

West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group
Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the LLWR Sub Committee
Wednesday 11th June 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 |
| Eileen Eastwood | Copeland Borough Council |
| Richard Evans | Cumbria County Council |
| Sue Brett | Cumbria County Council |
| Dave Weatherburn | Nuclear Decommissioning Authority |
| 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 |

Apologies:

| | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Adrian Dalton | Drigg & Carleton Parish Council |
| Steven Shepherd | Drigg & Carleton Parish Council |
| Andrew Fairhurst | Environment Agency |
| Glyn Davies | Nuclear Installations Inspectorate |

Observers:

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| John Jennings | Drigg & Carleton Parish Council |
| Steve McClure | Bardon Aggregates |
| Penny Hitchin | UK Monitor |
| Keith Hitchen | Drigg & Carleton Parish Council |
| Karen Bickerstaff | Durham University |

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 2nd April 2008

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

Page 4, last paragraph of Section 5 – Strengthen statement. “Richard Evans informed LLWR that they would require planning permission for the Cap and approval from Natural England”..... as the cap forms a key feature of LLWR’s Post Closure Safety Case which is integral to the future operation of the site.

3. Feedback from Special Security Arrangement Meeting held on 30/05/08

Nigel Lister reported on a special meeting of selected representatives from the LLWR Sub Committee held on Friday 30/05/08. (A note from this meeting was issued electronically prior to today’s meeting and circulated for completeness at the meeting.)

Nigel confirmed that LLW Repository Limited were competing the guard force contract at the site and that the tender specification did not make provision for an armed response unit as it was no longer a requirement because bulk PCM had been returned to Sellafield.

The notes from the special meeting cover the outline proposal and portray discussions. In summary Nigel reiterated that CNC will continue to back up the new guard force and will continue to patrol the village and visit the LLWR site. He offered to return to the LLWR Sub Committee in September to brief the group on progress and hopefully introduce the new security provider.

Dave Moore stated that the stakeholder concerns had been met and informed the group that CNC would be working more closely with Cumbria Constabulary to assist with a more joined up approach to community policing. He said that he welcomed the opportunity to meet the new guard force provider and LLWR and discuss arrangements.

Kneale Thompson asked that LLWR publicise contact numbers for the site through the Drigg & Carleton Parish News Letter. Nigel Lister agreed to provide.

Action

| | | |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|
| LLWR/14/001 | Nigel Lister to provide security contact details for publication in D&CPC News Letter through Cath Giel | Nigel Lister/ Cath Giel |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|

4. Update on Community Benefit Package

Dave Weatherburn reported that three separate meetings of the “Community Benefit Negotiating Committee” had been held since the last LLWR Sub Committee. He confirmed that an alternative to the community interest company had been suggested and agreed with DBERR sanction.

The Board of the delivery vehicle will comprise the following representation:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Copeland Borough Council | x2 |
| Cumbria County Council | x2 |
| Nuclear Decommissioning Authority | x1 |
| Independent | x2 |

The Board would have the flexibility to co-opt an additional 2 members if deemed necessary.

Dave also confirmed that the first instalment of £5M would be available late August with the final instalment falling in financial period 2009/2010. The agreement reached is that payment commences 30 days after “commencement of development”.

Dave went on to say that another meeting of the Negotiating Committee is scheduled for 3rd July 2008 to finalise details prior to submission to DBERR. Dave confirmed that he had offered to meet with John Jennings and Drigg and Carleton Parish Council to discuss how they could access the £50K ring fenced for Drigg and Carleton Community Projects, governance arrangements and delivery mechanism.

Kneale Thompson expressed concern over the pressure being placed on D&CPC to decide how and what they will spend the money on.

Richard Evans stated that one of the first tasks of the delivery board would be to decide how D&CPC will access the ring fenced funding.

Keith Hitchen was disturbed about the lack of engagement with Drigg & Carleton Parish Council and the Drigg Community with regard to governance and delivery arrangements for the Community Benefit Fund. He said that it was difficult to make a valued judgement on the delivery mechanism in the absence of detailed documentation and expressed concern that the PC would not get sight of said documentation until it was a “done deal”.

Richard Evans responded by saying that the meetings to date had dealt with procedural and legal issues and that the function of the Board had yet to be ironed out.

Keith Hitchen said that the role of the Parish Council was not clear.

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.

5. Traffic Management Plan for LLWR

Scott Anderson delivered a presentation on LLWR's Traffic Management Plan, highlighting key factors impacting on the Drigg Community. Scott pointed out that 3 silos would be situated close to LLWR rail sidings to service the construction materials anticipated for Vault 9 construction. He acknowledged that they would create a visual impact for the Drigg Community and promised to try and keep this to a minimum. He went on to say that the benefit of having 3 silos was that it allowed powder deliveries to come in by rail as opposed to road as was the current situation.

Scott explained that July and August would see commencement of enabling works which would result in the highest level of HGV movements through the village. He explained that a fully co-ordinated schedule would be shared with the Parish Council and would take into consideration school holidays and agreed curfew times. He added that Hanson were making provision for the employment of a full time materials logistics manager to co-ordinate material movements on the ground and act as a one stop shop for villagers. In addition, Hanson Workers would be shuttled onto LLWR site daily to reduce traffic movements through the village.

At this point, Sue Brown declared an interest as the Chairman of the Ghyll Scaur Liaison Committee.

Discussions ensued with the group asking how many additional jobs would be created to deliver the Vault 9 Construction Project and of that number how many would be West Cumbrians and how many would be from outside the area.

Elaine Woodburn asked if Hansons would consider shipping employees in from one of the town centres.

Scott agreed to explore these options with the contractor.

Sue Brown asked if the stacking of ISO freight containers on the rail sidings had been cleared to enable delivery of the construction materials. Scott explained that LLWR had recently received planning consent to stack un-grouted containers at B726 allowing the redundant PCM facility to be used as a transient store. He confirmed that work had commenced and that consignors of low level waste had been notified about construction activities and informed of the days (3 per week) that LLWR would be receiving waste.

John Jennings expressed concern about the silos being situated so close to the site boundary which would result in noise and dust implications for nearby residents and asked what mitigation measures LLWR were intending to take. Scott confirmed that the site would comply with imposed planning conditions and work within the constraints of such conditions.

He went on to say that he had experience of blowing machines and gave a commitment that if it was deemed necessary to implement a sound enclosure he would do so.

John also had an issue with increased working on the rail sidings. Scott tried to allay concerns by detailing some of the measures Hanson's were proposing to initiate to minimise disruption, for instance, no unloading of wagons before 7.30am, weekend work restricted to Saturday only and between the hours of 8am to 1pm. Richard Evans pointed out that this was in compliance of planning conditions. Richard went on to say that Condition 4 requires the review of traffic calming measures e.g. road markings, signage etc and said that this would need to be resolved prior to commencement of construction.

Scott Anderson confirmed that Hanson's plan recognises traffic calming measures.

Jimmy Naylor requested that Hanson meet with the Parish Council to discuss the Traffic Management Plan.

Action

| | | |
|-------------|---|--------------|
| LLWR/14/002 | Paul Pointon to arrange for representatives to meet with Drigg and Carleton Parish Council to discuss proposals in the Traffic Management Plan prior to submission to Cumbria County Council. | Paul Pointon |
|-------------|---|--------------|

Sue Brown said that she was still concerned about the number of HGV's passing through the village and asked how this would be communicated to the community.

Scott Anderson replied that the same tried and tested measures adopted for slag pots and B38 consignments would be incorporated into Hanson's working practices.

Elaine Woodburn asked what percentage of the £20M contract value was associated with socio-economic benefit to Copeland. Paul Pointon replied that the traffic management plan had a 20% weighting with socio-economic carrying a 5% weighting.

Steve McClure representing Bardon Aggregates asked whether the Train paths from North Wales were 100% guaranteed by Network Rail. Paul Pointon replied that DRS have guaranteed 1 out of every 3 which is sufficient to maintain supply and operation.

Keith Hitchen asked whether Hanson had considered other sites and stated that they should put something back into the local community.

Richard Evans informed the group that the Planning Authority had held discussions with the Aggregate Company regarding a rail facility at Ghyll Scaur but stated that nothing existed currently therefore they could not comply with the planning condition to maximise rail deliveries.

Sue Brown said she was aware that Hansons were in the 10-day cooling off period and asked what the next step(s) would be. Paul Pointon confirmed that LLWR would be conducting debriefing sessions next week and hoped to award the contract at the end of June 2008.

6. Sourcing Vault 9 Construction Materials Locally

Paul Pointon described the OJEU process that LLWR had gone through prior to nominating Hanson as Preferred Bidder. He explained that Hanson owned Cumbria Industrials and that 80% of the aggregate was sourced within Cumbria.

Dave Moore stated that the group were “victims of their own request” and acknowledged that insisting on maximisation of rail deliveries to LLWR had inadvertently penalised local aggregate suppliers Bardon. He said that Hansons needed to be encouraged to source labour and supplies locally within West Cumbria.

Dave Weatherburn pointed out that the OJEU process prevents positive discrimination and has very strict criteria which makes it hard to strike a balance.

Various community representatives expressed frustration over the process and the resultant outcome. Suggestions were made to try and create a level playing field but it was acknowledged that in this instance it was too late and a case of closing the stable door after the horse had bolted. That said, Elaine Woodburn pointed out that it was within LLWR’s gift to increase the weighting for socio-economic benefit and asked that the company consider this for future projects.

Sue Brown raised the subject of quality of sand and asked if it met the tender requirements. Paul Pointon confirmed that the sand meets the specification of the bid and that LLWR are satisfied with what Hansons are offering.

Steve McClure stated that the movement towards maximisation of rail transportation penalises the aggregate industry by £7/tonne because they do not have direct access to rail and have to transport materials to Workington. He went on to say that if this was going to be the trend then local aggregate suppliers would need assistance to develop rail heads in West Cumbria otherwise they would be unable to compete and would effectively be forced out of business.

Dave Moore said that he would canvas the local authority to help.

Keith Hitchen said he would welcome the opportunity to sit down with CCC/CBC/PC and look at how the project/process had been run and learn from the experience.

Action

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| LLWR/14/003 | Cath Giel/Dick Raaz to arrange a “lessons learned” meeting with involvement of all relevant parties. | Cath Giel |
|-------------|--|-----------|

7. Any Other Business

Richard Evans informed the group that the end of the consultation period for the Mineral and Waste Development Framework was 18/19 November 2008.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 4.10 pm

8. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the WCSSG LLWR Sub Committee will be held on Wednesday 10 September 2008 at **7.00pm** in Drigg Village Hall.