

West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group
Notes from Meeting of the Low Level Waste Repository Sub-committee
8th March 2006

Attendees:

Sue Brown	Cumbria County Council
Elaine Woodburn	Copeland Borough Council
David Cook	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Dave Weatherburn	NDA
Stephen Shepherd	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
James Fisher	British Nuclear Group
Cath Giel	British Nuclear Group
David Moore	Seascale Parish Council
James Millington	British Nuclear Group
Adrian Dalton	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Shirley Williams	British Nuclear Group (WCSSG secretariat)
Zena Bergman	Copeland Borough Council
Fi Wilson	UKAEA

Observers:

David Collier	Nick Seciuk
Derek Shepherd	Dave Millington

Welcomes/introductions

Apologies: Geoff Grint (NII), Dave Ferguson (Environment Agency), Eileen Eastwood (Seascale Parish Council), John Hetherington (Cumbria County Council), Mike Kopp (British Nuclear Group).

The notes from the sub-committee meeting in December 2005 were passed as an accurate record with one amendment: under “community support”, Mr Weatherburn had said that work on the socio-economic strategy would *begin* in early 2006, not *be completed* as implied.

Action 0306/1: Secretariat to amend minutes on website.

Terms of reference

The Chairman proposed that the LLWR sub-committee should establish a formalised Terms of Reference in line with WCSSG practice. The meeting (including observers) split into two groups to brainstorm ideas.

Action 0306/2: Secretariat to combine outputs from these groups to produce a draft Terms of Reference for circulation. To be ratified at next meeting.

Suggestions from the groups included the election of a vice-chair (to be covered under A.O.B.) and a proposal to include some evening meetings in the schedule. This was approved.

LLWR separation

James Millington gave a presentation on progress of the project to create a separate LLWR site license company (see attached).

Members endorsed the proposed name for the new organisation: the LLWR Site Licence Company. It was suggested that all organisations be encouraged to use the term “LLWR” rather than Drigg.

Cllr Woodburn commented that British Nuclear Group has developed a lot of trust within the community, and that if they do not win the contract post competition, community expectations need to be written into the tender document.

Dave Weatherburn offered to provide an update on competition to the next meeting in June.

Action 0306/3: Secretariat to add update to the agenda of the June meeting.

Q1: Does the workforce have any concerns about the separation process:

A1: There are concerns – it is a huge change and being the first site to face competition means it is uncharted territory. However, the vision outlined by the NDA is exciting, and that does offer hope. Employees know that Vault 9 is needed – that will provide jobs until at least 2018. Then there will be site closure work etc. So there is a lot of comfort in future work programmes.

Q2: Can people be transferred between SLC's?

A2: Work is in progress to provide those guarantees, and the NDA is providing regular updates to site employees.

Q3: Will separation increase the need for on-site employment?

A3: In the short-term, it's likely that a lot of support (administration etc.) will be provided from Sellafield. Any increase is likely to be small.

Q4: What confidence can be had in your ability to reduce the number of containers stored at the rail sidings?

A4: We are working on increasing throughput to 75%. We may need to work some longer hours to achieve a reduction.

Q5: Is another grouting facility required?

A5: We are exploring a number of options, including this one. This current situation arose because of an outage in 2004 due to work on the compound, resulting in a backlog which we're still treating. The visibility of this backlog is another reason to explore moving the rail siding further into the site.

Q6: Why are there so many containers arriving on site? Is it not possible to model receipts against plant availability?

A6: We're working on a waste minimisation programme to reduce arisings and to gain a better forecast of consignments.

Operational update

James Fisher gave a presentation on operational issues (see attached).

Questions:

Q7: The baseline document shows that you will apply to make higher stacking permanent. This does not align with promises made.

A7: This relates to a transferral application from storage to disposal. The NDA have given a guarantee that the contractor will not submit a planning application for permanent higher stacking unless there was full stakeholder support.

A suggestion was made that the committee should make a submission to the DEFRA consultation. Cllr Woodburn was concerned that it would be difficult to achieve a consensus. However, the committee should take the opportunity to develop a better understanding of the DEFRA proposals. Cllr Woodburn offered the Parish Council the opportunity to work with Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council on a joint submission.

Action 0306/4: The secretariat to investigate the possibility of a DEFRA briefing at the next sub-committee meeting.

Any other business

Vice-chair: Adrian Dalton was proposed and seconded.

A request was made for a presentation on planning issues.

Action 0306/4: Secretariat to invite Copeland and Cumbria councils to give a presentation on planning legislation.

Cllr Woodburn offered to work with Drigg & Carleton Parish Council, the NDA and British Nuclear Group on socio-economic plans.

Next meeting is on June 14th at 1400 in the Drigg Village Hall.