

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 6 July, 2011,
Birkbeck College, London**

Present:

CLlr Neil Swannick (Vice Chair) – Manchester City Council
CLlr Richard Smith – Suffolk County Council
CLlr Julian Swainson – Waveney District Council
Fred Barker – NuLeAF
Hamish Barrell – Essex County Council
Trevor Brown – Oxfordshire County Council
Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council
Katherine Dove – Essex County Council
Catherine Draper – NuLeAF
Gillian Ellis-King – South Gloucestershire Council
Richard Evans – Cumbria County Council
David Haughian – Cumbria County Council
Nicola Horne – Plymouth City Council
Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council
Barry James – Somerset County Council
Nick Johnson – Norfolk County Council
Louise Nurser – Lancashire County Council
Clive Pink – Suffolk Coastal District Council
John Pitchford - Suffolk County Council
Richard Sharples – Lancashire County Council

In the afternoon a presentation and discussion was held with Dr Juliet Long and Dave Bennett of the Environment Agency on its approach to applications to dispose of Very Low Level/Low Level Radioactive Waste to landfill, and engagement with local authorities.

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	CLlr Swannick welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially first time attendees.	
1.2	At the SG's request the ED will write to Mike Davidson, formerly an Allerdale BC councillor, to thank him for his contribution to NuLeAF.	FB
1.3	Apologies were received from: CLlr Carni McCarron-Holmes & Richard Griffin – Allerdale Borough Council, CLlr Sasha Wynn Davies – Anglesey County Council, CLlr Bob Pointer – Barrow Borough Council, CLlr Allan Holliday	

	<p>& Steve Smith – Copeland Borough Council, Cllr Tim Knowles & Stewart Kemp – Cumbria County Council, John Bennett – Dorset County Council, Lesley Stenhouse and Shelley Bailey – Essex County Council, Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council, Cllr Michael Green, Marcus Hudson & Andrew Smith – Lancashire County Council, Mark Woodger & Debi Bunkell – Maldon District Council, Sean Morris – Manchester City Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Kerry Rickards, Doug Bamsey & Claire Pearce – Sedgemoor District Council, Cllr Penny Wride – Stroud District Council, Cllr Andrew Nunn and Bob Chamberlain – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Tim Williams – Vale of White Horse District Council, Marianne Joynes – Worcestershire County Council.</p>	
2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 13 APRIL, 2011	
2.1	The Minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting and would be posted on the website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	5.3 The ED had submitted a response to the Plutonium consultation following approval by Chair and Vice-Chair.	
3.2	All other matters are covered within the meeting papers.	
4	FUKUSHIMA NUCLEAR ACCIDENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UK	
4.1	<p>FB introduced the report which provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an update on the actions taken as a result of the decisions of the April meeting of the Steering Group • a summary of the findings of the Chief Nuclear Inspector’s interim report on the implications of the accident for the UK nuclear industry; and • a summary of the wider implications for the UK, including the proposed new nuclear build programme. 	
4.2	<p>Points raised during discussion about the Chief Nuclear Inspector’s interim report included the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence that plans for recovery actions in the event of loss of water from spent fuel pools are robust and convincing; • further information underpinning the statement that use of MOX fuel appears not to have contributed to health impacts on or off the Fukushima site; • more detail about the review of potential climate change impacts, flooding studies & implications for 	

	<p>sea-level protection, plant infrastructure & layout, and management of legacy facilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further explanation of 'stress tests' and their relation to actions arising from the review; • consideration of whether there a need to rethink the safety regulator's definition of what constitutes a 'tolerable societal risk'; • information about the outcomes of reviews in other countries where incidents at nuclear sites could effect the UK; • information about the review of emergency planning for nuclear accidents in the UK; and • clarity about the plans for communicating the findings of the review and the resulting actions. 	
4.3	<p>The Steering Group agreed that the ED should write to Dr Weightman to request that key issues be addressed in more detail in his full report and indicating areas for discussion when he meets with the SG after the SG/AGM on 21 October. The draft letter would be circulated to all attending for comment.</p>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB/all</p>
4.4	<p>On the wider implications, the point was made that in the event of a major incident in the UK, it is unclear what the mechanisms would be for distributing monies to cover third party liabilities. The Steering Group agreed that a report covering this, and the UK review of emergency arrangements for nuclear accidents, should be considered at its next meeting.</p>	<p>FB</p>
5	COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
5.1	<p>FB introduced the report which provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a discussion paper about the nature of a potential Radioactive Waste Community Benefits Protocol; and • proposed next steps in developing such a protocol 	
5.2	<p>The purpose of a protocol would be to provide a flexible framework within which local authorities and communities can be engaged in discussion of the community benefits that might be agreed in association with a radioactive waste management facility. The benefits arising from those discussions would be separate and different to those measures that are necessary to make a proposed development acceptable in planning terms.</p>	
5.3	<p>The SG noted that the recent Government review of waste management policy had stated that with regard to community benefit protocols it "will explore with the</p>	

<p>5.4</p> <p>5.5</p>	<p>waste management industry whether such approaches could be suitable for waste infrastructure”.</p> <p>Points made in discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Government response to consultation on the draft Nuclear NPS also states that it is “giving further consideration to issues raised about the provision of community benefit outside the planning regime”; • it is important to liaise effectively with other organisations developing or implementing similar protocols; and • one approach to estimating the value of benefits could be to link it to the cost of disposing of the waste. <p>The Steering Group agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to support, in principle, the development of a Radioactive Waste Community Benefits Protocol for ‘beyond S106’ community funds, along the lines outlined in the meeting report, • that the ED should liaise with other organisations involved in developing or applying similar protocols; and • that authority be delegated to the Chair, Vice Chair and Executive Director to agree the timing and form of further NuLeAF approaches to Government to discuss a Radioactive Waste Community Benefits Protocol. 	<p>FB</p> <p>TK/NS/FB</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>LOW LEVEL WASTE (LLW) MANAGEMENT</p>	
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Government’s review of waste policy in England; • the Secretary of State’s decision to allow the appeal by Augean and grant planning permission to dispose of LLW to the hazardous landfill site at King’s Cliffe in Northamptonshire; • LLW developments in West Cumbria; • outcome of discussion with LLWR Ltd to develop understanding of the scale, timing and location of LLW arisings; and • initial consideration of future approaches to community engagement about the development of facilities for LLW management. <p>LN advised the group that Springfields Fuel had indicated that an application for the on-site disposal facility would be submitted shortly. The facility would take waste generated on-site, with the additional option of taking hospital waste.</p>	

6.3	The Steering Group agreed to: use the report to inform discussion with the Environment Agency in its afternoon sessions; and consider a more detailed report on approaches to community engagement on the development of LLW facilities at a future meeting.	FB
7	PROGRESS REPORT	
7.1	FB introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA Strategy and meetings with Local Authorities; • the process for siting a geological disposal facility; • the interim storage of spent fuel from new nuclear power stations; • the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP), and • NuLeAF finances. 	
7.2	The ED advised the SG that the engagement meetings with NDA, SLCs and regulators had been productive. A note would be forthcoming shortly and would be made available on the website. Further, topic specific, meeting(s) were being considered for late 2011.	
7.3	The ED also reported that in response to a letter from the Chair & Vice-Chair, correspondence had been received from Mark Higson of DECC stating that direct funding for this financial year would not be forthcoming. The ED would submit a more detailed finance report to the AGM.	FB
7.4	NH advised the SG that discussions with MoD on SDP were at a high level and at this stage, issues of confidentiality meant there was nothing further she could report.	
8	NEXT MEETING	
8.1	The next meeting will be held at Room 301, Town Hall, Manchester on 21 October, 2011, 11.00 – 3.00.	
9	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
9.1	None.	
10	PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION:	
10.1	Dave Bennett gave an overview of the Environment Agency's recent experiences regarding LLW disposal to landfill and Juliet Long covered the EA's engagement with local authorities.	

10.2	In response to questions and discussion it was agreed that there was an opportunity for both sides to establish improved lines of communication and also to develop thinking on ways of improving engagement with local authorities during the development and consideration of specific proposals for wider use of existing facilities or development of new facilities for radioactive waste management.	
10.3	ED will contact JL to discuss how this aim may be furthered.	FB