

Site End States feedback
Cleator Moor Civic Hall
14th November 2007

Chaired by:

David Moore - Chairman, WCSSG

Present:

Rosina Robinson - Sellafield Ltd
Eileen Turner - Sellafield Ltd
Sue Brett - Cumbria County Council
Mike McKinley - Gosforth Parish Council
Richard Wright - Gosforth Parish Council
Anthony Payne - CEN
Mike Davidson - Allerdale Borough Council
Stephen Tandy - Environment Agency
C Stafford - UKAEA Windscale
Tony Bishop - UKAEA Windscale
Claire Gallery-Strong - Sellafield Ltd
Phil Reeve - Sellafield Ltd
Colin Hill - Churches Forum
Andy Dietzold - LLW Repository Limited
Paul Croft - GENII
Steve Jones - Westlakes Research Institute
Penny Hitchin - UK Monitor
Sue Walley - South Lakeland Action on Climate Change
Fergus McMorrough - Copeland Borough Council
Elaine Woodburn - Copeland Borough Council
David Humphreys - CCC Emergency Planning Unit
P Tyson - Whitehaven and District Trades Council
Bill Anderton - Washington Group International
Iain Irving - Washington Group International
Carl Carter - Jamie Reed MP's office
Jonathan Brown - SERCO/SBB Nuclear
Peter C Connolly - Copeland Borough Council
Allan Holliday - Copeland Borough Council
Marjorie S K Higham - Drigg
W M Lachlan - Ennerdale and Kinniside Parish Council
Keith Hitchen - Drigg and Carleton Parish Council
Mark Dixon - NDA
Norman Clarkson - Cumbria County Council
Ron Hargreaves - WCSSG
Peter Mann - UKAEA Windscale
Tony Wood - LLW Repository Limited

Presenters:

Sarah Johnston	-	NDA
Nigel Pacey	-	AMEC
Emmanuelle Chardon	-	AMEC

Purpose of meeting:

The West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group has undertaken work to ascertain views from the local community on the 'site end uses and states' for the nuclear licensed sites within West Cumbria, ie: Sellafield, Windscale, Calder Hall and the LLW Repository at Drigg. This was part of the overall consultation by the NDA on the 'site end states' for all of the sites under its ownership.

The West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group arranged workshops and invited participation from the local community on both 'end uses' and 'end states'. Following this, a report was commissioned and forwarded to the NDA for inclusion in the overall strategy.

The purpose of this meeting was for the NDA to explain the processes it had followed to reach its conclusions and to present the findings from the consultation to all those who had taken the time to attend the workshops and complete questionnaires, this formed part of stage 4 of the NDA process – (Stakeholder Review and Feedback).

Presentations:

Three presentations were given:

- NDA End States Reconciliation process 2007 - Nigel Pacey
Covering the mapping process and outputs from it
- Preferred end uses and states of the LLW repository - Emmanuelle Chardon
\Sarah Johnston
- Preferred end states for Sellafield Sites – including Emmanuelle Chardon
Calder Hall, Sellafield and Windscale \Sarah Johnston

Handouts of the presentations were distributed and an electronic copy has been posted on the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group website at www.wcssg.co.uk

Questions and Answers as captured:

Q: Questions were asked about timescales for end states, whether the end state would mean total closure and if the end states desired at the moment would be in 'tablets of stone' it was also questioned what would happen if anything changes that could affect the site end state ie: rising sea levels?

A: No timescales as such have been given, the end state is the point in time when the site is left in a safe state to accommodate the preferred end use. As technology changes and as time moves on, there is the possibility it could have an affect on the end state. It is the intention to regularly review (every 5 years) the end states following which it will be subject to consultation. The end states at present are based on what is known at the present moment in time.

Q: There was discussion over how the aspirations of stakeholders with regard to end states would be reconciled with local planning processes and the local plan. It was felt by CBC that there had been inadequate dialogue with the local authorities prior to mapping the processes.

A: The NDA reported that there would be lots of opportunity to engage in dialogue with the local authority on how to achieve the preferred end states and how it would fit in with local planning processes and the local plan and agreed that would be done.

Q: Discussion took place about the LLW repository, one member reported that during the first consultation it was suggested that the LLW repository holds low to high grade waste and assumptions had been made about climate change and how there was a lot of new evidence that climate change was moving more rapidly than had first been thought, this suggested that the LLW site would have a strong chance of being under water.

A: The higher grade waste at the LLW repository referred to at the first consultation was Plutonium Contaminated Material (PCM) which has now been retrieved from the site and moved to the Sellafield site. Currently the only waste at the LLW repository is Low Level. There is a lot of work ongoing at present on coastal erosion by the LLW SLC, the Environment Agency as well as through an independent peer review looking at precisely the points raised by the questioner.

Q: The LLW end state 'Disturbance' was referred to and it was felt by one questioner that 'disturbance' referred to the seven trenches at the LLW site. It was understood that the trenches held more than LLW and that the site proposed packaging the trench material and removing it.

A: 'Disturbance' referred to whether you would dig up the whole site. Movement of the trenches was relevant to the end state option 'Partial disturbance'.

Q: One questioner raised the point that he felt we were talking in vain about site end states and that the community was hoping that the Government was looking at new build opportunities, his feeling was it was futile and that things should be taken month by month as the current situation would change many times before reaching an end state.

A: If the community wanted new build on the Sellafield site, work would need to be undertaken to determine that a particular site was suitable. In order to ascertain what options we have open to us in the future we need to acquire all the information we can now to allow us to make that decision.

Q: Questions were raised regarding the outer zone and the potential for businesses to house themselves on these areas. It was asked if the outer zone was identified as a potential site for a particular business would contamination be removed at the point at which a business shows an interest or would that be done anyway.

A: Remediation would occur anyway, if a case was put forward for a non-nuclear business then work would need to be undertaken to de-license the site.

(Note: it was recognised that new businesses would be more attracted to the area if the site was ready to move onto).

Q: LLW categorisation was raised, questions were asked about end state 6 (unrestricted use) and there had been reference made to LLW below LLW criteria; Did this mean that a LLW facility at Calder, Sellafield or Windscale could be de-licensed. This raised several other comments like, there would still be 'stuff' in the ground and that it sounded like categories were being 'streamlined' to make it easier for 'new build'.

A: It was recognised that it was conceivable that there could still be some LLW in the ground but given that it would present no long term danger, it could be de-licensed. If an area has ongoing institutional control and you ensure that you do not dig a hole more than 30ft deep, you could potentially have a leisure facility on the surface.

In summary:

The consensus was that the NDA needed to ensure dialogue with local authorities recognising that any move forward would need to be reconciled with planning issues.

It was welcomed that the site end states process would be regularly reviewed on a 5 yearly basis and opened up for consultation.

On this basis the consensus was that the conclusions were acceptable.