

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION
NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM**

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2006, County Offices, Kendal

Present:

Cllr Geoff Blackwell, Copeland Borough Council (Chair)
 Cllr Timothy Heslop, Cumbria County Council
 Cllr Tim Knowles, Cumbria County Council
 Cllr Alan Matthews, Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
 Cllr Julian Swainson, Suffolk County Council
 Cllr Bill Thompson, Fylde Borough Council
 Fred Barker, Executive Director, NuLeAF
 Zena Bergmann, Copeland Borough Council
 Christine del Corral, NuLeAF, PA to Executive Director
 David Davies, Copeland Borough Council
 Frank Duffy, Copeland Borough Council
 Shaun Gorman, Cumbria County Council
 John Hetherington, Cumbria County Council
 Stewart Kemp, Manchester City Council
 Debbie King, Lancashire County Council
 Gary Mongan, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

		ACTION
1	WELCOME	
1.1	Councillor Blackwell welcomed everyone to the meeting and expressed his gratitude to Cllr Bill Risby for standing in as Chair at the meeting held on 22 June.	
2	APOLOGIES	
2.1	Apologies were received from: Cllr Bill Risby, Manchester City Council; Andy Appleby, Harrow London Borough Council; Bruce Braithwaite, Staffordshire County Council; Mick Bullock, Caradon District Council; Rod Crawford, Dundee City Council; Sue Crisp, Cumbria County Council; David Evans, East Lothian Council; Mel Fleming, Suffolk County Council; Donna George, Dorset County Council; Cllr Jonathan Glen, Hampshire County Council; Cllr Brian Gregson, Shetland Isles Council; Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council; Neil Laws, Durham City Council; David Martin, Allerdale Borough Council; Cllr Roy Oldham, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council; Gary Ormondroyd, Barrow Borough Council; Simon Parker, Dorset County Council; Malcolm Perrins, Suffolk County Council; John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council; Alison Quant, Hampshire County Council; Richard Read, Hampshire County Council; Cllr George Regan, Dundee City Council; Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council; Sandy Taylor, Argyll & Bute Council; Dick Tregoea, Halton Borough Council; and Don Yates, Lancashire County Council.	

3	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 22 JUNE 2006	
3.1	The minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.	
3.2	<u>Matters Arising</u>	
3.2.1	Survey of Member Authorities with Nuclear Sites: FB reported that 13 out of 22 member authorities with nuclear sites had responded to the recent questionnaire. The most striking response was a request for more access to independent expertise. Further findings will be reported to the January meeting.	FB
3.2.2	Project Officer: FB reported that interviews were to be held on 24 October.	
4	LONG TERM MANAGEMENT OF RADIOACTIVE WASTES	
4.1	FB clarified that he was no longer a member of CoRWM. He had come off the committee after submission of its recommendations to Government, so that he could work full-time as Executive Director.	
4.2	FB outlined recent developments, including: CoRWM's recommendations; the Government's preliminary response; a draft briefing paper on 'siting partnerships'; a draft policy statement on institutional arrangements; and preparations for further initiatives.	
4.3	TK reported that recent developments in Cumbria, particularly concerning the sale of BNG had raised concerns about a lack of genuine commitment to openness, transparency and stakeholder engagement on the part of key national players. This would need to be addressed in taking forward arrangements for implementing policy on long-term management of wastes. SG noted that safeguards would be needed to ensure an appropriate role for community-based decision making. With regard to institutional arrangements, TH thought the 'NDA model' raised issues of public confidence and independence. Some members expressed a preference for an independent implementing body, but recognised that if this evolved from Nirex there would be the issue of historical 'baggage'.	
4.4	FB reported on a recent meeting with the Waste Advisory Group of the Planning Officers Society. They had expressed reservations about the need for a Planning Policy Statement specifically on siting a geological repository. SG thought that detailed guidance would be required.	
4.5	After discussion it was agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the briefing paper on 'siting' partnerships be used to inform future work and be sent to CoRWM, DEFRA, NDA and Nirex; - the policy statement on institutional arrangements be submitted to DEFRA, NDA and Nirex, highlighting the pros and cons of different models; 	FB FB

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a special meeting of the Steering Group be convened in December to consider the Government's full response to CoRWM; and - the Executive Director be authorised to take further initiatives as appropriate eg in developing thinking about the siting process and planning requirements. 	<p>CdeIC</p> <p>FB</p>
5	NDA ISSUES	
5.1	FB outlined developments relating to: the NDA's draft annual plan; the review of site 'end states'; socio-economic support; the LLW repository near Drigg; and options for rationalising ILW storage.	
5.2	TK highlighted concerns about current NDA arrangements for stakeholder engagement, including timetabling and capacity issues, particularly around major sites. DD expressed concern about the focus on SSGs as the primary vehicle for local engagement. More emphasis needed to be placed on engaging directly with local authorities. There was also a significant resource issue for authorities. It was suggested that the time had come for fundamental review of the NDA's stakeholder engagement arrangements. FB indicated that the questionnaire returns from member authorities with nuclear sites contained feedback that could help inform a review.	
5.3	<p>After discussion it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments on the draft annual plan be submitted to the NDA following a request for views from Member authorities via the e-bulletin; - The Executive Director be authorised to take further actions in relation to the site 'End States' review eg production of further briefing material, if required as a result of feedback from Member Authorities; - Member authorities with NDA sites be encouraged to respond to the forthcoming consultation on a strategy for socio-economic support and provide feedback to NuLeAF. 	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
6	MANAGEMENT OF LLW	
6.1	<p>FB outlined developments, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Government's policy review; - competition for the operation of the LLW repository (LLWR) near Drigg and the longer-term development and implementation of a strategic plan for LLW arising from the NDA's 20 sites; - Copeland Borough Council's Community Prospectus for the LLWR competition; - Magnox Electric's programme for assessing options for managing LLW; and - UKAEA assessment of LLW for Harwell 	

6.2	SG welcomed the fact that other parts of the UK were considering options for the local management of LLW arising in their areas. On the Community Prospectus, he cautioned that care should be taken not to set levels of support at a minimal level. DD pointed out that the Prospectus was intended to provide generic guidance. He also pointed out that the views of communities in West Cumbria should be taken into account when options for managing LLW are being discussed which might impact on the use of the LLWR near Drigg. SK questioned the extent to which option assessments were considering the impact of sea level rises. This would be an issue for clarification with Member Authorities involved in the assessments.	
6.3	After discussion it was agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copeland Borough Council's Community Prospectus for the Low Level Waste Repository be reported in the next issue of the e-bulletin, so that member authorities can consider adopting a similar approach as competition for other site contracts is prepared; and - The Executive Director contact Member Authorities around: (a) Hinkley Point and Dungeness to seek their views on Magnox Electric's feedback workshops and the way forward on LLW management at Magnox sites; and (b) Harwell to seek their views on the UKAEA assessment and consultation. 	FB FB
7	PROGRAMME ON REGIONAL SEMINARS	
7.1	FB outlined progress with organisation of the regional seminars on nuclear legacy management. The output of the seminars would be considered at the January meeting. The Steering Group noted the progress made.	
8	IMPLICATIONS OF THE ENERGY REVIEW	
8.1	FB outlined the conclusions of the Energy Review regarding new nuclear build, with emphasis on the implications for radioactive waste management and decommissioning.	
8.2	TK commented on the high quality of the reports prepared for the Steering Group and suggested that they be used to brief journalists and the LGA. FB thought that there should be scope to do this.	
8.3	After discussion it was agreed that the following comments be submitted to the DTI: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Government should consult a wide range of stakeholders, including NuLeAF, on the proposals that will be developed for arrangements to meet the costs of decommissioning and radioactive waste management. - The Government should accept CoRWM's recommendation that any substantive increase to the radioactive waste inventory for 	

	<p>geological disposal will require an additional step in the negotiation process with host communities to allow them to take a decision to accept or reject any additional waste. The spirit of this recommendation should also be applied to the siting and operation of any new regional or national facilities for LLW disposal or ILW interim storage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes to the planning system for major energy projects should not be allowed to set a precedent for pushing through the siting of radioactive waste management facilities. Commitments must be provided that siting processes for these projects will allow adequate exploration, scrutiny and resolution of all issues of concern to potential host communities. 	
10	LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND	
10.1	FB introduced the report providing an update and proposing liaison arrangements.	
10.2	It was agreed that the ED be authorised to attend meetings of the Steering Group of Scottish local authorities and establish other liaison arrangements as appropriate.	
11	WORK PROGRAMME AND TARGETS	
11.1	FB outlined the review of the work programme, which is divided into five main streams: infrastructure; profile; policy; member authorities; and budget.	
11.2	In addition to the initiatives outlined, SK suggested that there would be value in a meeting with green groups to explain the role and activities of NuLeAF. GB suggested that options for involvement in the LGA conference be reviewed, with a view to identifying the best value for resources expended.	
11.3	The Steering Group thanked FB and CdC for progress made.	
11.4	<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the aims and targets set out in the report be endorsed; - a meeting be sought with green NGOs; - the January meeting consider options for NuLeAF activities associated with the LGA conference; and - future progress with the work programme should be reviewed at the April meeting 	<p>FB CdC</p> <p>FB</p>
12	EUROPEAN INITIATIVES	
12.1	FB outlined developments relating to COWAM, CARL and EUROCLI	

12.2	<p>initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delegate authority to the Executive Director to represent NuLeAF at the meetings of the UK group of stakeholders in COWAM 3; and - confirm the signing of the EUROCLI 'statement of commitment' as an Associate Member. 	
13	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	There were no items of AOB.	
14	NDA Presentation on Assessing Options for Rationalising the Storage of Intermediate Level Waste (James McKinney, NDA)	
	<p>JMcK outlined the work that was being undertaken to assess options for rationalising the storage of ILW. The assessment could impact on the location of the site or sites for storing operational ILW from the following NDA sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Berkeley and Oldbury, Gloucestershire - Bradwell, Essex - Culham and Harwell, Oxfordshire - Dungeness, Kent - Sizewell, Suffolk - Winfrith, Dorset and - Wylfa, Isle of Anglesey. <p>The operational ILW from these sites amounts to about 5% of the NDA's ILW inventory.</p> <p>The assessment does not include sites where interim stores are already under construction or at an advanced stage of planning. Nor does it cover ILW that will arise from decommissioning. It is anticipated that decommissioning ILW will be sent straight to a geological repository, rather than be stored at an existing site prior to disposal.</p> <p>For the operational ILW from the sites listed above, it is likely that four basic interim storage options will be assessed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Building stores at each or most of the listed sites (the 'baseline') 2) Building an enhanced store at one of the existing sites in the south 3) Building enhanced stores at two of the existing sites (one in the SW and one in the SE/East) 4) Taking a centralised approach (eg storage of the wastes at Sellafield) <p>The NDA is currently undertaking work to identify 'candidate' sites for enhanced stores in options 2) and 3). Once candidate sites are known, the NDA intends to organise workshops with key stakeholders in order to evaluate the options. The evaluations are likely to involve a form of</p>	

	<p>multi-criteria assessment. The evaluations will inform identification of a preferred strategy.</p> <p>Points made in discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- the need to apply the waste hierarchy- the need to consider an approach based on volunteerism- concern that stakeholders from local government have not yet been involved in the process- the need to allow sufficient time for effective engagement	
--	--	--