

Dick added that LLW3R are currently working two marquee projects:

- i) the removal and treatment of Multi element bottles (MEB’s) from Sellafield and
- ii) the removal and subsequent treatment of Berkeley boilers from the Magnox site.

These are both very big projects that will use the recycling routes, no bulk metal will come to LLWR but the much reduced residual waste will.

David Moore asked whether LLWR intend to retain the PCM magazines for the cap profile, and when PCM activities were due to be complete.

Paul Pointon replied that the last magazine is scheduled to be decontaminated by 2016.

Dick added that the second phase of the contract with the NDA is currently underway and we would like to accelerate this project. All PCM was sent back to SL back in 2007, there are just contaminated buildings that remain at LLWR.

Jimmy Naylor asked if the demolition would be noisy, as the machines used to break up the concrete tend to be very noisy

Dick replied that there will be no more noise than what you are used to in surrounding areas, but the work will be very quick and swift. Paul added that the demolition works have yet to be confirmed as the concrete may not need to be broken down into small pieces.

4. Introduction to the new NDA Organisation Structure – Alyson Armett, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)

Alyson Armett apologised for the absence of Dr Ian Hudson who had been called to an urgent meeting and introduced herself as the Lead Programme Manager for Operations.

She explained that the NDA appointed a new Chief Executive, Tony Fountain, who had overseen the restructure of the organisation. This resulted in the loss of around a third of its staff to redundancy. She explained how the two Site Facing teams from LLWR and Sellafield (SL) had now merged together resulting in a much smaller team as the primary interface. She described the new Executive team, which is lead by Mark Lesinski, Executive Director, Delivery and the new four Programme Managers who are Dr Ian Hudson, Mark Steele, Alyson Armett and Stephen Sharpe.

Alyson reported that the restructure has not affected the priorities of the NDA which remain the same: to ensure each site delivers and is cost effective to the taxpayer. Alyson concluded with the NDA priorities at LLWR site, these included decommissioning of the PCM facilities, introduction of the new LLW packaging containers, the Environmental Safety Case (ESC), new waste and disposal services and consigning other SLCs to implement the Strategy.

This presentation can be found at www.wcssg.co.uk

5. Early Review stage of the ESC- Andrew Fairhurst, Environment Agency

Andrew Fairhurst began his presentation by describing that an Environmental Safety Case is a collection of arguments, data, assessments and information to demonstrate environmental safety now and into the long term future. The previous ESC that was submitted in 2002 was not adequate for a number of reasons, and so, in 2006 authorisation for continued disposal would only cover Vault 8. All future vaults, including Vault 9 would only be authorised for storage only. Capping of Vault 8 and the trenches was not allowed until risk management had been addressed, and an updated ESC was required by May 2011.

The importance of the ESC is to determine future disposals at LLWR, as the cost to replace the repository would be around £2bn, however the focus for LLWR is to demonstrate that the site is environmentally safe. The EA objectives are to have a fully authorised site to take the UK's low level waste, a robust and clear technical review to underpin the decision, and to review and complete their report by Autumn 2013, this may be sooner but they don't want to compromise the quality of the review. The scope of the project was described as being split into two phases, the first was to receive the ESC and complete a technical review which is happening at the moment, the technical review will then feed into the second phase, a permit review which will include a consultation period finalising with a decision.

Some expectations of the EA are that the ESC meets the principals and requirements in the Guidance on Requirements for Authorisation (GRA), the ESC must have reasonable arguments covering issues such as inventory monitoring, human intrusion, the nearby SSSI, and coastal erosion.

The Project Board set up by the EA has Senior EA oversight and recent papers have reached Director Level and Climate Change Board. There is also a working group set up at Penrith, Nuclear Waste Assessment Team (NWAT) who are working on the review together with some specialist roles such as coastal evolution specialists and hydrogeologists. All resources required are secured by the EA and supported by the Directors.

Andrew continued with the outline of timescales, confirming that the Initial review had been completed and feedback has been given back to Richard Cummings and his team. The next 9 months will concentrate on the Core technical review and audits, this will take us up to May 2012 when the EA will prepare conclusions and publish, completing in April 2013.

The initial review findings are that the EA has read all the top level documents and are continuing with the under pinning evidence. So far the ESC is clear, coherent and well written and is a good piece of work much better than the last one, but it is early days. Some issues have already been identified and clarifications are required from LLWR which include reassurance about ESC skills, knowledge maintenance, change control and the impacts of the updated UK Radioactive Waste Inventory (UKRWI). Over the next 9 months audits will be carried out in some areas for example quality

assurance and waste tracking, these will include interaction with LLWR and their contractors on site.

The planning application is vitally important to the ESC and the EA are a statutory consultee for the planning process, as this impacts on future vaults, disposal and closure engineering. The EA will be liaising with Richard Evans' team at CCC on this issue.

Finally Andrew provided the EA's website address for any further information and Q&A's and will continue to update this committee as the review progresses.

www.environment-agency.gov.uk/llwr

Richard Evans said that on one of the slides it showed a cost implication of £2bn to replace the repository, he stated he was not convinced about this figure.

Dick Raaz replied that the £2bn indicates the operational costs of the life of the repository.

Carole Woodman asked, in 2013 when the ESC review is complete will there be periodic reviews after this?

Andrew replied this is managed by LLWR's Change Control process which provides updates, which in turn provides the assurance required by the EA. The EA envisage a minimum full review period of 5-10 years and they will continue with annual periodic reviews of the permit.

Dick added that LLWR manage several Safety Cases and there is a management scheme to cover this issue.

6. Waste Management Services /Commercial – Jonathan Evans LLWR

Jonathan Evans began by explaining why his name appears twice on the agenda, he is deputising for Martin Walkingshaw, Head of Waste Management Services who is unavailable today. Jonathan is currently changing his role from Waste Services Manager to Head of Commercial, with both roles being linked the presentation will cover both agenda items.

Jonathan explained that in 2008 LLWR were faced with the challenge of the capacity gap of Vault 8 to store the UK's LLW. Things have progressed since then and Vault 9 has now been constructed and storage of waste is now current. The challenge remains that the LLW inventory figures still shows very high volumes of waste, by implementing the waste services routes and the new National Waste Programme, headed by Dave Rossiter at LLWR, this will show how to improve that inventory. He described the Business Objectives of the Waste Management Services as:

- Implement the National Waste Programme
- Reduce Waste Volumes
- Increase Waste Management Capacity

LLWR's role in this is to support the NDA team in delivering the National LLW Strategy, in terms of reducing the volumes LLWR intend to work on the new services in the waste management hierarchy. They are also working with customers particular in the NDA estate to work on improving the radioactive waste inventory and leading some of the key initiatives and enablers that improve the way waste is managed across the UK. Jonathan explained that it was essential to ensure that we have a sustainable supply chain that can continue the services such as metal treatment and incineration. In order to achieve the volume reduction LLWR have identified 8 different services, these include LLW, metallic, combustible, and supercompactable. New services

currently procuring are very low level waste, transport service, packaging and characterisation.

Jonathan described how the current services are working and who the service providers are for each treatment. Pictures of the new packaging solutions were shown which included reusable liners and soft sided packages. He explained how work on the transport service is being developed with Direct Rail Services (DRS), a subsidiary of the NDA, which can be introduced as a new service in 2012. Magnox is a key part of the DRS work, and LLWR are currently running some pilot schemes which will demonstrate how the low level waste shipments will work for them. The overall objective is to implement this service throughout the nuclear estate.

Jonathan concluded his waste services presentation with an overview of the Waste Management Services Team describing the individual departments and how they each implement the Waste Hierarchy and how they are increasing the focus on customer projects and customer sites, engaging early to influence which route is most suitable. Jonathan then gave a small detailed presentation regarding the Commercial aspect of the business. LLWR is the smallest SLC with around 170 people working at the repository, funding is around £30 million a year to run the business, and procurement and expenditure with the supply chain runs in the area of £15-20 million. LLWR are bound to follow the EU Procurement Rules and Public Contract Regulations, and work closely with the NDA estates Shared Services Alliance which means we buy more effectively as a group. LLWR also recognise socio-economic issues within West Cumbria and the small and medium enterprises (SME). He stressed the importance of encouraging them within the supply chain. LLWR have a number of frameworks and mini competitions, one of the objectives is how to make this process easier to build a sustainable supply chain.

This presentation can be found at www.wcssg.co.uk

Elaine Woodburn asked whether framework contracts identify the impacts in West Cumbria for SME's and Socio-economic benefit.

Jonathan replied that when LLWR are awarding contracts there has to be specific criteria of Socio-economic in relation to the value.

Elaine continued by asking, what percentage of the overseas contracts with America and France has gone to the socio-economic in West Cumbria.

Dick replied, not much. The total of the overseas metals contracts from last year is estimated around £2 million, we have yet to see inside their Socio-economic piece of the contract. Together Sellafield, NDA and LLWR are trying to establish this impact on the SME's from the bids. The procurements over the last 2½ years have not shown that any award has been won by socio-economic benefit, however behaviours must change. We are looking at this issue and spending a lot of time on this, especially with the bidders and are sensitive to this issue. The only direct impact we can show is when Vault 9 was built, this had a huge positive impact on West Cumbria and local communities

Elaine then asked, are the NDA happy that the majority of the work is going overseas with no benefit to West Cumbria, can they not act on this issue.

Alyson Armett replied on behalf of the NDA, that this response should come from the Commercial team who would be more suitable to answer these questions.

LLWR/026/001	To update the committee on contracts placed with overseas companies and how this impacts on West Cumbria Socio-economic benefit	NDA Commercial Team
--------------	---	---------------------

Dick explained how some of the metal services that have been done overseas were daunting in scale and were not available in the UK. He added that it is important to look at the health of the supply chain, and whether there is a business case that requires a super size metal facility. Unfortunately because it is not economically viable.

LLWR/026/002	To update the committee on LLWR procurement activities as they involve socio-economic benefit.	Dick Raaz, LLWR
--------------	--	-----------------

Marcus Swift asked if we are legally obliged to add in a socio-economic element into a bid.

Jonathan clarified that we have to work within the bounds of procurement regulations and the rules are about the service and goods that are being procured.

Richard Evans asked if any local business's had shown interest with the new reusable containers tender.

Jonathan replied that was a sensitive issue as LLWR is currently working on this tender process, so cannot comment at this time.

Marcus Swift then asked if the planning application did not succeed, do you have a contingency plan.

Dick explained that we would use what we have, Vault 9 for storage, then we would have to find another repository with a price tag being in the billions, a timeline of many years and the impact on the decommissioning would be bad.

Peter Morgan asked whether the waste tracking system development would be undertaken internally would this go out to tender.

Jonathan replied that the project was still at an early stage but would likely go out to tender.

7. AOB

Sue Brown enquired whether quarterly reports from ONR and EA could be added as agenda items.

David Moore confirmed that these reports are now going to each of the WCSSG sub committees, and so requested that this would be better served as an agenda item. It would also work better if the committee had this report to view before the meeting.

Andrew Fairhurst clarified that the EA does not currently do quarterly reports but is willing to do so in the future.

Nick Blackburn explained that if the quarterly report was an agenda item, any issues raised from the report can be clarified and discussed openly.

LLWR/026/003	ONR and EA to provide quarterly reports in advance of the sub committee meetings, these will then be added as agenda items	Nick Blackburn and Andrew Fairhurst
--------------	--	-------------------------------------

Richard Evans updated the committee from the CCC Planning Department, the planning policy document (Minerals and Development Framework), had got to the end of the line with the site allocations, which identified the repository and land near Sellafield, has now been quashed by the High Court. This now leaves us to start looking at different site allocations.

Peter Morgan asked the EA whether they were able to provide an update on their review of the SL exempt bagged waste event.

Andrew replied that he is not closely linked to this enquiry, but is aware that the investigation is still ongoing. It was Sellafield site that released those bags, and evidence is still being gathered, it was a Sellafield monitoring device that failed and so Sellafield will be taking responsible actions. Andrew confirmed he is not a Sellafield site regulator and can not directly comment on the investigation. However this event did have huge impacts on all the other SLC sites starting with a series of inspections to check competency within the sites.

Sue Brown closed the meeting at 16.10pm