

Minutes from Sellafield Local Liaison Committee (SLLC) Low Level Waste  
Repository Sub-Committee 18 November 2004

Attendees:

Cllr David Cook	Drigg and Carleton Parish Council
Mrs B Coombe	British Nuclear Group, External Affairs
Mr A Dalton	Drigg and Carleton Parish Council
Mr G Grint	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr J Millington	British Nuclear Group, Acting Head of Manufacturing LLW repository
Cllr David Moore	Chairman of SLLC
Mr I Streatfield	Environment Agency (EA)
Cllr K Thompson	Drigg and Carleton Parish Council
Ms Shirley Williams	British Nuclear Group, Secretariat to SLLC
Mrs Fee Wilson	UKAEA
Cllr E Woodburn	Copeland Borough Council

1. Welcome/Introductions:

Cllr Moore welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members introduced themselves and the organisation they were representing.

Cllr Moore explained that a Chairman's sub-committee had been called in September to address the need to establish a sub-committee to look specifically at issues relating to the Low Level Waste (LLW) site. He noted that at the full SLLC meetings issues relating to the LLW site were not getting discussed sufficiently. He stressed that from April 2005 the NDA would be in place and therefore the process for liaison meetings could change. He informed the meeting that a workshop was being held at the end of the month regarding the future for stakeholder engagement under the NDA.

He explained that at the Chairman's sub-committee it was discussed that the role of this committee would be to define the issues that need to be addressed; prioritise the key issues important to the community of Drigg and to discuss/agree who should be represented on this committee.

He confirmed that he was happy to chair this meeting until a chairman had been elected.

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr Tim Stoddard of Cumbria County Council.

3. Minutes from Chairman's sub committee/Agreement of membership

Cllr Moore asked if there were any comments on the minutes from the Chairman's sub-committee meeting, held on 28<sup>th</sup> September. Ms Williams asked if the committee would be comfortable to co-opt members as required. For instance if discussing transport it might be beneficial to have representation from Railtrack or the Highways

Agency. Cllr Woodburn commented that a lot of issues affect more than Drigg and Carleton Parish and it was therefore important not to restrict issues to the immediate area around the repository site- some issues had a wider impact. Cllr Dalton noted that if the issues affecting the Drigg community were addressed then this would have a beneficial knock on effect to others. Cllr Woodburn commented that it might not be beneficial to deal only with issues affecting the immediate community and that the committee should have a wider remit- should have a wider representation.

Ms Williams commented that the committee would identify issues of concern at Drigg, which can be dealt with within this committee, which would then go to a full SLLC meeting.

Cllr Moore stressed that the committee should discuss all issues from the LLW site, not just issues affecting Drigg residents, as there were issues that may have a wider impact/effect to the wider community. Cllr Woodburn noted that there should be some flexibility of membership to address concerns that those outside the Drigg community might want to be addressed.

Ms Williams suggested a process that could be adopted by the committee. She noted that under the NDA, Local Stakeholder Group a process was being framed for engaging with stakeholders on single issues. The committee would generate a list of issues and then it would need to be generated more widely to establish if any others needed to be involved. The process that is being proposed for single-issue stakeholder engagement needs more involved than just those at the meeting.

Cllr Cook commented that the parish council has its own liaison meeting with site management but it had been recognised that there was a need to get everyone around the table who could influence decisions that needed to be taken to affect change.

Cllr Woodburn noted that the group could only be a sub committee until April - it could be that under the NDA framework the LLW site should have its own stakeholder group/meeting.

Mrs Wilson asked if it would be acceptable to co-opt signors to the meeting. Cllr Moore stated that they could well be included when issues were being discussed. Ms Williams commented that the basic principle would be to decide if the meeting had appropriate representation, if the generic composition of the group was acceptable and if additional members would add value.

Mr Streatfield noted that there were other forums where issues were discussed. The EA consults widely. Some issues would be discussed at the sub committee but would also be discussed in other forums/ outside of the group. Feedback could be given back into the committee.

Cllr Thompson noted that the bordering parishes at the two sites were mostly affected by business on the sites. Additional representation from the 6 Parish Council could be considered. Cllr Woodburn commented that, equally, those wider afield needed to be considered.

Cllr Moore asked if members were comfortable with the current representation to make a start. The process would be open and transparent and would be open to the public.

Cllr Thompson highlighted that the sub-committee would report back to the full SLLC and therefore would be reporting to a wider audience. Deal with the doorstep effects/boundaries of the Drigg site. Cllr Moore commented that some of the issues are broader.

Mr Streatfield commented that the NDA would be owners and would therefore need to be represented- it was important that they were in attendance.

Cllr Moore proposed that the membership stays as it is and could be added to as required. This proposal was accepted.

#### 4. Issues/prioritisation of issues

Members discussed issues that needed to be addressed/prioritised. These were as follows:

- Transport
  - Movements
  - Infrastructure itself
  - Effect on properties
- Name of facility
- Noise and light pollution
- Higher stacking proposal
- Next disposal area
  - bulk material handling
  - modular vaults
  - transport options
  - BPM
- Safety Cases/Authorisations
- NDA
- Future of LLW disposals especially from decommissioning
- Socio-economic issues: identify and feed into process

Cllr Dalton asked if there would be an opportunity to look at the option for the next vault development and if there would there be a Best Practical Means (BPM) study as part of this development. Mr Millington stated that there would be a BPM study-it was a requirement of the Radioactive Substances Act (RSA) to carry this out. He commented that there would be presentations on the selection of the option for the next vault. He noted that the BPM study was not yet in position to be reviewed by the regulator but would be ready in the New Year and that it would be reasonable to offer a presentation on the selection of the next vault. BPM was only one element. He noted that the modular vaults project covered the future of the remaining disposal areas, how the vaults built, capping of the vaults, bulk material handling and a transportation study.

Cllr Moore stated that it was important to bring to the committee a view of site operations for the next few years. It would be beneficial to bring to the committee what is currently being looked at.

Mr Streatfield noted that developments were all subject to regulatory approval and planning. Most of the future impact is driven by what is already there in the trenches. Future operations on site was a wider issue that the committee and government would have a view on.

Cllr Moore stated that it was important that issues didn't come along as a shock. He commented it was not sure how much waste is going to be generated. Mr Millington commented that the NDA owned 22 sites. Each site will have its own long range planning and a handshake agreement was required between sites so there was a view on what's coming.

Mr Streatfield stated that the NDA would be responsible for setting a strategy for how the site is going to be used.

Cllr Dalton queried why it was necessary to shift waste around the country- why could some not be stored at individual sites. Mr Streatfield referred to the Radioactive Waste Policy Group, under DEFRA, who were carrying out a study into the likely arisings, possible disposal routes and they were looking at different options. The NDA were leading on this for Radioactive Waste Policy and presumably the NDA would be involving stakeholders in this strategy.

Cllr Moore noted that it would be important to find out more about the radioactive Waste Policy Group. Ms Williams took an action to discuss the Radioactive Waste Policy Group with the NDA- what it is, output, timescales and how stakeholders will be involved.

**ACTION:** Ms Williams: Discuss the Radioactive Waste Policy Group with the NDA.

The proposal to stack higher in Vault 8 was discussed. Cllr Thompson stated that this was an immediate issue. He commented that stacking higher would make the vault more open to prevailing winds and asked what would happen if soil moves.

Mr Streatfield noted that this would be part of the BPM assessment. Mr Millington commented that a BPM assessment would be submitted and the application would require regulatory approval. The application also included an environmental statement.

Concern was raised that this proposal would increase 'skyshine'- that radiation dose to the public would be increased from this proposal. Mr Millington responded that this had been assessed and there would be a slight increase but this would be very small. He explained that levels were set by law and targets were set below these limits and the dose rate would be well below these numbers. Cllr Thompson commented that he did not accept this. Any increase was not acceptable- a safe dose was no dose.

Cllr Dalton informed members that Peel Place, between Holmrook and Gosforth had put an application in for up to 120 lorries leaving the site per week. It was understood

that the application had been turned down. It had been stated that BNFL would be one of their main customers. Mr Millington replied that currently the LLW site did not have any plans to source this material.

Cllr Cook stated that the parish council had always pushed to get materials by rail and would rather material was sourced by rail. Mr Streatfield commented that just because material was available locally it did not mean that it would be necessarily be the best material required for capping.

Ms Williams noted that the principle still stood that if the committee recommended that all materials should be sourced by rail then this option could be put forward to the NDA.

Cllr Dalton stated that the small community would expect support from the larger community. He also noted there were concerns regarding the state of the road infrastructure/deterioration of the roads and effect on property. Cllr Thompson stated that there had been a report on the infrastructure 10 years ago- a BNFL study and asked if this was still available.

Mr Millington thought that this had been superseded by the transportation study which covered 3 packages one of which was a review of transportation which included user volume/traffic volume, looking at the total movement through the village.

During discussions on transport of large loads through Holmrook/Drigg villages the Chairman and other committee members were unaware, that the alternative route, via the County Council inert materials storage facility, had to be used to access the site. Residents on route were regularly asked not to park their vehicles on the roadside and to co operate by keeping these access roads clear during delivery of such loads.

There was a discussion regarding transfer of waste from site. Mr Millington informed members that between 60-70 % of LLW comes from Sellafield. Mrs Wilson noted that WAGR boxes are sent by road because of the design of the boxes.

Cllr Dalton informed the members that he had written to SEPA regarding the dissatisfaction that Dounreay would have to send waste to Drigg and he had not received a reply.

Mr Streatfield commented this application had yet to be determined- no decision had yet been taken.

Cllr Dalton raised socio-economic issues and that under NDA the responsibility belongs to local government. Cllr Woodburn commented that under NDA socio-economic policy the NDA would make their tier 1 contract contractor support the community- the money that is currently given to the community under community support by British Nuclear Group has been guaranteed. Any extra finances would come through the task force.

Cllr Cook asked about deliveries of external consignors' waste and the intention to re-route these deliveries to Sellafield, to then be sent to LLW site by rail. He asked if the

EA was blocking this issue. Mr Streatfield stated that this was not the case. The EA would support any initiative to minimise traffic impact. The EA had written back to BNFL regarding this matter - any change would need to be legal and meet the needs of the authorisation. The proposed change required BNFL to do some further work. Mr Millington said that there were issues to be addressed regarding this proposal.

Ms Williams suggested a process to discuss issues based on BNFL's national stakeholder process. A framework document would be produced on a chosen issue. After discussion it was agreed to start with transport- transportation of waste and supplies. Ms Williams agreed to pull together a framework document to trial this process.

**ACTION:** Ms Willaims: Produce a framework document for discussion at the next sub committee meeting

#### 5. Any other business

Mr Streatfield informed members that the EA would be issuing documents the following day regarding a review of authorisations for BNFL Low Level Waste site at Drigg. The Agency had published a Process and Considerations document explaining how it planned to carry out the review. He explained as part of the process the EA would be consulting and there would be the opportunity to make comment. Consultation was expected in March next year, with the new authorisation in place by Oct/November 2005.

It was agreed to defer the election of a Chairman until after the next meeting. Cllr Moore agreed to continue to chair in the interim period and would give a short report to the SLLC.

Cllr Moore thanked everyone for attending.

#### 6. Date of next meeting

The next meeting would be called following the distribution of the framework document. It was hoped that the meeting would take place towards the end of January 2005.