

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

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

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 24 October, 2012,
The Priory Rooms, Birmingham**

Present:

Cllr Tim Knowles, Cumbria County Council (Chairman)
 Cllr Albert Atkinson, Lancashire County Council
 Cllr Allan Holliday, Copeland Borough Council
 Cllr David Royle, Manchester City Council
 Cllr Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council
 Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council
 Cllr Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council
 Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council
 Robin Carton, Plymouth City Council
 Richard Evans, Cumbria County Council
 Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council
 Richard Griffin, Cumbria County Council
 Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council
 Louise Nurser, Lancashire County Council
 Guy Robinson, Somerset County Council
 John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council
 Steve Smith, Copeland Borough Council
 Nia Swann Bowden, Gwynedd County Council
 Philip Matthews, NuLeAF
 Stewart Kemp, NuLeAF
 Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	Cllr Knowles welcomed everyone to the meeting and participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Mike Garrity – Dorset County Council, Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council, Lillian Harrison – Kent County Council, Delyth Jones – Liverpool City Council, Sean Morris – Manchester County Council, Bogus Zaba & Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Kerry Rickards – Sedgemoor District Council, Cllr Matthew Riddle – South Gloucestershire Council, Robin Graham – South Ribble Borough Council, Clive Pink & Bob Chamberlain – Suffolk Coastal District Council, David Palk – Suffolk County Council	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 20 JULY, 2012	
2.1	The Minutes of the last meeting were approved as a true record of the meeting and would be posted on the website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	All matters are covered within the meeting papers.	
4	RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT: AN UPDATE ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS	
4.1	PM introduced the paper which gave an update on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NuLeAF/NDA/Magnox engagement meeting and national programme overview, • NDA Low Level Waste (LLW) Regulatory meeting, • NDA LLW Delivery Overview Group • NDA Alternative Disposal Routes for Very Low Level Waste (VLLW), • Environmental Permitting and LLW disposal, and • Scottish Councils Committee on Radioactive Waste (SCCORS) 	
4.2	Key points made in discussion were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the expansion of the number of groups which now met, an overview of their role and remit, detailing who the decision maker was, would be helpful. • Greater clarity of the Environmental Permitting Process would be gained if the Environment Agency and SEPA would set out the criteria they use. This could then be overlaid with planning considerations. • The Environment Agency should be asked to clarify why transport is not amongst their considerations when permitting mobile waste streams. 	PM PM PM
4.3	PM undertook to obtain a progress report on the organisation mapping exercise from the Environment Agency when he met with them in the fringes of the NDA National Stakeholder Event.	PM
4.4	The Steering Group noted the updates and their implications for NuLeAF and local authorities.	
5	AN UPDATE ON THE MANAGING RADIOACTIVE WASTE SAFELY (MRWS) PROGRAMME	
5.1	SK introduced the report which gave an update on the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developments in West Cumbria and Shepway, 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on-going MRWS promotion by DECC, • DECC/NDA/NuLeAF discussion 25 July 2012, • CoRWM discussion' • report back from the MRWS Regulatory Interface Management Meeting on 27 July 2012, • attendance at Radioactive Waste Management Division (RWMD) Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping workshop on 30 July 2012, and • meetings with RWMD on 30 August and 12 September 2012 	
5.2	<p>TK gave a brief update on the MRWS process in West Cumbria. The 3 councils (Allerdale BC, Copeland BC and Cumbria CC) are at present planning to hold meetings to decide whether or not to proceed to the next stage on 30 January; however this is contingent on the government acting to address the concerns raised during the 3 month 'pause'. The main points of concern are to provide a legal framework around the Right of Withdrawal and any Community Benefits package agreed, and to provide further reassurance about the prospects for identifying a suitable geology.</p>	
5.3	<p>SK advised the meeting that although DECC had attended the SOLACE conference earlier in the month, they had been unable to generate any further interest in engaging in the process. DECC is unable to confirm whether any other community is interested to engage with MRWS.</p>	
5.4	<p>During discussions regarding the issue of establishing the location of suitable geology, concerns regarding the approach taken by government were highlighted. TK advised the meeting that these had been raised with government, but to date no response had been received. It was agreed that the SG would monitor the situation and consider next year if it was appropriate for any action to be taken.</p>	
5.5	<p>It was also noted that once suitable geology had been established there was the potential for the area of affected communities to expand into neighbouring local authorities.</p>	
5.6	<p>Concerns were raised over the quality of communication between DECC departments regarding the MRWS process. A poor presentation of the facts at a recent public stakeholder engagement meeting regarding Hinkley Point C was cited.</p>	

5.7	The meeting's attention was drawn to the forthcoming Growth and Infrastructure Bill and the opportunity to comment.	
5.8	The Steering Group noted the report.	
6	COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
6.1	PM introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • examples of Community Benefits, • an update on NDA position on Community Benefits, • DCLG consultation on Section 106 Agreements, and • an update on the situation at Hinkley Point C. 	
6.2	The meeting's attention was drawn to comments made by John Hayes, Minister of State at DECC, in an adjournment debate regarding Community Benefits in Infrastructure Projects (Hansard , Westminster Hall debates, 18 October). It confirms that Business Rate Retention is to be regarded separately from Community Benefits Funds, and that "we may shortly be in a position to ... articulate a new paradigm for dealing with major infrastructural investments in the area of energy"	
6.3	DB flagged that the package agreed by the Somerset councils with EDF was for impact mitigation and was not a Community Benefits package. NuLeAF undertook to ensure this was correctly reflected in meeting papers. DB also stressed that it was important that Community Benefits should be linked to rewarding and incentivising communities.	PM/CD
6.4	The Steering Group noted the developments in NDA's position on Community Benefits Protocol, but agreed that NuLeAF should continue to push for a national policy.	
7	PARENT BODY ORGANISATION COMPETITION	
7.1	SK introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the background to the PBO competition process, • the competition process for Magnox and RSRL sites' and • the extension of the PBO contract at the Sellafield site. 	
7.2	GEK advised the meeting that South Gloucestershire Council had now received a response to their letter	

	<p>regarding the socio-economic component of the PBO competition from Sean Balmer, Commercial Director of NDA. In the letter he stated that it was the NDA's intention to "follow a similar approach to that taken at Dounreay where the socio-economic impacts of site closure are acute. This involved ... consulting with a range of stakeholders as to their expectations of an incoming Parent Body Organisation (PBO), and aspirations in regard to socio-economic matters." He went on to say that failure by the SLC or PBO to deliver on the socio-economic terms of the contract would constitute grounds for terminating the contract. South Gloucestershire reiterated that the broader aspects of environment should also be addressed.</p>	
7.3	TK updated the meeting on the potential 17 year PBO contract at Sellafield, and raised his concerns regarding whether this represented value for money for the taxpayer. The contract is reviewable at 5 yearly intervals with the first such review in 2013.	
7.4	JP queried whether all local authorities with Magnox sites would be aware of the PBO process. NuLeAF undertook to gain a clearer understanding of the timetable of the PBO competition, the opportunities to comment and to report back to the January SG meeting.	SK
7.5	<p>The Steering Group agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That officers assist relevant member authorities to ensure NDA involve them in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) determination of socio-economic, environmental and other relevant criteria in Parent Body Organisation competition processes for new management contracts at NDA sites; and b) evaluation of Parent Body Organisation performance against socio-economic, environmental and other relevant criteria in existing management contracts at NDA sites. 2. That officers report on progress to the next Steering Group meeting. 	SK
8	PROGRESS REPORT	
8.1	<p>SK introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • correspondence with NNLAG about the Nuclear Liabilities Regime, 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submarine Disposal Project (SDP), • NuLeAF seminar 2013, • NuLeAF funding, and • NuLeAF Service Plan 2012-14 	
8.2	LN highlighted concerns regarding the increase in liability level for level 1 landfill sites and the potential impact on Lancashire CC. There was some suggestion that LLWR Ltd had taken on this responsibility and NuLeAF undertook to confirm this.	SK
8.3	The Steering Group agreed to monitor and report on, as appropriate, the implementation of the revised Convention on Third Party Liability.	
9	NEXT MEETING	
10.1	The next meeting will be held on 29 January, 11.00 – 3.00, Local Government House, Smith Square, London	
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
11.1	None	

ACTION LIST

	ACTION	FOR	STATUS
2.1	Post minutes of Steering Group held on 20 July on NuLeAF website	CD	Done
4.2	Obtain or produce overview of groups working on low level radioactive waste management	PM	
4.2	Ask Environment Agency/SEPA to document the criteria used to determine environmental permitting applications	PM	
4.2	Seek clarification from the Environment Agency why transport is not considered when permitting mobile waste streams	PM	
4.2	Obtain update on organisation mapping exercise from Environment Agency	PM	
6.3	Amend Community Benefits paper to reflect Somerset package is a mitigation fund	PM/CD	Done
7.4	Clarify timetable for PBO competition and produce report to January SG on how local authorities can comment	SK	
8.2	Confirm whether or not LLWR had taken on insurance for third party liability at landfill sites where radioactive waste is disposed of.	SK	