

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

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

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 15 October, 2014,  
Premier Inn Hotel, King's Cross, London**

---

**Present:**

Cllr Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council (Chair)  
Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council (Vice-Chair)  
Cllr Alan Clifton-Holt, Shepway District Council  
Cllr Anne Fraser, Sedgemoor District Council  
Cllr Mark Hackett, Manchester City Council  
Cllr Chris Morgan, West Somerset Council  
Cllr Aled Morris Jones, Anglesey County Council  
Cllr Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council  
Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council  
Cllr David Southward, Cumbria County Council  
Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council  
Richard Conway, Purbeck District Council  
Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council  
Richard Griffin, Cumbria County 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  
Osian Roberts, Anglesey County Council  
Philip Matthews, NuLeAF  
Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

<b>1</b>	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1.1	Cllr Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting especially those were attending the meeting for the first time. Participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Kevin Kerrigan – Allerdale Borough Council, Cllr Elaine Woodburn and John Groves – Copeland Borough Council, Mike Garrity – Dorset Borough Council, Lesley Stenhouse – Essex County Council, Paul Prowting – Hampshire County Council, Cllr Robbie Payne – Hartlepool Borough Council, Cllr Marcus Johnstone and Marcus Hudson – Lancashire County Council, Janet Staples – Liverpool City Council, Peter Day and Trevor Brown – Oxfordshire County Council, Alistair Stewart – Shepway District Council, Guy Robinson – Somerset County Council, Matt Meldrum - West Berkshire Council.	

<b>2</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 JULY, 2014</b>	
2.1	The minutes were held as a true and accurate record and will be posted on the website.	CD
<b>3</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
3.1	All actions from previous meetings were in hand or completed.	
3.2	<p>Feedback on actions from previous meeting:</p> <p>5.2 Will any of the savings incurred by long term storage of wastes on site will be passed on to the host community: <i>NDA is developing an Overarching Position on Optimising Interim States; an Options Paper for deferred decommissioning at Magnox sites; and a range of work on the timing and pace of site restoration. There will also be a lot of information on this issue in Strategy III. However the basic position has not changed from that set out in Strategy II which highlighted the need for optimisation of end states. Consideration of the optimum final state for sites, and the storage of wastes, is constantly being assessed based on safety considerations, and also the wider impact of different options in terms of cost, energy use, environmental impact etc. The regulators play a key role in this process.</i></p> <p>5.3 What considerations have been given to the impact of coastal erosion on sites where it proposed waste will be stored until 2130: <i>As noted above, there has not been a significant change in plans for end states or the storage of waste. The implications of climate change for sites is assessed regularly through dialogue with the regulators, based on the best advice available. This will continue.</i></p> <p>5.5 What is the timetable for their stakeholder engagement with local government and communities regarding site restoration and site end states: <i>There will be engagement around Strategy III and local authorities and NuLeAF will be important stakeholders. With regard to individual sites there is no plan for additional engagement around end states unless there is a change in the current position. That said there will be ongoing consultation as there has been around Winfrith.</i></p> <p>5.5 What is the reason for the delay for the disposal of boundary wastes: <i>Financial implications are important but in reality a lot of the thinking of how best to manage boundary wastes is driven by risk management considerations. ILW and LLW are fairly arbitrary categories and some LLW is actually more problematic than some ILW. There is a considerable amount of ongoing research in this area and that will inform decisions about the best options (including both financial and risk considerations) for all such wastes. This will include the potential for in situ disposal, delayed disposal and options to reclaim, reuse or recycle wastes.</i></p>	

<b>4</b>	<b>UPDATE ON THE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY (GDF) SITING PROCESS</b>	
4.1	PM introduced the paper which provided background on developments in the GDF process; a report back on the technical event on the national geological screening process and the NuLeAF Briefing Paper on the GDF process.	
4.2	PM provided a verbal update to the meeting following a telephone conversation with RWM, the developer for the Geological Disposal Facility (GDF). He had raised concerns regarding the question over whether or not NuLeAF would be a member of the Community Relationship Working Group. This body would be addressing some of the fundamental issues around stakeholder engagement in the GDF process. He had stressed that NuLeAF was the appropriate organisation to provide local government representation, but felt that RWM had not yet fully developed its thinking on the composition of the group.	
4.3	MH commented that the potential for combined working amongst local authorities and the devolution of more powers from central government had the potential to change the way RWM would need to engage with local authorities.	
4.4	The meeting considered the draft Briefing Paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting:  Key points made during discussion were:	
4.4.1	It was noted that the previous Briefing Paper on the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Process had included an opening statement supporting the principle of geological disposal, but this was missing from the revised Paper. However, this was not supported by all local authorities and any statement included should reflect the range of views.	
4.4.2	Consideration should be given in the Paper to the need for the developer to ensure appropriate engagement and discussions are undertaken with communities who will be hosting waste until the time the GDF is available for disposal to take place.	
4.4.3	Important to ensure there is adequate and large scale dialogue with those affected. The scale of stakeholder engagement undertaken in Sweden is something NDA/RWM would do well to emulate and NuLeAF should encourage.	
4.4.4	It is important that NuLeAF encourages development and dissemination of information which can be used to counteract misinformation and allay unsubstantiated fears.	
4.4.5	The need to provide adequate resources to all tiers of local government and other stakeholders so they can engage effectively should be stressed.	
4.5	PM will incorporate points raised into final version of the Briefing	PM

	Paper which will be published on the NuLeAF website.	
4.6	The Steering Group approved the draft NuLeAF Briefing Paper on the recent White Paper on Geological Disposal.	
<b>5</b>	<b>AN UPDATE ON NDA STRATEGY AND OPERATIONS</b>	
5.1	<p>PM introduced the report which provided updates on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discussions at NDA Site Restoration, Integrated Waste Management, and Critical Enabler Theme Overview Groups;</li> <li>• the Sellafield Decommissioning Strategy;</li> <li>• publication of the Sellafield Excellence plan and issuing of an improvement notice; and</li> <li>• the management of uranics and overseas fuel.</li> </ul> <p>Key points made during discussion were:</p>	
5.2	Despite assurances from John Clarke at the meeting in October 2014 there still appeared to be a lack of evidence that NDA were actively seeking synergies between sites, in both waste and land management. This issue would be raised with Cavendish Fluor Partnership at the afternoon presentation, and followed up by PM at Theme Overview Group meetings.	
5.3	NuLeAF would write to Sellafield Ltd highlighting the need for local authority representation at meetings which discussed issues which had the potential to impact the local community.	PM
<b>6</b>	<b>AN UPDATE ON OTHER KEY TASKS IN THE SERVICE PLAN 2013-15</b>	
6.1	<p>PM introduced the paper which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• update on the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP)</li> <li>• proposed meeting with the Low Level Waste Repository on Very Low Level Waste and Low Activity Low Level Waste</li> <li>• submissions to consultations by Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)</li> </ul>	
6.2	SM advised the meeting that MOD would be issuing invitations to attend consultation events on the shortlisted storage sites for the SDP shortly.	
6.3	It was agreed that NuLeAF should approach LLWR Ltd with a view of a group site visit in 2015. This would be organised in conjunction with the July Steering Group.	PM/CD
<b>7</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>	
7.1	The next meeting will be held at Manchester Town Hall by kind invitation of Manchester City Council on 29 January 2015, 11.00 – 3.00. James McKinney, Integrated Waste Manager at NDA has been invited to speak on the Higher Activity Waste Strategy.	
<b>8</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	

	None.	
<b>9</b>	<b>PRESENTATION BY CAVENDISH FLUOR PARTNERSHIP (CFP) AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY (NDA)</b>	
9.1	The Chair welcomed Pete Knollmeyer Deputy Managing Director and Kelly Duane Communications Director Cavendish Fluor Partnership, and Karen Dickens Corporate Responsibility Manager and Jonathan Jenkins Stakeholder Relations Manager, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority.	
9.2	Jonathan Jenkin gave an overview of the context of the Parent Body Organisation competition and the requirements NDA set for bidders.	
9.2.1	All bidders were asked to meet minimum standards in a number of areas which included stakeholder engagement and socio-economics. It was important that bidders demonstrated a commitment to openness, transparency and good communications. Socio-economics are an important part of the PBOs remit – they need to assist in mitigating the impact of site closure on the local community.	
9.3	Karen Dickens advised the meeting that NDA has a duty to consider the impact of decommissioning on the local communities around the sites for which it is responsible. In the past this has been almost entirely financial, but the PBO competition has given them the opportunity to strengthen socio-economic activity and to look at other ways in which communities can be supported.	
9.3.1	CFP are required to deliver a three year rolling socio-economic plan. This must go through a thorough consultation process before being signed off by NDA. CFP must also prepare, consult and publish an annual performance report.	
9.3.2	Although the four priority areas remain, NDA are looking for CFP to be more sophisticated in their approach to the other sites as they go into Care & Maintenance. CFP will increase their data gathering and sharing to create a strong evidence base from which to work.	
9.3.3	CFP has been asked to: look at skills retention and transition; to ensure transfer of learning from PBO staff to those in the Site Licensee Companies (SLCs); develop the apprenticeship scheme; optimise the potential of the local supply chain to bid for work on the sites; engage with educational establishments; develop workforce transition plans including training and support for the workers; and improve supply chain communications so they are aware of what work is timetabled to happen when. CFP will produce an annual resource plan for stakeholders. Due consideration must be given to opportunities to work across sites on multi-station sites.	
9.4	Pete Knollmeyer gave a short introduction to Cavendish Fluor and their aims and objectives. The term 'closure programme' is being used to signify the intention that sites will be closed and left unmanned, monitored remotely. The schedule is the same as that under Energy Solutions, but the intention is to reduce the workforce more quickly as that is where cost savings lie. There will be an	

increased focus on security and no reduction in safety. Skills from the CFP parent company Babcock will be brought in. Parent company staff working for CFP are required to sign a contract for a minimum term to avoid a revolving door, and they are required to do their best for CFP not the parent company.

9.4.1 Mr Knollmeyer emphasised the importance of having a well motivated workforce, good relations with the unions and dialogue with stakeholders in order to deliver the contract. The parent companies have a large workforce in the UK working in other, but allied areas and looking to develop business further. An offer of work will be made to any member of staff who wishes to remain with the company, and an effort will be made to tide staff over from the end of one job to the start of another.

9.5 Kelly Duane welcomed the opportunity to speak to the meeting, though it was early in the contract. She stressed Cavendish Fluor's commitment to socio-economic support and open and transparent engagement with site stakeholders. It is important that CFP works with stakeholders in order to understand what it is they need in terms of socio-economic support. CFP recognises that each site will have different requirements and that they need to take into account local issues, existing initiatives and the culture and environment around each site. The assumptions made in the bid must also be checked to ensure they are correct.

9.5.1 Decommissioning dates are being reviewed. Some may accelerate and some be delayed. CFP aim to publish the plan by April 2015.

9.5.2 CFP plan to combine Magnox and RSRL into one organisation and relicence in the middle of 2015. They will review each organisations current socio-economic plan and review them against the proposals in the CFP bid. SMART (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic, Timed) targets will also be set. Socio-economics at the sites will be assessed and evaluated up to March 2015. Stakeholder consultation will take place between January to September 2015 and the three year rolling plan will be published in September 2015.

9.6 In response to questions from the meeting:

9.6.1 CFP were looking to target socio-economic support where it could make most impact. They can also provide support other than financial, i.e. provision of redundant computer stock.

9.6.2 NDA is considering how long socio-economic support will be provided following the closure of a site. Their aim is to support agencies in mitigating the impact of site closure.

9.6.3 There will be opportunities to work in the new build programme but these may require staff to relocate.

9.6.4 There may be some changes in the approach taken by Energy Solutions to dealing with Fuel Element Debris (FED). Where site plans are mature there will be no change, but elsewhere will consider moving away from dissolution to direct encapsulation. However, CFP

	needs to consult workforce first to gain their expertise before taking their proposal to NDA. There will then be regulatory and stakeholder engagement. Whilst there is no firm timeline it is hoped that this can be progressed within the next year.
9.6.5	CFP are negotiating with companies involved in new build project to ensure staff are released at an appropriate time to the disadvantage of neither party.
9.6.6	On cross boundary working, a number of initiatives are being considered including combined Intermediate Level Waste stores and active effluent treatment facilities. CFP has recruited a former Chairman of EDF to their board with the view of facilitating good working relationships, and a similar approach will be made to other companies.
9.6.7	CFP said that it would need to identify the appropriate stakeholders for engagement and encouraged NuLeAF members to contact them if there any issues they wished to discuss. The meeting advised them that local authorities were best approached through NuLeAF rather than Site Stakeholder Groups.
9.7	The Chair thanked CFP and NDA for an informative and open presentation and discussion.

## ACTION LIST

<b>Steering Group, 15 October 2014</b>			
2.1	Post minutes of previous meeting on website	CD	Done 12.11.14
4.5	Incorporate points from discussion into revised GDF Briefing Paper	PM	In-hand
5.3	Write to Sellafield highlighting need to include local authorities in all discussion which affect local communities.	PM	Superseded by change of management at NDA. Will contact when new management structure is clear.
6.3	Contact LLWR Ltd re possible site visit around July SG meeting	PM/CD	Scheduled for 22.7.15
<b>Steering Group, 24 July 2014</b>			
6.10	Ask DECC for clarity on its timeline (GDF) in order to assist NuLeAF in timetabling internal discussions	PM	Raised with DECC. Timeline not yet agreed