

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 7 June, 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/Chair)
Cllr Van Coulter, Oxford City Council
Cllr Peter Downing, Sedgemoor District Council
Cllr Grace Fletcher-Hackwood, Manchester City Council
Cllr Geoff Holdcroft, Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr David Monk, Shepway District Council (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Chris Morgan, West Somerset Council
Cllr David Southward, Cumbria County Council
Terry Burns, Essex County Council
Lisa Chandler, Suffolk Coastal District Council
Richard Conway, Purbeck District Council
Richard Griffin, Cumbria County Council
Katharine Harvey, Shepway District Council
Sean Morris, Manchester City 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. He noted that he would only be Chair for the first part of the meeting and that following the AGM, Cllr Sweeney would take over. Participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Nik Hardy – Allerdale Borough Council, Mike Garrity – Dorset Borough Council, Lesley Stenhouse – Essex County Council, Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council, Bryan Geake – Kent County Council, Cllr Marcus Johnstone – Lancashire County Council, Phil Watson – Northamptonshire County Council, Peter Day– Oxfordshire County Council, Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Jonathan Cawley – Snowdonia National Park, Guy Robinson – Somerset County Council, Cllr Matthew Riddle & Gillian Ellis-King – South Gloucestershire Council, Clive Pink – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Andrew Goodchild – West Somerset Council	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 MARCH, 2016	
2.1	Although not present at the meeting, comments on the draft Minutes and papers had been submitted by Cllr Matthew Riddle and Gillian Ellis-King of South Gloucestershire Council.	
2.2	4.9 It should be reflected in the Minutes that a request had been made for NuLeAF to push NDA to engage with affected communities over the production of lifetime plans.	CD
2.3	Subject to the above amendment, the Minutes were approved as a true and accurate record and would be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	4.5.2 A number of those present felt that the statement by Bill Hamilton felt that the statement by Bill Hamilton that there would be no consultation on the Lifetime Plans ran contrary to moves by NDA at their recent Manchester workshop on decommissioning. At that workshop there seemed to be a clear consensus that improved engagement with/involvement of Local Authorities with the NDA on their forward plans is needed and would be welcomed by NDA, and also that effective engagement/consultation with local communities is also needed. A request was made that NuLeAF push NDA on this matter.	PM
4	DISCUSSION WITH JOHN CLARKE, CEO, NDA	
4.1	The Chair welcomed Mr Clarke and Laurence Meehan to the meeting.	
4.2	Mr Clarke thanked Cllr Smith for his welcome and NuLeAF for the invitation to attend the meeting. There were three topics he wished to cover: NDA structure and changes of relevance to local government; NDA estate; and the way NDA interfaces with NuLeAF and local government.	
4.3	<i>NDA structure:</i> The main point to note was the departure in March 2016 of John Phillips, NDA Communications Director. His replacement is Paul Vallance who joins NDA from Rolls Royce, but also has experience in the nuclear sector. Laurence Meehan also joined the Communications Team in January, coming from LGA, and is looking after media and public relations. Andrew Van Der Lem joined from the civil service in November 2015 and is acting as NDA's prime interface with national government.	
4.4	<i>NDA estate:</i> NDA has now reached the position where the management arrangements are in place at all sites to the satisfaction of Mr Clarke and the Board. The fuel fabrication business at Springfields has been sold to Westinghouse. The Capenhurst site has been sold to Urenco, of which UK Government is one of the partners. The contract with Nuclear Waste Management Partners at LLWR will continue for a third five-year term as a result of their efforts in extending the life expectancy of	

the site (ongoing planning issues notwithstanding). Cavendish Dounreay Partnership won the Parent Body Organisation competition for Dounreay 3 years ago. They have committed to moving some materials to Sellafield, but no additional funding is available for this, therefore some other work has been deferred. The Parent Body Organisation competition for the Magnox and RSRL sites was won by Cavendish Fluor Partnership nearly two years ago and they are in the final part of the consolidation stage, whereby they ascertain if the assumptions on which they based their bid are true. It is a target cost contract. Changes to the Sellafield management structure were announced in 2015 and came into effect on 1 April 2016. It is now a subsidiary of NDA.

4.4.1 There are 2 issues of concern. The first is that standards of safety across the Magnox sites are trending downwards. This is not to say that the sites are unsafe, but a previous excellent safety record has slipped. This is of concern to NDA and to Cavendish Fluor Partnership. It is also of some concern to safety and environmental regulators. NDA is determined to reverse the trend and regain their excellent safety status.

4.4.2 The second issue is funding at Dounreay. Although NDA received a good funding settlement, it is not sufficient to carry out the full programme of work they would like. NDA is 2/3 funded by government and 1/3 by income. However, the income stream has started to decline for a variety of reasons. When compiling figures for the current Spending Review, NDA was asked to be as optimistic as possible in terms of income, with the offer of backing from the Treasury if this was not realised. However, there is now a reticence on the part of Treasury to stand by this.

4.5 NDA values the work NuLeAF does and is keen to make sure it supports NuLeAF and in turn NuLeAF supports NDA's work. NDA is also working directly with various councils and is keen to ensure it has the correct route for each issue.

4.6 Cllr Smith thanked Mr Clarke for his update and for his kind words about NuLeAF. He hoped that we gave value for money. It is in no small part to Mr Clarke that NuLeAF has sufficient funding for this financial year.

The floor was then opened for questions.

4.7 *Cllr Smith asked for clarification about waste reprocessing at Sellafield.*

Sellafield remains on target to reprocess all reprocessable fuel by the time the treatment plant closes. There will be some Magnox type fuel left over, but this is from early nuclear production and is not in a condition suitable for reprocessing. It will be packaged and stored until it can be disposed to the GDF. The decision to close the Thorp plant was made on economic grounds. An investment of £1.5Bn would be required to keep it operating and that does not represent value for money for the UK taxpayer. Operation will cease when all fuel which needs reprocessing has been dealt with. Any remaining fuel will be held in long-term wet storage and then

disposed of to the GDF. There will be up to 7000 te of un-reprocessed fuel such as that from the Dounreay reactors. The Dounreay reactors were of a very different design to other reactors and some of this fuel is proving very hard to extract. It will eventually be disposed to the GDF.

- 4.8 *Cllr Morgan said he was disappointed to hear Mr Clarke's comments about the decline in the safety record. He was also concerned about the perceived lack of progress on the GDF siting process, especially around the provision of community benefits. Promises made on the delivery of socio-economic benefits associated with the Hinkley Point C project were being rolled back. Failure by DECC and UK Government to abide by commitments on the GDF siting process could result in the project failing.*

Mr Clarke said in comparison to non-nuclear sites the safety record on the NDA estate was good. However, in the past it had been exceptionally good and it had slipped from that standing. He wanted to get back to that level. He was unable to comment on new nuclear build issues, but the GDF is a key underpinning of NDA's work and much of the waste generated in England and Waste will go there for disposal. The programme is still being led by DECC with support from RWM (a wholly owned subsidiary of NDA). At present work is being carried out on the definition of what is a community and what community benefits would be appropriate and welcomed by a host community. Mr Clarke's understanding was that the search for a host community will be opened just after local government elections in 2017. At this point the lead organisation will change from DECC to RWM. The GDF is a social challenge rather than technical and the big issue is whether they can find a community which is content to have the facility in its area.

- 4.9 *Sean Morris raised 3 issues around consultation. The HAW Strategy had been published recently and he was not clear whether there was a formal consultation accompanying it or not. Regarding the delicensing of sites, at the last SG meeting it was announced that that NDA would be holding a meeting in Manchester and there would be a wide invitation to attend. However, the NFLA had not been included in that invitation. Finally, he was concerned about the announcement that waste from Dounreay would be going to the USA by air, and the associated changes being made to Wick airport. NFLA had previously been involved in consultations regarding rail and sea transport, but there seem to have been no consultation about these plans.*

Mr Clarke responded that the HAW Strategy consultation was with a small 'c' rather than a capital. Comments were welcome. The Strategy contained no changes to existing plans, but rather NDA was seeking views on the direction of travel. Regarding the workshop Mr Clarke was not aware who was invited but he will go back to the organisers and make them aware of the omission. The focus of the work is the shift from nuclear regulator to environmental regulator. At present a site must be cleared of all nuclear material regardless of the end state use. On Dounreay – a lot has been said not all of which was accurate. Waste is not being sent from Dounreay to the USA. Some specific highly enriched

NDA

uranium which is not a waste is being sent to the USA for processing. In turn an equivalent amount of medical isotopes will come to the UK. Air transport is an option which is being considered and work is being carried out on the airport to facilitate that method of transport if it is chosen. It is difficult to consult on this topic because of government sensitivity on certain materials.

4.10 *Steve Smith asked if the outcome of the EU referendum was expected to impact on the work of NDA in any way?*

Mr Clarke commented that because of purdah he was unable to make any statement either for or against remaining in Europe. However, it is a matter of fact that a lot of the regulations and protocols in nuclear industry and nuclear decommissioning are pan-European. There would be significant changes if Britain was to leave the EU.

4.11 *John Pitchford asked if Mr Clarke's reference to discussions with individual local authorities referred to any particular issues, and whether it was just NDA or did that include Cavendish Fluor?*

Mr Clarke said that discussion tended to be around the movement of materials around certain sites, i.e. from Harwell to Winfrith. NDA needs to speak to councils earlier in the process and in more detail.

4.12 *Phil Matthews commented that there was a lot in Strategy III about changes in engagement including with SSGs, and direct engagement on socio-economic issues. Could Mr Clarke give more information about how this would happen in practice?*

Mr Clarke responded that stakeholder engagement was a critical enabler for NDA. They wished to discuss how well the SSGs were functioning, but as yet no plans about how this would take place were in place.

4.13 *Cllr Coulter asked how open to innovation was NDA? Automation is moving at a tremendous pace and with the internet of things it is possible to show in real-time how safe a site is by sharing monitoring data. What would NDA think of an IOT website?*

Mr Clarke said that NDA is very encouraging of technical innovation. A supply chain conference is held annually to push suppliers to consider different ways of doing things. Innovations in technology at Sellafield have allowed simpler processes to be used. Ideas have been taken from underwater work in the North Sea and adapted for use in ponds, and then exported back. There are two key drivers for NDA this year – we want to do things better, and we want to do better things. There are good examples where real-time information has been available to the public i.e. time lapse camera at Bradwell and Dungeness. However, anything web-based needs to be cyber-secure.

4.14 *Cllr Coulter said that taking material which was destined for disposal and turning into medical isotopes was a positive message.*

Mr Clarke said he wanted to move NDA from being a bit reactive and defensive to being proactive and open. There should be nothing to hide except those things which are of national security.

<p>4.15</p> <p>4.16</p> <p>4.17</p> <p>4.18</p> <p>4.12</p>	<p><i>Cllr Sweeney asked if NDA is responsible for delivering the near surface storage solutions in Scotland? Also, would EDF decommission their own stations, and how can we get more information on what is proposed?</i></p> <p>Mr Clarke confirmed that NDA was responsible for decommissioning in Scotland. With regard to EDF stations, at present the plan was that EDF would be responsible for decommissioning their fleet, however, there is the option that UK government could take the stations back into public ownership at the end of power generation. Mr Clarke said he would take the request for further information to DECC.</p> <p><i>Cllr Sweeney asked how the transfer of management structure at Sellafield was going?</i></p> <p>Mr Clarke respond positively saying it had gone better than they could have hoped for. There were no signs of negative trends on environmental indicators and output levels were astonishingly good.</p> <p><i>Cllr Morgan asked for clarification over funding for decommissioning of new nuclear stations.</i></p> <p>Mr Clarke said that historic sites were funded by the UK taxpayer as there was no fund. Decommissioning of the current fleet of stations was supported by the Nuclear Liability Fund which was set up on the sale of British Energy to EDF. If the Fund is insufficient to meet costs, then responsibility is with the taxpayer to meet the deficit. With new build sites, each site or cluster of sites with a single owner will have a decommissioning fund created in advance of the reactor starting up and the operator will continue to pay into the fund during the operational lifetime of the station.</p> <p>Cllr Smith thanked Mr Clarke and Mr Meehan for attending the meeting and for their support of NuLeAF. Mr Clarke and Mr Meehan left the meeting.</p> <p>The meeting broke to take the AGM.</p>	<p>NDA</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>DISCUSSION WITH EAMON LALLY ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (LGA) AND THEIR SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS (SIGs).</p>	
<p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p>Cllr Sweeney took the Chair and welcomed Eamon Lally, LGA Policy Officer to the meeting. Cllr Sweeney gave a brief overview of NuLeAF's efforts to engage with LGA.</p> <p>Eamon Lally introduced himself. He is the senior officer at LGA who supports the Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board (EEHT). The Board is chaired by Cllr Peter Box of Wakefield MBC. Membership of the Board is currently being reviewed. The Board seeks input from members on what work it should undertake, but it also receives commissions from LGA Executive. Work undertaken by the Board is confined by policy set by LGA. Reports are scrutinised by all political parties and LGA leadership prior to publication. The advantage of SIGs is their independence and that they can make direct representation to government. LGA expects SIGs to operate within the brand of LGA. SIGs can seek LGA Board</p>	

	<p>support in their representations to government. The Board meets 4 times a year, but work is carried on outside those meetings. It would help if NuLeAF could indicate where the Board could be of particular assistance, Eamon could then engage with the Board membership.</p> <p>The floor opened up to questions</p>	
5.2	<p>Cllr Holdcroft thanked Eamon for his presentation. As Chair of the New Nuclear Local Authorities Group (NNLAG), another SIG, it had helped clarify their role within LGA. He saw that LGA could be of assistance in broadening the appeal of the SIG and in recruiting members.</p>	
5.3	<p>Cllr Sweeney said that LGA could help NuLeAF in raising its profile with local authorities who think nuclear issues have no relevance for them. There are big economic opportunities associated with the GDF process, of which many authorities are unaware. Where central government is concerned LGA could help improve engagement with DCLG, but also provide support in NuLeAF's work on the provision of community benefits for affected communities. Treasury is perceived as blocking projects because they offer as little as possible, or are vague.</p>	
5.4	<p>It was agreed that a briefing meeting between NuLeAF and Cllr Box would be arranged.</p>	EL/PM
5.5	<p>Eamon Lally asked if in terms of representation of councils if there were any NuLeAF was not reaching. In response Catherine Draper said that all councils had a responsibility to make provision for radioactive waste and ideally every council should be a member of NuLeAF. Phil Matthews also said there were those who may be interested in the opportunities offered by hosting a GDF, but who were unaware of the project.</p>	
5.6	<p>Cllr Sweeney thanks Mr Lally for attending the meeting and looked forward to a closer working relationship with LGA in the future.</p>	
6	<p>UPDATE ON THE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY (GDF) SITING PROCESS</p>	
6.1	<p>PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Community Representation Working Group (CRWG); • GDF Stakeholder Action Group • NuLeAF/RWM event at 2016 Local Government Association Conference • RWM Societal Aspects report • CoRWM update • National Policy Statement on the GDF; and • National Geological Screening. 	
6.2	<p>PM highlighted that the work of the CRWG had now concluded. DECC would now prepare a paper based on the comments made by the group which would be submitted to Ministers for consideration.</p>	

6.3	In response to a request for a show of hands, Cllrs Holdcroft, Monk, Smith and Sweeney indicated that they would be attending the LGA Conference.	
6.4	The Steering Group noted the content of the report.	
7	UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENTS IN NDA STRATEGY AND OPERATIONS	
7.1	<p>PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • updates from Theme Overview Groups • the publication of the Higher Activity Waste Strategy; • the meeting on Guidance on Requirements for Release of Nuclear Sites from Radioactive Substances Regulation (GRR); and • E-learning module on Low Level Radioactive Waste. 	
7.2	Steve Smith commented that in respect of use of the term 'optimised end-states' he found it hard to understand how an end-state can be optimised when all the solutions are not in place i.e. the GDF does not exist and there is limited capacity in current waste facilities.	
7.3	Cllr Smith commented that whilst a visit to one of the 'Lead and Learn' sites had been mooted, neither Trawsfynydd nor Winfrith were typical sites and therefore had limited comparison with the remaining Magnox sites. Dounreay would be more appropriate though any visit would be challenging because of distance.	
7.4	<p>Other comments on the GRR workshop in Manchester were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information or papers were circulated in advance of the workshop which did not allow those attending to prepare comments, and any comments made were reactive rather than considered. • Regarding NuLeAF's response to the consultation, they highlighted that members have been clear in all discussions on this topic that they do not have the expertise, financial resources or capacity to take on a regulatory function in relation to radioactive waste remaining on decommissioned sites. • South Gloucestershire Council noted that a key point of the meeting in Manchester was that NDA welcomed engagement with local authorities and that they looked forward to more engagement on decommissioning plans in the future. • They asked that it be recorded that there had been discussions at the workshop on integration with new build. For those Councils that also host a proposed or potential nuclear new build site, the Environment Agency was very supportive and the workshop generally welcoming of requests from local authorities for better exploration of the potential for integration of decommissioning with nuclear new build proposals, in terms of exploring the potential for reuse of brownfield land, facilities, materials, etc. 	

8	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
8.1	The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, 7 September 2016 at The Town Hall, Manchester, 11.00 – 3.00.	
9	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
9.1	There being no other business the meeting closed at 13.07.	
10	PRESENTATION BY PAUL LONSDALE, MAGNOX, CARE AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME	
10.1	Cllr Sweeney welcomed Paul Lonsdale to the meeting.	
10.2	Paul Lonsdale thanked NuLeAF for the invitation to speak. Care and Maintenance (C&M) is one of seven programmes in operation across the Magnox fleet. His role is to define the acceptance criteria of a site to enter Care and Maintenance, and to understand how the sites will be looked after, until 2104 in the case of Wylfa.	
10.3	Paul gave a brief overview of Magnox. All sites are based on core Magnox technology, but each differs slightly as that technology was developed and refined over time.	
10.4	The intention is that all Magnox sites will be in C&M by 2028. Magnox's mission is to safely deliver the sites into C&M with a workforce motivated to deliver the closure programme. As part of this Cavendish Fluor (the Parent Body Organisation of Magnox) offer to re-skill and re-deploy workers elsewhere within their organisation.	
10.5	The period of C&M permits radioactive isotopes present on the site to decay over time to a point where they present a smaller radiological hazard and therefore make the decommissioning process safer for the workers.	
10.6	Once reactors and ponds are de-fuelled and the fuel sent off site, then the radiological level of that site is reduced by 99%.	
10.7	During C&M Preparation phase, the aim is to make the site safe and minimise the amount of work which will be needed during C&M. Where possible buildings will be reduced/rationalised so there is as little as possible to look after.	
10.8	Sites will be monitored throughout C&M with programmed checks e.g. buildings will be structurally checked every five years. All waste packages will be regularly checked for signs of degradation.	
10.9	The aim is to make the sites passively safe i.e. they will require no active intervention to assure their safety. As part of the C&M preparation phase sites will be managed regionally, then moving to central management when all lessons have been learnt.	
10.10	Questions were invited: <i>Cllr Smith asked how far behind was work at Bradwell? This had been hailed as a lead site for early entry into the C&M phase.</i>	

- Paul replied that the reality of what was on site when the new PBO contract was implemented has meant that they have fallen behind on the timetable by 18 months - 3 years. Magnox now understands what is required to deliver the site into C&M.
- 10.11 *Cllr Coulter asked if it was a case of discovering things of which they were unaware, and would that experience be used elsewhere?*
Paul's response was that he thought that would always be the case. At Bradwell the issue had been predominantly around the reprocessing of Fuel Element Debris. Lessons learnt at Bradwell would be rolled out to other sites.
- 10.12 *John Pitchford raised concerns that the reactor buildings at Bradwell now looked larger than before because of the new cladding. At Sizewell they were hoping that the reactor building would be reduced in size.*
Paul responded that that type of cladding probably wouldn't be used again in the future, and that the approach at each site would be tailored to its needs. There is a risk to the workforce working on re-cladding and they would avoid unnecessary re-cladding if possible.
- 10.13 *Cllr Fletcher-Hackwood asked if risk was the same, how much cost was an issue in deciding between options?*
Paul said that the cost associated with any work is driven by risk. As technologies develop approaches will change.
- 10.14 *Cllr Sweeney said presumably it would be necessary to change cladding at least once during the C&M phase.*
Paul responded that it would be unlikely that a site could get through C&M without changing cladding, but they would be seeking to get maximum value.
- 10.15 *Steve Smith commented that the optimised end state would be influenced by the lack of availability of disposal solutions.*
Paul confirmed this was the case. One of the main challenges is the dismantling of a reactor. The core is like a graphite honeycomb. It's a global issue and at present there is no way of treating it. Waste routes are always an issue.
- 10.16 *Terry Burns raised concerns about the quality of consultation by Magnox over the 2 planning applications submitted for the import of wastes to Bradwell. He felt that better consultation and engagement with the local authority and community by Magnox would have diffused the negative press which is currently surrounding the application.*
Paul said he would feed those views and concerns back.
- 10.17 *Terry Burns said that EDF, Magnox (CFP) and NDA needed to work together to provide a co-ordinated approach.*
Paul said that Magnox and EDF worked together to design EDF's decommissioning plans. Fluor are one of the largest decommissioning operations in the USA and their work there is 10-15 years ahead of operations in the UK. This know-how is being brought back in to the UK. Paul cited the example of Hunterston site where the A site is Magnox and B site EDF. The waste store being built on the A site is designed so it can take fuel from the B

	site, maximising use of limited space. EDF have in the past been focused on generation, however they now recognise that they are in the run down to decommissioning.	
10.18	<i>John Pitchford asked if there would be engagement as Magnox developed its decommissioning plans further and when could local authorities expect engagement on timelines for decommissioning?</i> Paul responded that engagement would be an essential part of the work. He suggested that SSGs would be the appropriate forum for engagement over timelines.	
10.19	Richard Conway said that whilst he recognised that SSGs were a useful forum for the general public and elected members, an officer group had been set up to liaise with Winfrith site and this worked well.	
10.20	<i>Cllr Sweeney said that problems arose when the timing of decisions made by Magnox were not in sync with council's 15 year development plans. There is also the issue of valuable land not being released for re-use. He offered to speak to PL further on this topic.</i> Paul said that having sites in C&M occupied provided additional safeguards and also generated income for the NDA.	BS
10.21	Cllr Sweeney thanked Paul for attending and looked forward to future engagement with Magnox on this topic, and to helping Magnox shape their engagement plans.	PM/BS

ACTION LIST

7 th June, 2016			
ITEM	ACTION	BY	OUTCOME
2.2/3	Amend Minutes of meeting on 10 March 2016 and post on NuLeAF website	CD	Done
3.1	Contact NDA re engagement with affected communities over lifetime plans	PM	Bill Hamilton will update the SG at the meeting on 7 September.
4.9	Issue invitation to NFLA for appropriate meetings	NDA	Sean Morris confirmed that this is happening.
4.15	Speak to DECC re EDF decommissioning plans and engagement with local authorities	NDA	
5.4	Arrange briefing meeting with Cllr Box	EL/PM	Board Chair changed recently A letter has been sent to the new Chair requesting a meeting
10.20	Discuss opportunities for release of land for re-use during C&M	BS/PL	
10.21	Speak to Magnox about engagement with local authorities	BS/PM	Ongoing communication.