

West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group
Minutes of the 15th Meeting of the LLWR Sub Committee
Wednesday 10th September 2008 held at Drigg Village Hall

Attendees:

Adrian Dalton (Chairman)	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Cath Giel (Secretary)	Low Level Waste Repository
Jimmy Naylor	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
David Moore	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group
David Davies	Copeland Borough Council
Richard Evans	Cumbria County Council
Sue Brett	Cumbria County Council
Dave Weatherburn	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Bob Churchill	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Andrew Fairhurst	Environment Agency
Dick Raaz	Low Level Waste Repository
Nigel Lister	Low Level Waste Repository
Scott Anderson	Low Level Waste Repository
Paul Pointon	Low Level Waste Repository
James Fisher	Low Level Waste Repository
Martin Walkingshaw	Low Level Waste Repository
Samantha Higgins	Legion Group
Stephen Greenaway	Legion Group

Apologies:

Sue Brown	Cumbria County Council
Mike Robbins	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Elaine Woodburn	Copeland Borough Council
Eileen Eastwood	Copeland Borough Council
Stephen Shepherd	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
David Harrison	Civil Nuclear Constabulary

Observers:

John Jennings	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Penny Hitchin	UK Monitor
Keith Hitchen	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Neil Shaw	Low Level Waste Repository
Keith Gibson	Low Level Waste Repository
Richard Cummings	Low Level Waste Repository
2 x Members of the Public (names not supplied)	

1. Welcome/Introductions/Apologies

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

2. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting held on 11th June 2008

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record by those who had attended the June meeting however, the Chairman of the meeting, Cllr Dalton, disputed Cllr Woodburn's comments on page 3, last paragraph:

'Elaine Woodburn pointed out that D&CPC had been engaged at a very early stage in the process and had been advised to develop a Parish Plan with a view to identifying potential projects for funding. They had also been sent the Section 106 Agreement for comment. She went on to say that the Negotiation Committee were still trying to get the right framework in place for delivery and that discussion on funding selection criteria were still to be held. She concluded by saying that the committee's efforts to date had concentrated on securing the best legal framework/agreements.'

saying that whilst he had not been present at the meeting, if he had, he would have pointed out that engagement with the Parish Council had been sporadic at best.

3. Update on Security Arrangements at LLWR

Nigel Lister provided an update on security arrangements at LLWR, explaining that from 1st October 2008, security provision at the Repository would be provided by Legion Group (sub-contractors to Operon FM) with armed response backup from the Civil Nuclear Constabulary. He introduced Stephen Greenaway, Operations Director Legion Group and Sarah Higgins, Accounts Manager Legion Group who delivered a joint presentation detailing the activities of the organisation as a whole and covering specific aspects of the LLWR contract.

They described certain requirements of the tender specification, particularly creating employment locally and utilising the local labour market. They explained that they had achieved the necessary mix by using existing experienced ex-military personnel and recruiting young local people who are currently undertaking training and will benefit from this mentoring approach.

David Moore asked how many local people has been recruited and was told that the contract stipulated a 50/50 split with 8 jobs created locally and filled by personnel from the immediate travel to work area. He went on to enquire whether Tony Clark, the Contracts Manager was a local person or resided locally. David was informed that Mr Clark had 17 years combined experience with the Black Watch and the Police Force and originated from the North East. He was reassured that Mr Clark would remain at the Repository until the contract was

change to the clauses relating to dispute resolution. Approval is anticipated around the 20/09/08.

Payments to the Fund: NDA will pay £5M to the Fund within 30 days of the commencement of development on Vault 9. Twelve months after the date of the first payment, a further £5M will be paid to the Fund. Thereafter, £1.5M will be paid to the Fund per year for each year that Vault 9 receives waste material.

Richard Evans confirmed that Cumbria County Council was the Accountable Body for the Fund and that administration duties would be carried out by the Regeneration Support Team in Cockermouth with a person being located at the Copeland Centre in Whitehaven.

Adrian Dalton and Jimmy Naylor expressed disappointment that a representative from the Parish Council or the 5 Rivers organisation had not been chosen to sit on the Project Board. They were advised to submit a nomination to the Project Board for consideration as an independent member. Bob Churchill undertook to inform the Parish Council when the positions would be advertised.

New Action

LLWR/15/001	Bob Churchill to advise Drigg & Carleton Parish Council when it would be appropriate to submit a nomination for independent member of the Copeland Community Fund	Bob Churchill
-------------	---	---------------

David Moore advised the group that Copeland's representatives would be himself and Cllr Elaine Woodburn; he added that the Project Board had the ability to co-opt members if they considered it necessary.

Bob Churchill added that the protocol for managing the £50k ring fenced sum for Drigg & Carleton Parish Council still needed to be established.

Adrian Dalton pointed out that Drigg & Carleton Parish Council have managed a charity fund for over 30 years and have recently appointed a financial officer and an auditor who is a current Commissioner of the Inland Revenue.

5) EA Review of Schedule 9

Andrew Fairhurst delivered a presentation on initial findings from LLWR's recent Schedule 9 submission to The Environment Agency (EA). In his opening remarks he reminded the group that following the EA's review of LLWR's 2002 Post Closure Safety Case they concluded that the site was currently safe and will remain safe while under active management and that an adequate case for continued disposals was not made.

A new Authorisation was issued by the EA (RSA93) in 2006 which placed the following restrictions on operations at LLWR:

- Disposal to Vault 8 within current limits allowed.
- Disposal to new Vaults not authorised.
- Vault 9 only has planning permission for storage.
- Restrictions on cap construction.
- Included 14 Improvement Requirements.

These measures were predominantly taken to move the 2002 Post Closure Safety Case forward to a full Environmental Safety Case which is due in 2011.

Andrew added that The EA were impressed with the May submission of Schedule 9 Requirement 2 and stated it was a good quality piece of work. He concluded by saying:

- The submission is certainly a substantial piece of work and shows good progress in terms of presentation and structure of the case.
- As reported by the LLWR in April, Erosion of the site by the sea is now considered very likely within a period of thousands of years. Due to the significance of this finding, we have commissioned an independent review into the LLWRs reports in this area and based upon the output of this review will consider this issue further.
- LLWR also present a case indicating that assessed risks and doses for a number of scenarios can be reduced compared to the 2002 case due to improved modelling, data and understanding. On the whole these risks also fall within our regulatory criteria stipulated in our Guidance on Requirements for Authorisation. These conclusions do not look unreasonable, however, at this stage there is an acknowledged lack of treatment of uncertainty in the case and further work will be required on this before we could reach a conclusion.
- We also note that significant developments have been made in a number of areas of modelling, however we believe some of this work requires further underpinning.
- LLWR also make proposals on radiological capacity and suggest that current disposal limits are appropriate, pending a more detailed review within the 2011 case. Initially these proposals seem consistent with the assessment, however, we expect that further information will be needed to make a long term decision on capacity.

New Action

LLWR/15/002	Andrew Fairhurst to present more detailed findings of Schedule 9 Requirement 2 submission at the Sub Committee's March meeting.	Andrew Fairhurst
-------------	---	------------------

Richard Evans asked whether the submission accounted for UKNWM's proposed innovations on waste segregation/treatment etc. as it could impact on the radiological capacity per volume. Richard Cummings replied that the submission was based on current operations and did not include UKNWM's future innovations however, future work planned throughout the next few years would.

Richard Evans enquired about progress on fast tracking of the trench inventory. He said that CCC had asked for this in 2005 and had yet to receive a formal response.

Andrew Fairhurst replied that the EA had requested LLWR to commission work covering the radiological capacity of the site, trenches and implications, climate change and sea rise. This work is underway.

Dick Raaz explained that much has been done to address key concerns and gave assurances that the technical expertise has been engaged to deliver the Environmental Safety Case.

David Moor asked that stakeholders be consulted prior to decisions being taken on the way forward with regard to the trenches. He added that remediation of trench inventory could be very intrusive and cause massive disruption to the village and community at large.

Jimmy Naylor asked whether the current authorisation and planning consent for storage in Vault 9 would be changed following review of the Environmental Safety Case in 2011.

Andrew Fairhurst replied that if additional information satisfactorily addressed the issues stated above EA would be minded to issue a disposal authorisation. Adrian Dalton asked if this would result in a new planning application and was told that it would.

6) LLWR Life Time Plan

Dennis Thompson delivered a presentation on LLWR's review of the 2008 Life Time Plan (LTP) submission and the key assumptions made within that document.

He informed the group that early LLWR LTP's did not capture the true long term costs of running the Repository and stated that the re-submitted LTP 2008 identifies, for the first time, the total cost of running the Repository for the next 47 years (and beyond). He added that once implemented, the innovations identified in the UKNWM bid will save money on three fronts:

- Against the original baseline by 2050 (> £127 Million)
- By delaying or eliminating the uncostered liability of building a second repository (> £1 Billion)
- By providing other SLC's avenues for significant waste reduction techniques and thereby saving Billions across the NDA estate.

Jimmy Naylor asked how confident the operators were in achieving the forecasted savings. Dennis Thompson replied that they were very confident they could deliver the savings which would be due to more efficient operations/practices ultimately resulting in maximising capacity in existing vaults and a delay in building new vaults. He added that the estimates were conservative and erred on the side of caution.

Jimmy referred to inflation and the current economic climate and asked whether these types of risks had been built into the analysis. Dennis confirmed that they had.

Richard Evans enquired when LLWR intended to implement the new packaging/storage innovations. Dennis replied that this was one of 57 projects identified in the LTP and stated that priority would be given to those projects that provided the largest savings and that these would be implemented within the next 3-5 years.

Improving LLW Management

As an adjunct to the LTP presentation Martin Walkingshaw appraised the group on a step change in service delivery with regard to managing low level waste. He talked about changes to the Conditions for Acceptance and incentives for consigners which encourage waste segregation. Martin pointed out that whilst this is a new approach that will see waste segregated into Metals, Combustibles and Very Low Level Waste (VLLW) it is dealing with the waste that normally would come to LLWR but in a mixed form.

David Davies stated that VLLW was used as infill to reduce volume and raise packing fractions he asked if this practice would continue. He went on to say that it was possible that the VLLW could go to municipal waste dumps and expressed concern about the potential impact this would have on the municipal waste authorities. He asked if LLWR were in discussions with the local authorities. Martin Walkingshaw replied that container innovations would address efficiency by optimising packing fractions and reducing the level of grout required. He added that proposed innovations were not a secret to the local authorities or stakeholders but that implementation was longer term and formal representation would be made at the appropriate time.

In a presentation designed to respond to improved ways of managing waste at LLWR, Andrew Fairhurst explained that the EA:

- Expect LLWR to apply for a variation to allow transfer of wastes to different facilities for treatment.
- Expect certain other nuclear sites to apply for variations to allow transfer of wastes to new facilities (e.g. Metals Recycle Facility, Lillyhall) for treatment.
- Nuclear site authorisations only currently allow transfer of waste to LLWR for the purposes of final disposal.

- EA propose to vary all nuclear site authorisations, where LLW is currently consigned to LLWR, to allow onward transfer for treatment, with radioactive waste residues being returned to the LLWR.

His presentation also covered timescales.

Jimmy Naylor asked where the waste would be treated – UK, Europe, USA and whether the EA envisaged any problems. Andrew Fairhurst replied that The EA preference would be to treat in the UK supported by a BPEO and that a trans-international agreement would have to be in place for partners outside the UK.

7) Any Other Business

Richard Evans informed the group that the public hearing for Radioactive Waste would be held in the Copeland Centre, Whitehaven on Tuesday 18th and Wednesday 19th November 2008.

Adrian Dalton raised an issue with Birse's Traffic Management Plan (TMP), servicing the LLWR during construction of Vault 9. He explained that the original preferred bidder - Hanson - had pulled out leaving the contract open to the remaining short listed companies. Birse won the contract. Drigg & Carleton Parish Council have an issue with the revised TMP because it involves approximately 800 additional traffic movement through the village during the construction period. He stated that this was a terrible inconvenience to the village and that they felt let down.

Richard Evans explained that submission of the TMP was a requirement of the planning consent and that the additional 421 vehicles would be bringing in Bentonite Powders and Powders needed to make concrete.

David Moore enquired why the additional vehicles were being brought through the village and asked if it was to make savings or due to practicalities. Dick Raaz replied that the contractor had tried to satisfy a mixture of demands that maximised rail transport and minimised impacts on the entire road system.

Keith Hitchin commented that a recent presentation to representatives of the Drigg & Carleton Parish Council identified costs of approximately £450k required to build a temporary rail facility at Millom to service materials from the Ghyll Scaur Quarry. He understood that building this facility would reduce traffic on the A595 by some 3,000 vehicles and that the reason for bringing 421 additional vehicles through the Village was to finance this facility – he asked how much Birse were contributing to this. Neil Shaw replied that LLWR would pick up the costs as Birse have a cost reimbursable contract. Keith responded by saying that those parishes along the A595 route who were disadvantaged should be compensated including Drigg and Carleton.

Neil went on to say that without a facility at Millom the Highways Authority was not minded to approve the TMP. Richard Evans offered to forward a copy of the letter to the Parish Clerk, Dave Millington.

New Action

LLWR/15/003	Richard Evans to forward a copy of the Highways Authority response to the Birse Traffic Management Plan to David Millington.	Richard Evans
-------------	--	---------------

In his closing comments the acting Chairman, Mr Dalton, expressed the disappointment of villagers to the TMP and said the additional vehicles were unacceptable to the village.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm.

8) Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the LLWR Sub Committee will be held on Wednesday 10th December 2008 at 2.00pm in Drigg Village Hall.