

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

### NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

#### Minutes of the Steering Group held on Wednesday 27 June 2007, Local Government House, London

Present:

Cllr Bill Risby, Manchester City Council (Vice Chair)

Cllr Allan Holliday, Copeland Borough Council

Cllr Tim Heslop, Cumbria County Council

Cllr George Regan, Dundee City Council

Cllr Geoff Lilley, Hartlepool Borough Council

Cllr Julian Swainson, Suffolk County Council

Cllr Bernard Whittle, Lancashire County Council

Fred Barker, Executive Director, NuLeAF

Dr Jill Sutcliffe, Project Officer, NuLeAF

Christine del Corral, PA, NuLeAF

David Martin, Allerdale Borough Council

Fergus McMorrow, Copeland Borough Council

Frank Duffy, Copeland Borough Council

Rod Crawford, Dundee City Council

Mark Woodger, Essex County Council

Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council

Kerry Rickards, Sedgemoor District Council

Gerald Hudd, Somerset County Council

John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council

		ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b>WELCOME</b>	
1.1	Councillor Risby welcomed everyone to the meeting. He explained that Copeland Borough Council had nominated Cllr Holliday as their representative to the Steering Group in place of Cllr Blackwell. Cllr Risby reported that the Executive Director had asked him to become acting Chair until the formal appointment of Chair and Vice Chair at the AGM in October. This was confirmed. It was also agreed that a letter of thanks should be sent on behalf of NuLeAF to Cllr Blackwell. The Chair also explained that FB's train was delayed and that he would be arriving at around midday.	FB
1.2	Apologies were received from: Sue Brett, Cumbria County Council; David Davies, Copeland Borough Council; Mel Fleming, Suffolk County Council; Steve Giblin, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council; Cllr Jonathan Glen, Hampshire County Council; Shaun Gorman, Cumbria County Council; Vimmi Hayes, Suffolk County Council; Peter Jackson, South Gloucestershire Council; Glyn Jarvis, Newport City Council; Rachel Jowitt, Welsh Local Government Association; Stewart Kemp, Manchester City Council; Cllr Alan Matthews, Bury Metropolitan Borough Council; ; Cllr Roy Oldham, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council; Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council; Andy	

	Appleby, Harrow London Borough Council; Bob Chamberlain, Suffolk Coastal District Council; Nicola Gough, Lancashire County Council; Marcus Hudson, Lancashire County Council; Andrew Murphy, Shepway District Council; Sandy Taylor, Argyll & Bute Council.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b>	
2.1	The minutes from meeting held on 19 April 2007 were approved as a correct record.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
3.1	5.2 LLW policy: JS explained that clarification regarding the higher limits on the disposal of specific radionuclides is still awaited from Government.	JS
3.2	6.2 JS explained that the meeting of the Southern Nuclear Local Authorities Sub-Group had been postponed to 9 July. The Executive Director will therefore report to the SG at the next meeting.	FB
<b>4.</b>	<b>MRWS – REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTS AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO CONSULTATION</b> [Although item 4 was held back until FB's arrival, the order of record in this minutes is as that on the meeting agenda]	
4.1	<p>FB presented the report which provided an overview of the following developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Government MRWS workshop on 25 April</li> <li>- NuLeAF's consolidated input to Government, 2 May</li> <li>- The Government 'sub-surface exclusion criteria' workshop on 14 May</li> <li>- Government planning proposals, published 17 May</li> <li>- A meeting with the Environment Agency on 21 May</li> <li>- The liaison meeting with Government on 22 May</li> <li>- The House of Lords report, 'Radioactive Waste Management: An Update', published 3 June and</li> <li>- A workshop on the preparation of revised versions of regulatory guidance on requirements for authorisation of disposal facilities, 21 June.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion took place on the following matters:</p>	
4.2	<i>Consultation on the Implementation Framework</i>	
4.2.1	FB explained that the Consultation Document had been published on 25 June, with a closing date for comments of 2 November [a 19 week consultation]. The consultation is sponsored by DEFRA, DTI and the Welsh and Northern Irish devolved administrations, but not by the Scottish Parliament. The implications for the long-term management of radioactive wastes in Scotland is not clear.	
4.2.2	The CD sets out proposals for:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the technical programme and aspects of design of a geological repository;</li> <li>- the process and criteria to be used to decide the siting of a repository, including development of a voluntarism/partnership approach and the assessment and evaluation of potential sites.</li> </ul> <p>4.2.3 FB reported that there are many aspects of the proposed implementation framework that can be welcomed, and that are consistent with NuLeAF's pre-consultation proposals. He noted, however, that there are likely to be some significant areas of comment, including the way Government proposes to issue invitations to participate in the siting process, and the need for a clear commitment to community benefit packages.</p> <p>4.3 <i>Government Planning Proposals</i></p> <p>JP (Suffolk CC) reported that the repository is likely to be subject of the proposed national decision making process and asked whether that is picked up in the Consultation Document on the implementation framework. FB reported that it was, and that a specific question about this is posed in the CD. It was agreed that comments should be submitted to the planning consultation to highlight the need for proposed reforms to fit with an approach to repository siting based on voluntarism and partnership.</p> <p>4.4 <i>LGA/NuLeAF Conference</i></p> <p>FB reported that Cllr Julian Swainson (Suffolk CC) had kindly offered to chair the morning session.</p> <p>4.5 The Steering Group agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 that officers make arrangements for responding to consultation on the implementation framework as set out in this report, including preparation of preliminary comments for consideration by member authorities;</li> <li>2 that officers enter into discussions with Government about the process for inviting participation in the siting programme, with particular emphasis on the preparation of information and briefing materials; and</li> <li>3 to endorse the nomination of Cllr Swainson as chair of the LGA/NuLeAF conference on 6 September.</li> </ol>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
<b>5</b>	<b>REPOSITORY SAFETY CASE: PAMINA WORKSHOP</b>	
5.1	<p>JS outlined the European-supported project PAMINA (Performance Assessment Methodologies in Application to Guide the Development of a Safety Case) which is holding a workshop in Manchester Town Hall on 17 October 2007. NuLeAF is being invited to send up to 16 participants. It was agreed that CdC should coordinate invitations and</p>	CdC

	registrations by NuLeAF members.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>REPOSITORY DESIGN: REVERSIBILITY AND RETRIEVABILITY</b>	
6.1	<p>JS introduced the report, explaining that it covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Definition of terms</li> <li>- Repository design concepts</li> <li>- The pros and cons of designing for reversibility</li> <li>- International experience</li> <li>- A note on monitoring and</li> <li>- Addressing repository design during the siting process.</li> </ul> <p>She highlighted that reaching a view on whether to design for reversibility was a matter of judgement, so in the recommendation, it is emphasised that the issue should be discussed and agreed with potential host communities.</p>	
6.2	<p>FMcM (CBC) expressed strong support for the issue to be agreed with potential host communities and to include the point in the consultation response. Cllr Regan (SCCoRWS) pointed out that CoRWM had not reached a unanimous position on whether reversibility should be addressed by potential host communities. Cllr Heslop (CCC) wondered whether the number of communities coming forward would be affected by whether they had opportunity to take a view on reversibility.</p>	
6.3	<p>It was agreed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the issue of whether to design a repository for an extended period of reversibility should be discussed and agreed with potential host communities during the siting process;</li> <li>- the NDA should be asked to clarify its thinking on this issue to promote further discussions; and</li> <li>- the report should be published as a Briefing Paper.</li> </ul>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
<b>7.</b>	<b>MANAGEMENT OF LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES</b>	
7.1	<p>JS introduced the report, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developments in LLW management;</li> <li>- An outline NuLeAF policy statement; and</li> <li>- Future initiatives on LLW management.</li> </ul>	
7.2	<p>GH (Somerset CC) reported that the scoping report for a LLW disposal facility at Hinkley Point had been submitted to the CC, and that a planning application was expected in August. Somerset County Council would respond with an opinion on the scoping report by early July. GH indicated that it is likely that an amendment to the local waste plan will be needed to take latest LLW developments into account.</p>	
7.3	<p>Cllr Whittle (LCC) commented that two issues about VLLW management had arisen in the recent discussions about site end</p>	

	<p>states. First that people local to the Springfields site were content that VLLW should be managed on site. The alternative of disposal to local landfill was not encouraged by LCC. Second that all sites should be encouraged to use the waste hierarchy to minimise volumes for disposal, and that development of landfill on virgin sites should not be promoted. Cllr Whittle referred to the landfill site at Clifton Marsh which is used for VLLW from Springfields. He was concerned that the site might also be used for VLLW from Capenhurst. On site management of wastes would be preferable.</p>	
7.4	<p>Cllr Heslop (CCC) referred to the planning application for a metal decontamination plant at Lillyhall that was causing controversy. He suggested that such plant might be better located on existing nuclear sites.</p>	
7.5	<p>KR (SDC) stated it was important to derive substantive community benefits from the siting of LLW management facilities. He suggested that in the proposed policy statement, item 8 (willingness to participate, partnership and community benefits) should be moved so that it follows item 2 (consultation and public involvement). FMcM (CBC) suggested that the recommendation point 3 on the paper should delete "that are waste planning authorities" as the situation varies in different LAs. The paper should recognise that waste management issues are addressed by counties in liaison with districts.</p>	
7.6	<p>Following discussion the Steering Group agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 this report be submitted for information to the LGA, the Waste Advisory Group of the Planning Officer Society and to the NDA;</li> <li>2 subject to the amendments suggested above, the outline policy statement be adopted and published as a NuLeAF Policy Statement;</li> <li>3 that member authorities be invited to take account of the Policy Statement when developing or revising local Waste Plans;</li> <li>4 an officer working group be convened to monitor and review developments in LLW management and to advise on NuLeAF initiatives;</li> <li>5 that LLW management be included on the agenda for discussion at the proposed regional seminars (see item 9); and</li> <li>6 an application be made for Trust funding to enable NuLeAF to commission and disseminate research to identify and address local authority and local community views about local approaches to LLW management, so that approaches can be implemented that can inspire public confidence (see item 11).</li> </ol>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>JS</p>
<b>8</b>	<b>NEW NUCLEAR BUILD: IMPLICATIONS FOR NUCLEAR LEGACY MANAGEMENT</b>	
8.1	<p>JS outlined the report on the current government consultation regarding future UK energy needs, focussing on new nuclear build and the implications for nuclear legacy management.</p>	

8.2	<p>The Chair, Cllr Bill Risby (MCC) expressed concern that, in considering the generation of wastes from a potential new build programme, the report raised issues that were outside the remit of NuLeAF. KR (SDC) commented that Hinkley Point is an example where there needs to be an awareness of the interface between the proposals for new build and possible impacts on legacy waste management. He felt that preliminary discussions regarding a HPt C must flag up the implications for future legacy. JP (Suffolk CC) said that the position regarding Sizewell echoes this. Cllr Whittle felt that the LGA would need guidance on the radwaste management implications of potential new build, and that NuLeAF should provide this. It was understood that NuLeAF should not express a view about whether new nuclear power stations should be built, but it should advise on the implications for legacy management. Cllr Risby felt that commenting on the future implications of new build could inadvertently give the wrong impression and, concerned that the well-earned effectiveness and neutrality of the group should not be compromised, he urged caution. He agreed, however, that member authority views should be canvassed using the waste management aspects of the report as a basis.</p>	
8.3	<p>The SG agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 To canvass member authority views on the issues relating to legacy management as outlined in the report, with a view to approving a formal response to the consultation at its meeting on 18 October.</li> <li>2. To request that the DTI accept submission of a formal response shortly after the SG meeting on 18 October (the formal consultation closing date is 10 October).</li> </ol>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
<b>9</b>	<b>REGIONAL SEMINARS</b>	
9.1	<p>FB introduced the report proposing that a series of regional seminars on nuclear legacy management be organised in the second half of November 07.</p>	
9.2	<p>The Steering Group approved the proposals outlined in this report and authorised the Executive Director to take the necessary actions to organise the seminars.</p>	FB
<b>10</b>	<b>DRAFT CONSTITUTION</b>	
10.1	<p>FB introduced the report providing a draft constitution for discussion.</p>	
10.2	<p>In view of the discussions under Item 8, Cllr Heslop suggested that a paragraph should be included clarifying that the remit of NuLeAF is to address nuclear legacy management.</p>	
10.3	<p>Subject to this amendment, the draft constitution was approved for presentation to the AGM in October.</p>	FB
<b>11</b>	<b>PROGRESS REPORT</b>	

11.1	<p>This report provided an outline of progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the NDA review of site end states;</li> <li>- the NDA review of its stakeholder engagement arrangements;</li> <li>- the National Audit Office study of NDA management and operation contracts;</li> <li>- Discussions with British Energy;</li> <li>- COWAM in Practice;</li> <li>- The ISOLUS programme;</li> <li>- The preparation of regulatory guidance on the management of radioactive wastes on licensed nuclear sites;</li> <li>- The Trust Fund application; and</li> <li>- NuLeAF finances.</li> </ul> <p>The Steering Group noted the report.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Future Meetings</b>	
12.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 18 October 2007 SG and AGM, Manchester Town Hall</li> <li>- January 08 SG meeting, Ipswich (date to be confirmed)</li> </ul>	
	<b>Presentation by 3KQ/DbD</b>	
	<p>An outline of progress with the review of NDA Stakeholder Engagement Arrangements was presented by Pippa Hyam and Sarah Graham.</p> <p>KR and FMcM highlighted the importance of direct engagement with local authorities, rather than reliance on engagement through the Site Stakeholder Groups. JP indicated that direct engagement with local authorities was important because of their statutory responsibilities and strategic view, contrasting with the very local perspectives of SSGs. BW referred to the Springfields SSG that had involved the appropriate local authorities in the review of site end states. He argued that the close involvement of local authorities was critical. KR suggested that common goals and a toolkit for SSGs would help other SSGs develop good practices. GH added that guidance to SSGs on minimum expectations for engagement would be helpful. FB suggested there was a need to make provision to address a 'missing tier' of engagement at regional level, perhaps involving meetings of relevant local authorities.</p> <p>PH acknowledged there was a need to look at all these issues. She suggested there was a need to for capacity building at SSG level so that they could engage with their local authorities. She thought it would be helpful to try to define the issues that require direct engagement with local authorities.</p>	