

**NuLeAF Radioactive Waste Planning Group**

Note of the meeting held on 3 September, 2014 at Local Government House, Smith Square, London

**Attendance:**

Tess Bond	Somerset County Council
Sue Brett	Cumbria County Council
Trevor Brown	Oxfordshire County Council
Terry Burns	Suffolk County Council
Catherine Draper	NuLeAF
Mike Garrity	Dorset County Council
Pat Graham	Copeland Borough Council
Dave Illsley	Shepway District Council
Philip Matthews	NuLeAF
Matt Meldrum	West Berkshire Council
Lisa Price	South Gloucestershire Council
John Prosser	Kent County Council
Lesley Stenhouse	Essex County Council
Phil Watson	Northamptonshire County Council

Apologies were received from: Paul Prowting – Hampshire County Council, Louise Nurser - Lancashire County Council, Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council, Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Alistair Stewart – Shepway District Council, James Holbrook – West Somerset Council.

**1. Welcome and introductions**

PM welcomed everyone to the meeting and round the table introductions were performed.

**2. Note of the meeting held on 5 March, 2014**

2.1 Para 4.6 second sentence should read "... (ESS) approach which measures the value a landscape gives..."

2.2 Para 7.3 amend first sentence to read "It was felt that NuLeAF provided a method of helping to comply with..."

2.3 Para 7.5 amend to "With respect to the significance of not gaining agreement of an authority where engagement had taken place (4.2), this would depend on the extent to which this affected the delivery of the strategy. It was noted that the significance of DtC varied according to the type of waste."

2.4 Subject to the above amendments the note of the last meeting was agreed as a true record and would be posted on the NuLeAF website.

**Action: CD**

### **3. Matters arising**

All actions had been completed.

### **4. Terms of reference**

4.1 Draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the group had been circulated prior to the meeting. Amendments had been received from Oxfordshire CC and copies were circulated at the meeting and discussed.

4.2 Other points made during discussion were:

- The ToR should refer to the group's link to the LGA through the Steering Group.
- Although the ToR shouldn't be prescriptive, was there a way to demonstrate active engagement between local authorities, and should the ToR outline how this should be carried out?
- Amend ToR to include reference to legacy issues i.e. socio-economics and community benefits.
- Para 4.1.1 – delete specific reference to location.

4.3 Secretariat would circulate re-drafted ToR to the group.

**Action: CD**

### **5. Presentation on coastal erosion and flooding and nuclear licensed sites by Environment Agency and Office for Nuclear Regulation**

5.1 Presentations were given by Tanya McLeod, Specialist Inspector – External Hazards, Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and Aaron Dixey, Flood and Coastal Risk Management, Environment Agency (EA). Peter Ford (ONR) and Dave Bennett (EA) also attended. The presentations are posted on the NuLeAF website.

5.2 Key points from presentations were:

- Both organisations work closely together to regulate nuclear licensed sites.
- A new nuclear licensed site has a lifespan of 160 years. There are several stages in its lifetime where the operator will need to submit a safety case to ONR, both in the planning, design, construction and operation phases, including a 10 year periodic review or when any change or occurrence takes place which will affect the safety case.
- EA works predominantly with new build, and whilst ONR focuses on safety of the sites, EA is the principal flood risk management authority, and looks at the resilience as well. It determines "What gets wet, when."
- Climate change issues need to be adequately addressed over the entire lifespan of the site, and communities around the sites need to be reassured that flood risk has been addressed.
- Whilst there is uncertainty amongst the scientific community about the exact impacts of climate change, it is accepted that sea levels will rise significantly and that there is also likely to be an increase in storm frequency.

- Mitigation measures are designed to cope with the extremes
- ONR tolerance to risk is for a 1 in 10000 year event (natural hazards). Risks must be ALARP (As Low As Reasonably Practical).
- ONR and EA have produced an advice note for operators. This sets out specific targets for them to achieve and talks about service resilience. It seeks to join up the gaps between ONR and EA.

Key points raised during discussion were:

- There are no differences in the standards required for new build sites and those in decommissioning as requirements are based on risk. However, whilst consequences tend to be lower for sites which have been de-fuelled, it is not usual practice to remove existing protection such as sea walls, so the safety level remains the same as for an operating site. Further information on this can be found in ONR's Safety Assessment Principles.
- New build sites will have a platform on which the station is built at a level designed to be above worst level scenario sea level rises. Other defences such as sea walls will be designed to be adaptable.
- With a site such as Sizewell, it may be necessary to add additional defences between the sites.
- The way risk is communicated to the public is important. The reason for regulations is not always understood. Safety is the overriding priority. ONR now has a Communications team and hopefully communications will improve.
- The same principles are applied to all sites, irrespective of its life expectancy. It is incumbent upon the licensee to develop an appropriate approach. One cannot make assumptions about what a future society might chose to do, therefore you have to be confident that a closed site would be safe without protection or action from future generations.
- Where new build sites are developed adjacent to or near existing nuclear licensed facilities, the existing site would be a consultee, and also need to take the development in to consideration for its own safety case. IAEA has recognised the stringing together of sites as an additional issue. Each site is a challenge to its neighbour.
- Following the nuclear accident at Fukushima, nuclear licensed sites in the UK were asked to carry out a wide-ranging review of their protection measures to ensure they are adequate for the design basis, and to go beyond this by providing additional back up on part of the site which wouldn't flood, or off site at a higher ground level. ONR has received reports from the sites, which are being reviewed. It is estimated that over £100 million of work will be carried out as a result of this review.

PM thanked ONR and EA for the presentation and discussion, which had been very useful and informative.

## **6. White Paper on the Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) siting process**

6.1 PM introduced the item with an overview of NuLeAF's involvement with GDF programme since launch of White Paper and key points contained in the White Paper.

6.2 During discussions, the following points were made:

- Concerns were raised about the timing of the Right of Withdrawal which some members of the meeting concluded fell before any boreholes were drilled. It was felt that this meant that any local authority considering engaging in the process would have to make a commitment without sufficient geological information.
- Whilst it was agreed that the volunteerist approach was preferable, doubts were expressed about who would volunteer. It would be a risky strategy for any elected body to take. Local Enterprise Partnerships may express an interest in participating, but it was felt that they would have a vested interest in where the community investment funding was spent, and this may not actually reflect the interests of the host community.
- The White Paper did not address what happened to waste prior to disposal in the GDF. Interim storage could become an issue for local authorities.
- Whilst it was recognised that it was very difficult to define 'a community' it was important that a clearer definition emerged over the coming two years.
- Need to clarify who determines how community investment funds are spent. Local authorities are in a better position to judge how funds should be spent within their area than NDA. Existing examples such as the Copeland Community Fund can be used as a model.

6.3 PG advised the meeting that Copeland Borough Council will be writing to DECC regarding the White Paper and will circulate a copy of the correspondence to the group through the NuLeAF secretariat.

**Action: PG/CD**

6.4 PM will revise the draft Interim Briefing Paper based on the comments made and it will be posted on the NuLeAF website. It was hoped that NuLeAF's participation in the Community Working Relationship Group would be clarified shortly.

**Action: PM**

## **7. Updates on national radioactive waste management**

7.1 A paper was circulated prior to the meeting which provided updates on:

- UK strategy for the management of NORM waste
- The Submarine Dismantling Project
- Uranics and overseas fuel management
- Low Level Waste Strategy Review

7.2 MM and PG commented on their authorities views on the Submarine Dismantling Project. Both would like to see Community Benefits come forward, which at present MoD is disinclined to do.

7.3 In respect of the cessation of Spent Nuclear Fuel (NSF) recycling at Sellafield, PG advised the meeting that although reassurances had been given by the operator that there would be no loss of jobs, the reality was that the same skill set would not be required and many personnel would not be suitable or wish to retrain.

## **8. Meeting proposal by LLWR Ltd**

8.1 A note was circulated prior to the meeting regarding a proposed meeting between local authorities, LLWR Ltd and Site Licensee Companies regarding forthcoming shipments of VLLW and LA-LLW. LLWR had proposed dates for a meeting in October/November of this year. PM sought RWPG's views on whether they would wish to attend such a meeting and preferred dates.

8.2 It was agreed that the meeting should go ahead and members would respond with preferred dates to the secretariat by 9 September.

**Action: All**

## **9. Updates from around the sites**

Copeland Borough Council has commenced an infrastructure project which encourages the developer of the new build site at Moorside to work with Sellafield Ltd.

Suffolk County Council – Sizewell A has been defueled.

Oxfordshire – conditions are being discharged on the planning permission for the ILW store at Harwell.

Dorset – meetings have been held with Purbeck District Council and RSRL to ensure planning issues around the Winfrith site are fully considered.

South Gloucestershire – the consultation on sites and places, which included Oldbury ended last week.

Northamptonshire – disposal to King's Cliffe was up on last year and would result in an increase in community benefits.

Cumbria – It had been expected that the planning application for the next set of vaults at LLWR would go to the August Development Control Committee meeting, but LLWR had asked for it to be deferred so they could resolve some issues. A meeting had been held with Sellafield Ltd to discuss their plans in relation to the site and adjacent land. Sellafield Ltd is currently reviewing its decommissioning plan, part of which includes a critical path analysis of what has to happen, in what sequence, including movement/storage of soils and construction, demolition and excavation waste, that is not radioactive.

West Berkshire –Burghfield site is being upgraded following last year's flooding. WBC is meeting with AWE to discuss their future plans.

## 10. Any other business

TBr advised the meeting that EA had submitted comments on their Waste Plan at the last consultation. They wanted to ensure that any potential radioactive waste facility would deal with waste generated outside the county as well as from within.

## 11. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Radioactive Waste Planning Group will take place on 10 December at London School of Economics.

### Actions:

Date	Action	By	Outcome/Comments
<b>Meeting held 3 September 2014</b>			
2.4	Post amended March meeting note on website	CD	Done 4.9.2014
4.3	Circulate re-drafted ToR for agreement	CD	Done
	Circulate Copeland BC letter to meeting members	PG/CD	Done
	Revise interim Briefing Paper on GDF White Paper and then post on NuLeAF website	PM/CD	Done
8.2	Confirm preferred date/s for LLWR meeting to secretariat by 9 Sept	All	Done