

2605

Key Points from CoRWM's Stakeholder Workshop on the Consultation Draft Report on Deep Geological Disposal of Higher Activity Wastes – 15th May, Workington, Cumbria (CoRWM Doc. 2593) May 2009

1.	Author	• Mark Dutton
2.	Date	• June 2009
3.	Subject	• Key Points from PSE Event in Cumbria 15.05.09
4.	Status	• 4th draft
5.	Recipients	• All Members
6.	When commissioned by CoRWM	•
7.	Confidential	• no
9.	Document no.	• 2605

1. There is a lack of clarity about what the Decision-making Body(ies) should be in areas with two tiers of local government, which needs to be resolved before a Decision to participate can be made. In the view of Cumbria County Council, Government assistance is required in the form of expert advice and facilitation in the discussions between Cumbria County Council and Allerdale and Copeland District Councils. This assistance should involve DECC and DCLG.
2. There is a lack of clarity on how potential host communities, i.e. parishes, will be identified in Stage 4 of the implementation process and how they will be involved in the decision-making process. Early engagement on this issue is required before communities will support a Decision to Participate. There is a concern that there may be imposition by District and County Councils.
3. There is also a lack of clarity on what is meant by a potential host community and affected communities since the footprint of the facility may be under several parishes and it may be under different parishes than those that contain the surface facilities.
4. The interest at grass roots level will intensify when sites and thus potential host communities are identified. At this time, there will be a need for an intensified period of providing information
5. For some local stakeholders, there must be an assurance that the condition of the waste will be monitored after it is emplaced. Others considered that the concept of retrievability is only applicable to storage and is contrary to the objective of disposal.
6. All participants in local partnerships will incur costs, which need to be covered by the Engagement package.
7. Before a Decision to Participate is made, there will need to be more clarity on the scale and nature of Benefits Packages. Some stakeholders expressed the view that the Benefits Package should be related to the extent that a disposal facility performs against the attributes that are commonly used in the assessment of the Best Practicable Environmental

Option (BPEO). This would make the package more robust if it were challenged.

8. CoRWM should make a recommendation that Government should explain how the long-term funding for the project will be assured.
9. Elected representatives held the view that Government should not continue to accept Expressions of Interest after a Decision to Participate has been made. Representatives of the Industry did not think that much effort should be spent in attracting Eols from other parts of the country.
10. There will need to be clarity on the inventory before the process of identifying potential sites begins if not before. As well as affecting the source term for the post-closure safety case, the inclusion of spent fuel, plutonium and uranium will significantly increase the footprint of the facility which may limit the sites that can accommodate it. Elected representatives supported the recycling of the fissile material from spent fuel, plutonium and reactor grade uranium rather than disposing of it. Representatives of the Industry thought that the priority should be to dispose of ILW and HLW.
11. There is a belief that using the provisions of the 2008 Planning Act is against the principle of voluntarism. CoRWM should stress that Government should implement the planning regime that allows the maximum local input.
12. There are significant uncertainties in some phenomena that affect the post-closure safety case, which must be reduced before safety can be demonstrated.
13. CoRWM should scrutinise the decision-making process to ensure there it makes the best use of science.