

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

### NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on Thursday 19 April 2007, Town Hall, Manchester**

---

Present:

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

Dr Jill Sutcliffe, Project Officer, NuLeAF

Christine del Corral, PA, NuLeAF

David Davies, Copeland Borough Council

Shaun Gorman, Cumbria County Council

Mark Woodger, Essex County Council

Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council

Nicola Gough, Lancashire County Council

Peter Moorcroft, Lancashire County Council

Stewart Kemp, Manchester City Council

Malcolm Perrins, Suffolk County Council

Steve Giblin, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

Rachel Jowitt, Welsh Local Government Association

		ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b>WELCOME</b>	
1.1	Councillor Risby welcomed everyone to the meeting, with a particular welcome to Rachel Jowitt, Peter Moorcroft and Jill Sutcliffe who were attending their first Steering Group meeting. Cllr Risby also made special mention of Malcolm Perrins who was attending the SG for the last time, prior to taking up a new post with Waveney District Council. Cllr Risby wished to put on record the important role that Malcolm has played in the development of NuLeAF and to wish him all the best for his new post.	
<b>1.2</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
	Apologies were received from: Sue Crisp, Cumbria County Council; Frank Duffy, Copeland Borough Council; Mel Fleming, Suffolk County Council; Cllr Jonathan Glen, Hampshire County Council; Vimmi Hayes, Suffolk County Council; Glyn Jarvis, Newport City 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; Cllr George Regan, Dundee City Council; Sandy Taylor, Argyll & Bute Council; Cllr Bill Thompson, Fylde Borough Council; Mike Topliss, Suffolk County Council; Cllr Bernard Whittle, Lancashire County Council; Dinah Wooley, South Gloucestershire	

	Council; Tony Akrigg, Hyndburn Borough Council; Andy Appleby, Harrow London Borough Council; Dorset Fire Service; David Evans, East Lothian Council; Paula Hewitt, Somerset County Council; Marcus Hudson, Lancashire County Council; Clive Pink, Suffolk Coastal District Council; Stephen Ratcliffe, Lake District National Park Authority	
<b>2.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b>	
2.1	Minutes from meeting held on 25 January were approved as a true record.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
3.1	5.3 – British Energy has agreed to a meeting with the Executive Director (ED) to discuss nuclear liability management at the company’s sites, including site end states and local engagement arrangements.	FB
3.2	10.5 – The inaugural meeting of the Scottish Councils Committee on Radioactive Management (SCCORM) was held the previous week in Dundee. The ED attended to make a presentation on the work of NuLeAF. A commitment was given to explore the scope for joint working on key issues. NuLeAF will have observer status at the next meeting of the Committee.	FB
<b>4.</b>	<b>MRWS – NuLeAF INITIATIVES ON IMPLEMENTATION</b>	
4.1	<p>FB presented the report which provided an overview of the following developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Input to Government on the implementation framework</li> <li>- The Government’s next steps</li> <li>- Outcome of Implementation Briefing with NDA and EA</li> <li>- Oral evidence to the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee</li> <li>- Bilateral meetings with CoRWM</li> <li>- LGA Conference</li> <li>- Regulator consultation on Management of Radioactive Waste on Nuclear Licensed Sites</li> <li>- Exchange with the Low Level Radiation Campaign</li> </ul> <p>Key points from discussion were as follows:</p> <p><b>Government Next Steps</b></p>	
4.2	SK highlighted the importance of allowing sufficient time for local authorities to participate in a meaningful way in the forthcoming consultation on the implementation framework. He thought that a period of 6 months would be a minimum. It was agreed to raise this point at the Government’s forthcoming MWRS seminar and in the next meeting with DEFRA/DTI/NDA.	FB

<p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p>	<p><b>Outcome of Implementation Briefing with NDA and EA</b></p> <p>TH and SK referred to the importance of maintaining understanding of the R&amp;D related to repository development. It was agreed that this should be revisited once the consultation on the implementation framework has been launched.</p> <p>The question of repository design and retrievability was also raised. It will be important to generate a good understanding of the respective merits of early closure of a repository, compared with a period of extended underground storage prior to closure. It was agreed that a report on this would be prepared for the next Steering Group.</p> <p><b>Consultation on Draft Regulator Guidance on the Management of Radioactive Waste on Nuclear Licensed Sites</b></p> <p>Although the consultation did not raise major issues of contention, it was agreed that a formal response should be prepared and reported to the next meeting of the SG.</p> <p><b>Areas of Further Work</b></p> <p>The report outlined potential areas of further work on the MRWS programme. Thinking on these would be developed in consultation with DEFRA. The SG agreed to authorise the ED to progress work on these topics.</p> <p><b>New Build</b></p> <p>MP felt that should any new build go ahead there would be implications for nuclear legacy management that NuLeAF should address at an early stage. SK reported that there would be further consultation on new build in May. It was agreed to table a report on nuclear legacy aspects at the next meeting.</p>	<p>FB</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JS/FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>MANAGEMENT OF LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE</b></p>	
<p>5.1</p>	<p>FB presented the report which provided an overview of the following developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government policy on the management of LLW</li> <li>- NDA Strategy for managing LLW</li> <li>- the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) near Drigg</li> <li>- the potential for LLW facilities at existing nuclear sites</li> <li>- plans for a LLW disposal facility at Hinkley Point</li> <li>- implications for new regional or national facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Key points from discussion are as follows:</p>	

5.2	SK commented that there is a need for an explanation of the basis for raising limits on the disposal of specific radionuclides. Concerns about this possibility had been raised at an earlier LLW workshop but they were not addressed in the policy statement or associated material. It was agreed to seek clarification about this from Government.	JS
5.3	MW reported that his authority is reviewing its policy on LLW management. He highlighted the potential for local authorities to support locally based solutions in the context of emphasis on the application of the waste hierarchy to minimise waste arisings. GL commented that it is not a local community's waste, but nuclear industry waste. SG expressed concern that there needed to be more urgency in the development of local approaches, given the problems associated with the future use of the LLWR near Drigg and the emphasis on accelerated decommissioning and clean-up. SG and DD referred to concerns about the status of the LLWR, given uncertainties about its long-term safety case. There was a preference in Cumbria for the LLWR to be seen as a facility for the storage of LLW arising within the county, rather than as a national disposal facility.	
5.4	SK thought that a paper should be prepared identifying potential policy positions around key LLW management issues. This could then provide the basis for advice to member authorities and further discussion with NDA and Government. It was agreed that a paper would be prepared for the next meeting. One of the issues that might be addressed in the paper is the potential applicability of siting processes based on concepts of willingness to participate, partnership and community benefits to the development of long-term LLW management facilities	FB
5.5	<p>It was also agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the current SG report be submitted for information to the LGA and to the Waste Advisory Group of the Planning Officer Society;</li> <li>- the current SG report be submitted to the NDA, with a request that NuLeAF be included in future discussions about the development of NDA strategy for LLW management; and</li> <li>- a Briefing Paper on LLW management be prepared for member local authorities once policy issues had been addressed.</li> </ul>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>JS/FB</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>SEDGEMOOR DISTRICT COUNCIL INITIATIVE</b>	
6.1	FB introduced the report outlining the initiative taken by Sedgemoor District Council to promote discussion about the scope for local communities to benefit from financial savings resulting from new approaches to nuclear legacy management. The report outlined the key points arising from a meeting of District Council Leaders and Chief Executives covering NDA sites in the south of England. These points	

6.2	<p>have important implications for NDA stakeholder engagement arrangements, the potential for inter-site movements of radioactive wastes and socio-economic support around NDA sites.</p> <p>The SG agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Endorse the Executive Director’s participation in a Working Group to develop proposals for: (a) processes of engagement for addressing the potential for financial savings in legacy management, and (b) development of the case for funding community benefits from those savings.</li> <li>- Consider a report at its next meeting proposing ways of involving NuLeAF’s wider membership in discussion of the Working Group’s proposals.</li> </ul>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
<b>7.</b>	<b>NDA PROGRAMME INITIATIVES</b>	
7.1	<p>FB provided an update, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of site ‘End States’</li> <li>- Magnox Decommissioning</li> <li>- Interim storage of ILW</li> <li>- Stakeholder Engagement Review</li> <li>- Socio-Economic Policy</li> <li>- NDA Budget</li> </ul>	
7.2	<p>It was noted that the ED will be attending: a meeting of the ‘reference group’ established to discuss process issues with the NDA’s convenor for stakeholder engagement; and NDA-convened panel meetings to discuss the site ends states ‘reconciliation’ process.</p>	
7.3	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A report outlining the main themes in local authority responses to the site end states review be tabled at the next meeting of the Steering Group.</li> <li>- The NDA be invited to make a presentation on its review of stakeholder engagement arrangements at the next meeting of the Steering Group.</li> <li>- A meeting of member authorities concerned about the effectiveness of Site Stakeholder Groups be convened in liaison with the NDA and its stakeholder engagement contractors.</li> </ul>	<p>JS/FB</p> <p>CdC/FB</p> <p>CdC/FB</p>
<b>8</b>	<b>INVOLVEMENT IN EUROPEAN INITIATIVES</b>	
8.1	<p>FB introduced the report outlining NuLeAF’s involvement in two major collaborative research projects (COWAM and CARL), the response to</p>	

	questionnaires relating to the CARD and ARGONA projects, and potential involvement in the PAMINA project.	
8.2	CdC reported on the arrangements for attending the final CARL seminar in Sweden in September. Clarification was awaited about the number of delegates that could attend. CdC would inform interested members as soon as this clarified.	CdC
8.3	The Steering Group agreed to endorse the approach being taken to involvement in European initiatives as set out in the report.	
<b>9</b>	<b>FINANCES</b>	
9.1	FB outlined the financial projections for 06/07 and 07/08 and reported on prospects for funding from the NDA, DEFRA and member authorities.	
9.2	The SG endorsed the proposed approach to securing funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in view of the substantive increase in work on NDA-related issues, the Executive Director will make the case to the NDA for an increased level of funding compared with that provided in 06-07;</li> <li>- in view of the substantive anticipated input to the MRWS programme, the Executive Director will explore the scope for an increased level of funding from DEFRA (beyond that included in projections for 07/08); and</li> <li>- in order to encourage payments from member authorities, to write in early June to (a) Corresponding Member Authorities (to CEOs, cc officer and member contacts) highlighting the value of NuLeAF work and (b) to non-member authorities (to CEOs) explaining what NuLeAF does and inviting membership.</li> </ul>	FB  FB  CdC/FB
9.3	The SG also discussed the possibility of approaching other organisations for funding, but agreed to revisit this if the need arises later in the financial year.	
<b>10</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL FUNDING</b>	
10.1	JS introduced the report outlining options that may exist for additional funding, covering Trust funding and Partnership working.	
10.2	It was agreed that the Project Officer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- should draw up a draft application to an appropriate Trust Fund and report to the next Steering Group meeting; and</li> <li>- explore partnership options for research, information provision</li> </ul>	JS  JS

	and conferences and report back to the next Steering Group meeting.	
<b>10</b>	<b>ISOLUS</b>	
10.1	The report outlining the setting up on an Independent Advisory Committee was noted.	
<b>11</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
11.1	It was agreed that the next meeting of the SG consider a draft constitution, with a view to formal adoption at the AGM in October.	FB
<b>12</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>	
12.1	27 June at LGA House, London.	
	<b>PRESENTATION</b>	
	<p>Dr Sara Johnston, Lead Site Programme Manager, Magnox North, NDA gave a presentation updating on the current situation regarding the Site End States review. The following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the reconciliation process (between local views and national policy/strategy issues) would take place in June/July;</li> <li>- the ED would need to feed back to member authorities about the outcome of the reconciliation process;</li> <li>- SG members expressed concern that in (a) some cases local authorities had been too peripheral to the processes of local consultation and (b) discussion needed to take place within a local authority setting in order to get a corporate local authority view;</li> <li>- SJ reported that some consultation recommendations could lead to changes in local development plans;</li> <li>- SJ agreed that there would be learning on the role and effectiveness of SSGs from the site end state work that could be fed into the review of local engagement processes;</li> <li>- British Energy should be encouraged to address site end states at its sites.</li> </ul>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
	There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting.	