

**westcumbria:mrws**

West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership

# The Final Report of the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership

## Executive Summary

**August 2012**

Website: [www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk](http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk)

Email: [contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk](mailto:contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk)

Freephone: 0800 048 8912

**This is the Executive Summary of the full Final Report of the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership, published in August 2012.**

See the Introduction section for more details.

The Final Report is available on our website at [www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk](http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk). You can also request a paper copy by emailing [contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk](mailto:contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk) or calling **0800 048 8912**.

# Introduction

The West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Partnership was set up to consider the issues that would be involved in taking part in a search to see if there is anywhere in the Allerdale and/or Copeland areas suitable for a repository for higher activity radioactive waste.

Over the last three years we have looked at reports and literature, heard from experts in the field, commissioned independent research and invited reviews by independent experts.

We have placed a high priority on public and stakeholder engagement (PSE), carrying out three rounds of engagement in order to inform people, seek their input, and give feedback on how this changed our work.

Our **Final Report** presents our work, together with our opinions and advice to Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council – who are the decision-making bodies in this process. This report will help inform the three Councils' decisions about whether to participate in the next stages of the siting process or not.

If they *do* decide to participate, then desk-based studies (Stage 4 of the MRWS process) and site investigations (Stage 5) would precede possible construction and operation of a facility (Stage 6). A right of withdrawal exists up until the end of Stage 5.

This **Executive Summary** provides an overview of the issues we have considered and some of our key opinions and advice, which is abbreviated in some places. It is important to read our full Final Report to see all the opinions and advice we have agreed, and to get a clear picture of the work that lies behind them.

# Background

Currently, higher activity radioactive waste is kept in stores above ground at 36 sites across the UK. A large amount of the waste is at Sellafield in West Cumbria.

The Government accepted the recommendation of the independent Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) that the best available long-term solution for this waste is geological disposal.

The Government says geological disposal involves placing the waste deep underground in a purpose-built facility, called a geological disposal facility (GDF) or a repository, leaving the waste there forever once the facility is closed.

The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) is responsible for implementing the Government's policy on the long-term management of radioactive waste.

The Government says it is committed to an approach based on voluntarism. This means that communities would express willingness to search for a site for a potential GDF, and perhaps ultimately host a facility, rather than having it forced upon them. Indeed, a right of withdrawal exists up until construction is due to start.

However, the Government has also made it clear that, if a site is not geologically suitable or safe for a GDF, one would not be built.

The Government says that, following any decision to participate in the siting process, it would expect a community siting partnership to be set up. This would be a partnership of local interests to provide advice and recommendations to the decision-making bodies.

We looked at various topics. Each is covered below with a brief summary of our key opinions and advice to the decision-making bodies, which are **emboldened** for ease of reading.

See **Chapters 2 to 4** of the Final Report for more detailed background information.

# Inventory

The types and amounts of radioactive wastes for disposal – the inventory – could affect a GDF in a number of ways including the design, the size of the underground footprint, the period of operation, the developing safety case and, potentially, the number of required repositories.

**Overall, we are unable to say at this stage that we are satisfied with the proposed inventory because we do not yet have definite information on what actually would go into a GDF (GDF operation is over 25 years away).**

However, we have developed a set of Inventory Principles in order to ask for commitments from the Government about how inventory issues will be handled if a decision to enter the siting process is taken. **Progress has been made towards agreeing the principles that define an acceptable process for how the inventory could be changed, including how the community can influence this.**

If there is a decision to take part in the first stage of the search for a suitable location for a GDF (Stage 4), we advise that **a community siting partnership should enter into negotiations with the Government to develop a mutually acceptable process for how the inventory would be changed, including the circumstances under which the decision-making bodies should have a veto on changes to the inventory even after the right of withdrawal has ceased.**

See **Chapter 7** of our Final Report for more detail.

# Geology

Finding a suitable rock formation that can act as an effective barrier is essential for the construction of a safe disposal facility.

As a first step, the Government said that any area expressing an interest in this process should have a test carried out by the British Geological Survey (BGS). This was designed to rule out certain areas as being clearly unsuitable, and thereby enable a judgement about whether the remaining area is enough to continue investigations for a potential site. This test was done in West Cumbria and ruled out about 25% of the land area, leaving 1890km<sup>2</sup> for possible investigation. We commissioned two peer reviews of this study, which both said we could rely on the results.

**We believe that the 1,890km<sup>2</sup> of land not ruled out as clearly unsuitable by the BGS provides a sufficient amount of land, in terms of area, available for investigation.**

We also looked at the suitability of the geology of the remaining area. We have received expert geological submissions arguing that West Cumbria's geology is unsuitable and further progress is not worthwhile. However, we have also received contrary expert advice stating that further progress is worthwhile because not enough is yet known to be able to say that all of West Cumbria should be ruled out.

**The Partnership agrees that it is inherently uncertain at this stage whether a suitable site can be found, that more geological work is therefore required, and that it should be done as soon as possible. However, there is a difference of view in the Partnership about whether this further geological work should be done *before* or *after* a decision about participation in Stage 4.**

**The Partnership agrees that, if there is a decision to proceed to Stage 4, a community siting partnership should independently review the NDA's work, in particular the geological assessments.**

See [Chapter 8](#) of our Final Report for more detail.

# Design and engineering

Knowing how a GDF might be designed and engineered is important because: it helps people to visualise what it might look like and appreciate the scale of the project; it can affect, or be affected by, what goes into it and where it is located; and the design affects the safety of the facility.

**Our opinion is that, overall, we are content that detailed design issues are largely site-specific and, as such, cannot and should not be resolved at this time. Specifically, we understand the generic design concepts being worked on, and they fit with our expectations.**

We looked at ‘retrievability’, which means the possibility of withdrawing the waste after it has been put into a GDF. **We have confirmed that retrievability of waste is an option, to be decided on in the future.**

See **Chapter 9** of our Final Report for more detail.

# Safety, security, environment and planning

Making sure that any GDF would be as safe, secure and environmentally sound as possible is of the highest importance.

## Regulatory and planning processes

**We are as confident as is possible at this stage that the necessary regulatory bodies exist and have, or are developing/modifying, processes by which they will consider proposals for a GDF.**

If there is a decision to move to the next stage, we advise that **areas within the National Park are not considered for surface facilities because of the likely impact this would have on the special qualities of the Park, which would not be consistent with current planning policies.**

## Safety

**We believe that the NDA will have suitable capability and an acceptable process in place to develop site-specific safety cases. Of course, any site-specific safety cases would need further monitoring and independent reviews.**

**Our opinion is that, overall, the NDA's research & development programme is acceptable. However, we note that there remain some concerns about the lack of progress with the programme, as well as the lack of clarity over the timescales for completing individual research topics.**

Our additional advice includes a suggestion that **a community siting partnership should secure an 'Engagement Package' (funding) from the Government that allows it to commission independent reviews of any work conducted by the NDA, including safety-related work, potentially via setting up a panel of independent experts.**

See **Chapter 10** of our Final Report for more detail.

# Impacts

If a GDF was to be sited in West Cumbria it could lead to a number of different negative and positive impacts for the community, the economy and the environment. These might include:

- The immediate effects of construction such as noise and dust.
- Whether there would be any impact on health.
- Changes in investment in the area.
- Traffic impacts.
- Possible effects on the visual or physical environment and on tourism.
- Changes in employment.

These impacts, both positive and negative, would ultimately need weighing up against the impacts of the waste remaining in its current form, and of the above-ground storage arrangements at Sellafield or elsewhere in the country.

**Our overall opinion is that, at this stage, we are fairly confident that an acceptable process can be put in place to assess and mitigate negative impacts, and maximise positive impacts.**

**There are potential risks to some parts of the economy if the process moves forward, particularly the visitor, land-based, and food and drink sectors. We advise that a coordinated strategy and action plan is prepared to support those aspects of Cumbria's economic activity if the process enters the search for a site.**

**Our opinion is that the development of a GDF appears broadly compatible with the economic aspirations of West Cumbria. We advise that a full economic impact assessment is conducted if the process proceeds any further, as potential site areas are identified.**

See **Chapter 11** of our Final Report for more detail.

# Community benefits package

The Government has said that any area in which a GDF is sited would receive some kind of community benefits package. We would expect it to be a substantial long-term investment provided by the Government in things like infrastructure, services and/or skills that benefit the whole community.

The Government has agreed that this means that benefits would be beyond those that derive directly from the construction and operation of the facility, and would be in addition to those that the community would normally expect.

We have developed a set of Community Benefits Principles that set out how we would expect community benefits to be discussed, agreed and potentially administered. The Government has agreed to our principles as the basis for negotiation in the next stage of the process.

**This gives us a certain amount of confidence that an acceptable community benefits package could be negotiated. We advise that a community siting partnership should use these principles as the basis for negotiations with the Government, if Stage 4 starts.**

**However, we cannot be certain what specific package the Government might agree to this far in advance and, therefore, whether the amount and type of these benefits would match the expectations of local people.**

**We believe a final decision to accept a GDF should only be made if the community is convinced that the Government – and future governments that follow – will honour commitments on community benefits.**

See [Chapter 12](#) of our Final Report for more detail.

# Stages 4 and 5 of the MRWS process

We wanted to be confident that a good process can be put in place if the next steps are taken.

In Chapter 13 of our Final Report we set out our views on the way in which voluntarism should work during a siting process.

We believe the emphasis on a strong commitment to voluntarism and community ‘willingness to participate’ is one that parties should keep at the forefront of their minds if this process continues. At each stage, any future community siting partnership should seek to maximise consensus amongst the decision-making bodies, potential host communities and wider local interests.

**Our opinion is that our work in Chapter 13 provides some confidence that the siting process can be sufficiently robust and flexible, at least during Stage 4. We are reassured by the Councils’ ability to withdraw West Cumbria from discussions with the Government. However, we recognise that the very first challenge in a possible Stage 4 will be to agree how a community siting partnership should operate and what partnership agreement should exist between members.**

**We advise that any community siting partnership should be established and operated in line with all of the guidance set out in Chapter 13.**

See **Chapter 13** of our Final Report for more detail.

# Overarching issues

There are a number of issues that either run across all of our work, or provide an important context for the decision about whether or not to participate in the first stage of the search for a suitable location for a GDF. A selection of these are summarised below.

## Uncertainty

A great many uncertainties remain, primarily because they relate to issues that can only be considered in detail at a later date. **Should a decision to participate be taken, we would advise that a community siting partnership uses the indicative schedule provided in the ‘Stage 4 and 5’ chapter of our Final Report (Chapter 13) to build its work programme and, in doing so, help reduce the range of uncertainties that exist.**

## Trust

A lack of trust appears to us to be at the root of many of the key concerns raised by the public and stakeholders. We have provided advice on this throughout our Final Report.

**In particular, we advise that prior to a decision about participation the decision-making bodies secure a commitment that, by the end of Stage 4, the Government will have decided what mechanisms it will use to make key parts of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely process (including the right of withdrawal) legally binding. We have received this commitment from the Minister of Energy, and advise that any community siting partnership should tackle this early in its work programme.**

**We also advise that a community siting partnership should continue the Partnership’s approach to transparency and extensive public and stakeholder engagement, operating by consensus where practical, and seeking agreements from others where useful e.g. regarding legislation.**

## Strategic Environmental Assessments

We considered whether the Government's MRWS policy is consistent with European legislation on Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs). This legislation includes looking at 'reasonable alternatives' such as alternative sites, alternative disposal methods and alternatives to the current process of voluntarism.

**Some members believe that the aspect of a Strategic Environmental Assessment that assesses reasonable alternatives should take place *before* a decision about participation. Other members believe that the NDA's plans for carrying out a Strategic Environmental Assessment *after* a potential decision to participate are appropriate.**

See **Chapter 6** of our Final Report for more detail.

# Public and stakeholder views

Engaging the public and stakeholders has been a priority for us (see Chapters 5 and 14 of our Final Report for more detail). We wanted to understand how partner organisations, stakeholders, and interested members of the public, as well as the silent majority of the general public, felt about this issue.

As well as three extensive rounds of engagement, we conducted a statistically significant opinion survey to gauge people's views. The results show that across Cumbria there are more people in favour of taking part in the search for a suitable site than people who oppose taking part. However, this must be considered alongside other parts of our engagement.

Other aspects of our engagement aimed to understand concerns so they could be addressed, to ensure our opinions and advice are credible. We have done a considerable amount of work to respond directly to consultation submissions. Overall, most Partnership members are satisfied that the opinions and advice given in our Final Report reflect the public and stakeholder views we have received. However, some members feel this is not the case on some topics and this has been noted in the relevant chapters, Chapters 8 and 13 in our Final Report. Specific significant changes have been made as a result of public input, for example requiring a firm legal footing to the process, and advising that an outline community benefits package should be developed and agreed with the Government before any site investigations start.

We thank everybody for their time in submitting their views and contributing to our work.

This Executive Summary provides an overview of the issues considered by the Partnership and some of our key opinions and advice. It is important to read our full Final Report to see all the opinions and advice we have agreed, and to get a clear picture of the work that lies behind them.

The Final Report is available on our website at [www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk](http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk). You can also request a paper copy by emailing [contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk](mailto:contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk) or calling **0800 048 8912**.

If you require this document in another format  
(eg CD, audio cassette, Braille or large type) or in  
another language, please telephone 0800 048 8912

আপনি যদি এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে  
0800 048 8912 নম্বরে টেলিফোন করুন।

如果您希望通过母语了解此信息，  
请致电 0800 048 8912

**Jeigu norétumète gauti šią informaciją savo kalba,  
skambinkite telefonu 0800 048 8912**

**W celu uzyskania informacji w Państwa języku proszę  
zatelefonować pod numer 0800 048 8912**

**Se quiser aceder a esta informação na sua língua,  
telefone para o 0800 048 8912**

**Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde görmek istiyorsanız lütfen  
0800 048 8912 numaralı telefonu arayınız**

Website: [www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk](http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk)  
Email: [contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk](mailto:contact@westcumbriamrws.org.uk)  
Freephone: 0800 048 8912