

**Draft Note of the meeting of the Radioactive Waste Planning Group, 10 December 2014**

**3 Clements Inn, London**

*Present:*

Tess Bond	Somerset County Council
Trevor Brown	Oxfordshire County Council
Terry Burns	Suffolk County Council
Jane Corry	Cumbria County Council
Catherine Draper	NuLeAF
Gillian Ellis-King	South Gloucestershire Council
Denice Gallen	Copeland Borough Council
Mike Garrity	Dorset County Council
Dave Illsley	Shepway District Council
Philip Matthews	NuLeAF
Matt Meldrum	West Berkshire Council
Rob Sellon	Hampshire County Council
Lesley Stenhouse	Essex County Council
Phil Watson	Northamptonshire County Council

*Apologies:*

Doug Bamsey	Sedgemoor District Council
Richard Conway	Purbeck District Council
Kevin Kerrigan	Allerdale Borough Council
Sharon Thompson	Kent County Council

**1. Welcome and introductions**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and round the table introductions were made.
  
2. Presentation and discussion with Radioactive Waste Management re the national geological screening exercise

- 2.1 An outline note of the discussions is at Annex A. RWM chaired the meeting and will produce their own record.
- 3. Note of the meeting held on 3 September
- 3.1 The Note was held to be a true and accurate record and will be posted on the NuLeAF website.

**Action: CD**

**4. Matters arising**

- 4.1 All actions were complete.

**5. Review of the meeting with LLWR Ltd and supply chain**

- 5.1 PM gave a brief introduction to the issues which brought about the meeting, the draft Minutes of which had been circulated to participants. It was generally agreed by all sides that the meeting had been useful. A follow up meeting will be arranged by LLWR in June 2015.

**Action: PM**

- 5.2 In response to a request from LS the secretariat will ask LLWR for the presentation slides and post on the NuLeAF website.

**Action: CD**

- 5.3 In response to a question about incentivising maximising capacity PM advised that waste can only be sent to a site with appropriate permits. Comments had also been made at the meeting that there was a limited number of sites and that landfill capacity was restricted generally. It was a difficult market to get into and there were no guarantees about the quantity of waste requiring disposal.

**6. Updates on national developments in radioactive waste management**

- 6.1 PM advised the group that he would be updating Briefing Paper 23 to include reference to the newly published National Planning Policy for Waste, although this did not include specific reference to radioactive waste.
- 6.2 MOD are currently engaging with communities and other stakeholders around the sites which are on the shortlist to host the Intermediate Level Waste produced by dismantling decommissioned nuclear powered submarines. National events will be held in Birmingham (6 January 2015) and Glasgow (8 January 2015). NuLeAF will circulate its draft response.

**Action: CD**

- 6.3 A further national geological screening exercise event is being organised for local authorities by Radioactive Waste Management on 12 February. CD will circulate details when available, though format will be similar to discussions held today.

**Action: CD**

- 6.4 PM advised the group that there will be a number of developments around NDA strategies in the first half of 2015: Higher Activity and Low Level Waste Strategies and NDA Strategy 3. All topics will be subject to public consultation.
- 6.5 GEK and TBo advised the group that they had both, separately, been approached by Magnox to discuss issues around the co-location of Fuel Element Debris and Intermediate Level Waste. They would report back to the group.

**Action: GEK/TBo**

## **7. Duty to Cooperate**

- 7.1 LS advised the group that Essex CC had written to and liaised with Cumbria CC regarding the waste data produced by Environment Agency, and the volumes of waste transported between to the two areas, with focus on radioactive waste.
- 7.2 TB advised that Oxfordshire had been undertaking extensive consultation on waste movements, and issued an open invitation for anyone who wished to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Oxfordshire CC. There had been no interest expressed in radioactive waste.

## **8. Updates on developments at local sites**

- 8.1 ***Oxfordshire*** – TBr had attended the Harwell SSG meeting. The focus had been on the outcome of the Parent Body Organisation (PBO) competition. Cavendish Fluor Partnership had announced that they would be amalgamating RSRL and Magnox. Concerns had been raised at the meeting that the ILW store would take waste from other Magnox sites, but told this had been denied. A thorough review of whether store should be built at all had been undertaken. Consequently building had not yet begun. However the indication was that building will go ahead. The Minerals and Waste proposed submission document had been through cabinet and would go to full Council at the end of January.
- 8.2 ***Somerset*** – an update on discussions with Magnox regarding co-location of waste would be provided at the next meeting.

- 8.3 **Dorset** County and **Purbeck** District Councils are having regular meetings with RSRL about their planning requirements. There have been discussions about part of licensed site being taken on by company which deals with NORM waste and similar, but the rest of the site is being remediated. A draft Waste Plan for Dorset will be produced after the 2015 elections and will cover both strategy and site allocation.
- 8.4 **South Gloucestershire** – De-fuelling at Oldbury continues. The situation regarding ONR’s emergency planning zones is unclear. Horizon are going to start developing a strategic approach to the proposed new power station over the next year, and South Gloucestershire will start to develop their policy also.
- 8.5 **Essex** – consultation on the preferred approach to the Waste Local Plan will take place after the 2015 elections.
- 8.6 **Cumbria** – the application for 5 further vaults over a 60+ year time period at the Low Level Waste Repository is still being assessed. Negotiations are also being undertaken on a new application for 2 vaults over a 20-25 year time period. This later application will require a new Environmental Impact Assessment, which should include a protected species survey. LLWR has indicated that it intends to submit the application in May. However the survey should be carried out in the summer months. If LLWR decide to continue with the current application then it will go to committee in February.
- 8.7 **Northamptonshire** – indications are that the King’s Cliffe facility will take a similar volume of waste as last year (3500 tonnes). A full review of the Minerals and Waste Plan has begun and a call for sites was undertaken. Augean has not put in for an extension to the life of the King’s Cliffe site, current permission is to 2026. This may impact on LLWR assumptions re capacity.
- 8.8 **Copeland** – Sellafield are undertaking a transport and sequencing review of the site in light of access requirements. Copeland BC met with MOD to discuss the storage of Intermediate Level Waste from the Submarine Dismantling Project.
- 8.9 **Suffolk** – no developments
- 8.10 **Hampshire** – an Oil and Gas Supplementary Planning Guidance is being produced for the benefit of potential onshore oil and gas developers within Hampshire.
- 8.11 **West Berkshire** – no developments
- 8.12 **Shepway** – DI reported that, through discussions with Magnox, he had received the impression that socio-economic benefits were being tightened under the new Parent Body Organisation.

## 9. Any Other Business

9.1 None.

**10. Date of next meeting.**

10.1 The next meeting will be held at Local Government House on 3 March 2015.

**Action list**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
3.1	Post Note of 3 September meeting on website	CD	Done
5.1	Contact LLWR to agree to follow-up meeting in June 2015	PM	To be arranged in due course
5.2	Contact LLWR for presentation slides from 14.11.2014 and post on NuLeAF website	CD	Done
6.2	Circulate draft SDP response	CD	Done and final response submitted
6.3	Circulate details of local authority event re geological screening on 12 February	CD	Done
6.5	Report back on discussions with Magnox re ILW/FED co-location	GEK / TBo	Done – paper presented to meeting on 4 March

## **Annex A**

### **Draft note of the meeting with Radioactive Waste Management on 10 December 2014 to discuss the national geological screening exercise.**

#### **RWM participants:**

Cherry Tweed, Acting Director of GDF siting

Adam Dawson, GDF siting adviser

Glenda Crockett, Acting Head of Site Selection

Sally Thompson, Senior Research Manager

Roy Payne, Head of Stakeholder Engagement & Community Relations

John Dalton, Stakeholder Engagement Adviser

1. Participants were welcomed by Cherry Tweed who introduced the RWM representatives and gave an overview of the organisation. She highlighted the importance of local authorities and of NuLeAF in shaping the process.
2. Adam Dawson gave a presentation on the background of the Geological Disposal Facility siting process, and the current proposals.
3. We are currently in a period of awareness raising which will run until late 2016. Following this RWM will go out to communities and talk to them about participating in the siting process.
4. As part of the initial actions following the publication of the White Paper in July 2014 DECC will write the National Policy Statement for the Geological Disposal Facility. This will provide the framework for the GDF and for exploratory boreholes, both of which will be classified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.
5. Consultations will be carried out on the National Policy Statement and the Assessment of Sustainability.
6. DECC is leading on the issue of working with communities. Key issues are community representation within the process, community investment and the test of public support. A working group is being established to help address these issues.
7. RWM is leading on the national geological screening exercise. The objective is "to provide authoritative information that can be used in discussions with communities and may help RWM focus on its engagement activities." Screening will be based on existing information.
8. There will be two main outputs from the geological screening exercise:
  1. Guidance

2. Output from the application of the guidance. This will include; narrative on the relevance of geological attributes to the safety of a Geological Disposal Facility, commentary on the geological attributes and why they are relevant and some maps of geological attributes.

From this some areas will be able to rule themselves out.

RWM has been speaking to those who have already been through this process in other countries and learning from their experience. It is also running 'expert' workshops, and taking advice from its own technical panel and CoRWM.

9. At this point the participants were asked if there were any points they would like clarified.

*Q: In terms of working with communities how proactive do you see yourselves as being. Are you going to go out to local authorities?*

A: Both proactive and reactive. We are open to any community who wishes to express an interest. We will definitely want to respond to communities who come forward, but we are aware they will only do so if they are aware of the opportunity and the issues. This is why we are now in a 2 year period of awareness raising at a general level – about radioactive waste and the solution to the problem of how it should be managed. It is too early to say how the engagement will take place, but we will be in a better position to communicate once we have the outputs from such things as the geological screening exercise.

*Q: Is there cross party support for the proposal?*

A: We believe there is.

*Q: How long is the construction period likely to be?*

A: Construction should last between 10-15 years from drilling the first access shaft before disposal begins. Construction and operation will run concurrently and the operational life expectancy is expected to be 100 years

*Q: What happens after the facility ceases to operate?*

A: The site will be backfilled and then sealed. Once regulators are confident that it is operating safely then we will be able to walk away. The facility needs to be passively safe – it should not need active maintenance.

*Q: Does the White Paper rule out retrievability?*

A: This is an important issue which needs to be decided together with the host community. While the waste is being emplaced it is possible to retrieve it, but once the site is sealed that will be more difficult. For long term safety engineered and natural barriers work best when the waste stays underground, and anything being emplaced will have been declared waste and will be considered to have no further use or value.

10. The meeting divided into 2 groups to discuss the following questions:

1. To help us shape the outputs of national geological screening – what information would you like and how would you like to receive it? Reports maps, commentary narrative, geological models, regional geological summaries.
2. To continue involvement in the national geological screening exercise – how would you like to be involved? Website updates, email subscription, other notification, consultation on guidance, further meetings.
3. Any other observations?