

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

**LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR
DECOMMISSIONING**

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 23 October 2013,
NCVO, 8 All Saints Street, London**

Present:

Cllr Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council (Chair)
 Cllr Mark Hackett, Manchester City Council
 Cllr Allan Holliday, Copeland Borough Council
 Cllr Marcus Johnstone, Lancashire County Council
 Cllr Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council
 Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council
 Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council
 Peter Allen, Cumbria County Council
 Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council
 John Groves, Copeland Borough Council
 Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council
 Louise Nurser, Lancashire County Council
 Sean Morris, Manchester City Council
 Clive Pink, Suffolk Coastal District Council
 John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council
 John Prosser, Kent County Council
 Guy Robinson, Somerset County Council
 Lesley Stenhouse, Essex County Council
 Stewart Kemp, NuLeAF
 Philip Matthews, NuLeAF
 Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	Cllr Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting and participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Cllr Smith advised the meeting that John Clarke, Chief Executive Officer of NDA hoped to join the meeting for a brief Q&A session at some point during the morning.	
1.3	Apologies were received from: Christian Branch – Anglesey County Council, Cllr Elaine Woodburn – Copeland Borough Council, Cllr David Southward and Richard Griffin – Cumbria County Council, Mike Garrity – Dorset County Council, Paul Prowting – Hampshire County Council, Cllr Robbie Payne – Hartlepool Borough Council, Cllr Brian Jones -London Borough of Harrow, Cllr Van Coulter – Oxford City Council, Peter Day and Trevor Brown – Oxfordshire County Council, Robin Carton - Plymouth City Council, Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council, Gillian Ellis-King – South Gloucestershire Council, Rebecca Williams - West Berkshire Council.	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 JULY, 2013	
2.1	The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2013 were held to be a true record and would be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	All matters were in hand or would be addressed elsewhere within the meeting.	
4	AN UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENTS IN LOW LEVEL WASTE (LLW) MANAGEMENT	
4.1	<p>PM introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An update on DCLG consultations on the Waste Management Plan for England and PPS10 revision; • Report on the Low Level Waste Delivery Overview Group (LLW DOG) meeting held on 19 August; • Report on LLW Regulators meeting; and • Update on NuLeAF work on the Duty to Cooperate. <p>Key points arising from discussion were:</p>	
4.2	Confirmation that government had indicated that it intended to publish updated guidance at the same time as new PPS10 policy, although no indication had been given that this would cover radioactive waste.	
4.3	The Environment Agency's challenge to LLWR over their assumption that planning permissions would be granted should be welcomed and supported.	
4.4	Clarification should be sought over local government/NuLeAF representation in discussions regarding NORM strategy.	CD
4.5	LLWR had advised the NDA National Stakeholder Event on 21 & 22 October that because there was now a greater volume of waste being diverted away from the repository, it was possible there would be no requirement to construct further vaults. The SG noted, however, that this meant that applications for disposal might be made at other sites and would result in a dispersal of radioactive waste around the country.	
4.6	PM confirmed that NuLeAF's view remained that waste should be disposed of as near as possible to the point of arising.	
5	AN UPDATE ON NDA STRATEGY AND OPERATIONS	
5.1	<p>SK introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Magnox PBO competition process and the Sellafield PBO contract; • NDA Theme Overview Groups (TOGs); • Plutonium management; and • a report on the IPPA conference in Prague. <p>Key points made during discussion were:</p>	

<p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.6</p>	<p>In light of the renewal of the contract between Nuclear Management Partners and NDA for the management of the Sellafield site it was agreed that performance at the site should be monitored and the opportunity sought to engage with NDA before the next break point in the contract.</p> <p>Sellafield would be invited to send a representative to the April Steering Group meeting to give a presentation on the plan for the next 5 years.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the perceived lack of co-operation and communication between A/B/C sites.</p> <p>NDA has indicated that it expects to begin the procurement process for any new MOX plant in 2016 and a supplier selected in 2018. Consequently a decision must be made by government before that date.</p> <p>Cllrs Smith and Hackett and P Matthews gave a verbal report on the Euradwaste Conference in Vilnius. They had been impressed by the public and stakeholder engagement process carried out by Sweden in their search for a geological disposal facility and hoped NDA could learn lessons from this.</p>	<p>SK</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>AN UPDATE ON THE MANAGING RADIOACTIVE WASTE SAFELY (MRWS) PROGRAMME</p>	
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p>	<p>SK introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and addressed the publication by government of a consultation paper proposing changes to current policy towards siting a geological disposal facility.</p> <p>Key points raised during discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the lack of clarity regarding the definition of a community; • whether a single repository is the correct approach and whether a suitable host geology exists in one location to accommodate such a large facility; • whether proposed decision making arrangements will be widely supported; • a lack of clarity regarding the timing of both the right of withdrawal and the demonstration of community support; • a lack of information on how government would seek to build consensus; • whether the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime is sufficiently community focused and capable of ensuring public confidence and community support; and • that government must undertake to provide the resources needed at all levels to address siting issues adequately. <p>The SG recognised that it was important for local authorities to support central government in their efforts to improve the process and get it right, but that it will be challenging to get the appropriate balance to ensure that a voluntarist approach is</p>	

	maintained whilst the process also moves forward.	
6.4	The Steering Group agreed that a draft NuLeAF response should be circulated to the Group before the DECC workshop on 14 November (see above for details). There will then be a short period (until 22 November) in which member authorities could comment on the proposed response. The final response will be submitted to DECC following approval from the Chair and Vice-Chair.	SK/RS/BS
7	FRACKING AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
7.1	CD introduced the paper which gave brief background information on fracking and its potential to impact upon radioactive waste management in the UK.	
7.2	The Steering Group agreed that the paper should be published as a Briefing Paper and the NuLeAF should keep a watching brief on developments, but only in relation to impacts on radioactive waste management.	CD
8	AN UPDATE ON OTHER KEY TASKS IN THE SERVICE PLAN 2012-14	
8.1	PM introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP); • an update on community benefits; and • Magnox ILW and FED co-location workshop. 	
8.2	PM updated the meeting that MOD would not be publishing the list of provisional sites for the storage of Reactor Pressure Vessels from the dismantling of nuclear submarines until after 5 December.	
9	NEXT MEETING	
9.1	The next meeting will be held on 21 January at the Town Hall, Manchester.	
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
10.1	None	
11	JOHN CLARKE	
11.1	John Clarke, CEO of NDA joined the meeting and was welcomed by the Chair. Mr Clarke confirmed NDA's recognition of the important contribution NuLeAF makes and NDA's intention to continue to support NuLeAF, but not constrain its work. He would like to maintain an atmosphere of open dialogue. Mr Clarke then took questions from the meeting.	
11.2	In response to a question from Cllr Riddle regarding the perceived lack of communication and cooperation between A/B/C sites, Mr Clarke commented that NDA was very keen to optimise skills and	

	workforce and to 'only do the job once' – there was no point in knocking something down only for a later operator to rebuild it. However, NDA had experienced some difficulties in engaging with site operators, but would continue to work on developing lines of communication and cooperation.	
11.3	S Kemp asked how closer scrutiny would be applied to the work being carried out on the Sellafield site following the renewal of the contract with NMP. Mr Clarke said that the decision to renew the contract had been a difficult one as there had been many disappointments. NDA had made clear to NMP what the expectations were of them, both as a parent body and as a site operator. The two organisations were working through how the triangular relationship would be optimised, and Mr Clarke would be meeting with the CEOs of the 3 NMP constituent corporations. Specific milestones and achievements would be set out for Sellafield Ltd to meet, and NMP would be expected to improve the quality of their documentation and performance of their management. He advised the meeting that NDA was not tied into the 5 year extension as the contract contained a termination for convenience clause in NDA's favour, though not in favour of NMP.	
11.4	In response to comments from D Bamsey and G Robinson regarding the perception that NDA doesn't recognise local authorities as key stakeholders with the potential to key partners in their work, Mr Clarke said that NDA was now recognising that Site Stakeholder Groups could not be their only method of engagement with local authorities and that they (NDA) had previously over-relied on Magnox to engage.	
11.5	The Chair again thanked Mr Clarke for attending the meeting and hoped that this was indicative of a closer working relationship between NDA and NuLeAF.	
12	PRESENTATION BY NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY ASSOCIATES (NWAA)	
12.1	The afternoon session of the meeting was taken by Professor Andy Blowers and Pete Wilkinson of NWAA who had requested the opportunity to give a presentation to NuLeAF on their views on the MRWS process. The Chair welcomed Professor Blowers and Mr Wilkinson to the meeting.	
12.2	NWAA is concerned that little has been done to improve the understanding of the issues which will be faced in undertaking geological disposal of radioactive waste since the decision to follow this approach.	
12.3	They understand that the Radioactive Waste Management Directorate of NDA is working on some 900 issues around the disposal of radioactive waste in a geological disposal facility (GDF), however they are concerned that the process is not open and transparent and does not give confidence to communities.	
12.4	NWAA is concerned that government does not have a back-up plan	

	in place in case no community comes forward or no suitable geology is found.	
12.5	<p>In respect of the current review of the GDF siting process, whilst NWAA felt that there were some good points in what was proposed it also felt that it failed to address some issues. Their recommendations were that the process should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that the method of demonstrating popular support is agreed, and is fair and inclusive; • broaden the terms under which the 'decision-making bodies' are empowered to act on behalf of the community; • maintain the positive aspects of MRWS such as right to withdraw, community packages and maintaining a staged process; • ensure the process is geology-led; • address the need for Knowledge Transfer - accessible information updates to rectify lack of availability of NIREX documentation; and • that there is a need for a conference to establish what is known and what is not known and how long (and at what cost) that search is likely to take. 	

ACTION LIST

Steering Group, 23 October 2013			
	ACTION	FOR	STATUS
2.1	Post Minutes of the meeting held on 11 July on NuLeAF website	CD	Done
4.4	Seek clarification re local government representation in discussions re NORM strategy	CD	Done. Rob Murfin is representing Planning Officer's Society, not NuLeAF.
5.3	Invite representative from Sellafield to give presentation on plan for next 5 years to April SG	SK	
6.4	Circulate draft MRWS consultation response before 14 November workshop	SK	
6.4	Approve finalised MRWS consultation response before submission on 5 December	RS/BS	
7.2	Keep watching brief on developments in fracking	CD	On-going
7.2	Publish paper to SG as Briefing Paper	CD	15 November 2013
Steering Group, 11 July 2013			
	ACTION	FOR	STATUS
4.4	Redraft NuLeAF Community Benefits protocol with reference to that developed by NNLAG and circulate for comment.	PM	In progress
Steering Group, 24 October 2012			
4.2	Ask Environment Agency/SEPA to document the criteria used to determine	PM	Requested

	environmental permitting applications		
4.2	Seek clarification from the Environment Agency why transport is not considered when permitting mobile waste streams	PM	Requested
4.2	Obtain update on organisation mapping exercise from Environment Agency	PM	Requested