

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

Minutes of the Steering Group held on Thursday 25 January 2007, Endeavour House, Ipswich

Present:

Cllr Geoff Blackwell, Copeland Borough Council (Chair)

Cllr Bill Risby, Manchester City Council (Vice Chair)

Cllr Tim Heslop, Cumbria County Council

Cllr Geoff Lilley, Hartlepool Borough Council

Cllr Julian Swainson, Suffolk County Council

Fred Barker, Executive Director, NuLeAF

Christine del Corral, PA, NuLeAF

David Davies, Copeland Borough Council

Shaun Gorman, Cumbria County Council

Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council

Stewart Kemp, Manchester City Council

Malcolm Perrins, Suffolk County Council

Clive Pink, Suffolk Coastal District Council

Mike Topliss, Suffolk County Council

Mark Woodger, Essex County Council

		ACTION
1.	WELCOME	
	Councillor Blackwell welcomed everyone to the meeting, with a particular mention for those who were attending for the first time, Councillor Lilley from Hartlepool Borough Council, Clive Pink from Suffolk Coastal District Council and Mark Woodger from Essex County Council.	
2.	APOLOGIES	
	Apologies were received from: Leah Clark, Plymouth City Council; Sue Crisp, Cumbria County Council; Mel Fleming, Suffolk County Council; Steve Giblin, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council; Vimmi Hayes, Suffolk County Council; Peter Jackson, South Gloucestershire Council; Cllr Inga Lockington, Suffolk County Council; David Martin, Allerdale Borough Council; Cllr Alan Matthews, Bury Metropolitan Borough Council; Cllr Roy Oldham, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council; John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council; Dinah Wooley, South Gloucestershire Council; Bruce Braithwaite, Staffordshire County Council; Tony Curd, Waveney District Council; Peter Day, Oxfordshire County Council; Keith Bacon, Dorset Fire Service; Nicola Gough, Lancashire County Council; Cllr Clive Grunshaw, Lancashire County Council; Debbie King, Lancashire County Council; Martin King, Kent County Council; Neil Laws, Durham City Council; Andy Mullaney, Lancashire County Council; Keith O'Brien, Snowdonia National Park Authority; Sharon Thompson, Kent County Council; Cllr Bernard Whittle, Lancashire	

	County Council, Dylan Williams, Isle of Anglesey County Council; Cllr Don Yates, Lancashire County Council	
3.	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS	
3.1	11 December 2007 Councillor Blackwell expressed his appreciation to Councillor Bill Risby for chairing the meeting in his absence.	
3.2	12 October 2006 8.3 Delete the sentence “The spirit of this recommendation ... ILW interim storage.”	CdC
3.3	Minutes from both meetings approved as amended.	
4.	MATTERS ARISING	
4.1	12 October 2006 Minutes:	
4.1.1	6.3 Management of Low Level Waste, 2 nd bullet: Action has not been carried out yet because still waiting for the workshop reports.	JS
4.1.2	8.3 Comments were submitted to the DTI as per the decisions of the Steering Group. Government has recently appointed Dr Tim Stone as Senior Adviser. NuLeAF will monitor on developments.	FB
4.1.3	11.4, 2 nd bullet: Meeting with green NGOs not yet arranged, although Project Officer is making a presentation at the SERA workshop on 10 February.	JS
4.2.	11 December 2006 Minutes	
4.2.1	5.2 FB explained that an updated policy statement had not yet been prepared because it would be more appropriate to do so following completion on the briefing papers for input to Government.	FB
5.	NDA REVIEW OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	
5.1	FB presented the report outlining member authority views on NDA stakeholder engagement arrangements as obtained through questionnaire returns and discussion at the regional seminars.	
5.2	Members expressed the view that the NDA and site operators should give higher priority to direct and early discussions with local authorities around its sites. There is a concern that in some areas Site Stakeholder Groups do not provide an effective mechanism for engagement with local authorities. It was agreed that the Executive Director should enter into discussions with the NDA to identify ways of delivering a more systematic and consistent approach to engagement with local government, building on the views of member authorities.	FB

5.3	JL asked whether British Energy would be reviewing its arrangements for engagement with site stakeholders. It was agreed that BE should be contacted to establish their thinking on this issue.	FB
5.4	SK raised the issue of whether NDA funding constraints would impact on stakeholder engagement arrangements. It was agreed that the next meeting should consider a report on the impact of budget cuts on the NDA, together with the implications for key parts of its programme.	FB
6	NDA PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENTS	
6.1	<p>FB introduced the report outlining developments in key areas of NDA activity, including discussion at NuLeAF regional seminars. The developments covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft socio-economic policy - Review of site 'End States' - Interim storage of ILW; and - LLW management 	
6.2	Draft Socio-Economic Policy	
6.2.1	A letter had been sent to the NDA setting out comments on the draft policy. The letter highlighted key themes and messages based on discussion at the regional seminars and feedback from member authorities.	
6.2.2	Potential cuts in NDA income underlined the view that there should be a guaranteed minimum level of funding for socio-economic support.	
6.3	Site End States Consultation	
6.3.1	Members raised a range of issues about the review of site end states. There was concern that in some areas a lack of engagement with local authorities is leading to insufficient account being taken of local development plans. The focus on end uses was also thought to be raising unrealistic expectations in some areas. Members were also concerned that the review should be seen as part of an incremental process, with future opportunities for review as developments take place that impact on site end uses/states.	
6.3.2	Members also asked to what extent British Energy is considering site end states.	
6.3.3	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A report outlining the main themes and concerns in local authority responses to the Site End States should be tabled at the next meeting; (2) the NDA officer with responsibility for the site end states 	FB CdelC

	<p>review be invited to give a presentation to the next meeting, and this should include reference to the approach being taken at BE sites.</p>	
6.4	Interim Storage of ILW	
6.4.1	The NDA review of options for consolidating the interim storage of ILW at a smaller number of sites is delayed because of linkage to issues associated with the approach to siting a geological repository.	
6.4.2	It was agreed that NDA plans for engagement on its review of options for interim storage should be considered at the next meeting.	FB
6.5	Low Level Waste Management	
6.5.1	The outcome of the national policy review and receipt of reports from the Magnox LLW workshops were still awaited. MW reported that there was recognition on the part of his authority that some form of on-site disposal of LLW was needed, rather than transportation to the LLW Repository near Drigg.	
6.5.2	GB proposed that the authorities involved in the Magnox LLW workshops should be asked to provide a note on their views on the workshop outputs. This was agreed.	JS
6.5.3	It was also agreed that the next meeting should consider a report reviewing the outcome of the national policy review and Magnox workshops.	JS
7.	MRWS – POSITION ON GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL	
7.1	<p>FB introduced the report, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the nature of geological disposal - observations about confidence levels in its long-term safety - qualifications associated with CoRWM’s support for geological disposal; and - definition and use of the term ‘geological disposal’. 	
7.2	BR pointed out that member authorities will make their own judgements about the confidence that can be placed in the long-term safety of emplacing wastes in a geological repository, and that for some, assurance will not be forthcoming until the facility is in use. SK stated that the proposed definition of 'disposal' is acceptable as a straightforward descriptor, but use of the term shouldn't be taken to infer that value judgements are being made about the acceptability of the approach. DD pointed out that there is a need to distinguish clearly between 'disposal' and 'storage' as they are different management approaches.	

7.3	<p>SK proposed an addition to the wording in the penultimate paragraph of the report. It was agreed to amend the paragraph to read:</p> <p>“Use of the term must not be read to imply unqualified acceptance of geological disposal, nor that all member authorities have the same level of confidence in its long-term safety or consider that it constitutes a solution.”</p> <p>With that amendment, it was agreed that the main sections of the report should be adopted as NuLeAF policy for publication on the NuLeAF website.</p>	FB
8.	MRWS – NuLeAF INITIATIVES ON IMPLEMENTATION	
8.1	<p>FB provided an update on NuLeAF initiatives, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparations for input to Government on the implementation framework - Preparations for the Implementation Briefing meeting on 21 March - Submission to the House of Lords Science & Technology Committee and invitation to provide oral evidence - Submission of comments on the CoRWM Implementation Report - Arrangements for a bilateral meeting with CoRWM - Proposed LGA Conference 	
8.2	<p>FB explained that there were three potential areas of difference between NuLeAF and CoRWM on implementation issues. These related to the role of national bodies in siting partnerships; the role of ‘self-defining’ communities in volunteering to participate in a siting process; and the whether there was a need for special arrangements for devolved decision-making in authorities covering large geographic areas.</p>	
8.3	<p>FB noted that a response from the Secretary of State’s office about a preferred date for the LGA conference was still awaited.</p>	
8.4	<p>After discussion it was agreed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Endorse the approach being taken to the preparation of inputs to Government. 2 Arrange a bilateral meeting with CoRWM on 14 or 15 February. 3 Accept the invitation to present oral evidence to the HoL S&T Committee on 19 February 	CdelC FB

	<p>4 Encourage attendance at the Implementation Briefing Meeting in Manchester Town Hall on 21 March</p> <p>5 Submit comments to Government stating that it is broadly supportive of most aspects of the CoRWM Implementation Report, with the exception of three main areas of potential difference and subject to the need for more detailed discussion of proposals over coming months.</p>	FB
9	MRWS – INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS	
9.1	FB introduced the report outlining what is currently known and highlighted outstanding questions.	
9.2	SK suggested a supplementary question about the need for NDA funding to be ring-fenced regarding repository development and participation in the siting process.	
9.3	<p>It was agreed that the questions raised in this report together with any further additional questions identified by members should be raised with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government at future liaison meetings; and - NDA at the implementation briefing on 21 March. 	FB
10	ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS	
10.1	<p>FB outlined recent and proposed organisational developments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - appointment of the Project Officer - responding to the output from the regional seminars - budgetary developments - links with the Scottish Steering Group and - the first meeting of the European Project Group of the COWAM in Practice project. 	
10.2	Jill Sutcliffe has been appointed as Project Officer. Jill's initial work programme would focus on proposals for enhancing NuLeAF's provision of information to member authorities; developing NuLeAF work on LLW management; and exploring the scope for obtaining funding from new sources.	JS
10.3	In response to the statement in the report of the regional seminars that it should be made clear that NuLeAF is not an anti-nuclear organisation, BR requested that it be minuted that NuLeAF is neither pro nor anti-nuclear.	CdeIC
10.4	It was agreed that a full report on budgetary developments and	FB/JS

	proposals for funding should be considered at the next meeting in April.	
10.5	The Scottish Steering Group is holding its inaugural conference in March. The next meeting of the NuLeAF Steering Group would need to nominate someone to attend future meetings of the Scottish Group.	
10.6	It was agreed that plans for the development of the COWAM in Practice project would be considered at the next Steering Group meeting.	FB
11	LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE	
11.1	CdC presented the report providing a comparison of the options available for the LGA Conference in Birmingham from 3 to 5 July 2007.	
11.2	It was decided that a half page advert should be taken out in the Conference Handbook at a cost of £1,000 in order to publicise NuLeAF and its services to member authorities. This should be booked as soon as possible.	CdC
12.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
12.1	<u>ISOLUS</u> FB reported that SK will be representing NuLeAF at the forthcoming workshop on 8 February,.	SK
12.2	<u>CARL Project</u> Final conference will be from 25 to 27 September 2007 in Oskarshamn. Cllr Knowles has attended all the previous conferences. CdC to compile list of those interested in attending and liaise with Nirex.	CdC
12.3	<u>NW Regional Assembly</u> The NWRA is organising a conference on the future of nuclear power on 30 March. FB has accepted an invitation to make a short presentation on nuclear legacy management at one of the conference workshops. He has agreed to do so on the clear understanding that NuLeAF's remit does not address whether or not new nuclear power stations should be built.	FB
13.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
13.1	The next meeting will be held on Thursday 19 April in Manchester Town Hall. There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 13.48 hrs.	