

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 January 2016, 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 David Chubb, South Gloucestershire Council
Cllr Peter Downing, Sedgemoor District Council
Cllr Grace Fletcher-Hackwood, Manchester City Council
Cllr David Godfrey, Shepway District Council
Cllr Geoff Holdcroft, Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr Marcus Johnstone, Lancashire County Council
Cllr David Monk, Shepway District Council
Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council
Richard Griffin, Cumbria County Council
Catherine Hadfield, Allerdale Borough Council
Dave Illsley, Shepway District Council
Guy Robinson, Somerset County Council
Clive Pink, Suffolk Coastal District Council
John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council
Steve Smith, Copeland Borough Council
Philip Matthews, NuLeAF
Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	ACTION
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: Nik Hardy – Allerdale Borough Council, Mike Garrity – Dorset Borough Council, Lesley Stenhouse - Essex County Council, Bryan Geake - Kent County Council, Rob Sellen – Hampshire County Council, Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council, Sean Morris – Manchester City Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Phil Watson – Northamptonshire County Council, Peter Day and Trevor Brown – Oxfordshire County Council, Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council, Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Matt Meldrum - West Berkshire Council, Cllr Chris Morgan & Andrew Goodchild - West Somerset Council.	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 OCTOBER, 2015	
2.1	The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2015 were held to be a true and accurate record and will be posted on the website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	All actions from previous meetings were in hand or would be addressed through the course of the meeting.	
4	UPDATE ON THE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY SITING PROCESS	
4.1	PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Representation Working Group • GDF siting process in Wales 	PM
4.2	The Chair highlighted the close working relationship with RWM, who see NuLeAF as a way of delivering their message to local government. NuLeAF and RWM will be co-hosting a stand and a fringe event at the Local Government Association Conference in July.	
4.3	NuLeAF has been asked to assist in the production of the national geological guidance by providing a focus group to consider outputs. The timing of this work is not yet known. It was proposed that RWM should be invited to give a presentation to the March SG meeting if timing was appropriate. PM will discuss this with RWM when he meets their MD on 3 February.	
4.4	A question was asked about how policy could be applied across 3 different governmental administrations. PM responded that the situation was complex, although Welsh Government policy was mostly in line with that of England. Ultimately it was up to RWM and central government to decide which site provides the best solution.	
4.5	The response to the Call for Evidence on issues surrounding community representation had come predominantly from organisations rather than individuals. The nature of the responses had ranged from specific to the general.	
4.6	The meeting stressed that the issue of how a community is defined remains of paramount importance and were disappointed that no progress on this topic had yet been demonstrated. PM noted that this issue was due to be discussed at the CRWG the following week.	
5	UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENTS IN NDA STRATEGY AND OPERATIONS	
5.1	PM introduced the paper which included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report from Theme Overview Groups (TOGs) • NDA Strategy III and Business Plan 2016-19 consultations • NDA National Stakeholder event 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spending Review: implications for NDA • Updated NDA Values Framework published • Magnox Socio-economic plan • New Chair for Sellafield Ltd Board announced • LLW National Strategic BAT meeting 	
5.2	The Chair asked that PM approach NDA for an update on their discussions at the Spent Fuel and Nuclear Materials Theme Overview Group.	PM
5.3	<i>Stakeholder engagement</i>	
5.3.1	SS highlighted that there was an opportunity to comment on local stakeholder engagement in the response to draft Strategy III. Feeling in Copeland is that the SSG does not work as effectively as it could.	
5.3.2	Views were mixed about the effectiveness of SSGs, but it was noted that they should not be considered as the only method of engaging with local authorities. They are not designed to deal with the level of technical engagement which is sometimes necessary. Information is not always disseminated by those who attend the meetings to other members of their organisation.	
5.3.3	The Chair commented that he thought NDA was becoming keener to talk to local authorities through other means other than via SSGs. However he was disappointed with the content of the NDA National Stakeholder Event which lacked an opportunity for two-way dialogue.	
5.3.4	The SG will take this issue up with John Clarke when he attends the meeting on 7 June.	PM/RS
5.4	<i>Strategy III consultation response</i>	
5.4.1	PM introduced the paper. There had been some changes to the draft Strategy since the earlier consultation. The number of questions had been reduced.	
5.4.2	GEK pointed out that it would have been helpful if the updated strategy showed where it had changed from the earlier version. Also if reasons were given where changes had not been made despite comments, why this was.	
5.4.3	Cllr M provided copies of Shepway DC's responses to both the Strategy III and Business Plan.	
5.4.4	The Chair commented that it was very disappointing that NDA had pulled out of their commitment to give a presentation on the revised draft Strategy III that afternoon. It was not a good demonstration of stakeholder engagement.	
5.4.5	The meeting discussed the reference to a single radioactive waste strategy, of which little was known. NuLeAF will ascertain the status of the Higher Activity Waste Strategy which had been flagged up in 2015 and circulate the response.	PM/CD

5.4.6	It was agreed that the NuLeAF response should highlight the lack of reference to planning in the draft Strategy and encourage engagement with local authorities on this topic.	
5.4.7	SS gave the meeting an overview of the response from Copeland BC to the consultation. They are concerned that it is often difficult to have meaningful engagement with NDA, and 'it's outside our remit' is given too often as a reason for not discussing issues, especially in relation to socio-economics. Copeland BC will be writing to DECC as it recognises some of these issues need governmental input. NuLeAF will also write to DECC.	PM
5.4.8	Cllr F-H advised the meeting that the NFLA response would not be greatly different from that circulated by NuLeAF. They would not be seeking to include new build, and support more reference to environmental principles in Q8 and Q9.	
5.5	<i>Business Plan</i>	
5.5.1	SS commented that it would have been helpful if NDA had attended the meeting to discuss the Business Plan. He raised the lack of any definite plan or timetable for dealing with the plutonium stockpile. He also would like to see clearer indication of what NDA is hoping to achieve through its socio-economic policy.	
5.5.2	GR raised concerns about the changing narrative on waste management by Magnox and the lack of engagement and detail on what exactly is going to happen.	
5.5.3	In response to a question from Cllr F-H it was agreed that NuLeAF should find out how NDA proposed to save the £1Bn required under the Comprehensive Spending Review.	PM
5.5.4	It was suggested that in a year's time an invitation to attend the meeting could be sent to Tony Fountain.	PM/CD
6	DECOMMISSIONING AT EDF STATIONS	
6.1	PM introduced the paper which provided an overview of decommissioning plans at the current EDF fleet of nuclear power stations. He also noted that EDF had begun to attend some NDA Theme Overview Group meetings.	
6.2	The Vice-Chair noted that as many of the EDF stations were due to begin decommissioning within the lifetime of Local Plans, EDF should be in discussions with the relevant local authorities, but he was not aware that this was happening. It was agreed that EDF should be invited to give a presentation/discussion at a subsequent meeting. DECC may also be asked to attend.	CD/PM
6.3	CD undertook to ask if the decommissioning paper which she had received from EDF could be circulated to meeting members.	CD

7	NuLeAF FINANCES	
7.1	PM advised the meeting that he and the Chair had had brief encouraging conversations with John Clarke and Bruce McKirdy in the margins of the national stakeholder event regarding NDA and RWM's funding contribution. He would be meeting with RWM the following week and discussing with NDA in the near future too. NuLeAF had written to both organisations early in the new year outlining the work it had carried out in assisting NDA and RWM deliver their missions.	
7.2	In response to a question PM advised the meeting that he had yet to approach Welsh Government regarding funding. He had held off making contact pending discussions with NDA and RWM and for Welsh policy on Higher Activity Waste to be finalised.	
7.3	The possibility of working with similar international partner organisations elsewhere was raised, but CD advised that her research had found that NuLeAF was a fairly unique organisation in the breadth of its role and the way it worked across local and central government, operators and regulators. It would difficult to find a suitable organisation to partner.	
7.4	Cllr M advised the meeting that Shepway District Council had made a specific reference in their response to the Strategy III consultation to the importance of NDA maintaining their funding support of NuLeAF.	
7.5	The Chair advised the meeting that a letter had been sent to all Corresponding Members asking for a contribution of £100 in recognition of the value of the information they receive from NuLeAF. Letters would also be sent to those local authorities with nuclear licensed sites within their borders who were not Contributing Members.	
7.6	The Steering Group agreed that the Officers and Secretariat should continue to monitor NuLeAF's financial situation, and seek further funding opportunities where possible.	
8	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
8.1	The next meeting will be held on Thursday, 10 March, 2016, 11.00 – 2.45 at the Town Hall, Manchester.	
9	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
9.1	Cllr Richard Smith advised the meeting that he would not be able to attend on March 10 th and Cllr Brendan Sweeney would Chair the meeting. His term as Chair would cease at the AGM in June and he thanked Brendan for his support and hoped that he would stand as Chair. He encouraged elected members from contributing authorities to consider whether they would stand as Vice-Chair, or Chair.	

9.2	JP read out a section of a letter from the Head of OND to Somerset County Council regarding the retention of business rates at new nuclear power stations and the implications for community benefits. There is still little clarity on what portion, if any of business rates on new nuclear stations will be kept by local authorities.	
10	EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING	
10.1	A paper was submitted to the meeting presenting an amendment to the Constitution which would permit the re-alignment of the meeting schedule which had been agreed at the AGM in October 2015.	
10.2	The amendment was proposed by the Chair and seconded by the Vice-Chair and passed unanimously.	
11	PRESENTATION BY JOHN RENNILSON OF CoRWM	
11.1	The Chair welcomed John Rennilson, a member of the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM), and thanked him for stepping in to speak at very short notice.	
11.2	JR thanked the Chair and advised the meeting that on some points he would have to give a personal, rather than a CoRWM opinion. He went on to give an overview of his background prior to joining CoRWM which had been in local government in both Scotland and England. His experience allowed him to give advice on how to involve the public in stakeholder engagement.	
11.3	JR gave an overview of the history of CoRWM. It was established in 2003 as an independent advisory body to provide scrutiny and advice to Government on issues related to the management of radioactive waste in the UK. In that iteration it was well funded and the members brought a broad range of experience to the table. Following production of a report in 2006 which had a number of recommendations including Geological Disposal as the best method currently available for dealing with the UK's Higher Activity Wastes, CoRWM was then reconstituted in 2007 with a smaller budget, revised Terms of Reference and a commitment to pay its members for one day of work per week. The body was further reduced in size and budget in 2012. The uncertainty about the composition of the group continues with four members' contracts having expired in autumn 2015 and temporary contracts currently in place. Following the 2015 Triennial Review, Government has just awarded an external contract to re-recruit the full membership tally. JR raised his concerns about the timing and expense of this.	
11.4	CoRWM is completely funded by DECC, although 25% of their time is spent on work for the Scottish and Welsh administrations who provide no direct financial support.	
11.5	CoRWM's approach to their work has evolved. Previously they produced reports for submission to Ministers, but it is now	

	<p>considered more timely to comment on draft documents produced by DECC and other bodies. Although this means their work/input is less visible, they feel they are making a more satisfactory contribution.</p>	
11.6	<p>Because of pressures of funding and the sensitivity of issues, CoRWM no longer holds public events, although plenary meetings where decisions are made are still open to the public.</p>	
11.7	<p>The last 18 months has focused on working with DECC on implementing the White Paper; with RWM on geological screening; with the Communities Representation Working Group, and on sub-group visits.</p>	
11.8	<p>CoRWM is disappointed by its web presence which has deteriorated since it moved onto gov.uk. This has been a result of the turnover of the secretariat provided by DECC. It is important that this improves especially over the next 12-18 months as it provides an important resource for the public.</p>	
11.9	<p>55% of their work time has been spent on siting policy. This is then followed by helping Welsh Government formulate its policy on Higher Activity Wastes. The remainder of the time spent on safety and interim storage. For CoRWM the safety case is of prime importance, which includes but is not exclusively geology.</p>	
11.10	<p>As a Non-Departmental Public Body, CoRWM is reviewed every three years (Triennial Review) to consider whether its purpose is still required. The 2015 review took nine months as opposed to the previous review in six. There were 23 respondents. The majority view was that the functions delivered by CoRWM were still important and it provided reassurance to the public that there was independent scrutiny of government.</p>	
11.11	<p>JR commented that the work programme of the CRWG had slipped and thought it likely that there may be need for a further meeting at the end of the current timetable. This could push public consultation into the summer or later. He stressed the importance of getting this stage of the process right, otherwise there was the possibility that the process might stall again.</p>	
11.12	<p>JR went on to raise concerns about RWMs ability to present information in a form which would be comprehensible by the general public. RWM will be appointing a Strategic Communication Partner to assist them. It is important that expectations on the geological guidance outputs is managed as the level of detail is unlikely to match people's expectations.</p>	
11.13	<p>CoRWM's understanding is that the Minister would like the process to open up to the public to express an interest in early 2017. It is important that the safety cases are available at this time.</p>	
11.14	<p>CoRWM has been advised that it may have to make a 22% cut in its budget in line with the 22% required of DECC following the</p>	

11.15	Comprehensive Spending Review. This will have to be considered in its work programme which is currently being produced.
11.16	JR said he was pleased with the paper produced by DECC for the CRWG on the Call for Evidence and the issues around the definition of community and community investment.
11.16	<p>Questions</p> <p><i>Q: Can you provide an update on land use?</i></p> <p>A: The draft NPS, Habitats Regulation and Appraisal of Sustainability should be published in mid to late Spring for consultation. The Independent Review Panel is not meeting DECC until March to consider the geology output so this may also be delayed.</p> <p><i>Q: Is there anything NuLeAF can do to assist CoRWM?</i></p> <p>A: When we publish our work programme it will contain information about the budget. You may wish to comment on how the budget may restrict working hours and thus the delivery of certain tasks. If CoRWM is down-sized as an interim move, it would be difficult to regenerate it later in a timely way. This would also have implications for the breadth of experience the group would have.</p> <p><i>Q: The current GDF siting process includes future waste arising from new nuclear build in the inventory, whereas this was not necessarily the case under the MRWS process. What are CoRWM's views on this?</i></p> <p>A: CoRWM originally stated that waste from new build was separate to the GDF siting process (MRWS). Government did not take this view and CoRWM decided this was a political decision and outside its remit to pursue. New build wastes will be hotter and in many cases may stay on-site at the station for 100 years. Its ultimate disposal site may be the same GDF or another may be developed. We may not know the answer to that for 20-30 years.</p> <p><i>Q: There was previously talk of including a research facility on the GDF site, but I haven't heard this discussed lately.</i></p> <p>A: CoRWM were keen for this to go ahead to help reduce volumes of waste. However, I am not aware of RWM taking this forward at the moment.</p> <p><i>Q: You referred the need for RWM to manage expectations in relation to the geological guidance outputs, do you see that as part of the role of the Communications Partner RWM are recruiting?</i></p> <p>A: Our understanding is that a contract will be issued to BGS in March. The material is likely to be available in the autumn. We hope that Cabinet Office can approve the spending on the Strategic Communications Partner at the earliest possible time. The scale of the detail in the guidance will mean that you won't be able to see where your home falls on the geological maps – it is based on</p>

<p>information currently available, and is a siting not a screening exercise.</p> <p><i>Q: Would a worked out potash mine be a suitable candidate or would the geology be regarded as compromised? I'm thinking about those local authorities which don't currently engage with NuLeAF and who we should approach to raise their awareness of the process.</i></p> <p>A: It has possibilities. Interested parties can go to RWM now and ask for information off the record.</p> <p><i>Q: Is the preparation of any particular reports in the current CoRWM work programme?</i></p> <p>A: Not specifically. We are more likely to concentrate on responding to draft documents.</p> <p>The Chair thanked JR for an interesting and thought provoking presentation and discussion.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 2.30 p.m.</p>	
---	--

ACTION LIST

Steering Group, 28 January, 2016			
2.1	Post Minutes of SG 15 Oct 2015 on website	CD	Done
4.3	Discuss opportunity to consider national geological screening outputs at meeting on 3 Feb with RWM	PM	Done
5.2	Seek update on work by SNF&NM TOG	PM	
5.3.4	Raise issue of SSGs and engagement with local authorities with John Clarke at meeting on 17 June	PM/RS	
5.4.7	Write to DECC re NDA socio-economic engagement remit	PM	
5.5.3	Find out how NDA proposes to save £1Bn on budget	PM	
5.5.4	Invite Tony Fountain to SG meeting in 2017	PM/CD	
6.2	Invite EDF to give presentation to future meeting.	CD	Attending 7 September
6.3	Ask EDF if paper can be circulated	CD	Done
Steering Group, 15 October, 2015			
2.1	Amend Minutes of 23 July as directed	CD	Done
2.2	Post Minutes of 23 July on website	CD	Done
4.2	Ascertain who is preparing the Societal Aspects Status report and its status.	PM	ARUP are preparing the report on behalf of RWM.

4.5	Consider holding NuLeAF SG meeting in Wales to facilitate meetings with Welsh local authorities around GDF	PM/CD	In hand.
5.4	Ascertain if it is still UK policy for any new station build to be accompanied by a station decommissioning	PM	No clarity as yet.
6.4	Write to tier 2/3 contractors around Sellafield site for funding contribution	PM	Awaiting clarity on core funding for 2016/17 from NDA/RWM.
Steering Group, 23 July, 2015			
7.6	Contact Welsh Government re: funding support	PM	In-hand
11.2	Seek clarity on the distribution of business rates from new nuclear build. Prepare paper to October SG if necessary	PM	In-hand
11.3	Pass SCCORS secretariat details to NuLeAF	SM	In-hand
Steering Group, 14 May, 2015			
5.8	Seek meeting with LGA Chair and Lead Board Members	CD/CG	Awaiting appointment of board (September)
5.10	Consider cross SIG issues such as NSIPS and developing an LGA approach to central government to move issues forward.	CG	CG now moved on. Will follow up with replacement
5.12	Check NuLeAF Minutes are read.	CG	
5.13	Look at LGA work programme and that of other SIGs for common interests	PM	Information requested from LGA. No response to date.
5.14	Circulate list of LGA Board members and political affiliation (when new Board formed)	CD	Awaiting appointment of board (September)
6.8	Identify topics for commissioned work	PM	In-hand