

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 9 April 2014,
Local Government House, Smith Square, London**

Present:

Cllr Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council (Chair)
Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Marcus Johnstone, Lancashire County Council
Cllr Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council
Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council
Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council
Mike Garrity, Dorset County Council
James Holbrook, West Somerset Council
Charles Holmes, Allerdale Borough Council
Dave Illsley, Shepway District Council
Louise Nurser, Lancashire County Council
Clive Pink, Suffolk Coastal District Council
John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council
John Prosser, Kent County Council
Steve Smith, Copeland Borough Council
Lesley Stenhouse, Essex County Council
Stewart Kemp, NuLeAF
Philip Matthews, NuLeAF
Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	ACTION
1.1	Cllr Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting and participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Carni McCaron-Holmes – Allerdale Borough Council, Dylan Williams – Anglesey County Council, Tudor Smith – Colchester Borough Council, Cllr David Southward & Richard Griffin – Cumbria County Council, Cllr Elaine Woodburn, Copeland Borough Council, Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council, Cllr Mark Hackett & Sean Morris – Manchester City Council Bogus Zaba & Lucy Atkinson - Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Cllr Van Coulter – Oxford City Council, Peter Day – Oxfordshire County Council, Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council, Jonathan Cawley – Snowdonia National Park Association, Guy Robinson, Somerset County Council Cllr Matthew Riddle – South Gloucestershire Council, Robin Graham -South Ribble District Council.	
1.3	The Chairman advised the meeting that this was Stewart Kemp’s last meeting as Executive Co-Director as he would be retiring on 30 April and Philip Matthews would be taking over the role fulltime. The Chairman thanked Stewart for all his work over the years and Stewart gave a brief overview of his involvement with NuLeAF from inception in 2003 to the present date.	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21 JANUARY, 2014	
2.1	Subject to the clarification of which JP had spoken at 4.2, the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2014 were held to be a true record and would be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	All actions from previous meetings were in hand or completed.	
3.2	Re 5.3 a response had been received from the office of Baroness Verma. Whilst acknowledging the points raised by NuLeAF it was defensive of the approach taken by DECC.	
3.3	Re 8.2 there had been no feedback on the submitted NuLeAF response to the consultation on the draft NDA Business Plan. It was also noted that the finalised Business Plan had also not yet been published and NDA should be contacted to ascertain likely publication date.	SK
3.4	Re 8.3 RS had written to Adrian Simper regarding NuLeAF attendance at the SF&NM TOG. AS had advised that it was necessary for anyone attending the meeting to have Developed Vetting security clearance. The cost of this is £50,000 and so made NuLeAF presence impracticable. However, AS had offered to provide quarterly briefings which had been accepted.	
4	AN UPDATE ON THE MANAGING RADIOACTIVE WASTE SAFELY (MRWS) PROGRAMME	
4.1	SK introduced the paper which reported on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • publication of responses to the 2013 DECC consultation on proposals for a revised GDF siting process; • publication of 3 reports from workshops conducted in support of the DECC consultation; and • NuLeAF's continuing contribution to the GDF siting policy review process. 	
4.2	SK gave an update regarding the meeting between himself, PM and Roy Payne of NDA/RWM.	
4.2.1	The purpose of the meeting had been to ascertain how RWM saw policy developing following the announcement of the revised MRWS process expected in July 2014. Also to discuss the proposed national awareness raising programme with the aim of identifying opportunities for NuLeAF to engage and participate.	
4.2.2	Quick developments were not expected and RWM was likely to engage in low key conversations with a broad range of stakeholders in local government rather than a formal programme of workshops.	
4.2.3	RWM had expressed an interest in contacting LEPs which are not a body NuLeAF engages with.	
4.2.4	The commitment to voluntarism had been restated.	

4.2.5	Quarterly engagement meetings between RWM and NuLeAF had been reinstated. RWM had indicated that they clearly see local government as central to part of the next stage of the process.	
4.3	Members of the meeting felt that MRWS was not an issue which would be on the radar of the majority of LEPs. The exception perhaps being the Cumbrian LEP which had specifically excluded it from its Strategic Economic Plan.	
4.3.1	Any engagement which NuLeAF undertook with LEPs would need to be formulated very carefully.	
4.3.2	Meeting members undertook to engage with their contacts at their local LEP on the topic of MRWS and a specific item on the subject would be placed on the agenda for the July SG meeting. NuLeAF officers will prepare a Briefing Note for LEPs on MRWS.	All/PM
4.3.3	MJ undertook to invite the Chair of the local LEP to the July SG as an observer.	MJ
4.4	SK and PM had advised RWM that a 'taskforce' approach may be more appropriate, involving BIS and other government contacts. This appeared to have been taken on board and RWM indicated that government wished to highlight the 'transformative' potential of the project in bringing socio-economic benefits, not only in community benefits, but also jobs, potentially improved infrastructure etc, to the host community.	
5	AN UPDATE ON NDA STRATEGY AND OPERATIONS	
5.1	SK introduced the report which provided updates on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of NDA's progress on approaches to the management of separated plutonium, and a DECC 'consultation on the management of overseas origin nuclear fuels held in the UK'. • Publication of NDA's uranics credible options paper; • Publication of NDA's Magnox fuel strategy contingency options paper; • Publication of NDA's strategic position paper on the management of graphite wastes; • Developments with NDA Theme Overview Groups; and • Publication of the 2013 UK Radioactive Waste Inventory. 	
5.2	Re 1.4 and the bulk re-use of plutonium, previously the government had indicated that a new MOX reprocessing plant would be available as early as 2018, however the new paper indicated that this would now not take place until 2030-35. JPi queried the reason for the slippage and SK undertook to write to NDA for clarification.	SK
5.2.1	In response to a question from BS, SK indicated that the delay in dealing with the stockpiled plutonium (Pu) might result in an increase in contaminants (e.g. americium) which would reduce the amount of Pu available for recycling. SK undertook to obtain confirmation from NDA that this would be the case.	SK
5.2.2	SK also undertook to obtain clarification from NDA regarding the reported inclusion of 800Kg of Swedish Pu in the UK stockpile.	SK

5.2.3	SS queried whether the delay in MOX manufacture would have a deleterious effect on the clean-up and decommissioning of the Sellafield site. This issue would be raised with Phil Reeve who was giving the afternoon presentation.	
5.3	With regard to the NDA strategic position paper on the management of graphite waste (section 4), BS queried whether the inclusion of the graphite waste as part of the GDF inventory would increase the footprint of the site because of the heat generated by the material. Whilst graphite was a significant part of the ILW inventory it was expected to occupy only 2% of the GDF. However, no explanation had been given in the NDA paper. SK undertook to seek clarification from NDA.	SK
5.4	The Steering Group agreed the responses to a) the DECC consultation on the management of overseas origin nuclear fuels held in the UK, subject to the clarifications indicated above; and b) the NDA's uranium credible options paper, both as proposed in the meeting paper, subject to final approval by the Chair and Vice-Chair	SK/RS/ BS
6	COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
6.1	PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting. This set out a revised version of Briefing Paper 14 taking into account comments made at both the Steering Group meeting on 21 January 2014 and the Radioactive Waste Planning Group meeting on 5 March 2014. The paper included a draft NuLeAF Community Benefits Framework.	
6.2	PM advised the meeting that Bill Hamilton, Head of Stakeholder Relations at NDA, had indicated that he would be interested in a round table discussion to move forward the topic of a national Community Benefits Framework.	
6.3	<p>During discussion regarding the proposed Framework, the following points were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any indication that planning gain and S106 were the same would be removed; • Principle 3 should be amended to local/regional/national; • 'Management of Principles' para 3 – reword so it no longer implies that a community cannot have more than one CB package if hosting more than one scheme; 	
6.4	Re para 3.8, MJ noted that most local authorities would be looking for 7% of gross revenues, not the 1% offered and that as such the support could not be described as generous.	
6.5	There was debate concerning the appropriate mechanism for administering any fund. Factors which needed to be considered the size of the project and the size of the fund. It was agreed that defining the 'community' affected was complex and complicated, but it was an issue which would need to be addressed.	

6.6	The Steering Group agreed the proposed new position on community benefits and the Framework set out in Annex A to the meeting paper, subject to the amendments above.	PM
6.6.1	The SG further agreed that the paper should be forwarded to NDA and Government, and that it should be used as a basis for new dialogue to develop a national community benefits framework in respect of radioactive waste management.	PM
7	SERVICE PLAN 2013-15 UPDATE	
7.1	PM introduced the paper which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report on the LLW Delivery Overview Group; • An update on the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP); • An update on UK NORM strategy; • Detailed Emergency Planning Zones; and • The new NuLeAF website. 	
7.2	SS asked whether there was any knowledge of the scope of the HAW strategy? He was curious how a strategy could be developed when there was no final solution for disposal. SK undertook to seek clarification from James McKinney at NDA.	SK
7.3	BS gave the meeting a verbal update on the SDP workshop which he attended in Bristol on 25 March. He had been impressed by the commitment of MoD and the organising of the event had been superior to that of the MRWS workshops. Officers and members from West Berkshire had attended and had a positive reaction to the proposals. Capenhurst nuclear licensed site had also been heavily represented and he felt they saw this as a good business opportunity. This meant that more than one site would be interested in taking on the work. The actual Reactor Pressurised Vessels, which once housed the nuclear core, were actually low risk in terms of movement and storage. MoD was keen to keep engaging with potential sites.	
7.4	BS gave a meeting a brief overview of the issues being faced by Barrow BC following the delay in DEPZ boundary determination. The meeting agreed that they would ascertain the status of their own boundary discussions with ONR and then write collectively seeking progress on the outstanding issues.	All
8	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
8.1	The next meeting will be held at County Council Offices in Preston by kind invitation of Lancashire County Council.	
9	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
9.1	DB advised the meeting that SDC was making reasonable progress on securing a PPA for FED/ILW consolidation with NDA.	

10	PRESENTATION BY PHIL REEVE, DECOMMISSIONING HEAD AND TECHNICAL, SELLAFIELD LTD
10.1	PR gave a short presentation based around 2 key documents – ‘Key to Britain’s Energy Future – The Strategy for Sellafield’ and ‘Sellafield Decommissioning Strategy’ the latter not yet being in the public domain.
10.2	There are 3 key tenets which inform all the work, planning and decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safe, secure site stewardship; • to make demonstrable progress (expedite resolution of the 3 ‘intolerable’ projects); • to give a return on investment.
10.3	Sellafield currently has a full order book, but if it is successful in its work it could look at other missions (SDP, decommissioning North Sea Oil rigs). PR believes that Sellafield has world class knowledge of nuclear decommissioning and clean-up and it is important to recognise this as an asset with potential for use elsewhere.
10.4	The purpose of the Sellafield Decommissioning Strategy is to get maximum accelerated rate of hazard risk reduction. All avenues need to be considered – focus should not be solely on the 3 ‘intolerable’ facilities. Because of the congested nature of the site, clearing a low hazard building can provide useful resources for work on higher hazard facilities. It is not possible to do everything at once, therefore careful consideration must be given to what tasks are undertaken and in what order.
10.4	The Decommissioning Strategy will set out what tasks will be undertaken, when and the reasoning behind the decision. It is hoped that this information can be placed in the public domain.
10.5	In answer to questions from the Steering Group, key points were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sellafield will need to make substantial steps on delivering progress on decommissioning and clean up in the next 12-18 months in order to ameliorate previous poor record and perceived lack of progress. • Regulatory milestones will be placed in the public domain against which performance can be judged. • Evaporator Bravo has been brought back in to service to increase the resilience of the site in respect of fuel reprocessing. Work has also been carried out to consider what steps would be necessary should reprocessing fail completely, and a conceptual design for a fuel drying facility has been produced. • Work has been undertaken to profile resource needs following the end of reprocessing. Staff would be redeployed elsewhere and there would be no sudden drop in numbers. However, that income stream would end. • PR was unable to clarify the reason behind the slippage in the dates for re-use of the Pu stockpile or the inclusion of Swedish Pu, but undertook to seek an answer to the question. • PR confirmed the importance of the National Nuclear Laboratory to the work at Sellafield. Improving the efficiency of access to

	<p>universities is currently being considered jointly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footprint of the site is 96% utilised and the remaining 4% is not sufficient to ease decommissioning. A number of options are being considered which could increase the size of free space including decommissioning and cleaning up lower hazard facilities and moving staff, whose role does not require them to be on-site, elsewhere locally. • It is important that staff remain focused on delivering core business and not be distracted by the volume of tasks which need to be undertaken. The provision of a timed, specific plan of works will assist this. 	
--	--	--

ACTION LIST

Steering Group, 9 April 2014			
	Post minutes for meeting of 21 January on website	CD	Done
3.3	Ascertain publication date for NDA Business Plan	SK	Done. Will be published w.c. 14.4
4.3.2	Raise awareness of local LEP contact re MRWS	All	Email sent 24 April to SG members
4.3.2	Produce note NuLeAF/LEP engagement for July SG	PM	Done
4.3.3	Invite local LEP Chair to July SG	MJ	
5.2	Write to NDA to ascertain reason for slippage in Pu re-use date	SK	Done
5.2.1	Write to NDA and confirm if delay in re-use of Pu will lead to increase in contaminants which will reduce quantity of re-usable Pu	SK	Done
5.2.2	Write to NDA and seek clarification about the inclusion of Swedish Pu in the UK stockpile	SK	Done
5.4	Submit response to consultation on management of foreign nuclear materials following approval by C&VC	RS/BS/SK	Done
5.4	Submit response to consultation on credible options for uranics following approval by C&VC	RS/BS/SK	Done
6.6	Amend Community Benefits Framework (CBF) paper in light of SG comments	PM	Done
6.6.1	Engage with government and NDA on way forward for CBF	PM	In hand
7.2	Seek clarification of scope of HAW strategy with particular reference to GDF	SK	Done

7.4	Ascertain status of DEPZ boundary negotiations with ONR, and feedback to secretariat for collation.	All	Information received from a number of local authorities
7.4	Write to ONR for clarification of reason for delays in resolving above issues	PM	In hand
Steering Group, 21 January 2014			
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	On-going
11.1	Invite ONR representative to speak to future SG meeting as appropriate	PM/CD	ONR spoke to NuLeAF seminar. On list for future engagement as appropriate.