

**RP739: Site Decommissioning: Sustainable Practices in the Use of Resources (SD:SPUR)**

**Minutes of working group meeting to discuss Task 2: Practical flow diagrams.**

**Held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2006 at IOD Hub, Birmingham**

**1. PRESENT**

John Barritt	WRAP
Richard Bramhall	LLRC (had to leave early)
Paul Dorfman	University of Warwick
Marion Hill	Consultant to CIRIA (research contractor)
David Owen	C&EWG
John Potter	BNG
Lisa Hughes	BNG
David Adamson	BNG (observing)
Mark Bentley	CIRIA
Jeff Kersey	CIRIA
Jo Facer	CIRIA

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None

**3. CIRIA INTRODUCTION**

CIRIA gave a brief introduction to the practical flow diagrams work and the aim of the working group meeting.

**Background:** The SD:SPUR project steering group have agreed, as part of the 2006/7 financial year work plan, that an information paper be produced on the good practice tools that are available in the UK to assist the development of strategies, plans and procedures for the management of decommissioning wastes.

**Meeting aim:** to discuss and agree the scope and outline contents of the paper and the draft generic process flow diagram.

**4. DRAFT FLOW DIAGRAM**

**4.1 Introduction**

The draft flow diagrams were circulated. These set out the process for setting up a waste management strategy and implementing it. It does not show the process for how you make these decisions e.g. stakeholder engagement (need to wait for the development of the key principles). Box 2 is equivalent to undertaking BPEO studies and box 4 to undertaking BPM studies. The second diagram shows how the site level processes fit in with higher level strategies, policies and regulations.

These diagrams are about making the guidance more practical and based around steps. They aim to tie people down to key considerations and revised guidance could be built around these steps.

#### **4.2 Working group comments**

- (a) It was suggested that setting targets and reviewing progress should be included in the flow chart. You don't want to end up with a list of things that people never do. Measurement process and management should be a principle within the process.
- (b) There are problems with setting targets/ applying the waste hierarchy within the radioactive arena. The waste hierarchy in terms of conventional waste is fine. If you bring targets into the flow diagram you are introducing judgements. This flow diagram should avoid making these judgements. It is suggested that the flow diagram should include setting targets rather than what these targets might be.
- (c) Box 2 is broadly what you're going to do and box 4 is exactly how you're going to do it.
- (d) You always start with end in sight, the site-end state vision. When you consider the broad options you need to consider the constraints. There are different constraints at different levels.
- (e) In optioneering, if you have a plant you are decommissioning, the simplest option is to stick it in a box and grout it in. How do you strike the balance between environmental and risk burden.
- (f) In the conventional sector it is fairly easy to get environmental footprint for materials – Carbon footprint verses intergenerational equity.
- (g) This is an important flow diagram in terms of the strategic thinking on box 2, given that we haven't decided a number of things that SD:SPUR says we should do.
- (h) We are looking for guidance for what to do in these boxes.
- (i) This is at site level. Is a box on the left containing stakeholders and arrows to it along the flow process all the 'greens' can hope for?
- (j) We mustn't do anything here that would prejudice what happens next.
- (k) It was agreed that the term 'assets' should not be used.

#### **4.3 Way forward**

It is agreed that the research contractor will redraft the flow diagrams based on the discussions above. Something about constraints and targets will be included in the text about key considerations.

### **5. GOOD PRACTICE TOOLS PAPER**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

CIRIA introduced this paper. This section of the work sets out the other tools that exist to help with this process. A meeting took place to discuss this paper on 22 September 2006 (see paper 1) with representative of WRAP, NDA, C&EWG and CIRIA present.

WRAP gave an outline of their various tools that exist and may be of relevance.

- WRAP Quality Protocol – This is for the production of aggregates from inert waste. It is for defining points of change from waste to product.

- ICEWRAP Demolition Protocol – This is about linking the demolition process to new build – identifying materials in a building, pre-demolition, that could be recovered for use in an adjacent new build.
- Site waste management plans (SWMPs) – These have been integrated into the Clean Neighbourhoods Act. Site waste management plans need to be integrated into development projects over a certain size. There is a standard format and it is being refined at the moment.

## **5.2 Working group comments**

- (a) WRAP is great for the conventional side but there are concerns/reservations over translation into radioactivity.
- (b) There is no point re-inventing the wheel. We really need to explore the applicability.
- (c) Do these WRAP tools only apply to clean stuff? No, the Demolition protocol does include hazardous waste.
- (d) There is a case study of the use of the demolition protocol at a nuclear facility. This is looking at materials that are non-inert (alkaline), but not radioactive.
- (e) C&EWG CoP tells you clearly what is legal - but it doesn't tell you what stakeholders will accept.
- (f) Would there be a problem with knocking down an office block just inside the site boundary? Yes, but no...

## **5.3 Way forward**

It was agreed that there is a place for these tools in this paper but not the 32 'sustainability tools' listed on the WRAP website. The research contractor will redraft the outline contents and CIRIA will circulate it to the working group for comments.

**CLOSE**