

**NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM**  
**LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON**  
**RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR**  
**DECOMMISSIONING**

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 20 July, 2012,**  
**Town Hall, Manchester**

---

**Present:**

Cllr Tim Knowles, Cumbria County Council (Chairman)  
 Cllr Neil Swannick, Manchester City Council (Vice-Chair)  
 Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council  
 Cllr Michael Green, Lancashire County Council  
 Cllr Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council  
 Cllr Michael Ladd, Waveney District Council  
 Charles Holmes, Allerdale Borough Council  
 Denice Gallen, Copeland Borough Council  
 Richard Evans, Cumbria County Council  
 Richard Sharples, Lancashire County Council  
 Delyth Jones, Liverpool City Council  
 Bogus Zaba, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service  
 Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council  
 John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council  
 Philip Matthews, NuLeAF  
 Stewart Kemp, NuLeAF  
 Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

		ACTION
<b>1</b>	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b>	
1.1	Cllr Knowles welcomed everyone to the meeting and participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Carni McCarron-Holmes – Allerdale Borough Council, Dylan Williams – Anglesey County Council, Cllr Neil Gulliver – Chelmsford City Council, Allan Holliday & Steve Smith– Copeland Borough Council, Mike Garrity – Dorset County Council, Cllr Geoff Lilley & Adrian Hurst– Hartlepool Borough Council, Lillian Harrison – Kent County Council, Abigail Burrige – Local Government Association, Sean Morris – Manchester City Council, Peter Day – Oxfordshire County Council, Robin Carton & Nicola Horne – Plymouth City Council, Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council, Kerry Rickards & Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Cllr Matthew Riddle – South Gloucestershire Council, Barry James – Somerset County Council, Cllr Penny Wride – Stroud District Council, Cllr Richard Smith – Suffolk County Council, Bob Chamberlain – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Cllr	

	Colin Law – Waveney District Council, Adrian Dyer – West Somerset County Council.	
<b>2</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 25 APRIL, 2012</b>	
2.1	RE asked that the 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet points of 5.2 reflect a) that the outcome was subject to the granting of various planning permissions in Cumbria, Lancashire and Northamptonshire, and b) that development of LLW facilities are not currently within the scope of the National Infrastructure Directorate's responsibilities.	
2.2	Subject to this amendment the Minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting and would be posted on the website.	CD
<b>3</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
3.1	6.6.2 An update on Community Benefits will be provided once the position at Sellafield has been clarified. TK confirmed that there was no progress to date to report.	PM/SK
3.2	8.3/8.4 Due to time constraints caused by the changes in staff, there had not been the opportunity to consider this issue (level of liability following a nuclear accident). Following discussions it was agreed that the secretariat would write to NNLAG to highlight the issue. A draft letter would be circulated for comment, and would also include reference to the lack of provision for managing operational and decommissioning waste liabilities. SK would provide a report to October SG and include outcome of correspondence.	SK
3.3	All other matters are covered within the meeting papers.	
<b>4</b>	<b>MANAGING RADIOACTIVE WASTE SAFELY</b>	
4.1	SK introduced the paper which gave an update on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the West Cumbrian MRWS Partnership (WCP) and the process to site a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF)</li> <li>• public consultation in Shepway to consider participation in the MRWS process,</li> <li>• the Geological Disposal Implementation Board (GDIB)</li> </ul>	
4.2	SK provided a verbal update on the meeting of the WCP on 19 July, which had met to finalise the report to the Decision Making Bodies. Topics discussed had	

	<p>included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the composition of the inventory for the proposed GDF;</li> <li>• the geological situation in West Cumbria – on advice from CoRWM, British Geological Society and NDA, it had been agreed that not enough was known at this stage to stop proceedings, and further investigations should be made in order to make an informed decision;</li> <li>• the balance of influence between the three tiers of local government in the decision making process - it was accepted that a small potential 'host community' (i.e. parish) could not opt out of a GDF siting process if no equivalent or better alternatives existed and DMBs considered, with justification, that continuation was in the interests of the wider community.</li> </ul>	
4.3	<p>A decision by the Cumbrian councils on whether or not to proceed to the next stage of the GDF process is expected in October.</p>	
4.4	<p>It was noted that Shepway District Council had undertaken a public consultation on whether they should participate in the Expression of Interest process. A decision on whether to progress further was expected on 19 September.</p>	
4.5	<p>The Chair advised the meeting that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the report to the WCP would be available in August. NuLeAF would advise members when and where it could be viewed</li> <li>• NuLeAF would produce a case study on the volunteerism process as it was unique and could set a precedent for major capital schemes</li> <li>• in respect of the way local authorities worked together in Cumbria a letter from Government had stipulated that there should be there was a need for all tiers of local government to be in favour of participating. However, it would appear that this consensus was unlikely as Kent County Council members had voted overwhelmingly to oppose the Shepway proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>SK/PM</p> <p>TK/SK/PM</p>
4.6	<p>Points covered in discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need to remember that Copeland and Allerdale BCs should be considered as separate entities in terms of the GDF process, not one unit;</li> <li>• DECC should seek to take advantage of the broadly positive attitude taken by communities likely to host new nuclear power stations in their search for</li> </ul>	

	<p>additional potential GDF host sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NuLeAF should encourage the use of Sustainability Appraisal rather than Strategic Environmental Assessment at the workshop being run by RWMD on 30 July as this includes socio-economic impacts.</li> </ul>	SK/PM
<b>5</b>	<b>SUBMARINE DISMANTLING PROJECT (SDP)</b>	
5.1	<p>PM introduced the report which gave an update on the outcomes of the SDP Independent Advisory Group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the public consultation exercise, the Strategic Environmental Assessment, the options analysis workshop; and</li> <li>• a review of the group and the future role for NuLeAF</li> </ul>	
5.2	<p>The SG noted the report and supported the continued involvement of NuLeAF in the SDP process.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>CONSULTATION ON THE MANAGEMENT OF THE UK CIVIL NUCLEAR STOCKPILE</b>	
6.1	<p>SK introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an overview of the Government consultation on the management of the UK civil plutonium stockpile;</li> <li>• a draft response to the consultation; and</li> <li>• alternatives to the use of plutonium as MOX fuel</li> </ul>	
6.2	<p>After discussion it was agreed that the consultation response should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• highlight the need to identify areas impacted by the proposals and to give consideration to local impacts of stock pile management</li> <li>• give reference to the need to assess benefits and detriments across the full range of social, economic and environmental factors in the short, medium and long term, and to ensure that appropriate measures to mitigate or offset any consequences of hosting such a facility.</li> <li>• stress the need to engage with affected communities</li> <li>• give a response to Q1&amp;2 stating that NuLeAF had no points to raise in connection with the process proposed</li> </ul>	
6.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be consistent with the response to the earlier Plutonium consultation.</li> </ul>	
6.4	<p>DG undertook to share Copeland BC's consultation response with NuLeAF</p>	DG

	The SG agreed the response to the consultation and delegated final sign off to the Chair, Vice-Chair and ExCoDs.	TK/NS/SK/PM
<b>7</b>	<b>LOW LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT</b>	
7.1	PM introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an overview of the current LLW situation;</li> <li>• the refusal of the Keekle Head planning application;</li> <li>• the King's Cliffe application to the National Infrastructure Directorate (NID)</li> <li>• the working group on VLLW and LALLW; and</li> <li>• the consultation on Dounreay LLW disposal.</li> </ul>	PM
7.2	PM advised the SG that he would amend the current NuLeAF Briefing Paper to take into account recent developments, especially in light of the stress being placed by Planning Inspectors on the Duty to Cooperate and the new National Planning Policy Framework	
7.3	RE advised the meeting that a major strategic application had been submitted to Cumbria CC for development of around 1 million cubic metres of disposal capacity including 6 further vaults at the Low Level Waste Repository. Environment Agency is currently considering the Environmental Safety Case, it is not expected that a report will be able to be made to the County Council Committee for a decision on the planning application before February 2013.	
7.4	The SG noted the reports.	
<b>8</b>	<b>NDA STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT</b>	
8.1	PM introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an update on the NDA Integrated Waste Management (IWM) Strategy and the meeting of the IWM Topic Overview Group;</li> <li>• an update on the 2013 radioactive waste inventory, and</li> <li>• the proposed engagement meeting with NDA, SLCs and regulators.</li> </ul>	PM/SK/CD
8.2	PM advised the SG that the NDA was cognizant of the need to be aware of the status of the various Waste Planning Authority policies. NuLeAF had undertaken to assist them in improving their understanding of the situation and engagement with local authorities on these issues.	

8.3	Two engagement meetings were proposed for 25 September and 24 October. Final confirmation from NDA was awaited and the meetings invitations would be sent once finalised.	PM/SK/CD
8.4	The Steering Group noted the updates and the proposed engagement meetings.	
<b>9</b>	<b>PROGRESS REPORT</b>	
9.1	PM introduced the report which gave: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an outline of the planned approach to joint working of the secretariat,</li> <li>• an update on NuLeAF finances,</li> <li>• an update from National Infrastructure Directorates consideration of the Hinkley Point C application, and</li> <li>• an update on plans for the revision of NuLeAF's interim guidance on MWDFs.</li> </ul>	
9.2	SK advised the SG that a preliminary meeting had been tentatively arranged with Bruce McKirdy of NDA to discuss financial arrangements for 2012/13.	SK/PM
9.3	It was agreed that NuLeAF could not continue to rely on reserves to meet deficits, and that consideration should be given to approaching SLCs and Government and/or encouraging NDA to increase their funding.	
9.4	It was agreed that, particularly in light of the emphasis on the Duty to Cooperate, local authorities should be encouraged to join NuLeAF.	SK/PM/CD
9.5	TK expressed his thanks to Suffolk CC for their work in handling the recruitment of SK/PM.	
<b>10</b>	<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	
10.1	The next meeting will be held on 24 October, 11.00 – 3.00	
<b>11</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
11.1	NuLeAF had been asked if it could provide input to the National Dose Awareness Working Group. Requests to local authority members had so far yielded no response and the circulation would be widened.	CD/SK
<b>12</b>	<b>PRESENTATION</b>	
	The afternoon presentation was given by Charles Temple, HM Superintending Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR). The presentation is	

available on the NuLeAF website.

Following Mr Temple's presentation, the following points were raised in discussion:

- the programme of actions to be taken at nuclear licensed sites following the findings of the Weightman Report is in development and will be published in September/October 2012. All sites are looking at improving resilience
- an agreement exists between IAEA countries to provide support, learning and assistance to each other, to which the UK is a signatory. In addition, a high level agreement was signed by David Cameron and President Sarkozy on British/French cooperation in nuclear matters.
- ONR is moving towards the position whereby they would not object to planning developments in a detailed emergency planning zone (DEPZ) if the local authority felt they could cope with the additional demands. However, there is no timeline for when this shift in approach will commence, but the emphasis would be on ensuring that the public was adequately protected. ONR would only object if they felt that a) the development represented an external hazard to a nuclear installation, and b) could not be satisfactorily accommodated within the off-site emergency plan, or would have an impact on the extendibility of appropriate countermeasures.
- New safety standards are being negotiated at EU level.