

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Draft Minutes of the Steering Group held on 27 January 2010,
at The Town Hall, Manchester**

Present:

Cllr Allan Holliday (Chair) - Copeland Borough Council
Cllr Neil Swannick (Vice Chair) – Manchester City Council (afternoon)
Cllr Tim Knowles – Cumbria County Council
Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council
Fred Barker – NuLeAF
John Cain – Copeland Borough Council
Meirion Davies – Anglesey County Council
Catherine Draper – NuLeAF
Shaun Gorman – Cumbria County Council
Nicola Horne - Plymouth City Council
Adrian Hurst - Hartlepool Borough Council
Sean Morris – Manchester County Council
Bogamil Zaba – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service

In the afternoon, Dean Gallacher, Assistant Head Nuclear Fuel Recycling at DECC, gave a presentation and answered questions on the government's forthcoming consultation on its proposals for dealing with plutonium.

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	Cllr Holliday welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially first time attendees.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Mike Davidson and Charles Holmes – Allerdale Borough Council, Cllr Ken Williams – Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, Fergus McMorrow – Copeland Borough Council, Stewart Kemp – Cumbria County Council, Mark Woodger – Maldon District Council, Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Barry James – Somerset County Council, Cllr Jane Storey and John Pitchford – Suffolk County Council,	
2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 15 OCTOBER, 2009	
2.1	The Minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting, subject to the amendment of Hartlepool Borough Council's designation, and would be posted on the website.	CD

3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	None	
4	RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NEW NUCLEAR BUILD	
4.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the scope of the current consultation • NuLeAF's strategic objectives relating to new nuclear build and previous responses to related consultations; • key questions of concern to NuLeAF; and • proposed responses to consultation and other associated activities. 	
4.2	TK expressed his appreciation on the quality of the report.	
4.3	JC – a view had been expressed at a meeting of the Planning Officers' Society that it would be beneficial if the IPC membership included someone from a health background – it would provide assurance to the general public that health issues were being dealt with competently.	
4.4	SM – the draft response to Q17 should be strengthened, especially with regard to the weight the IPC gives to Local Impact Reports.	FB
4.5	SG – draft response to Q26 –it is <i>essential</i> for local authorities to be involved in a proper assessment of options for the interim storage of spent fuel. With reference to 'greenfield sites' – care should be taken with this wording as Braystones and Kirksanton are not the only sites involving greenfield land.	FB
4.6	SG also reported on a recent meeting of local authorities from the areas with proposed sites for new nuclear power stations. This discussed the resourcing of local authority work on the issue and the scope for developing a network of new build local authorities. Somerset CC would be convening a further meeting.	
4.7	<p>The Steering Group agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • submit the consultation responses as drafted and attached to the report, subject to small amendments in response to SG comments; • write to member local authorities in areas with proposed sites to draw their attention to the radioactive waste management issues which could be addressed in Local Impact Reports and to offer a meeting to discuss these issues; 	FB

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • write to the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership to draw its attention to the issues most relevant to the siting of a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF); and • request that the secretariat monitor those aspects of the Generic Design Assessment process which deal with the assessment of the quantities and types of waste which are likely to arise, their suitability for storage, transport and their disposability. 	
5	SUBMARINE DISMANTLING PROJECT (SDP)	
5.1	<p>FB introduced the report which outlined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the background to the project; • the meeting of the SDP Steering Group in November 2009; • the programme review, briefing and next steps. 	
5.2	NH advised the meeting that Plymouth CC had not been informed of any further developments since the initial meeting between elected representatives and MoD had taken place.	
5.3	<p>GL expressed concern at the detrimental effect to the process resulting from the lack of openness and transparency. MoD should be open about potential sites and greater clarity was needed on the actual physical process of decommissioning the submarines. FB had been pressing MoD on the first point and would review the information on the SDP website about the process of decommissioning (at Submarine Dismantling).</p>	FB
5.4	<p>SG advised the meeting that Cumbria CC had not been contacted by MoD about a meeting with elected representatives and echoed GL's concerns about the need for openness and transparency. TK added that there appeared to be insufficient liaison and coordination between Government departments on major nuclear projects, which could have serious implications for engagement processes in West Cumbria. FB would raise this issue with DECC.</p>	FB
5.5	<p>FB advised the meeting that ultimately MoD were looking for one site for dismantling operations and one for storage of Intermediate Level Waste, which may or may not be the same as the dismantling site.</p>	
5.6	<p>The Steering Group endorsed the recommendation that NuLeAF offer to liaise with and brief member local authorities which may become involved in the SDP programme.</p>	

6	LOW LEVEL WASTE (LLW) STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENTS	
6.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an update on the NDA consultation on the proposed UK LLW Strategy • issues discussed at the November meeting of the NDA's LLW Strategy Group; and • secretariat initiatives, including the meeting of NuLeAF's LLW Officer Working Group on 8 December, 2009. 	
6.2	<p>JC had understood that the Environment Agency (EA) may be taking advice on the vulnerability of the King's Cliffe authorisation process to challenge. FB undertook to seek clarification from EA on this point.</p>	FB
6.3	<p>TK highlighted the fundamental issue of proximity versus dispersal away from licensed nuclear sites. SG advised the meeting that the Cumbria CC Minerals and Waste Development Framework Site Allocation document would shortly be submitted to the Secretary of State. It proposes the increased use of Sellafield and an adjacent site for LLW/VLLW disposal. Keekle Head and Lillyhall are not proposed as allocated sites.</p>	
6.4	<p>SG welcomed development of the spreadsheet overview of proposed LLW/VLLW disposal facilities and suggested that this be expanded to include other facilities of public interest, for example, incinerators and recycling.</p>	CD
6.5	<p>The Steering Group endorsed the initiatives being taken by the secretariat.</p>	
7	NDA UPDATE	
7.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues addressed at the National Stakeholder Group meeting in November 2009; • consultation on the draft NDA Business Plan for 2010-13; • plans for engagement on the NDA Strategy review; and • discussion with the NDA on 'credible options' for the management of Higher Activity Wastes (HAW). 	
7.2	<p>TK expressed his concern that the NDA was halving its annual socio-economic spend. This opinion has been communicated to DECC by both Cumbria CC and Copeland BC. It was also included in NuLeAF's comments on the NDA's draft Business Plan.</p>	

7.3	The Steering Group noted the developments outlined in this report	
8	PROGRESS REPORT	
8.1	<p>FB introduced the report which gave updates in developments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • siting a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF); • consultation on Scottish Government policy on higher activity wastes (HAW) (see item 8A below); • forthcoming consultation on plutonium management; • a COWAM in Practice workshop in Luxembourg; • an HSE workshop on proposals to alter some aspects of the arrangements for licensing the storage and disposal of radioactive wastes; and • proposals for a future Exemptions Regime under the Radioactive Substances Act 1993 and the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. 	
8.2	TK gave a brief update to the meeting on the current process in Cumbria that would inform a decision about whether to participate in the GDF siting process. Care was being taken to ensure appropriate rigour was applied at all stages of the process and it would not be rushed. Positive progress was being made.	
8.3	FB elaborated on the HSE workshop that was about the way HSE intended to bring the GDF into the nuclear licensing regime.	
8.4	TK asked whether the future of CoRWM was under review. FB referred to the review of CoRWM's remit and progress that was being undertaken by the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee. An update would be provided at the next SG meeting.	FB
8A	ADDENDUM: SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT POLICY ON HIGHER ACTIVITY WASTES	
8A.1	FB introduced the paper which outlined the Scottish Government's proposed policy on the management of higher activity wastes and suggested the main points of a response.	
8A.2	SG expressed concern regarding key aspects of the Scottish government's proposals, particularly the lack of clarity about siting processes. TK expressed concern that it was undemocratic to delegate preparation of a siting strategy to NDA.	

8A.3	FB agreed to contact SCCORS to seek their views prior to finalising a response to the proposals.	FB
8A.4	The Steering Group agreed to delegate authority to the Chair and Vice Chair to agree the submission of comments on the Scottish Government consultation.	AH/NS/FB
9	NEXT MEETING	
9.1	The next meeting of the Steering Group will be held on 20 April, 2010 in Local Government House, Smith Square, London.	
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
10.1	FB reminded contributing member authorities that NuLeAF would shortly be writing out for the next financial year's contributions. He hoped all would continue their support and that if it would assist, invoices could be submitted in this financial year.	
11	PRESENTATION ON PLUTONIUM MANAGEMENT	
	Dean Gallacher gave a presentation on the background to the Government's forthcoming consultation on policy for plutonium management. The timing of the consultation is uncertain because of the forthcoming General Election. A copy of the presentation is available on the website . Although there will be a range of views on the best way forward amongst member authorities, there is likely to be agreement that a clear policy is needed.	