

## **NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM**

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

#### **Minutes of the Steering Group held on 21 January 2014, Town Hall, Manchester**

---

**Present:**

Cllr Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council (Chair)  
Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council (Vice-Chair)  
Cllr Mark Hackett, Manchester City Council  
Cllr Marcus Johnstone, Lancashire County Council  
Cllr David Southward, Cumbria County Council  
Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council  
Robin Carton, Plymouth City Council  
John Groves, Copeland Borough Council  
James Holbrook, West Somerset Council  
Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council  
Louise Nurser, Lancashire County Council  
Sean Morris, Manchester City Council  
John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council  
John Prosser, Kent County Council  
Guy Robinson, Somerset County Council  
Stewart Kemp, NuLeAF  
Philip Matthews, NuLeAF  
Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

		ACTION
<b>1</b>	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b>	
1.1	Cllr Smith welcomed everyone and thanked Manchester City Council for hosting the meeting. Participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Aled Morris Jones & Christian Branch – Anglesey County Council, Cllr Elaine Woodburn, Copeland Borough Council, Richard Griffin - Cumbria County Council, Lesley Stenhouse & Hamish Barrell – Essex County Council, Cllr Robbie Payne – Hartlepool Borough Council, Cllr Rilba Jones – Hull City Council, Cllr David Blackburn – Leeds City Council, Juliet Staples – Liverpool City Council, Bogus Zaba - Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Peter Day & Trevor Brown – Oxfordshire County Council, Cllr Matthew Riddle & Gillian Ellis-King – South Gloucestershire Council, Robin Graham -South Ribble District Council, Cllr Andrew Nunn & Clive Pink – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Rebecca Williams & Matt Meldrum - West Berkshire Council.	
<b>2</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 OCTOBER, 2013</b>	
2.1	The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2013 were held to be a true record and would be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD

<b>3</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
3.1	All actions from previous meetings were in hand or completed.	
3.2	DB asked if further action was required following the clarification of Rob Murfin's status on the NORM group.	
3.3	CD advised that the NORM strategy consultation was to commence in the next few days and NuLeAF would be submitting a response.	
<b>4</b>	<b>NuLeAF STAFFING</b>	
4.1	SK advised the meeting that he had decided not to renew his contract when it expired in July 2014 and would be retiring at the end of April.	
4.2	JPi advised the meeting that following consultation with Suffolk CC HR department, PM was offered, and had accepted, the additional hours and will take the fulltime role of NuLeAF Executive Director following Stewart's departure.	
4.3	The Chair thanked Stewart for his contribution to NuLeAF.	
<b>5</b>	<b>AN UPDATE ON THE MANAGING RADIOACTIVE WASTE SAFELY (MRWS) PROGRAMME</b>	
5.1	SK introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the DECC consultation on a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) siting process;</li> <li>• proposed campaign of national awareness raising and engagement by DECC/NDA;</li> <li>• the approach to the siting process by CoRWM; and</li> <li>• the International Socio-Technical Challenges (InSoTeC) programme.</li> </ul>	
5.2	DECC are currently considering the responses to the consultation which closed in December. NuLeAF has secured a meeting with DECC officials in mid-February at which we expect to updated on the responses and the reports on the consultation events. DECC has been at pains to stress that no decisions as to the content of the White Paper (expected in June) have been taken.	
5.3	Bruce Cairns had called SK, as he had been tasked with responding to the letter sent to Baroness Verma regarding the consultation process. A formal response was yet to be received.	
5.4	DS complimented SK on the NuLeAF consultation response, which he found concise and coherent.	
5.5	SK advised the meeting that he expected DECC to release a report summarising the consultation responses in advance of the publication of the White Paper. However, this could not be guaranteed.	

5.6	RS sought the meetings agreement to invite members of CoRWM to present their views on the process to a future Steering Group meeting. Agreed.	PM/CD
6	<b>COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT</b>	
6.1	<p>PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and updated NuLeAF Briefing Paper 14 on Community Funds and Radioactive Waste facilities. It was proposed that:</p> <p>1) That Steering Group agree this proposed new position on community benefits.</p> <p>2) That NuLeAF officers forward this paper to NDA and use it as the basis for a new dialogue to develop a national community benefits framework.</p>	
6.2	<p>Key points raised during discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a formula has been established for calculating community benefits in respect of the application for new build at Hinkley Point. This is based on installed capacity, £1,000 per MWh;</li> <li>• it is important to recognise the difference between community benefits and corporate social responsibility;</li> <li>• timing on this subject is key as the issue of ILW/FED co-location presents the opportunity to press NDA/government on this matter. Communities are being asked to accept waste which they were not expecting;</li> <li>• the principles set out in the NNLAG protocol provided purpose and definition which can be used to support negotiations;</li> <li>• care should be taken not to make the framework prescriptive and it is important to address each case on its merits i.e. new nuclear differs from LLWR;</li> <li>• approaches on recompensing blighted communities in other areas such as housing indicates a shift in government thinking on community benefits and could provide a useful precedent;</li> <li>• NDA should not be considered as the only target audience for discussions, ultimately HM Treasury is the paymaster;</li> <li>• it is important to distinguish the difference between community benefits for communities with nuclear sites and those who may host fracking wells. Fracking will be a comparatively transient operation compared to the long term operation of nuclear sites;</li> <li>• those entering into negotiations should be aware of what leverage they have; and</li> <li>• it is important to remember that these are <b>community</b> benefits and not a source of funds for the local authority;</li> </ul>	
6.3	PM will redraft the paper in light of the comments made at the meeting. This will then be circulated to the Radioactive Waste Planning Group for comment and returned to the Steering Group on 9 April for comment and agreement.	PM

<b>7</b>	<b>PROPOSED DRAFT RESPONSE TO NDA'S PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR CO-LOCATING FUEL ELEMENT DEBRIS (FED) TREATMENT AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL WASTE (ILW) STORAGE ON MAGNOX SITES</b>	
7.1	SK introduced the paper which included a draft response for consideration which whilst broadly supporting NDA proposals stresses the importance of local community consultation.	
7.2	Key points raised during discussion were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDA has issued a tender for a contractor to provide services in support of their proposals which includes the option to change the approach taken should the contractor be able to offer a better solution;</li> <li>• NDA needs to recognise the importance of engaging with local authorities in a meaningful manner in the course of their consultations;</li> <li>• concerns were raised about the safety of transferring waste between sites;</li> <li>• the response to the consultation should include a reference to the need for 'sustained meaningful communication';</li> <li>• NDA needs to recognise the importance of meaningful pre-planning application discussions with Waste Planning Authorities; and</li> <li>• NDA should be encouraged to provide Planning Performance Agreements in conjunction with applications.</li> </ul>	
7.3	SK will redraft the consultation response in light of the comments made. The Steering Group agreed that the response could be submitted following review and comment by the Chair and Vice-Chair.	SK/RS/BS
<b>8</b>	<b>AN UPDATE ON NDA STRATEGY AND OPERATIONS</b>	
8.1	PM introduced the report which included a draft response to the consultation on the NDA Draft Business Plan 2014-17 and also covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• changes in NDA Directors;</li> <li>• NDA Priority Programmes Report;</li> <li>• feedback on NDA Theme Overview Groups (TOG) meetings;</li> <li>• Sellafield related issues; and</li> <li>• NDA stakeholder engagement.</li> </ul>	
8.2	The draft response on the NDA Business Plan was agreed without amendment.	PM
8.3	It was agreed that RS would write to NDA seeking clarification regarding the exclusion of NuLeAF from the Nuclear Materials & Spent Fuels TOG.	RS/SK
8.4	The response to NDA regarding improvements to their annual survey on stakeholder engagement would be circulated amongst members of the Steering Group.	SK

<b>9</b>	<b>SERVICE PLAN 2013-15 UPDATE</b>	
9.1	PM introduced the paper which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) environmental safety case;</li> <li>• Update on NuLeAF research on Duty to Cooperate;</li> <li>• the Submarine Dismantling Project;</li> <li>• NORM strategy development;</li> <li>• ONR changes to Detailed Emergency Planning Zone principles;</li> <li>• the NuLeAF website; and</li> <li>• proposal for NuLeAF seminar 2014.</li> </ul>	
9.2	LN asked if it would be possible that she would be included in the proposed NORM strategy stakeholder engagement meetings. PM will keep her informed of developments.	PM
<b>10</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>	
10.1	The next meeting will be held at Local Government House on 9 April 2014, 11.00 to 3.00.	
<b>11</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
11.1	It had been suggested that NuLeAF might find it useful to attend the quarterly meeting between ONR and NGOs as a means of establishing regular dialogue between ONR and NuLeAF. On the advice of SM, who attends the meeting on behalf of NFLA, it was agreed that this was not a suitable forum for NuLeAF, and consideration would be given to inviting a ONR representative to speak to a future Steering Group meeting.	RS/CD
11.2	SK advised the meeting that NDA has recently published 2 position papers on the management of separated plutonium and waste graphite along with a credible options paper for the management of uranics. These will be reviewed and papers presented to the April Steering Group.	SK
<b>12</b>	<b>PRESENTATION BY DR ANNA CLARK, HEAD OF SITE RESTORATION, NDA.</b>	
12.1	AC opened with a review of the site restoration process. A key question was – how clean do we want to make our sites? There is a range of options from a site which would be under regulatory control to restoring the site to its original condition. Achieving a balance of benefits and detriments is not straightforward and the regulatory framework affects choices which can be made.	
12.2	AC has been working with the Radioactive Substances Policy Group and has received backing from government to look at resolving issues with the regulatory framework which might impede site restoration.	
12.3	NDA recognises the need to demonstrate that controls work and that this will instil public confidence in the decommissioning process. To that end they hope to undertake work on safeguarding	

	controls on land use.	
12.4	Consideration is being given to interim uses for sites during the quiescent period i.e. whilst the site is in care and maintenance, such as for a solar array. Also looking at whether sites should be retained for national infrastructure purposes at a later date. Disposal of a site may not be the best option.	
12.5	Optimising End States – each site will be different, but NDA want to produce guidance which sites can follow to determine to decide what the desired outcomes are, how they should be timed and in what order. This will include credible options on next use. NDA needs to be able to tell government what projects will need to be funded.	
12.6	Timing is an important factor – there is a finite amount of funding so the best way to spread this across the NDA estate needs to be carefully considered. There are merits in slowing the process down as radioactive decay reduces the hazard and releases funds for use elsewhere.	
12.7	It is hoped that the Site Restoration Roadmap will be in a state to be circulated to a wider audience within the next 18 months.	
12.8	Sites will be encouraged to implement share good practice and steps are being taken to ensure that they communicate the state of their site in a consistent way across the NDA estate.	
12.9	In response to questions from the SG, AC confirmed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Magnox Optimised Decommissioning Programme took into consideration the skills need across the sites</li> <li>• NDA is considering best way of working across A/B/C sites.</li> <li>• Much of the learning has come from experience of restoring disused open cast mines.</li> <li>• Hydrology will form part of every risk assessment</li> </ul>	
12.10	Members of the Steering Group stressed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it was important to engage with communities whilst there is still a chance to influence outcome.</li> <li>• NDA should learn from example of new nuclear – developers came to local authorities early to help them firm up their plans, and then later engaged with the local communities.</li> <li>• they would encourage AC/NDA to use NuLeAF as a means of communicating with officers and elected members before going public. This will enable NDA to receive input to refine options and avoid raising public expectations about options which may ultimately prove unviable.</li> </ul> <p>RS thanked AC for attending the meeting and looked forward to future discussions.</p>	

## ACTION LIST

<b>Steering Group, 21 January 2014</b>			
2.1	Post minutes for meeting of 23 October on website	CD	Done 23 January
5.6	Invite members of CoRWM to present to future SG meeting re MRWS process	PM/CD	
6.3	Redraft Community Benefits paper, circulate to RWPG for comment and return to SG on 9 April	PM	
7.3	Redraft ILW/FED preferred options consultation response, circulate to C&VC for approval and submit by 31 January	SK/RS/BS	
8.2	Submit agreed response on NDA Draft Business Plan 2014-17	PM	Done 22 January
8.3	Write to NDA seeking clarification regarding the exclusion of NuLeAF from the Nuclear Materials TOG	SK/RS	
8.4	Circulate response to NDA on their approach to conducting annual survey on stakeholder engagement to SG	SK/CD	Done 23 January
9.2	Advise LN of dates of NORM stakeholder workshops	PM/CD	Done 23 January
11.1	Invite ONR representative to speak to future SG meeting as appropriate	PM/CD	
11.2	Submit papers to April SG covering NDA position papers on graphite waste and separated plutonium management and credible options for the management of uranics.	SK	
<b>Steering Group, 23 October 2013</b>			
	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>FOR</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
5.3	Invite representative from Sellafield to give presentation on plan for next 5 years to April SG	SK	Awaiting response