

NFLA: SWANSEA:Sept' 2019  
Nuclear Issues for South Wales  
Swansea GDF;  
EDF's Hinkley Mud  
Safe Haven for Nuclear Maritime Cargos  
Nuclear Laundry

*Tim Deere-Jones*

*Marine Radioactivity Research & Consultancy*

# GDF and what's to be disposed of

- A single GDF is proposed for the UKs Highly Active Waste(HAW) from all UK SOURCES (NPS, MILITARY, INDUSTRIAL, MEDICAL, EDUCATIONAL)
- 4,501,150 CUBIC METRES/TONNES OF HIGH/MEDIUM AND LL WASTE (RECENT ESTIMATE)
- SOME OF IT **VERY HAW**: 74% BY VOLUME FROM SELLAFIELD
- HAW FOR GDF WILL INCLUDE SPENT FUEL, REACTOR PARTS, FUEL ASSEMBLY PARTS, HIGHLY ACTIVE RESINS & REPROCESSING WASTES, DUSTS,
- 2016: NDA ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS OF 120 YEAR DECOMMISSIONING AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS :£164 BILLION (TAX PAYER TO FRONT 55%)
- LIKE EVERYTHING ELSE NUCLEAR WE SHOULD EXPECT COST-ESTIMATES TO RISE VERY SIGNIFICANTLY ONCE THE PROJECT RECEIVES "GO-AHEAD"

## GDF Policies across the UK

- Scot' Gov' policy for HAW states that the long-term management of HAW should be in near-surface facilities (where the HAW is permanently accessible) & as near to the site where the waste is produced as possible.
- Scot Gov' does NOT support the GDF proposal in ANY form
- NI Assembly?
- Policy of the UK Gov' and the Welsh Gov' is that HAW in England and Wales should be managed in the long-term through a GDF, coupled with safe and secure interim storage until a national GDF is completed
- Why has Welsh Gov not considered the Scottish proposal?>

# ID of Swansea as a good site for the National GDF

- Geology considered favourable (offshore and under the sea-bed)
  - Would require a shore based entrance on Welsh coast and a long tunnel (high cost excavation, large volume & high cost mineral waste disposal, multiple traffic movements)
  - Transport links considered favourable (road/rail/sea and even air available) for import of nuclear waste from multiple UK and possibly overseas sites
  - Volume of waste to be disposed of
  - Nature of waste
- 
- **Multiple transports of N.Waste breach Precautionary Principles identified re N. transports**
  - **Multiple transports pose risk of transport accidents,**
  - **Time scales of disposal "deposition" activity extended till dismantling of current & future NPS (hence transport risk period extended)**
  - **GDF to be "sealed" over "Geological Time Spans" : uncertain predictions for fate of GDF over such periods.....**

# Response to Welsh GDF proposal

## SWANSEA CITY and COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION:

- "The Council strongly objects to the proposal from Radioactive Waste Management (RWM), to hold a consultation event in Swansea. "
- "The Council is disappointed that this decision was made without consulting or informing Swansea Council of its intent and feel it is very wrong not to inform the elected representatives of the City of Swansea of their intentions before going to the media with a press statement. "
- "The Council objects to the establishment of any Geological Disposal Facility within the City & County of Swansea."
- The Council will also strongly support any other Welsh or UK local authorities that object to these proposals. The Council requests that the Leader writes to the Prime Minister, the First Minister for Wales and to the UK Government department for Radioactive Waste Management (RWM), to express the views of this Council.
- Swansea City & County Council has the support of Welsh Authorities (Powys, Ceredigion, Neath/Port Talbot and many more Community Councils) for its objections to both GDF and the way the UK government and RWM have managed the issue to date.

# How to Build Wylfa now that Hitachi et al have withdrawn:1

- New Westminster Gov proposed Regulated Asset Base (RAB) funding proposals for Wylfa, and potentially all the other proposed N. sites.. Moorside, OLDBURY, Bradwell, Sizewell.....
- RAB being used to pay for £4.2 billion Thames Tideway Super Sewer.. (by raising water bills for consumers while company & shareholders continue to earn dividends/profits un-interrupted by having to spend anything)
- Gov says RAB is good for new nuclear .... because
  - it allows investors to receive "returns before projects are completed"
  - It therefore "has potential to attract significant investment.. At a lower cost for investors"
- Clear that RAB will be bad for renewables, because **funding will be focussed on new nuclear to the detriment of renewables like Swansea Tidal Lagoon which has been denied such an opportunity, current decline of funding for wind and solar?**

## How to Build Wylfa now that Hitachi et al have withdrawn: 2

- BUT:: Consumers pay higher electricity bills for new reactors BEFORE they are ever built
- RAB also commits TAXPAYERS to pay a share of cost over-runs
- RAB commits taxpayers to compensate nuclear investors if the projects is scrapped
- Government admits " significant challenges remain" : including raising the capital sums and creating risk sharing agreements
- UK Gov only require £1.2 billion insurance from operators: both Chernobyl & Fukushima clean-up costs already exceed several hundreds of billions: UK taxpayers will pay any EXCESS if there is an accident

## Regulated Asset Base and other sites

- If RAB process workable for WYLFA then it is likely to be applied to successive proposals for nuclear new build:
- Eg: Moorside (Sellafield coast : northern basin of Irish Sea)
- + Oldbury (Severn side : Bristol Channel)
- Sizewell and Bradwell
- Hinkley Point C (where funding seems in place ... but subject to possible change)



## Cardiff Mud Dump updates.....

- Current status re EDF action (less dredged and dumped than originally proposed)
- Re- application for dredge and dump has been anticipated but not made to date...
- This would be a NEW licence rather than an up-date of an existing licence
- "Complaint" to EC .. has been "accepted" and now under consideration (time scales could be long!)

# Mud Dump::::Where next for edf/welsh gov/NRW/ campaigners

- What might EDF do? : re-apply, find alternative disposal method, prepare a new lobbying strategy
- What should Welsh Gov' do? : invigorate the NRW and provide them with correct expertise instead of forcing their reliance on Westminster based organisations with a long working relationship with the Nuclear Industry
- What should the NRW do? demand more funding for staff and technology to enable them to comment **authoritatively** and **independently** on radiological issues
- *It's a scandal that Wales with it's own history of nuclear reactors discharging to air and sea (Traws and Wylfa), with more reactors close to it's northern and southern borders and subject to major fallout from very distant sites (Chernobyl) STILL doesn't have that independent expertise and technology*
- What should campaigners do? Be vigilant and prepared

# Proximity of HPC

Operational pollution (marine/atmospheric)

Accidents small and large

Exclusion zones ( circular and bearing little relevance to atmospheric or marine conditions)(screen shot?)

Long term pollution of land and sea from both operational and accidents

Ignorance of impacts of FOR VARIOUS RADIO NUCLIDES EG TRITIUM

# Unitech Crumlin : nuclear laundry

- UNITECH CRUMLIN offers laundry and decomm facilities for UK nuclear operators (protective clothing, machinery, metallic items....)
- Unitech history/origins (US 1950s)
- Unitech sites elsewhere in UK and Europe (Cumbria, Sweden, Holland, Germany, France)
- Transport issues
- Waste discharge issues (main Glamorgan waste water system ..... discharging into Orchard levels (along with medical n.wastes, remant environmental wastes from Llanishen factory etc)
- Status of Licencing and monitoring
- Information request submitted to NRW
- *NRW's admitted lack of relevant radiological expertise*

## UK GOV :: "Safe Haven" for non MOD Vessels in trouble and carrying rad' mats

- No such Safe Havens **officially** ID'd : but can be ID'd on the spur of the moment, by DoT officials as required
- Potential s.Wales sites= Milford Haven, Swansea Port & Bay, Newport, Bristol, Bristol Channel, Caldey Roads, S. Pembs coast
- Due to non ID of Safe Haven Status, Ports/Anchorages in Wales and Bristol Channel Ports have
- No impact assessments
- No Emergency planning
- No Exclusion/evacuation zones
- No mitigating strategies or medical fixes
- **Arguably** Welsh Local Authorities with enough port facilities/anchorages to warrant possible ID as Safe Haven should undertake such planning as a precautionary exercise.....