

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 25 January, 2012,
Local Government House, Smith Square, London.**

Present:

Cllr Tim Knowles, Cumbria County Council (Chairman)
Cllr Neil Swannick, Manchester City Council (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Michael Green, Lancashire County Council
Steve Smith, Copeland Borough Council
Stewart Kemp, Cumbria County Council
Mike Garrity, Dorset County Council
John Prosser, Kent County Council
Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council
Louise Nurser, Lancashire County Council
Nicola Horne, Plymouth City Council
Richard Conway, Purbeck District Council
Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council
Guy Robinson, Somerset County Council
Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council
Bob Chamberlain, Suffolk Coastal District Council
John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council
Fred Barker, NuLeAF
Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

In the afternoon, a presentation and discussion was held with Bruce Cairns of DECC on the Geological Disposal Facility siting process.

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	Cllr Knowles welcomed everyone to the meeting and participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Carni McCarron-Holmes, Charles Holmes & Richard Griffin – Allerdale Borough Council, Cllr Allan Holliday – Copeland Borough Council, Richard Evans – Cumbria County Council, Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council, Katherine Dove – Kent County Council, Andrew Smith – Lancashire County Council, Sean Morris – Manchester City Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Peter Day & Trevor Brown – Oxfordshire County Council, Robin Carton – Plymouth City Council, Bridget Downton – Purbeck District Council, Cllr Matthew Riddle – South Gloucestershire Council, Cllr Penny Wride – Stroud District Council, Cllr Julian Swainson – Waveney District Council.	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 6 JULY, 2011	
2.1	The Minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting subject to the deletion of the final sentence of item 6.3 and would be posted on the website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	3.2 The meeting of LLW Programme Delivery Group is on 8 February. ED will report back to the SG meeting on 25 April.	FB
3.2	4.2 FB confirmed that Government policy allowed the disposal of LLW to facilities developed at existing licensed nuclear sites and had advised RS accordingly. The discussion with the Planning Inspectorate had not taken place, but they had agreed to present at the seminar in March.	
3.3	5.2 Cumbria CC's work on the standards of LLW management in France is ongoing.	RE
3.4	All other matters are covered within the meeting papers.	
4	NuLeAF STAFFING	
4.1	TK reported to the Steering Group that Fred Barker, the Executive Director, had decided not to renew his contract when it expired in early June 2012.	
4.2	Approval was given by the Steering Group for TK/NS/JP and FB to handle the recruitment process for a new Executive Director. Meeting participants were encouraged to publicise the post within their authorities.	All
5	NDA STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	
5.1	FB introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strategy development on Integrated Waste Management (IWM) • strategy development on Site Restoration • other aspects of strategy development • an update on representations about implementing NDA strategy for contracting and supply chain development • an update on the proposal for a Community Benefits Protocol. 	

5.2	In response to a request from the Chair, a press release had been drafted urging the Government and NDA to revisit that aspect of LLW strategy that encourages the supply chain to come forward with proposals for LLW disposal to landfill away from licensed nuclear sites. The Steering Group approved publication of the press release in principle, subject to circulation of the draft for comment.	All
5.3	It was suggested that that it would also be beneficial for members to lobby their local MPs on this matter. FB would prepare further advice which would be circulated.	FB
5.4	Recent developments leading to the involvement of Cumbrian local authorities in the contract strategy for the Sellafield site were welcomed. SS agreed to supply relevant documentation so that it could be circulated to SG attendees.	SS
5.5	Cumbrian representatives at the meeting felt there was no reason that the 'pathfinder' discussions being undertaken with NDA on Community Benefits (CB) should prevent the ED having further discussions on a national framework with NDA. FB agreed to seek a meeting with NDA.	FB
5.6	The SG agreed the comments on NDA's draft IWM strategy development programme attached to the report. FB to submit.	FB
6	NDA DRAFT BUSINESS PLAN 2012-15	
6.1	FB introduced the report which highlighted key aspects of the draft Draft Business Plan and presented draft comments for SG approval.	
6.2	The Steering Group approved the proposed response as detailed in the report. FB to submit.	FB
7	NuLeAF/NNLAG PROTOCOL	
7.1	A draft Protocol was circulated prior to the meeting. It covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the remits, objectives, membership and governance and working arrangements for each organisation; the areas of mutual interest, and arrangements for communication and liaison between the two bodies. 	
7.2	FB advised the meeting that the NNLAG secretariat had indicated that the draft protocol would be acceptable to	

7.3	<p>leading NNLAG members.</p> <p>A concern was raised that reference should be made to circumstances where staff from one organisation are asked to make a substantive input to work for the other organisation and whether this should involve financial re-imburement.. It was agreed that this would be covered, the draft wording being circulated to meeting participants for comment prior to inclusion. Upon agreement the Protocol would be formally adopted.</p>	All
8	RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS	
8.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the granting of interim acceptance by the regulators of the generic designs for two nuclear reactors proposed for construction in the UK; • the application for approval to construct a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point in Somerset; • an initial review of the current position on proposals for managing radioactive wastes and spent fuel from new nuclear power stations; and • the publication of Government guidance on the Funded Decommissioning Programme for new nuclear build. 	
8.2	<p>The meeting noted that at the request of the Minister, Charles Hendry, NDA were looking at ways of accelerating the timeline for the Geological Disposal Facility and, potentially, therefore, for bringing forward the disposal of spent fuel from new nuclear power stations. The NDA's work would be reviewed by CoRWM and independently before decisions are taken.</p>	
8.3	<p>GR updated the meeting on the Somerset CC approach to the Hinkley Point C application submitted to the Infrastructure Planning Commission. He agreed to find out when the topic paper addressing radwaste issues could be circulated to the group.</p>	GR
8.4	<p>The Steering Group agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • write to the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) asking it to take account of the views of the Royal Society on methods of spent fuel storage when requiring future new build licensees to undertake actions to underpin their approach to such storage; and • publish the report given to the meeting on the NuLeAF website as a Briefing Paper on radioactive 	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>

	waste management and new nuclear power stations.	
9	UK RESPONSE TO THE FUKUSHIMA ACCIDENT	
9.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key background findings in the Weightman Report; • the Government response to the Weightman Report; • the report of the EC 'Stress Tests' for UK nuclear power plants; and • a proposed NuLeAF strategic objective. 	
9.2	Several local authorities have been approached recently by the ONR to discuss the local approach to planning controls around nuclear sites. These authorities agreed to provide feedback on these meetings to NuLeAF, so that key points could be circulated.	GEK/BC/DB/FB
9.3	<p>It was noted that there appeared to be widely differing results from the stress tests as applied across the EU. It was agreed that ONR should be invited to present to the next Steering Group on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning controls around nuclear licensed sites, and • the differing stress test results across the EU. 	FB
9.4	The Steering Group agreed to adopt the strategic objective as detailed in the report. The updated Strategic Objectives for 2012-13 would be published on the website.	FB/CD
10	NUCLEAR EMERGENCY PLANNING	
10.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an outline of the post-Fukushima reviews of nuclear emergency planning; • the current position on 'detailed emergency planning zones' and the concept of their 'extendability' to deal with major nuclear accidents; • planning for the recovery phase of a major nuclear accident; and • nuclear emergency exercises. 	
10.2	<p>During discussion concerns were raised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the size of Detailed Emergency Planning Zones (DEPZ) were in no way comparable to the size of the area affected by either the Fukushima or the Chernobyl accidents, so it is important to be confident that plans are 'extendable', and that • this topic is not given sufficient weight in local 	

10.3	<p>government as a rule and needs a higher level of scrutiny.</p> <p>The Steering Group agreed to keep developments under review and consider further reports as the results of further DECC and Office for Nuclear Regulation reviews become available.</p>	
11	CONSULTATION ON THE SUBMARINE DISMANTLING PROJECT	
11.1	A report proposing a response to national consultation on the Submarine Dismantling Project was circulated prior to the meeting.	
11.2	It was suggested that the response to Q9 be amended to include the requirement to refer to the local authority's planning policy.	FB
11.3	NH gave the meeting an update on Plymouth City Council's approach: it is working closely with its Primary Care Trust who are providing data and will also be responding in their own right. NH agreed to share PCC's response with FB before submission, if time permits.	NH
11.4	The Steering Group agreed the proposed response subject to the amendment above and delegated final sign-off to the Chair, Vice-Chair and Executive Director following the SDP workshop in Birmingham on 31 January.	TK/NS/FB
12	PROGRESS REPORT	
12.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the NuLeAF seminar on 9 March; • the Government statement on plutonium management; • the process for siting a geological disposal facility (GDF); • environmental permitting; and • the NuLeAF budget. 	
12.2	The Steering Group was encouraged to register and promote the March seminar amongst their colleagues.	All
12.3	Further discussions with NDA about additional funding opportunities would take place shortly and FB would report back to the April meeting.	FB

13	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
13.1	The next meeting will be held at Manchester Town Hall, 11.00 to 3.00 on 25 April, 2012.	
14	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	None.	
15	PRESENTATION	
	<p>The Steering Group watched the DVD produced by the West Cumbrian Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership as part of their third stage of public and stakeholder engagement on potential participation in the programme for siting a Geological Disposal Facility.</p> <p>Bruce Cairns (BC) of DECC gave an overview of the MRWS programme and was interested to understand the group's awareness of the process and welcomed any suggestions as to how local authority awareness could be raised. He confirmed that there was no intention to close the invitation to participate in the GDF siting process in the near future and that lessons learnt from working with the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership would influence working with any future interested parties.</p> <p>BC highlighted the benefits that siting a GDF could bring to an area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inherent benefits from hosting a large-scale, long-term engineering project (averaging over 550 jobs a year, and 1000 during the construction phase); • inward investment for mitigation of impacts (which could include transport and infrastructure); and • an additional community benefits package. <p>The government's desire to speed up the process is aimed at creating NDA efficiencies in the programme, not about compromising the technical or safety aspects of the GDF, nor the engagement process.</p> <p>It was suggested that DECC should reposition the invitation to express an interest in the programme as a regeneration opportunity and contact officers and members with this remit.</p>	