

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Draft Minutes of the Steering Group held on 28 April, 2009,
The Wave, Maryport, Cumbria**

Present:

Cllr Allan Holliday (Chair) - Copeland Borough Council
Fred Barker – NuLeAF
Cllr Mike Davidson – Allerdale Borough Council
Catherine Draper – NuLeAF
Paul Feelihy – Cumbria County Council
Charles Holmes – Allerdale Borough Council
Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council
Stewart Kemp – Cumbria County Council
Cllr Tim Knowles – Cumbria County Council
Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council
Cllr Tony Markley – Cumbria County Council
Fergus McMorrow – Copeland Borough Council
Sean Morris – Manchester City Council
Cllr Neil Swannick – Manchester City Council
Cllr Bernard Whittle – Lancashire County Council
Cllr Ken Williams – Barrow Borough Council

Also present for afternoon discussion with CoRWM: Cllr Sam Standage, Cllr Tim Heslop, Cllr Peter Kendall and Cllr Alan Smith, Allerdale Borough Council.

		ACTION
1	WELCOME	
1.1	Cllr Holliday welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially first time attendees.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Steve Giblin – Tameside Borough Council, Cllr Oldham – Tameside Borough Council, Andy Appleby - Harrow Borough Council, Sue Brett – Cumbria County Council, Tim Williams – Vale of White Horse District Council, Lesley Stenhouse – Essex County Council, Cllr Eddy Alcock – Suffolk County Council, John Pitchford – Suffolk County Council, Cllr Julian Swainson – Suffolk County Council, Kerry Rickards – Sedgemoor District Council, Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council	

1.3	The Chairman thanked Cllr Bernard Whittle for his valuable and appreciated contribution to NuLeAF. Cllr Whittle will not be standing for re-election in June.	
2	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM REPORTS TO THE CANCELLED STEERING GROUP MEETING, 3 FEBRUARY 2009	
2.1	The SG meeting scheduled for 3 February had been cancelled because of inclement weather. Recommendations which had been tabled for the meeting had been circulated for comment electronically and subsequently agreed with the Chair.	
2.2	Minutes for the Steering Group held on 29 October, 2008 had also been circulated electronically and had been signed off by the Chair and posted on the website.	
3	TAKING ACCOUNT OF PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER VIEWS IN DECISIONS ABOUT MANAGING RADIOACTIVE WASTE	
3.1	<p>FB introduced the report which addressed how public and stakeholder views should be taken into account in the decision making processes that will impact on the siting of radioactive waste management facilities. The report considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the different levels and types of decision processes • the nature of the decision processes and the role of public and stakeholder confidence or acceptability • addressing public and stakeholder confidence or acceptability in decision making. 	
3.2	<p>The following points were made in discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BW was concerned that the Environment Agency was not engaging sufficiently with local authorities over its authorisations for disposal to landfill. • TK endorsed the philosophy of the report and expressed concern that NDA and LLWR Ltd technical staff do not comprehend the importance of social issues. • GL was concerned that engagement should be genuine and find ways of effectively involving local communities. • MD was concerned that information should be accessible and factual. • SM suggested the report should also be sent to Government. 	

3.4	<p>The recommendations made in the report were endorsed by the SG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That this report should be published as a Policy Statement in order to promote effective and robust decision making in radioactive waste management. 2. That the NDA should be encouraged to take account of the Policy Statement in developing its strategy for public and stakeholder engagement. 3. The NDA should be encouraged to follow the steps outlined in Section 3 of this report when reaching decisions about its LLW strategy, and to make explicit judgements about public acceptability in reaching those decisions. 4. The NDA should be encouraged to require nuclear site operators to undertake community engagement to inform their decisions about the development or use of on-site or off-site facilities for managing or disposing of LLW. 5. The Environment Agency should be asked to clarify how it will reach judgements about whether a disposal to a near-surface disposal facility will be made in a way that inspires public confidence, and what role such judgements will play in decisions about authorisations. <p>In addition it was agreed that NuLeAF would write to Government emphasising the need for a consistent approach to engagement and consultation across all nuclear issues.</p>	FB
4	APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY FUNDS ASSOCIATED WITH FACILITIES FOR THE MANAGING RADIOACTIVE WASTES	
4.1	<p>FB presented the report which reviewed initiatives NuLeAF has undertaken to promote the provisions of community funds in association with radioactive waste management facilities.</p>	
4.2	<p>The SG agreed to the following points that were made in discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FMc suggested that NuLeAF should monitor developments relating to (a) the Infrastructure Planning Commission and the implications for negotiation of S106 agreements and (b) the introduction and use of the Community Infrastructure 	FB/CD

4.3	<p>Levy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those authorities with experience of negotiating community funds should assist others, and NuLeAF would act as point of contact. <p>The Steering Group also endorsed the recommendation that NuLeAF publish a Briefing Paper for planners on the use of planning obligations in the siting of radioactive waste management facilities.</p>	FB
5	CONSULTATION ON STRATEGIES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE	
5.1	<p>FB presented the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> background information on the development of the NDA's LLW strategy; initiatives to promote discussion of issues raised by the developing strategy; recent meetings and developments associated with the draft strategies; and plans for consultation on proposed (a) NDA LLW strategy and (b) non-nuclear industry (NNI) LLW strategy. 	
5.2	<p>Points made in discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TK highlighted his authority's support for focussing LLW management activities at existing nuclear sites, rather than using new sites. BW reported that provision for on-site disposal was being made in the Lifetime Plan for Springfields. Following a meeting between NDA and Cumbria CC, SK highlighted that NDA had given a commitment to absorb social impact issues into the consultation paper and give potential suppliers an indication of the level of stakeholder engagement expected from them. 	
5.3	<p>It was noted that the NDA consultation would commence at the end of May, but that the NNI consultation would probably start in the autumn. Both organisations remained committed to presenting at the forthcoming NuLeAF seminars.</p>	
5.4	<p>The SG agreed the recommendations contained within the report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To submit a report with comments on the LLW strategies to the LGA Environment Board meeting on 29 June. 	FB

	2. To prepare a draft consultation response for consideration by the Steering Group at its meeting on 15 July.	
6	NDA STRATEGY REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENTS	
6.1	<p>FB presented the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the meeting of NuLeAF's Strategy Review Group on 23 March updates on topic reviews, the value framework, the NDA business plan, socio-economic projects and the National Stakeholder Group (NSG). 	
6.2	FB highlighted the important role of the use of the value framework in informing NDA decision-making, but that there was little information in the public domain about how it worked or was applied.	
6.3	<p>Points made in discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TK expressed concern at the perceived lack of importance which NDA places on social issues and what it stands to lose if it fails in its engagement with stakeholders. He felt it important that NuLeAF help in getting this message across to NDA. BW suggested that NuLeAF work with SSG Chairs to raise these concerns with NDA. If a permanent CEO was not appointed soon, the issue should be raised with the NDA Chairman. 	
6.4	It was agreed that NuLeAF representatives should raise these issues at the NSG in June.	FB/SK/TK
6.5	The Steering Group endorsed the recommendation to write to the NDA to request that it consider ways of increasing stakeholder understanding of, and confidence in, the Value Framework, for example, through commissioning and publishing an independent review of its development and use.	
7	PROGRESS REPORT	
7.1	<p>FB presented the report which gave updates on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the siting programme for a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) NDA and CoRWM reviews of interim storage arrangements for higher activity wastes new nuclear build European projects and NuLeAF finances 	

7.2	MD gave a presentation on his and CH's attendance at the recent meeting of the NEA Forum on Stakeholder Confidence in France. A copy of the reports presented at the Forum can be viewed in the Research section of NuLeAF's website	
8	FUTURE MEETINGS	
	15 July, 2009, County Hall, Oxford, hosted by Oxfordshire County Council 15 October, 2009, The Council Room, King's College London, Strand Campus, London (includes AGM)	
9	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
9.1	TK advised the SG that as a result of discussion with Government about the implications of decommissioning, the West Cumbria Vision had been launched which harnessed Regional Development Agency funds for development in Copeland and Allerdale boroughs, and had the agreement of partners (including the NDA) to align their socio-economic policies with the Vision's aims.	
10	CoRWM PRESENTATION	
10.1	CoRWM members attended the afternoon session to discuss their draft report to Government on geological disposal. It was agreed that NuLeAF would write formally to CoRWM setting out its comments, drawing on the discussion at the meeting.	FB/AH