

## West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group

### Minutes of the 13th Meeting of the LLWR Sub Committee Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2008 held at Drigg Village Hall

#### Attendees:

Sue Brown (chairman)	Cumbria County Council
Cath Giel (secretary)	Low Level Waste Repository
Kneale Thompson	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Jimmy Naylor	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
David Moore	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group
Elaine Woodburn	Copeland Borough Council
David Davies	Copeland Borough Council
Andrew Fairhurst	Environment Agency
Richard Evans	Cumbria County Council
Sue Brett	Cumbria County Council
Dave Weatherburn	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Chris Halliwell	Low Level Waste Repository
Dick Raaz	Low Level Waste Repository
Nigel Lister	Low Level Waste Repository
Andy Baker	Low Level Waste Repository

#### Apologies:

Eileen Eastwood	Copeland Borough Council
Adrian Dalton	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Steven Shepherd	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Glyn Davies	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate

#### Observers:

John Jennings	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Penny Hitchin	UK Monitor
Jeanne Park	Energy Solutions

#### 1. Welcome/Introductions/Apologies

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, asked those around the table to introduce themselves and acknowledged the apologies.

A technical hitch resulted in the Chairman rearranging the order of agenda items, with those items not requiring electronic media being heard first.

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting held on 28/01/08

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record subject to the following minor amendments being made:

**Page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph** – replace “that a specific figure for Drigg & Carleton had” with “the overall figure had”.

**Page 4, 6<sup>th</sup> Paragraph** – replace “maximise interest” with “be tax efficient”.

### **3. Update on Security Arrangements – Nigel Lister, LLWR**

Nigel Lister gave an update on the security position at LLWR. Nigel explained how the security requirements for LLWR are defined by the Office for Civil Nuclear Security which determines the level of security required depending on the risks present at the Site. He added that following the recovery of all bulk PCM from Site there was no longer a requirement to have 24 hour policing by CNC.

LLWR has reviewed options in the light of stakeholder concerns and was looking for a continued CNC presence in the form of a guard force. Following extensive discussions between LLWR and CNC, CNC have decided that they will not be providing such services at the current time.

LLWR are now considering utilising a private sector security guard force in future security arrangements, however in response to stakeholder concerns, CNC have agreed to have a continuing presence in the area in support of any guard force. This would include a first line response to any security issues at the Site.

The group expressed disappointment that CNC were not able to provide such a service. Nigel stated that they had given the matter considerable thought, and the Chairman and Chief Executive of the CNPA had visited the Repository as part of these considerations.

The group was concerned that the level of Security at the Site would only meet minimum requirements; Nigel explained that OCNS specify the level of security which is appropriate for a Site in considerable detail, rather than insisting on a minimum level. There would still be a full 24 hour security presence at the Site.

Nigel suggested the group provide representation to attend further discussion about which aspects of the guard force, and continued CNC involvement, were important to the local community. Noting that the security of the Site is key to the SLC and confirming that LLWR will ensure that any future security resource on site is of a high quality.

#### **Action**

LLWR/13/001	Agree representation at security discussions with Sub Committee Chairman and organise meeting to take place before next LLWR Sub Committee meeting on 11/06/08.	Cath Giel
-------------	---	-----------

Jimmy Naylor pointed out that a private security firm had no powers of arrest.

Nigel Lister confirmed that an armed response unit with powers of arrest were only five minutes away from the Repository.

Kneale Thompson summed it up by saying that it really depended on what CNC were prepared to provide and this was still not finalised. He requested an update on progress at the June meeting.

**Action**

LLWR/13/002	Nigel Lister to provide an update on progress with regard to security arrangements at the LLW Repository at the June meeting	Nigel Lister
-------------	--	--------------

**4. Update on Community Benefit Package – Dave Weatherburn, NDA**

Dave Weatherburn reported that NDA and the Local Authorities were closer to identifying a satisfactory solution to the delivery mechanism for administering the Community Benefit Package. He told the group that a meeting was scheduled for Friday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2008 where a time line would be agreed that would run in parallel to the commencement of development time frame of July 2008. Dave pointed out that the Parish Council must develop a “fit for purpose business case” and suggested that they take up UKNWM offer of resource to assist with pulling together the business case.

Elaine Woodburn expressed concern over the Parish Council having to produce a business case, she felt that the process could prove to be more onerous than it needed to be and she said Copeland’s preference would be for the Parish Council to receive their ring fenced £50k and provide a detailed report stipulating how they had spent the money in line with the NDA’s socio-economic policy/strategy.

Richard Evans pointed out that it was difficult to secure funding from NDA’s own socio-economic fund and said that a less bureaucratic process would be favoured.

The group asked that an update on progress be brought back to the next meeting.

**Action**

LLWR/13/003	Dave Weatherburn to provide an update on progress on the delivery mechanism for the Community Benefit Package at the next WCSSG LLWR Sub Committee Meeting.	Dave Weatherburn 11/06/08
-------------	---	------------------------------

**5. Feedback from PBEO Workshops Connected to PCSC – Andy Baker, LLWR**

Andy Baker began his presentation by issuing the caveat that the work conducted to date and on which his presentation was based, had not yet been fully approved as it had still to go through independent peer review. He apologised in advance for reference to any technical terms in the presentation and promised to try and keep it simple.

Andy explained the background to what had been done and why. He talked about the implications to the safety case and the site as a whole and provide a snap shot of progress to date and the work still to be undertaken to assist in the development of the full post closure safety case (PCSC) for submission to the Environment Agency in

2011. He reminded the group that the last submission had been in 2002 and explained that things had changed since this date, namely:

- Site will be eroded by the sea within some thousands of years unless coastal defences are put in place;
- Less cautious models for radon and thoron inhalation and exposures on the beach - interim view is that site performs well against relevant quantitative criteria;
- Improved and calibrated groundwater flow model;
- Less uranium in the trenches;
- Leaching model for uranium;
- Less pessimistic Potentially Exposed Groups;
- Changed view of engineering.

Andy concluded by explaining that the PBEO study was part of the PCSC process and contributed to a suite of documents that make up the safety case.

David Davies asked if a characterization study of the trenches had been conducted and whether LLWR were more certain about the content of inventory in the trenches.

Andy Baker responded by pointing out that a great deal of work and progress had been made with regard to inventory in the trenches. He said that an integrated study was looking at what do we need to know, how well do we know it and what actions do we need to consider.

David Davies cautioned against reliance on desk top studies and suggested that a proper characterization study be conducted to address magnitude of uncertainty. Andy Baker replied that if the concern was in respect to uranium then this was not an issue.

Richard Evans informed the group that the inventory in the trenches was of great concern to CCC and reminded LLWR that a fast track of the inventory in the trenches had been promised in 2005 along with a presentation to the Council.

Andy Fairhurst responded by saying that the EA were aware of the concerns of the Council and would be mindful when considering the submission in May. Andy Baker added that the option assessment does go into greater detail.

Cath Giel informed the group that LLWR had agreed to give a presentation to CCC on the PCSC work in June but that this had been postponed by the County and that a new date was yet to be advised.

Richard Evans informed LLWR that they would require planning permission for the Cap and approval from Natural England.

The Chairman thanked Andy Baker for his presentation and noted that the group would expect a presentation on the Environment Agency's response in due course.

## **6. A New PBO at LLWR – Dick Raaz, UKNWM**

Dick Raaz delivered a presentation on UKNWM's proposals for ongoing and future operations at the Low Level Waste Repository. He explained that the partner

organisations of the consortium had been specifically selected for the individual areas of expertise they brought to the partnership. Dick announced that in the future UKNWM would exist only as a shelf company and that from now on they would be fully integrated into LLW Repository Limited and operating under that name.

Dick predicted that as of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008, LLWR would be viewed differently because it was at the centre of a national programme that encompassed the whole of the UK which was looking at the management of radioactive low level waste. In addition, Dick described the difference between current operations and some of the initiatives he would be looking to introduce in the future:

- Segregation
- Avoidance
- Minimisation
- Treatment
- Innovative packaging

Dick revealed that the consortium only earned fee on savings and told the group that receiving more waste at the facility would not make his company any money. A more innovative approach was required to both preserve a national facility and reduce the burden on the UK tax payer. Dick pointed out that the processes/measures listed above were not new - they are all being practiced elsewhere in the world.

He went on to say that “business as usual is not a considered option” and confirmed that he would maintain the impetus on rail usage as part of an integrated transportation model. He added that there were many options available, all of which would help to inform the Low Level Waste Strategy.

Dick concluded by saying that he did not intend to predict the outcome of the strategy but was prepared to speculate on significant changes in the future.

**The Chairman left the meeting at this point (4.00pm). David Moore took the chair.**

Elaine Woodburn thanked Dick for an interesting presentation and asked what provision UKNWM made in their bid for socio-economic.

Dick replied that the NDA had negotiated very hard on behalf of the community and confirmed that UKNWM/LLWR would contribute economically both with financial assistance and benefit in kind. He detailed plans to:

- use professional expertise to help the community develop proposals/business plans to draw down match funding for projects;
- encourage staff to participate in community activities and groups;
- live and work in the immediate vicinity of the site;
- encourage use of local supply chain and labour pool whilst still complying with EU legislation.

Elaine Woodburn commented on NDA’s reluctance to levy additional charges against consignors and asked Dick where he thought the money (part of the community

benefit package) should come from. Dick replied that there was a fundamental question on how to get consignors to practice the implementation of the proposals UKNWM made in their bid – funding initiatives could be part of the solution.

Elaine expressed concern over accelerated decommissioning, stating that she was not a fan as it put additional pressure on the local authorities to find alternative jobs. She asked Dick if UKNWM had any plans to ease the burden on the economy and contribute to the jobs pool.

Dick replied that options to increase the job base at the Repository were available but that more work would need to be done to build a business case and wide spread consultation would need to be conducted. He believes that technology improvements could dramatically improve the waste curve at the same time as opening up new types jobs and businesses in the area. He focused on a leading edge assay capacity situated at the Repository as an example of opening up a world market but stressed that this was not a given purely an idea that may or may not be taken further.

Kneale Thompson asked whether UKNWM intended to place a new facility for waste segregation, compaction or treatment at the Repository stating that the general consensus is to locate such facilities as close to the sites of origin. Dick replied that he was not aware of anything additional to base operations at this time.

Kneale stated that Dick had not mentioned seeking an alternative to the LLWR. Dick reminded Kneale that whilst the community had the burden they were also now receiving the benefit. He stated that any alternative would result in Billions of pounds worth of expenditure and an additional burden on the British tax payer.

Richard Evans said that he was not authorised to speak on behalf of CCC but that he welcomed the approach and urged LLWR to provide visibility of potential planning applications as soon as possible.

David Moore thanked Dick for his presentation and asked that further updates be scheduled for future meetings.

## **7. Any Other Business**

Richard Evans informed the Parish Council that he had not received any comments on the B726 planning application and asked that they be submitted as soon as possible but before 20/05/08.

He also informed the group that CCC was consulting on the Mineral and Waste Development Framework (MWDF), copies available at the back of the room. The consultation period ends on 30/05/08.

Richard Evans enquired when the consultation period on requirement 2 submission would commence. Andrew Fairhurst said that he expected it to begin late 2008 or early 2009.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 4.30pm.

**8. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the WCSSG LLWR Sub Committee will be held on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2008 at 2.00pm in the Drigg Village Hall.

**Please remember the September meeting is an evening meeting commencing at 7.00pm in Drigg Village Hall on Wednesday 10/09/08.**