

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM
LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE
MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

Minutes of the Steering Group held on 19 July 2017,
Coram Campus, Brunswick Square, London

Present:

Cllr Brendan Sweeney, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council (Chair)
 Cllr David Monk, Shepway District Council (Vice-Chair)
 Cllr David Southward, Cumbria County Council
 Cllr Michael Green, Lancashire County Council
 Cllr Grace Fletcher-Hackwood, Manchester City Council
 Cllr Peter Downing, Sedgemoor District Council
 Cllr David Chubb, South Gloucestershire Council
 Cllr Chris Morgan, West Somerset Council
 Annwen Morgan, Anglesey County Council
 Steve Smith, Copeland Borough Council
 Richard Griffin, Cumbria County Council
 Lesley Stenhouse, Essex County Council
 Richard Conway, Purbeck District Council
 Sean Morris, Manchester City Council
 Peter Day, Oxfordshire County Council
 Doug Bamsey, Sedgemoor District Council
 Dave Illsley, Shepway District Council
 Sarah Povell, Somerset County 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: Andrea Hines – Allerdale Borough Council, Cllr David Moore – Copeland Borough Council, Sue Brett – Cumbria County Council, Charlotte Rushmere & Mike Garrity – Dorset Borough Council, Bryan Geake – Kent County Council, Cllr David Blackburn – Leeds City Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Phil Watson – Northamptonshire County Council, Cllr Matthew Riddle – South Gloucestershire Council, Cllr Geoff Holdcroft & Lisa Chandler – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Cllr Richard Smith – Suffolk County Council, Andrew Goodchild – West Somerset Council	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 MARCH, 2017	
2.1	The Minutes of the last meeting were held as a true and accurate record and would be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	<p>3.1 PM advised the meeting that a letter had now been drafted and circulated for comment to members of the Radioactive Waste Planning Group. Once comments had been received this would be sent off. He had held back on preparing this letter as NuLeAF was already in conversation with Magnox regarding ILW/FED and he wanted to avoid confusion.</p> <p>5.2 PM will be attending an Integrated Waste Management Theme Overview Group meeting on 20th July, and will update Copeland BC on the discussion of radioactive waste strategy after the meeting.</p>	<p>PM</p> <p>PM</p>
4	DISCUSSION OF THE BEIS REVIEW OF UK'S RADIOACTIVE WASTE INFRASTRUCTURE AND POLICY	
4.1	PM introduced the topic and the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting, along with a copy of the presentation given by Juliet Long, BEIS to the Radioactive Waste Planning Group on 26 th April 2017.	
4.1.1	BEIS is undertaking a review of UK radioactive waste policy and infrastructure across the nuclear, healthcare, manufacturing, defence and oil and gas industries.	
4.1.2	<p>Key points made at the RWPG meeting were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of national planning policy on radioactive waste makes integration difficult at a local level. The review should include other government departments, particularly DCLG, to provide a co-ordinated approach; • Lack of certainty in terms of the scale and timing of waste arisings can be an obstacle to the private sector coming forward with applications to extend existing facilities or attract new industry; • The lack of certainty regarding the expected quantity of arising of NORM wastes is a particular challenge; • Locally, it is felt that decisions are driven by cost and not by policy; • There is a perceived lack of reference to broader policy framework by Magnox; and • Whilst a single radioactive waste policy framework is desirable, it's practicality was questioned. 	
4.2	Questions and comments raised during discussion were:	
4.2.1	<p><i>Was it correct to refer to the Geological <u>Disposal</u> Facility, as in effect the waste will be stored as it will never cease to exist?</i></p> <p>The Chair responded that the waste would be put beyond human intervention and to all intents and purposes that could be</p>	

	<p>considered disposal. The Executive Director added that, while there were good reasons why there was a preference for disposal and the sealing of the GDF, the issue of retrievability was an important one. Public engagement suggested that there would be less resistance to a GDF if the option of retrieving waste was available</p>	
4.2.2	<p><i>If the inconsistent approach to the use of national policy framework raised by the RWPG continues after the review has been completed and any revised policy announced, what sanctions will be taken, and by whom?</i></p> <p>Government makes policy, but it is up to NDA to implement it and they should require the Site Licensee Companies to comply.</p>	
4.2.3	<p>Concerns were noted that DCLG addressed few planning issues outside fracking and housing.</p>	
4.2.4	<p>Concerns were raised that despite having positive conversations with government, little seemed to change.</p>	
4.2.5	<p>As it was unclear whether there would be an opportunity to comment on the draft report, or if there would be any further consultation, it was agreed that NuLeAF would write to BEIS (Juliet Long), and highlight the need for further engagement because of the implications for planning, and the difficulties the proposed changes to classification of wastes, and disposal routes may cause to the preparation of Waste Local Plans.</p>	PM/BS
5	UPDATE ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
5.1	<p>PM introduced the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting and covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report from Theme Overview Groups (TOGs) and other related meetings; • Inquiry into Parent Body Organisation (PBO) competition legal case, and Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP) contract termination; • Lifetime plans for Magnox sites; • Publication of NDA Business Plan 2017-20 and Radioactive Waste Inventory 2016; • BEIS and Brexit update; • NDA sites and regulatory updates; and • NuLeAF Knowledge Hub. 	
5.2	<p>PM advised the meeting that the topic of STEM skills had been discussed at the Critical Enablers Theme Overview Group (CE TOG) meeting held the day before. NDA is concerned about the lack of people coming into the workforce with the necessary skills and the lack of gender balance in this part of their workforce. There was a recognition that NDA did not have the resources to lead national engagement on STEM – that was a role for BEIS – but that engagement with schools and colleges around NDA sites may be appropriate. PM had raised the importance of engaging with local authorities and LEPs on this issue given their important role in local education and skills.</p>	

5.2.1	It was agreed that a joined-up approach by all those in the Energy Sector was required. NuLeAF will contact members for examples of good working practice and advice on how NDA's approach could improve, and feed this in to the CE TOG secretariat before the group met again.	PM
5.2.2	It was generally agreed that there was a piecemeal approach taken by companies to the promotion of STEM skills. Local authorities lacked the resource to co-ordinate, and with many schools being independent academies these falls outside the control of councils' education departments.	
5.3	The meeting discussed the settlement to EnergySolutions by NDA in regard of the Magnox PBO contract: although NDA said that the money had been raised from efficiency savings and would not impact on future work plans, it was still money which, however it was raised, should have been spent on decommissioning and came from the tax payer. No indication had yet been given as to the level of settlement which would be required by the early termination of the contract with Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP).	
5.3.1	Concerns were expressed that the termination of the contract with CFP would have negative impacts in practical terms on sites as key staff would depart and there would be a disruption to the work programme.	
5.3.2	It was noted that there was no public profile for the inquiry into the PBO competition which had been announced by the BEIS Secretary of State. The perception was that nothing had happened. The meeting agreed that NuLeAF should write to the Secretary of State and ask what was the timetable and how could NuLeAF engage with the inquiry.	PM/BS
5.4	It was suggested that NuLeAF should present a list of issues of concern to the NDA Chief Executive, David Peattie, in advance of the NDA stakeholder summit, so that these could be addressed. It was agreed that NuLeAF would approach David Peattie again to see if he would be able to attend either the NuLeAF Steering Group meeting or planned dinner to be held around the stakeholder summit.	PM/CD
6	UPDATE ON THE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY (GDF) SITING PROCESS	
6.1	<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; • Feedback on geological survey materials; • European Local Network for Radioactive Waste Dialogue (ENWD) meeting; and • Public engagement on geological disposal of radioactive waste. 	

6.2	PM advised the meeting that RWMs engagement at the LGA conference had gone well. PM and the Chair had met with RWM's MD, Bruce McKirdy, along with Ann McCall and Ivan Stone, and they had had a positive discussion about NuLeAF's work with RWM. The possibility of a longer-term funding settlement had been discussed and PM would follow this up with Ann McCall.	
6.3	The Chair had represented NuLeAF at a meeting in Brussels of international municipalities in the guise of the European Local Network for Radioactive Waste Dialogue (ENWD). The group was part of a wider group (GMF) which represented nuclear communities – the ENWD had a focus on decommissioning and legacy waste management and had been set up as it felt that there was a lack of dialogue between the EU and local authorities on these issues. The meeting had been positive and well attended – however there was an acceptance that the network was in need of reinvigoration. Those present had been very welcoming and encouraged greater British involvement, including the potential for NuLeAF to possibly Chair the group. There would be merit in NuLeAF working with international partners, and there had been indications that RWM might consider providing additional funding to support engagement. Membership of ENWD is around €1,000 but a single membership for NuLeAF would affiliate all member local authorities in England and Wales. The costs to NuLeAF of taking over the Chair and secretariat of ENWD were unclear, but these would be clarified through future dialogue.	
6.3.1	The Chair asked the meeting for their views on whether NuLeAF should investigate the possibility of its involvement further. At present, he had the time to commit to the work.	
6.3.2	The Steering Group agreed that the secretariat should make further enquiries in to the commitments involved in participating in the ENWD, both as a member, and should the situation arise as Chair. The SG asked that a paper be submitted for consideration at the September meeting.	PM
7	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
7.1	The next meeting will be held on Monday, 18 th September, 9.00 – 10.00 at Energus, Workington.	
8	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	There being none, the meeting closed and moved on to the AGM.	
9	PRESENTATION BY PROFESSOR LAURENCE WILLIAMS, CHAIR, CoRWM	
9.1	The Chair welcomed Professor Williams, who introduced himself and gave a presentation on the origins and work of CoRWM. His presentation will be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD

	<p>Questions arising from the presentation were:</p>	
9.2	<p><i>Has CoRWM looked at the way financial benefits to host communities will be provided? With the MRWS process, there was a perceived lack of trust the Treasury would deliver on the promises.</i></p> <p>This was one of CoRWM's workstreams. The host community will be accepting the waste on the behalf of the country as a whole, and appropriate recognition should be made. CoRWM has said that there may need to be more than one GDF, possibly each taking a different form of waste. The forthcoming consultation document should address the issue of community benefits and if it doesn't, local authorities should raise this issue in their response.</p>	
9.3	<p><i>Do you have any advice in how we can ensure government listens to what we say?</i></p> <p>Take the opportunity to respond to consultations. NuLeAF also has the opportunity to help areas which express an interest, especially those with no previous involvement in nuclear issues.</p>	
9.4	<p><i>Can NuLeAF, or any other organisation, shape the work CoRWM does?</i></p> <p>If there are issues NuLeAF feels CoRWM should address then it should write to CoRWM. The group would discuss whether or not it was appropriate for CoRWM to address the issue, and if accepted it would go into the next revision of the work programme. There is however the risk that the Minister would not agree to its inclusion.</p>	
9.5	<p><i>Does CoRWM get involved with the work on new nuclear issues?</i></p> <p>CoRWM is only an advisory body, it does not have a regulatory role. It would consider whether government strategy was appropriate.</p>	
9.6	<p><i>Should there be no volunteer host community, what do you see happening?</i></p> <p>A good question, and one you could pose to ministers. Our feeling, from talking to others, is that there are communities out there who are waiting to see what is offered.</p>	
9.7	<p>The Chair thanked Professor Williams for his presentation.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 15.00</p>	

ACTION LIST

19TH JULY, 2017			
ITEM	ACTION	BY	OUTCOME
2.1	Post minutes on the website	CD	Done
3.1	Send letter to Magnox re piecemeal approach to planning applications	PM	Sent 3 August
3.1	Update Copeland BC regarding radioactive waste strategy following IWM TOG meeting on 20 July 2017	PM	PM contacted Copeland to advise that the discussion was on the governance of the work rather than the detail. He will provide updates to Copeland on any future discussions on the strategy.
4.2.5	Write to BEIS (Juliet Long), and highlight the need for further engagement because of the implications for planning, and the difficulties the proposed changes to classification of wastes, and disposal routes may cause to the preparation of Waste Local Plans.	PM BS	Sent 14 th August
5.2.1	Gather together examples of good practice in promotion of STEM skills and submit paper to NDA in time for next CE TOG meeting.	PM	Examples received. Paper to be drafted and submitted to NDA in advance of next CE TOG.
5.3.2	Write to SofS regarding timetable and opportunities to contribute to inquiry into PBO competition.	PM BS	Done. Response received from Richard Harrington.
5.4	Pull together list of issues from NuLeAF members to send to David Peattie in advance of NDA stakeholder engagement summit.	PM	David Peattie will be attending Steering Group meeting.
5.4	Contact Bill Hamilton with details of evening social event on 18 th September so he can pass invitation to David Peattie to attend dinner.	CD	Done. DP not attending.
6.3.2	1. To make further enquiries in to the commitments involved in participating in the ENWD, both as a member, and should the situation arise as Chair. 2. A paper to be submitted for consideration at the September meeting.	PM	Paper will be submitted to SG on 18 th September. A verbal update following a meeting with ENWD Secretary General on 14 th September to be given.
9.1	Post CoRWM presentation on NuLeAF website.	CD	Done