

THE GOVERNMENT'S CONSULTATION ON POLICY FOR THE LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT OF SOLID LOW LEVEL WASTE

PORTFOLIO HOLDER: Cllr Elaine Woodburn

LEAD OFFICER: David Davies

REPORT AUTHOR: David Davies

Summary: To report back on the consultation with a draft response in order to provide Members with information upon which to come to a view on the Government's LLW Policy Review published on the 28th February.

Recommendation:	That the proposed response to the Government's consultation is discussed and the views and recommendations of the Council be forwarded to DEFRA by 31st May, the consultation end date.
------------------------	---

Impact on delivering the Corporate Plan: Key decisions need to be discussed as national Low Level Waste policy may have significant impact, both beneficial and detrimental on the Council's objective to "create and sustain a healthy local economy".

Impact on other statutory objectives (e.g. crime & disorder, LA21): None

Financial and human resource implications: None

Project & Risk Management: None

Key Decision Status

- **Financial:** N/A
- **Ward:** Yes

Other Ward Implications: All.
The LLW Policy review will have significant implications for West Cumbria with regard to the national LLW repository.

1. INTRODUCTION

On 28 February 2006, Government issued a consultation on policy for the long-term management of solid low level radioactive waste, deadline for response is the 31st May 2006. It is a consultation by DEFRA and the DTI about clarifying and reviewing the options for the long-term management of solid Low Level Radioactive Wastes (LLW). It is intended to lead to a new policy that will update the 1995 White Paper "Review of Radioactive Waste Management Policy: Final Conclusions (Cmnd 2919)". UK Government and the devolved administrations for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are carrying out the consultation. However, it is clear that Government is not proposing to change primary legislation relating to the regulation of radioactive waste in the UK.

The issue of the consultation follows two stakeholder workshops, which Copeland Borough Council attended, held in Manchester in April and October 2005 to discuss issues relating to the management of LLW. Please note that background papers for the two workshops, which were facilitated by a team led by University College London, as well as reports of the workshops, may be found on the website:

<http://www.peoplescienceandpolicy.com/llw/index.html>.

2. CONTENT

The full document, "A Public Consultation on Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom", can be found on the DEFRA website: Copies can be made for any Member wishing to see the full document:

<http://www.peoplescienceandpolicy.com/llw/index.html>.

In considering its response to the energy review, the Nuclear Working Group will need to consider the potential impact of national policy in Cumbria and West Cumbria in particular. This will include consideration of safety, security, economic, environmental and social impacts. Questions to consider that will feed into Council Policy development on Waste Management issues are listed in Appendix 1.

3. BACKGROUND

LLW contains relatively low levels of radioactivity. Most of it arises from the operation of nuclear power stations, nuclear fuel reprocessing and the decommissioning and clean up of nuclear sites. It is estimated that 98% of the wastes will be from nuclear sites including power stations. Whilst LLW is forecast to constitute about 90% of future radioactive waste arisings by volume it will contain less than .0003% of the total radioactivity. It is estimated that 2 million cubic metres of LLW will need long-term management. (This excludes an estimated 18 Million m³ of contaminated soils at Sellafield).

The Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) was established as a munitions depot and ordnance factory back in the 1930s. It was first used as a radioactive waste facility when UKAEA took ownership of the site in 1959, and has steadily grown into a national resource over the past 47 years. During this time there has been no public consultation as to its local community acceptance as a national radioactive waste repository.

There are currently significant concerns over the suitability of the site as a permanent repository due to the issue of climate change and the subsequent risk of coastal erosion. Other current issues are concerned with the planning proposal for temporary higher stacking (now granted) and the future extension proposal and construction of vault 8.

The site is the first of the NDA owned nuclear sites to be placed on the market for competition. A contract will be awarded to the successful applicant by the end of 2006 and work will commence in April 2007.

Furthermore, the national LLW disposal site does not have sufficient capacity to meet future forecasts of LLW arisings. Its disposal authorisation is currently under review by the Environment Agency. The NDA must have the necessary routes available for the long term management of LLW if it is to progress its decommissioning and clean-up of the UK's older, publicly owned civil nuclear sites.

Finding small scale treatment and disposal routes (in particular, incineration and landfill) for the least radioactive LLW which are very important for non-nuclear industry users of radioactive materials, such as hospitals, research and educational establishments, and the oil and gas industry, is proving increasingly difficult.

4. CURRENT POSITION

- Most LLW is permanently disposed of at the repository near Drigg
- Some LLW at the lower end of activity is buried in situ, e.g. at Sellafield
- Some LLW, also at the lower end of activity, is placed in conventional landfills under a process known as Controlled or Special Precautions Burial
- Very low level wastes in small quantities are placed in conventional landfills where it is diluted by significant volumes of non-radioactive wastes
- Small proportions are incinerated, e.g. some clinical wastes with other hazardous properties
- Decay storage where radioactivity is allowed to decay to make subsequent management easier or until it becomes exempt from regulatory requirements

Accelerated programmes for decommissioning and clean up of the UK's older nuclear sites mean that LLW arisings will be much greater in the future. At the present time the majority of waste is operational waste such as paper and overalls. A large proportion of decommissioning waste will be building rubble and contaminated land. Also the imminent introduction of a new regulatory regime for the remediation of radioactively contaminated land could also lead to the generation of additional amounts of LLW in the future.

The paper identifies as its first key issue whether the site near Drigg should be used to take large quantities of lower activity LLW from decommissioning and clean up.

Its second key issue is whether greater consideration needs to be given to increased use of the other options available for long-term management of LLW.

Its third key issue is what should be done to halt the decline in disposal routes for non-nuclear industry LLW and how to minimise transport needs for these disposals.

5. WHAT GOVERNMENT IS PROPOSING

Allow greater flexibility in the management of the wide range of LLW wastes and: -

- Maintain necessary levels of safety through the use of a risk-informed approach.
- Give greater emphasis to minimising LLW arisings.
- Revise the definition of Very Low Level Waste to bring it into line with the wider definition of LLW.

Government does not aim to be prescriptive in its approach. It acknowledges that each LLW management problem will have its own solution; the development of solution is a matter for the waste owners. The key aim is to provide a high level framework within which individual LLW management decisions can be taken flexibly to ensure safe, environmentally acceptable and cost-effective management solutions that appropriately reflect the nature of the LLW concerned.

Despite this stated aim of not being prescriptive, the Government expects the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority to – “develop and publish a plan for the optimal use of the LLW disposal facility as a UK national asset”.

6. COUNCIL POLICY

The Council in its response to the NDA Draft Strategy, the NDA Annual Plan, CoRWM Discussion Document and the EA Safety Case Review of the national LLWR has announced the following key policy statements with regard to the management of LLW and its role in our local community. The key statements are summarised below:

Waste Capacity

The Council supports the view that the remaining capacity at the LLWR site should meet local community (West Cumbrian) needs, including local decommissioning and reprocessing waste requirements, rather than be assumed to provide a single solution to LLW and decommissioning waste management.

The Council has formally taken the view that no further increase in capacity at the LLWR should be allowed until the industry reaches agreement with the Council on a package of “offset” measures to compensate for the presence of a radioactive waste facility in its area.

Coastal Erosion

The Council recognises that there are both key UK policy decisions to be made, and regulatory concerns with regard to climate change and subsequent coastal erosion issues, which question both the role and location of the LLWR at the village of Drigg. The Council feels that to make any decisions that consider the future of the LLWR would be premature given the current uncertainty over coastal erosion. Indeed we believe that the current uncertainties should rule out any further increase to disposal at the site and it should be considered as a storage site until these issues are resolved.

Historic Waste

The Council feels that historic disposal should not be ignored and stakeholder engagement should take place over the issue of the tumble tipped trenches to consider whether these should be removed, repackaged and stored in a way that is up to current standards.

Costs

We support the NDA's desire to reduce costs at the LLWR and would be interested in seeing cost comparisons as there appears to be conflicting information on where the LLWR sits in terms of comparative costs. We understand that methods of disposal can vary significantly depending on local circumstances. For example, tumble tipping may be acceptable in parts of the U.S., thus bringing down costs, but would be concerning in a more densely populated country as our own. Related to this we should be seeking to maximise waste minimisation, recycling and free release. This is not best served by reducing the cost of disposal.

The Council believes that consideration should be given to reviewing the cost of disposal at the LLWR as any net increase in disposal income should be used firstly to fund a local offset package and then to provide additional funding for decommissioning work.

Hosting Waste Sites

Compensation and recognition of its strategic national importance has been minimal and the Council does not accept the concept that it is equitable for West Cumbrian communities to host waste generated in their own areas just because they have received benefits from previous nuclear operations.

Nuclear facilities in West Cumbria were installed to meet a national need and not a local need; the benefits have therefore been national whilst most of the detriment has been local.

The Council believes that a key issue which needs to be addressed is the siting and location of waste stores, the proximity principle guides towards the waste being managed as near as practicable to where it originated, whereas greater management and control is more apparent with only one or two 'centralised' stores. Integral to the debate is stakeholder involvement and public acceptance through education and local empowerment.

The Council would have serious concerns if Copeland were used as a centralised interim storage location. This may prejudice a future siting decision for a repository or other permanent waste facilities and concentrate perceived hazard and risk and associated stigma in our area to our further detriment. Increasing the amount of the UK's waste stored locally will increase the likelihood of a disposal facility being in West Cumbria. Copeland Council has maintained a consistent policy in recent years that additional LLW and ILW from outside this area should not be moved to Copeland.

The Council takes the view the local community represented by Local Councils should have a veto over the import of radioactive waste into their communities and that no community should be an unwilling victim. We believe that the presence of radioactive waste creates significant detriments for our communities and no community should have such detriments forced on them.

Waste Hierarchy

The Council supports the message of waste minimisation, reuse and recycling, and that the waste hierarchy is reinforced within the management of LLW as a result of the UK decommissioning programme. There is also a need for greater use of assessment by Best Practical Means for minimisation and decontamination.

Integrated Waste Strategy

The Council feels that it is important the NDA controls the Integrated Waste Strategy (IWS) process across the UK nuclear sites so that it is indeed 'integrated' rather than 20 separate waste plans. This would be more apparent on the Sellafield site, which could have a Calder Hall IWS, a Windscale IWS, a Sellafield IWS and finally a LLWR IWS. It is the Council's view that this would not be a practical solution to waste management.

Stakeholder Involvement

It is the Council's view that as a key stakeholder it is important that the local community is able to contribute to the whole local LLW decision-making process from start to finish and not just be informed of progress. As the Council is democratically elected by local people to represent their interests we need to be an integral part of the decision making process in our role as community leaders.

Community Benefit

It is the Council's view that it is important to have prior agreement of an 'offset package' in the form of an inter-generational community endowment to ensure long-term local community sustainability for the lifetime of the LLW waste. This endowment would be held in such a way as not to be affected by any change in central government, political party, local government and/or boundary. Furthermore the offset package would have a levy type mechanism as currently applied to non-radioactive waste disposal as this is yet to be agreed as our preferred mechanism on all radioactive waste under long-term storage and/or disposal at the site(s). This would be paid into a community socio-economic fund for the sole use of the local community.

7. Conclusion

Members should also consider the questions of community benefits, veto and volunteerism for communities that may host radioactive waste management/disposal facilities and that these should reflect the roles played in meeting national requirements. The Local Government Association's Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF) has commissioned research into these matters and Members heard a presentation by the consultants at the Nuclear Issues Seminar on 9 March.

A draft response is attached for consideration in Appendix 2. Once agreed by Copeland Borough Council's Nuclear Working Group and submitted as a draft to other partners as part of the Council's consultation to obtain a joint response. Following further endorsement by the NWG (after amendment by partners) the response will be forwarded to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

List of Appendices

APPENDIX 1 – KEY QUESTIONS

APPENDIX 2 - DRAFT RESPONSE TO MANAGEMENT OF LLW
CONSULTATION

APPENDIX 3 - TIMETABLE

List of Background Documents:

Managing Radioactive Waste Safely -
Proposals for developing a policy for
managing
solid radioactive waste in the UK. Sept. 2001

A Public Consultation on Policy for the Long
Term Management of Solid Low Level
Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom.
Feb 2006.

List of Consultees:

CBC Nuclear Working Group, D Martin, F Mc
Morrow, F Duffy, R Evans, S Crisp

APPENDIX 1

KEY QUESTIONS

As an aid the relevant chapters and paragraphs of the DEFRA Document are listed after each question.

1. Given that future arisings of LLW will exceed currently available capacity, do you agree that a change in LLW management policy is necessary? Have we identified the correct guiding principles for such change: flexibility of approach; use of a risk-informed approach to ensure safety; and additional emphasis on minimisation of arisings. (see Chapter 2, para 14; Chapter 3 paras 3, 10-16).
2. Have we identified the correct requirements for the production of LLW management plans? (see Chapter 3, paras 9-10).
3. Is use of the waste hierarchy as defined, the right way of securing LLW minimisation? (see Chapter 3, paras 15-16).
4. Is best use being made of incineration of combustible LLW, for the minimisation of waste? If no, what are the obstacles for greater use of incineration? (see Chapter 2, para 9; Chapter 3, para 15).
5. Should the proximity and minimisation of transport principles apply to the management of LLW of different kinds? If yes, do you have any observations on the way they should be applied? (see Chapter 3, paras 21-22).
6. Should the NDA also provide facilities for the disposal of non-nuclear industry LLW, where this is possible in conjunction with its main work on civil nuclear decommissioning and clean up? (see Chapter 3, paras 26, 29).
7. What should be the relative roles of national or regionalised facilities vis a vis local management schemes for LLW, and how might these depend on the nature and activity of the waste in question (for example, in considering transport impacts)? (see Chapter 3, paras 21-22; 27-28, 30-34).
8. Is the availability of disposal routes for disposal of non-nuclear industry LLW diminishing? If so, please provide specific examples of difficulties and their consequences on operation of relevant industries. What steps can you suggest to address these problems? (see Chapter 2, para 9; Chapter 3, paras 30-34).
9. Is it right in principle that local communities should take greater responsibility for the disposal of non-nuclear industry LLW arising from producers serving their communities, for example, hospitals and research and educational organisations? (see Chapter 3, paras 31-32).
10. What role should national, regional and local planning strategies play in relation to the provision of facilities to dispose of such LLW (landfill and

incinerators), particularly that at the lower end of the LLW activity range? (see Chapter 3, para 32).

11. Do you support the proposed redefinition of VLLW to make it compatible with the wider definition of LLW? If not, why? (see Chapter 2, paras 12-13; Chapter 4, para 4).

12. Do you believe that we have identified the correct options to be considered for the disposal of LLW, subject to the preparation of plans and safety cases that are acceptable to the regulators? (see Chapter 4, para 12).

13. Should such LLW facilities be available to all waste producers including those in nuclear and non-nuclear industries, such as hospitals, research and educational organisations, and the oil and gas industries? If not, what should be the nature of any exception and why? (see Chapter 4, paras 12-14).

APPENDIX 2

INITIAL DRAFT RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT LLW POLICY REVIEW

“A Public Consultation on Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom”

Dear Sir,

A Public Consultation on Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom

Thank you for giving Copeland Borough Council the opportunity for comment on your consultation, “A Public Consultation on Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom”.

Copeland Borough Council welcomes the full public consultation approach adopted by DEFRA in developing its recommendations for the Government to embed in a future UK Low Level Waste policy. We have endeavoured to look at the key questions from a national, regional and, particularly, from a more holistic West Cumbrian point of view. You will appreciate that with four nuclear licensed facilities – Calder Hall, Sellafield, Windscale and the national LLW Repository – and in addition some 60% of the UK’s nuclear legacy in Copeland Borough, the issue of Low Level Waste is of great importance to our local community.

Copeland has played a significant part in the nation’s Low Level Waste requirements, through its leading role in the UK’s nuclear industry. Our local community is probably one of the few communities in the UK with a real understanding of the issues under consultation. We therefore hope that the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs will give our response the correct weighting it deserves.

However, we would like to express our disappointment that the consultation paper pays little attention to the scale of the problem that Cumbria faces in managing the LLW, which will arise within the county.

Waste Capacity

The Council agrees that future arisings of LLW from decommissioning and the potential arisings from any nuclear new-build would greatly exceed the current available capacity. Currently the management of radioactive waste resulting from the decommissioning programme is project driven and thus is largely influenced by time and cost. The project driven approach is sometimes done at the cost of minimisation of both volume and activity. It is important that the nuclear industry is strongly encouraged to minimise their arisings and look at efficient methods of decontamination, this would be helped by more appropriate waste disposal and treatment planning methods. A robust system of disposition mapping which took into account of each stage of a waste products life including the pre- treatment needed, BPM assessment, interim

storage and final disposal route should be incorporated during the design stage, this would reduce the risk of inadequate resource and capacity.

The Council is concerned that the possible use of the LLWR at Drigg as a UK national asset is not raised as one of the questions but is taken as an assumption. The Council considers that there should be an open and objective process for considering all potential national or regional sites using consistent criteria. Given the limited capacity of the site, the coastal erosion issues and the considerable amounts of LLW arising in Cumbria, the site should not be used to accommodate waste from other nuclear sites in the UK.

We are concerned about the assumption that there is an existing facility near Drigg, which has 800,000 cubic metres of authorised capacity, which is not the case in our view. This misunderstanding has implications throughout the consultation paper and the manner in which it addresses its proposals. By assuming that the site has existing capacity it is not treated as just one of the options and its further use is not questioned. We need to seek a level playing field in which all possible new facilities are to be considered in the same way through a transparent and consistent process.

It is understood that the licensing regimes of the Environment Agency and the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate do not, in fact, indicate that the LLWR site could possibly accommodate an additional 800 000 m³ of LLW. The question of its radiological capacity has still to be answered together with that of its long-term suitability.

The Council supports the view that the remaining capacity at the LLWR site at Drigg should meet local community (West Cumbrian) needs, including local decommissioning and reprocessing waste requirements, rather than be assumed to provide a single solution to LLW and decommissioning waste management. As a result the Council has formally taken the view that no further increase in capacity at the LLWR should be allowed until the industry reaches agreement with the Council on a package of “offset” measures to compensate for the presence of a radioactive waste facility in its area.

Hosting Waste Sites

Compensation and recognition of its strategic national importance has been minimal and the Council does not accept the concept that it is equitable for West Cumbrian communities to host waste generated in their own areas just because they have received benefits from previous nuclear operations. Nuclear facilities in West Cumbria were installed to meet a national need and not a local need; the benefits have therefore been national whilst most of the detriment has been local.

The Council believes that a key issue which needs to be addressed is the siting and location of waste stores, the proximity principle guides towards the waste being managed as near as practicable to where it originated, whereas greater management and control is more apparent with only one or two ‘centralised’ stores. Integral to the debate is stakeholder involvement and public acceptance through education and local empowerment. The Council

takes the view the local community represented by Local Councils should have a veto over the import of radioactive waste into their communities and that no community should be an unwilling victim. We believe that the presence of radioactive waste creates significant detriments for our communities and no community should have such detriments forced on them.

Indeed the Council does not accept the concept that it is equitable for West Cumbrian communities to host waste generated in their own areas just because they have received benefits from previous nuclear operations. Furthermore, the Council would have serious concerns if Copeland were used as a centralised interim storage location. This may prejudice a future siting decision for a repository or other permanent waste facilities and concentrate perceived hazard and risk and associated stigma in our area to our further detriment. Increasing the amount of the UK's waste stored locally will increase the likelihood of a disposal facility being in West Cumbria. Copeland Council has maintained a consistent policy in recent years that additional LLW and ILW from outside this area should not be moved to Copeland.

Non-Nuclear Industry Waste

The Council recognises that the current management arrangements are that non-nuclear industry LLW, for example waste from hospitals and universities is accepted at the LLW repository in Cumbria. The volume and activity of these wastes are comparatively small and would therefore have no significant impact on capacity. It would appear to be the best practical solution to small-scale non-nuclear industry LLW. However, the Council would again like to emphasise that the remaining capacity at the LLWR should meet local decommissioning needs rather than national arisings, furthermore non-nuclear industry LLW should be disposed as close as practicable to its origin. Therefore we support the concept of greater responsibility at local level for these types of waste and communities need to make provision via regional and local planning strategies in order to deal with their own waste. However, it is important that there is no short cuts made with regard to public safety and therefore the relevant regulatory bodies should conduct the same level of scrutiny.

VLLW

The Council supports the idea of a more consistent definition of VLLW in order to bring it in-line with the definition of LLW. The use of specific activity based on mass is a more practically applicable approach.

Coastal Erosion

We are concerned by British Nuclear Group's assessment, which predicts that destruction of the repository by coastal erosion is possible in as little as 500 years from now. Regardless of the calculated risks, the potential for the destruction of the repository by coastal erosion means that disposal of long-lived LLW on the site might be creating undue burdens on future generations, as a result of mitigating engineering measures and contamination.

As a result of climate change the risk of coastal erosion and the current estimated timescales at the LLWR site is great enough to seriously consider

its existence in its current operational form, i.e. as a final disposal site. We request that the EA urge BNGSL to carry out a BPEO study into the option of changing the current operational status and future capping strategy into one of safe interim storage until a national disposal solution is established. The image of radioactive waste falling into the Irish Sea in 500 years is one that clearly suggests that the LLWR is not situated in the safest and most sustainable location. Although outside the scope of this review, it is evident that a location away from the coast should be considered and a study into suitable locations should be undertaken.

The international commitments set out in the Process & Considerations Document, paragraph 22.5 (c) of the Rio Declaration (UN 1992) notes that States, in co-operation with relevant internal organisations, where appropriate, should:

“Not promote or allow the storage or disposal of high-level, intermediate-level and low-level radioactive wastes near the marine environment unless they determine that scientific evidence, consistent with the applicable internationally agreed principles and guidelines, shows that such storage or disposal poses no unacceptable risk to people and the marine environment or does not interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, making, in the process of consideration, appropriate use of the concept of the precautionary approach.”

In addition the UK Government has reflected the OSPAR agreements in the current UK Strategy for Radioactive Discharges, 2001-2020, “The Strategy” (DEFRA 2002). The main aims of the Strategy are to achieve:

- The progressive and substantial reduction of radioactive discharges and discharge limits.
- The progressive reduction of human exposure to ionising radiation from radioactive discharges, such that a representative member of the critical group will receive a mean dose of no more than 0.02 millisieverts per year (mSv y⁻¹) due to liquid discharges to the marine environment from 2020 onwards (this is not a limit but a projected consequence of achieving reduced radioactive discharges); and
- The progressive reduction of concentrations of radionuclides from radioactive discharges in the marine environment such that by 2020 they add close to zero to historic levels.

In order to mitigate the risk substantial engineered coastal defences would be required, which does not lend itself to an effective sustainable solution as a constant battle against coastal erosion would be a burden to future generations. Indeed we believe that the current uncertainties should rule out any further increase to disposal at the site and it should be considered as a storage site until these issues are resolved.

Historic Waste

The Council feels that historic disposal should not be ignored and stakeholder engagement should take place over the issue of the tumble tipped trenches to

consider whether these should be removed, repackaged and stored in a way that is up to current standards. We recognise that it would be unreasonable to expect historical practices to fully comply with present day guidance and modern standards, but there may be reasonable options to optimise the performance of the site as a whole and BNGSL needs to demonstrate it has considered, and implemented them where appropriate.

Costs

The Council believes there is conflicting information on where the LLWR sits in terms of comparative costs. Indeed, the assumptions that have been made in the Regulatory Impact Assessment in estimating the costs of continued use of the LLWR site compared with other facilities need to be considered in more detail.

We understand that methods of disposal can vary significantly depending on local circumstances. For example, tumble tipping may be acceptable in parts of the U.S., thus bringing down costs, but would be concerning in a more densely populated country as our own. Related to this we should be seeking to maximise waste minimisation, recycling and free release. This is not best served by reducing the cost of disposal.

The Council believes that consideration should be given to reviewing the cost of disposal at the LLWR as any net increase in disposal income should be used firstly to fund a local offset package and then to provide additional funding for decommissioning work.

Waste Hierarchy

The Council supports the message of waste minimisation, reuse and recycling, and that the waste hierarchy is reinforced within the management of LLW as a result of the UK decommissioning programme. There is also a need for greater use of assessment by Best Practical Means for minimisation and decontamination.

The Council supports the use of the waste hierarchy (as defined chapter 3, paras 15-16), we were encouraged to see that the issue of reduction in radioactivity would be encouraged along with volume reduction. It is important to recognise the significant advantages of volume reduction with regard to decommissioning-type low level waste arisings. Non-compactable low level wastes, which are generally packaged in ½ height iso-freight containers destined for the LLW repository in Cumbria are usually no more than 50% full, increasing this figure to 70% or 80% by better planning, resources and facilities would increase the remaining capacity lifetime significantly.

The Council recognises that the process of incineration minimises waste volume effectively, however it has significant concerns over its suitability in populated areas. That is concerns regarding public health, social intrusion and public perception of risk.

Waste Plans & Strategy

The Council supports the concept of producing LLW Waste Plans, however this needs to be done at all levels of the waste process and not just at a higher level. The waste will arise at an individual decommissioning project level and it is important that waste planning is achieved at this level and prior to project start-up.

The Council feels that it is important to have a tight centralised control on the production of individual Integrated Waste Strategies (IWS) across the UK nuclear sites so that it is indeed 'integrated' rather than 20 separate waste plans. This would be more apparent on the Sellafield site, which could have a Calder Hall IWS, a Windscale IWS, a Sellafield IWS and finally a LLWR IWS. It is the Council's view that this would not be a practical solution to waste management.

Stakeholder Involvement

It is the Council's view that as a key stakeholder it is important that they are involved in early community input to an open and transparent consultation and decision making process in order for the local community to contribute to the whole local LLW decision-making process from start to finish and not just be informed of progress. As the Council is democratically elected by local people to represent their interests we need to be an integral part of the decision making process in our role as community leaders. Furthermore, we would like to encourage the NDA to coordinate its public and stakeholder engagement processes, in part, with those of the **planning authorities in preparing their Local Development Frameworks.**

Community Benefit

That Council would like to express its surprise and disappointment that the consultation paper appears to virtually omit the subject of community benefits and volunteerism. **This issue was strongly raised at both the stakeholder events. Indeed at the second event one of the conclusions was that the wording related to it in the draft was not strong or clear enough and alternative wordings were discussed. So as it stands the consultation document does not reflect the feeling of the stakeholder workshop in this respect.** The Council considers that the consultation on the review of policy should pay attention to the matters of community benefits packages to offset the impacts that arise from hosting LLW facilities and to the issues of community veto and volunteerism.

Indeed, it is the Council's view that it is important to have prior agreement of an 'off-set package' in the form of an inter-generational community endowment to ensure long-term local community sustainability for the lifetime of the LLW waste. This endowment would be held in such a way as not to be affected by any change in central government, political party, local government and/or boundary. Furthermore the offset package would have a 'landfill tax' type mechanism of waste management (on both volume and activity) to be levied on all radioactive waste under long-term storage and/or disposal at the site(s). This would be paid into a community socio-economic fund for the sole use of the local community.

Finally, we believe that the local community represented by Local Councils should have a veto over the import of radioactive waste into their communities and that no community should be an unwilling victim. We believe that the presence of radioactive waste creates significant detriments for our communities and no community should have such detriments forced on them.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Davies', is centered within a light gray rectangular box.

David Davies
Head of Sustainability & Nuclear Policy

APPENDIX 3

TIMETABLE

WHAT	WHO	WHEN
Complete Discussion Document and Draft Response.	S&NP	By 24 th April 2006
Send to Parish Councils, CCC, ABC, WLR etc	S&NP	Send Out by 9 th May 2006 Comments Back by 19 th May 2006
Draft to Nuclear Working Group (NWG)	S&NP	5 th May 2006 (Deadline for NWG papers 27 th April 2006)
Prepare Final Document and Make any further amendments	S&NP	22 nd – 24 th May 2006
Email NWG for Endorsement of Final Document	S&NP	24 th – 26 th May 2006
Send Final Version to DEFRA	S&NP	30 th May 2006
DEADLINE TO DEFRA		31ST MAY 2006