

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

Minutes of the Steering Group held on 7 December, 2016, Coram Campus, Brunswick Square, London

Present:

Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council (Chair)
Cllr Marcus Johnstone, Lancashire County Council
Cllr Peter Downing, Sedgemoor District Council
Cllr David Chubb, South Gloucestershire Council
Richard Griffin, Cumbria County Council
Terry Burns, Essex County Council
Bryan Geake, Kent County Council
Sean Morris, Manchester City Council
Richard Conway, Purbeck District Council
Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council
Dave Illsley, Shepway District Council
Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council
Clive Pink, Suffolk Coastal District Council
John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council
Philip Matthews, NuLeAF
Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	ACTION
1.1	Cllr Sweeney welcomed everyone to the meeting. Participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Catherine Hadfield – Allerdale Borough Council, Cllr David Moore & Steve Smith – Copeland Borough Council, Cllr David Southward – Cumbria County Council, Mike Garrity – Dorset Borough Council, Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council, Cllr David Blackburn – Leeds City Council, Cllr Grace Fletcher-Hackwood – Manchester City Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Phil Watson – Northamptonshire County Council, Cllr Van Coulter – Oxford City Council, Peter Day – Oxfordshire County Council, Cllr David Monk & Katharine Harvey – Shepway District Council, Paul Browning – Somerset County Council, Cllr Matthew Riddle – South Gloucestershire Council, Cllr Geoff Holdcroft – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Cllr Richard Smith – Suffolk County Council, Matt Meldrum – West Berkshire Council, Andrew Goodchild & Cllr Chris Morgan – West Somerset Council	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 SEPTEMBER, 2016	
2.1	5.4 should be amended to show that some councils still had concerns regarding operations at Sellafield. 10.8 amend NFLA to SM.	
2.2	Subject to the above changes, the Minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting on 7 September 2016 and would be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	All matters arising were dealt with elsewhere within the meeting papers, or had been concluded.	
4	DISCUSSION WITH MAGNOX ON STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND 'LEAD AND LEARN' SITES	
4.1	The Chair welcomed Angela Vincent and Ian Warner of Magnox to the meeting.	
4.2	AV gave a brief presentation on the way in which Magnox communicates with its stakeholders. A stakeholder survey was underway at present and she encouraged NuLeAF members to complete the online survey. A review of stakeholder engagement would be carried out in 2017.	
4.3	AV went on to outline their approach to engagement on Waste Strategy. Engagement strategies are being developed at the sites and will be rolled out in 2017.	
4.4	Questions:	
4.4.1	<i>Q: Some of us are concerned that you are using SSGs for consultation. Experience at some sites shows that the SSGs are not an effective mechanism e.g. the Sizewell SSG has been taken over by the anti-nuclear lobby and Suffolk CC no longer attend. Magnox management are aware of the situation, but have made no efforts to include Suffolk CC in consultations by other means.</i> A: We are aware of the situation, and it was highlighted in the Chair's letter to Paul Lonsdale. Part of the review of SSGs next year will be looking at how our message is getting across.	
4.4.2	<i>Q: Planning applications are being submitted for sites in a piecemeal way. We are not seeing the overall picture and this does not allow the wider community to understand what you are trying to achieve.</i> A: I will feed this back. This may have arisen because we do not have a finalised funding settlement from NDA. Hopefully things will become clearer once lifetime plans have been published.	
4.4.3	<i>Q: We have concerns about the level of awareness of Magnox operations amongst elected members whose wards neighbour the sites. We need to increase their understanding of the issues, otherwise there is the danger that members of the Planning Committee will not have the requisite knowledge to just planning applications.</i> A: Magnox is looking at producing a Briefing Note of the Minutes of SSG meetings. Wider dissemination of knowledge has always	

	<p>been an issue. We would welcome any examples of good practice.</p>
4.4.4	<p><i>Q: We don't view the SSG as the suitable place for a technical discussion. A request for information to Magnox has taken a year to get a response. Why? The new PBO made many promises about how it would engage with local authorities and local communities but we have not seen these promises followed through.</i></p> <p>A: I think this is another product of the changeover of PBO. Things are settling down now and we would like to get our communications right.</p>
4.4.5	<p>The Chair expressed his concerns that SSGs did not contain the technical knowledge to deal with the issues properly. The Magnox sites represented a significant area of land within a local authority's purview and it had significant impact on plans for the local area. In our letter to Paul Lonsdale we proposed putting together 3 or 4 sides of information on each site which could be given to new local authority Chief Executive to enable them to quickly understand the issues and opportunities around their local site. In addition to produce a document which would go to a site director highlighting the issues for a local authority and the reasons behind them. The response to this proposal from Magnox had been disappointing. He reiterated that CFP had made many promises, but he felt that we had effectively lost two years of engagement.</p>
4.4.6	<p>Shepway is the exception around the table, as we feel our SSG functions well. But, we do not see it as the only way of communicating with Magnox or EDF. Topics are not discussed at a sufficient level at the SSG, but it can be a useful introduction.</p>
4.4.7	<p>AV said she understood that there needed to be more engagement with planners and senior management outside the SSG.</p>
4.5	<p>IW gave a presentation on optimising site end states and in particular the lead and learn programme which is testing the proposals set out in the guidance for release from regulatory control (GRR). The presentation is available on the NuLeAF website.</p>
4.6	<p>Questions:</p>
4.6.1	<p><i>Q: None of your lead and learn sites are adjacent to sites for new nuclear power stations. Where is that thinking being developed? Also at Trawsfynydd there are proposals for siting SMRs.</i></p> <p>A: We did consider using Hunterston as a lead and learn site, but there was an issue with it being ready to meet the timescales for the trial, as EDF are not yet engaged with decommissioning issues. With regard to SMRs, any development of a SMRs at Trawsfynydd would not impact the decommissioning programme as it would have to be built on a site adjacent to the current site, not on the old one. Under the terms of the GRR you must establish what the potential radioactive inventory will be of waste left behind and that influence that would have.</p>

<p>4.6.2</p> <p>4.6.3</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.6.5</p> <p>4.6.6</p> <p>4.6.7</p> <p>4.7</p>	<p><i>Q: PM commented that on his recent visit to Trawsfynydd he was struck by the number of hazardous substances other than radioactive waste which would be left behind. How would Magnox address these?</i></p> <p>A: All waste will have to be considered. In my opinion the asbestos landfill at Trawsfynydd presents a greater hazard than any low level radioactive waste which would be left in-situ.</p> <p><i>Q: Could you tell us about your approach to biodiversity and landscape?</i></p> <p>A: We will address these as part of the Environmental Safety Case.</p> <p><i>Q: Planning permission will be required if you wish to leave radioactive material behind (disposal).</i></p> <p>A: Land use will be considered. We will also need to address Article 37 which looks at cross national boundary release of radioactivity. Snowdonia National Park has been co-opted to help address issues.</p> <p><i>Q: None of the lead and learn sites is on the coast.</i></p> <p>A: Dounreay is. We have to consider coastal erosion and to set out what impacts there may be up until the point of final site clearance. Beyond that point we have to consider any potential impacts following release from regulatory control and that would include human intrusion. We need to demonstrate that we meet the standard set out by the regulatory bodies.</p> <p><i>Q: What information will be made available to local authorities and the public following delicensing? We had difficulty in obtaining information following the delicensing of part of Winfrith site.</i></p> <p>A: All documentation will be public registered documents. It is likely that the Site Wide Environmental Safety Case would be passed to the local authority.</p> <p><i>Q: Some local authorities may be concerned that Magnox would want to hold on to sites so that they could be used for SMR deployment. This would restrict their end use.</i></p> <p>A: CFP only have 12 years left on their contract and then they will be gone. They would not have an interest in holding on to the sites.</p> <p>The Chair thanked AV and IW for their presentation.</p>	
	<p>UPDATE ON THE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY (GDF) SITING PROCESS</p>	
<p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p>PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on the GDF framework; and • RWM stakeholder engagement. <p>PM clarified that the forthcoming engagement on the GDF siting process will be around geological, community and engagement issues. Other areas such as transport will be considered at a later stage for any individual sites that enter the process.</p>	

5.3	The Chair commented that he had advised RWM that there was presently insufficient information in their draft outputs to sufficiently inform councils.	
5.4	It was noted that there had been no community organisation representation at the recent Stakeholder Event. SM commented that the format had been dominated by presentations from RWM and there had been little opportunity for discussion. It was felt that RWM needs to demonstrate two-way engagement and it needs to show that it is listening and responds appropriately. Requests for information had not been followed up. A lack of political awareness was apparent.	
6	UPDATE ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
6.1	PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report from Theme Overview Group (TOG) and other related meetings; • Magnox update; • Proportionate Regulatory Controls (PRC) and Guidance on Requirements for Release of Nuclear Sites from Radioactive Substances Regulation (GRR) update; and • Update on Low Level Waste issues. 	
6.2	In response to a question, Ian Warner of Magnox clarified that any landward part of pipeline would have to be included in the optimised end-state and would require a permit from EA. A host of issues would be raised where pipes were on land owned by someone other than Magnox.	
6.3	DB advised the meeting that he was aware of investigative work being carried out at Hinkley Point A into the best way of sorting Fuel Element Debris to separate Low Level Waste from Intermediate Level Waste.	
6.4	Concerns were expressed that Magnox had still not demonstrated that they had given due consideration to the transport of waste from Sizewell to Bradwell, in particular the use of rail. It was agreed that NuLeAF would write to Magnox again on this topic.	PM/BS
6.5	Concerns were raised regarding the piecemeal way in which Magnox released information on their work programme, and in the submission of planning applications. This did not allow authorities to take a holistic view, either on a site basis or nationally. It was agreed that this topic should be discussed at the next SG.	PM
7	UPDATE ON NuLeAF BRIEFING PAPERS	
7.1	PM advised the meeting that the secretariat had undertaken a review of the Briefing Papers available to members. Subsequently papers had been updated or archived as necessary and a re-ordered suite of papers was posted on the NuLeAF website.	
8	PROPOSAL FOR SITE VISITS	

8.1	A paper was circulated prior to the meeting outlining options for site visits to 'lead and learn' sites: Trawsfynydd, Winfrith and Dounreay and the travel and accommodation requirements.	
8.2	After consideration of the options, the meeting agreed that a site visit should be arranged to Trawsfynydd around the September Steering Group.	CD
9	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
9.1	The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, 15 TH March 2017 at Manchester Town Hall.	
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
10.1	There being no other business the meeting closed at 13.05. SM gave his apologies, he had another meeting to attend and would not be able to stay for the afternoon presentation.	
11	PRESENTATION BY PETER HASLAM, HEAD OF POLICY, NUCLEAR INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION (NIA)	
11.1	Cllr Sweeney welcomed Peter Haslam to the meeting.	
11.2	Peter Haslam introduced himself and gave a presentation on the role and work of the NIA in respect of decommissioning and radioactive waste management.	
11.3	Key points of the presentation were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NIA is a trade association and sees itself as the voice of the UK nuclear industry. It makes the case for nuclear to government and promotes the interest of its members • It has 270 members spread across the nuclear fuel cycle • There are a series of business groups sitting beneath the NIA board, one of which looks at decommissioning. • NIA external communications cover a range of approaches, direct lobbying to government on specific issues, publications, political briefings on key issues, production of an annual map showing the diverse employment in the nuclear industry in the UK. • NIA sees SMRs as complementary to large stations. There is the potential there for significant manufacturing opportunities in the UK, increased UK nuclear expertise, and significant export potential. • NIA is keen that there is smooth transition from the current systems to whatever is put in place post Brexit. • The nuclear industry is keen that UK Government makes a decision on the future of the UK plutonium stockpile. • NIA supports continuing the current level of funding in decommissioning and seeks to raise awareness within government of the impact of reducing funding. • NIA works with other organisations and groups in delivering the skills strategy. A skills crunch has been identified in 2020, when there will be a convergence of work programmes. There is also the impact of the increasing age demographic of the current nuclear workforce. A Strategic Plan was published recently and 	

sets out 19 recommendations for tackling the skills shortage.

- Decommissioning is extremely important. It is the responsibility as a reputable industry to deal with legacy effectively and make the environment safe for future generations. The case cannot be made for new build if the industry is not seen to be dealing with old plant responsibly.
- The UK has significant expertise in decommissioning which it sells around the world. UK companies are working in the US and Russia, and assisting with decommissioning in Fukushima, Japan.
- It is vital that the industry demonstrates that it has a long term solution to High Activity Wastes. GDF is the solution which has been adopted internationally by most countries. NIA will work with RWM to put their message across.

11.4 Questions:

11.4.1 *Q: There is increasing involvement of foreign companies in the UK nuclear industry. How do you engage with them?*

A: We invite overseas companies to become NIA members. We try to encourage them to partner with UK companies who can help them under the nuclear industry culture in the UK.

11.4.2 *Q: How can we encourage more dialogue and co-operation between NDA/Magnox and EDF. There seems to be a barrier between decommissioning and operating sites, and also at a corporate level.*

A: I could put the question to EDF as there are common interests and it would be logical for co-operation. My understanding is that CEOs of NDA and EDF meet.

PH/PM

11.4.3 *Q: Could you tell us why you view the plutonium stockpile as a problem?*

A: It is not a problem in itself, but the lack of a strategy for dealing with the plutonium does not send a positive signal. The UK sets itself out to be a country which supports responsible use of nuclear power and non-proliferation. It would be easier for us to make that case credibly if we dealt with plutonium stockpile at Sellafield.

11.4.4 *Q: The perception is that it is difficult to break into the nuclear supply chain. Do you offer advice and assistance?*

A: We encourage people to attend the NDA supply chain event. There are companies which have transferable technology and skills such as in North Sea oil and gas working, which can be transferred to the nuclear industry.

11.4.5 *Q: Could you say more about the skills gap, in particular in relation to its impact on decommissioning.*

A: There will be a need for a larger workforce than we currently have. This is across the workforce at all levels. I will forward the paper produced by Nuclear Skills Strategy Group on how they think this can be addressed.

11.4.6	<p>Q: <i>We have concerns that decommissioning sites could be 'bounced' into becoming sites for Small Modular Reactors without proper consultation. Nor should assumptions be made that Cumbria would be the automatic storage site for spent fuel.</i></p> <p>A: I think it is recognised that any developer planning on building an SMR would want to have the local community alongside, and wouldn't go ahead if there was a lot of opposition.</p>
11.4.7	<p>Q: <i>We are concerned that there is no joined up approach to infrastructure project. How can you help us to get government to address this?</i></p> <p>A: The National Infrastructure Commission will be consulting shortly on their priorities. I suggest you respond to the consultation and raise this issue. Energy will be a key area for them.</p>
11.5	<p>PM summarised the areas of common interest for NuLeAF and NIA: ensuring NDA receives an adequate funding settlement, opening up procurement opportunities to local businesses, development of technologies for clean up, and the impact of the timeframe of programmes around the world on the workforce.</p>
11.6	<p>The Chair thanked Peter Haslam for attending and for his presentation.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 14.45</p>

ACTION LIST

7th December, 2016			
ITEM	ACTION	BY	OUTCOME
2.2	Amend Minutes of 7 September as directed and then post on NuLeAF website	CD	Done
6.4	Write again to Magnox highlighting concerns of transport of FED/ILW by road	PM/BS	Letter sent 23 Feb. No response received to date.
6.5	Item for March SG – way in which Magnox are applying for planning permissions in a piecemeal fashion	PM/CD	
8.2	Arrange site visit to Trawsfynydd for September meeting	CD	Visit being reviewed under 5.4 on 15.3.17
11.4.2	Raise awareness with EDF of need to engage with local authorities now on issue of decommissioning	PH/PM	Done