

25 May 2006

NOTE FOR THE RECORD

Stakeholder Meeting regarding the Optioneering Process for Modular Vaults @ LLWR, held at Sellapark House on Tuesday 28th March 2006, 10.00 – 16.00hrs.

Cath Giel

Aims: To explain the Optioneering Process adopted for Modular Vaults (Vault 9) and involve Stakeholders in the weighting/scoring element of this process to ensure that they have an opportunity to influence the outcome of a single preferred option for LLWR to take forward for Regulator approval and acceptance (including planning submission).

Present:	Adrian Dalton	Deputy Chair LLWR Sub-Committee/Drigg & Carlton Parish Councillor
	Elaine Woodburn	Leader, Copeland Borough Council
	Eileen Eastwood	Ward Councillor, Copeland Borough Council
	David Moore	Chairman West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group/Ward Councillor CBC
	Richard Evans	Cumbria County Council Planning Authority
	Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council Nuclear Issues
	Dave Weatherburn	NDA
	Glyn Davies	NII
	Dave Ferguson	EA
	David Brazier	EA
	Mike Kopp	Superintendent LLWR
	James Fisher	Senior Project Manager LLWR
	Keith Thomson	Engineering Manager Projects LLWR
	Dave Anderson	Project Manager Project Services
	Brian Edwards	Project Manager LLWR
	Phil Walker	Legal Directorate British Nuclear Group
	Bill Paul	Construction Manager/SO
	Cath Giel	Stakeholder Relations, LLWR
	Andy Smith	Westlakes Scientific Consulting
	Leanne Williams	Workshop Facilitator (Scoring exercise)
	Adrian Proctor	Acting Technical Secretary (Scoring exercise)

It was agreed that in the absence of Sue Brown, Chairman of the WCSSG LLWR Sub-Committee, Adrian Dalton the Vice Chairman of the Sub Committee would chair today's proceedings.

It was also agreed that the views of individual participants are without prejudice to their respective organisations' formal consideration of any proposals arising.

1) Introduction

The Chairman explained that the date for this meeting had originally been set aside for a Regulator/Stakeholder meeting and as such had been in some people's diaries for some time. He explained that a recent commitment by BNGSL to involve WCSSG LLWR Sub Committee in the Modular Vaults Optioneering Process had resulted in an extension of the original invitation list to include all members of the LLWR Sub Committee. He apologised to those who had received short notice.

The Chairman reminded the group of the aims of the meeting, explaining that he was seeking support from the wider group in scoring and weighting specific aspects of the optioneering process that relate to Regulator and Stakeholder issues.

Richard Evans remarked on a comment the Chairman had made during his introduction about the meeting being closed to members of the public and sought agreement that all material was suitable for the public domain. BNG representatives acknowledged that this was acceptable.

Mike Kopp delivered the safety topic – slips, trips and falls.

2) Review of Note for the Record and Actions from Previous Meeting Held on 13/12/05

The Note for the Record was accepted as an accurate record and the action regarding annual arising figures was confirmed as closed out.

3) Aim of Today

James Fisher reiterated the aims of today's session – to assist in the selection of a preferred option for Modular Vaults (Vault 9) – and explained the current situation:

- Vault 8 will be full by mid 2008.
- Unlikely Vault 9 will be available before 2009.
- Technical assessment on interim contingency measures shows problems with using PCM slabs – unable to support Fork Lift Truck (FLT) and containers) now looking at compound.
- Require your help to deliver Vault 9.

David Ferguson sought clarification on why BNGSL were going for 'storage' and not disposal. James Fisher explained that there was a degree of uncertainty regarding LLW and that several studies/reports were underway e.g. CORWM, DEFRA, NDA Strategy, CCC Minerals and Waste Development Framework, LLWR Lifetime Project that could impact on the status of the LLWR site. James went on to say that it is recognised that facilities are required at the LLWR as soon as possible, it is also recognised that some may consider a disposal application premature in the current climate. With this in mind, BNGSL intend to submit an initial application for storage rather than disposal.

4. Presentation – New Vault Optioneering – Keith Thomson

Keith Thomson delivered the above presentation which generated the following comments/questions:

Richard Evans stated that he does not accept the DEFRA consultation conclusion for the future capacity of the LLWR after Vault 8. He said that CCC, CBC and ABC are considering writing a joint response to DEFRA covering this particular point.

Action: David Anderson to provide David Brazier with further details on the American sites covered in the presentation.

David Ferguson quoted the 125,000 m³ material required for cut off wall and asked what happens to the excavated material. Keith Thomson confirmed that it is likely to be used in the cap profiling.

Action: Keith Thomson to provide David Ferguson with an example where deep cut off walls has been used in the UK.

Richard Evans asked how deep the cut off wall would be and was told it would be in the order of 20m in the north and 40m in the south.

Dave Weatherburn enquired when the cut off walls would be installed and reminded BNGSL that the Lifetime Plan quotes a timescale in 2050. Keith Thomson said that the cut off wall is required at different times for the various options presented. He added that the trenches influence this requirement and that a more detailed project plan will pinpoint timeframes.

Richard Evans stated that the Consented Area Planning Permission does not apply to the new vault developments – these are very different from the trenches.

David Moore sought clarification that monitoring would cease at closure stage in approximately 2150. Keith Thomson confirmed this to be a correct principle. However, he pointed out that this will be reviewed as part of the LLWR Lifetime Project which addresses future work on the Post Closure Safety Case.

Glyn Davies asked how robust the cut off wall would be to coastal erosion and was told that the lifetime project would address this issue.

Adrian Dalton's main concern was that any preferred option would be radiologically secure.

Richard Evans questioned the dilute and disperse philosophy referring to it as dilute and pollute and stating that an unlined landfill is a "no no". (Secretary's note: The option selected provided the most robust containment.)

Stakeholders and Regulators questioned the validity of Option A - dilute and disperse. Mike Kopp replied that BNGSL are offering unconstrained options that are technically sound and worth consideration but accepted that they may not be acceptable to stakeholders which is why BNGSL are involving stakeholders in the optioneering process.

David Moore asked Mike Kopp if Option A was effectively the same system used for the trenches. Mike replied that they were very similar.

Adrian Dalton asked how long it would take for the waste to decay to VLLW status. Andy Smith (Head of Environmental Sciences at Westlakes Scientific Consulting Limited), responded, stating that Uranium would take in the order of 100,000 years to decay to VLLW. He confirmed that in his opinion Option B was the best option for encapsulation of short lived isotopes but that option A would better meet the requirements of long lived isotopes. He added that the majority of the risk came from the trenches but wished to put things into perspective by reminding the group that we were talking about low level waste and the associated risks were relative.

Three options were presented:

- Option A
 - No water barrier in cap, no liner.
 - Dilute and disperse – proximity to sea.
- Option B
 - Barrier in cap plus liner through all phases.
 - Containment for as long as practicable.
- Option C
 - Barrier in Cap plus liner through operation and management phases.
 - Containment through operation and management phases (not reliant on the liner during closure phase).

The merits of the three options presented were discussed in some detail and it became clear from these discussions that anything other than controlled discharge for Vault 9 was unacceptable to the stakeholders.

5) Optioneering Process – Weighting and Scoring

The optioneering process was explained to the group and there followed much discussion around the suitability of the process with some members wishing to postpone the exercise until additional community representation was available. Participation in the scoring process was inappropriate for the regulators present as it would potentially compromise their position, they were however happy to provide advice/guidance to those who would be participating in the weighting and scoring exercise.

A decision was taken by the elected representatives to proceed with the weighting and scoring element of the Optioneering Process:

- Cllr Elaine Woodburn, Leader of Copeland Borough Council and Chairman of West Cumbria Site Stakeholder Group (WCSSG) Community Engagement Sub Committee.

- Cllr David Moore, Opposition Leader Copeland Borough Council, Ward Councillor for Seascale and Chairman of West Cumbria Site Stakeholder Group
- Cllr Eileen Eastward Copeland Borough Councillor for Drigg and Carleton
- Cllr Adrian Dalton, Drigg and Carleton Parish Councillor and Vice Chairman of the WCCSG LLWR Sub Committee.

In order to alleviate perceived pressure on the elected representatives, the Chairman took a decision to proceed with the weighting and scoring exercise with only elected representatives present.

Elected representatives were invited to score the three options against the following attributes:

ATTRIBUTE	ATTRIBUTE DESCRIPTION
E6. Nuisance	Transportation. Noise and Dust.
C4. Socio-economic Impact	Potential to sustain existing employment and create new employment in the local economy, including the spin-off benefits in service industries.
R1. Public Acceptability	The perceived advantages of the project and disadvantages of adverse publicity as a result of adopting a particular option.
R2. Regulatory Risks	The perceived opinions of the Regulators to this type of project or activity, with regard to current regulation and the potential impact of future legislation.
R3. Political Risks	The perceived views from both local and national government towards the proposed options.
R4. Authorisations	The time, effort, uncertainty and potential delay involved in obtaining authorisations for new discharges (EA/SEPA). This attribute also covers the potential difficulties in obtaining agreement with Nirex or BNFL to accept the waste.
R5. Site Licence Conditions	The effort required to ensure compliance with site licence conditions.
R6. Planning Requirements	The time, effort, uncertainty and potential delay involved in obtaining planning permission.

Taking each attribute in turn, the following comments represent the opinions of the elected representatives who participated in the weighting and scoring exercise:

Attribute E6: Nuisance

The stakeholder group agreed with the scoring awarded by the experts at the previous workshop on 22/23 February. The scoring was based on the intensity of traffic and material handling operations associated with each option

Attribute C4: Socio-Economic Impact

The scoring was based on the perception by the stakeholder elected representatives that the option which required the most construction work would lead to the most employment in construction and local service industries.

Attribute R1: Public Acceptability

The scoring was based on the perception by the stakeholder elected representatives that the most robust option, which would protect the environment for as long as possible, would be most acceptable to the people who they represent.

Attribute R2: Regulatory Risks

The scoring was based on the perception by the regulators that the most robust option, which would protect the environment for as long as possible, would be most acceptable in terms of the present legislation. Dilute/Disperse was not thought to be acceptable in the present environment and the ability to delay the decision as to whether to install the vertical drains until some time in the future was thought to be an advantage.

Attribute R3: Political Risks

The scoring was based on the perception by the stakeholder elected representatives that the most robust option, which would protect the environment for as long as possible, would be most acceptable to the government as a legacy for the future, especially if the political attitude to disposal of nuclear waste were to become more onerous.

Attribute R4: Authorisations

The scoring was based on the perception by the stakeholder elected representatives and discussions with regulators that the most robust option, which would protect the environment for as long as possible, would be least likely to be delayed significantly by challenges from regulatory bodies.

Attribute R5: Site Licence Conditions

The scoring was based on the perception by the stakeholder elected representatives that the most robust design would be the most compliant with the principles of the site licence conditions. However, it was accepted that all three options would have to comply with the site licence, and so this attribute was not thought to be a high differentiator.

Attribute R6: Planning Requirements

The scoring was based on the perception by the stakeholder elected representatives that the most robust option, which would protect the environment for as long as possible, would be least likely to be delayed significantly by challenges from planning authorities.

Weighting of Attributes

The attributes were weighted as follows by the workshop delegates.

Attribute No.	Attribute Description.	Attribute Weighting	Attribute Weighting %.
E6	Nuisance	80	17.39
C4	Socio-Economic Impact	90	19.57
R1	Public Acceptability	100	21.74
R2	Regulatory Risks	Not weighted	Not weighted
R3	Political Risks	30	6.52
R4	Authorisations	50	10.87
R5	Site Licence Conditions	10	2.17
R6	Planning Requirements	100	21.74

The key criteria were thought to be the acceptability to members of the public, local stakeholders and the local planning authorities. The stakeholder group felt that the potential for the project to generate jobs in the local economy, both directly and in spin-off industries, was an important factor.

It was accepted that BNGSL need to build a new vault, and that, in order to honour the commitment made to import as many materials as possible to site by rail, an extension to the rail siding and a materials handling facility of some description will have to be built.

6) Conclusion

- A detailed presentation was delivered to representatives of the LLWR Sub Committee and key stakeholders on Tuesday 28/03/06 to explain three concepts – A, B and C for Modular Vaults.
- A scoring exercise, based on a number of non-technical attributes, was undertaken by the elected stakeholder representatives.
- A clear preference was expressed for Option B which was considered to be the most robust and which would retain the leachate for as long as possible.
- Option A was considered to be unacceptable for Vault 9.

The Chairman shared the results from the scoring exercise with the whole group and thanked everyone for their participation.