

## NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

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

**Minutes of the EGM and Steering Group meeting held  
on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2019, 18 Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ**

---

**Present:**

Cllr Matthew Riddle	South Gloucestershire Council (Chair Elect)
Cllr David Moore	Copeland District Council (Vice-Chair Elect)
Cllr Eddy Newman	Manchester City Council (Vice-Chair NFLA)
Cllr David Southward	Cumbria County Council
Cllr Craig Rivett	East Suffolk District Council
Cllr Mike Caswell	Sedgemoor District Council
Cllr Chris Morgan	Somerset West & Taunton Council
Cllr Richard Smith	Suffolk County Council
Richard Griffin	Allerdale Borough Council
Steve Smith	Copeland Borough Council
Claire Notman	Cumbria County Council
Terry Burns	Essex County Council
Graham Hammond	Folkestone & Hythe District Council
Sean Morris	Manchester City Council
Louise Martin	Somerset County Council
John Burton	Somerset West & Taunton Council
Gillian Ellis-King	South Gloucestershire Council
Jon Beckett	Stroud District Council
John Pitchford	Suffolk County Council
Philip Matthews	NuLeAF
Catherine Draper	NuLeAF

	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>Philip Matthews (PM) welcomed everyone to the meeting and round the table introductions were made.</p> <p>Apologies were received from: Charlotte Rushmere - Dorset County Council, Lisa Chandler – East Suffolk Council, Cllr David Monk – Folkestone &amp; Hythe District Council, Linda Townsend – Gloucestershire County Council, Nia Swann Boden – Gwynedd County Council, Cllr Sean Chaytor – Hull City Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Peter Day – Oxfordshire County Council, Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Dylan Williams – Ynys Mon County Council.</p>	

	<b>EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>ELECTION OF NuLeAF OFFICERS</b>	
1.1	There being no other candidates, Cllr Matthew Riddle of South Gloucestershire Council will be Chair of NuLeAF for the year 2019-20. Nominated by South Gloucestershire Council and seconded by Suffolk County Council.	
1.2	There being no other candidates, Cllr David Moore of Copeland Borough Council will be Vice Chair for the year 2019-20. Nominated by Copeland Borough Council and seconded by Cumbria County Council.	
1.3	Cllr Eddy Newman was supported to remain for a second term as NuLeAF Vice-Chair (NFLA). Nominated by Cllr David Blackburn (Leeds City Council) and seconded by Cllr Sean Chaytor (Hull City Council).	
1.4	Cllr Matthew Riddle welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a short overview of his role at South Gloucestershire and involvement with NuLeAF.	
<b>2</b>	<b>PRESENTATION OF THE AUDITOR'S REPORT</b>	
2.1	PM introduced the report and briefly explained NuLeAF's current financial situation. He thanked the contributing member authorities for their continued financial support.	
2.2	RS asked if it was likely that the level of commissioned work from RWM would be repeated in the current financial year. PM advised that although commissioned work showed a figure of over £35,000, most of this was paid out to consultants who carried out the work, while NuLeAF earned a 10% management fee. Whilst it was anticipated that some commissioned work would be forthcoming, the level could not be predicted.	
<b>3</b>	<b>WORK PROGRAMME 2019-20</b>	
3.1	PM provided an update to the meeting: discussions are still on-going with RWM over this year's work programme. An extension of the 2018-19 contract was awarded which runs until the end of July 2019. NuLeAF is awaiting a decision from RWM as to whether the work currently provided by NuLeAF will have to be put out to tender after July. If so NuLeAF will seek to gain funding through such a process.	
3.2	Once the situation is resolved, NuLeAF will share an agreed work programme with members.	
<b>4</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
4.1	At the direction of the Steering Group the secretariat will write to Brendan Sweeney thanking him for his contribution to NuLeAF and wishing him well for the future.	PM

	<b>STEERING GROUP MEETING</b>	
<b>1.</b>	Welcome and apologies were covered earlier in the meeting.	
<b>2</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2019</b>	
2.1	The Minutes were approved as a true record and will be posted on the NuLeAF website.	CD
<b>3</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
3.1	At the Steering Group held on 20 <sup>th</sup> March members had expressed an interest in holding a meeting with BEIS, NDA and EDF to discuss the decommissioning of the current AGR fleet. Following enquiries to BEIS, NuLeAF had been advised that an announcement on who would undertake decommissioning was not expected until spring 2020. It was agreed to postpone the roundtable discussion until a more appropriate time.	
<b>4</b>	<b>REVIEW OF POSITION PAPER ON SOCIO-ECONOMICS</b>	
4.1	A position paper on Nuclear Decommissioning and Socio-Economics had been circulated prior to the meeting. This had been informed by earlier discussions and feedback from members. PM asked the meeting for comments.	
4.2	<p>Comments made were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 'Desired outcomes' in Section 4a should include engaging with other energy industries.</li> <li>2. It should be noted that a new policy of accelerated decommissioning has not yet been formally approved and the paper should accurately reflect the current situation.</li> <li>3. Some sites are facing changes to funding as NDA resources are diverted to other sites.</li> <li>4. The paper should include reference to on-site disposal of LLW and how it relates to community benefits.</li> <li>5. The paper could promote engagement between NDA and local authorities on planning issues including the identification of interim and end state uses.</li> <li>6. Where employment on site reduces because a site enters Care &amp; Maintenance, NDA and local authorities need to promote diversification of skills and jobs.</li> <li>7. Assessment of return on public investment must reflect more accurately the different circumstances in rural areas. Section 5c should stress the need for different metrics to give a fairer assessment of added value of investment.</li> <li>8. Section 4a – although it is good to include the reference to LEPs, these are becoming more dominated by business interests. However, engagement with LEPs on skills issues should be included.</li> <li>9. Section 6f – emphasise need to set up community funds to support those sites which will be hosting ILW stores. Refer to precedent of dry fuel store at Sizewell.</li> </ol>	

4.3	Comment was made that NDA needs to be more proactive in promoting what they do and why. At present they are reactive, predominantly to negative headlines.	
4.4	Views were expressed over the timing of publication. It was agreed that the paper would be published following revision incorporating points made at this meeting and via email (see 4.5), and a further revision would be carried out after the NDA Stakeholder Summit if necessary.	PM
4.5	Members of the meeting agreed to pass the paper on to their colleagues in economic development for comment. All comments to be passed to PM by 26 <sup>th</sup> June.	All
<b>5</b>	<b>UPDATE ON GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY (GDF) SITING PROCESS</b>	
5.1	A report was circulated prior to the meeting which covered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NuLeAF Policy Statement on Geological Disposal;</li> <li>2. GDF siting process; and</li> <li>3. International update.</li> </ol>	
5.2	PM sought the meetings views on the revision of Policy Statement 3 which had been produced following discussion at earlier meetings. The Statement updates the current Policy Statement on Geological Disposal of Higher Activity Wastes which had been produced in 2007.	
5.2.1	Concerns were expressed about including reference to retrievability as it is a disposal facility. PM noted that the Policy Statement does not endorse retrievability but instead stresses that the view of the host community on this matter must be considered. Members agreed that because of the time frame involved in developing and operating a GDF, there needed to be reference to the concept of retrievability.	
5.2.2	Concerns were also expressed that with the development of interim stores with a life expectancy of 100 years, UK Government would not move forward on the GDF siting project and that it would eventually be dropped.	
5.2.3	It was suggested and agreed that the Policy Statement should reflect that there may not be public consent for a GDF to be built and that UK Government needs to have a contingency plan/s.	
5.2.4	The meeting was advised that Copeland Borough Council will be preparing a policy on the Working with Communities Policy, and would encourage other local authorities to do the same. Although a major infrastructure project, the public profile is much less than that of HS2, for example.	
5.2.5	It was agreed that the Policy Statement should take a more robust stance on the need for visible progress on the siting process to be made.	

5.3	Disappointment was expressed that RWM had not been willing to provide funding for the GMF visit to the underground facility at Bure in France. It would have been beneficial for elected members to provide them with information to pass on to their constituents.	
5.4	The meeting agreed that, subject to amendment to reflect the comments made, the updated Policy Statement 3 and Briefing Paper 19 should be published.	PM
<b>6</b>	<b>UPDATE ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT</b>	
6.1	A report was circulated prior to the meeting which covered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Feedback from NDA Theme Overview Group (TOGs) and associated meetings;</li> <li>2. Update on NDA strategy and operations;</li> <li>3. Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP);</li> <li>4. Update on activities at BEIS;</li> <li>5. Update on GRR Task Group; and</li> <li>6. SCCORS.</li> </ol>	
6.2	There was discussion on the topic of Near Surface Disposal (NSD). It was recognised that not all Higher Activity Waste would be suitable for NSD, but that a decision to develop such a facility had the potential to impact on the inventory for a GDF and on the need for interim ILW stores. NDA needs to demonstrate a joined-up approach and provide clarity on how plans for NSD and a GDF can sit together.	
6.3	The meeting expressed its disappointment that NDA Transport Strategy will not be dealing with travel to work issues. It asked the secretariat to write to NDA regarding this omission and to stress the need for more urgency in the development of a Transport Strategy.	PM
6.4	Cllr Mike Caswell advised the meeting that he had visited Hunterston site to review the issues with cracking in the graphite reactor core. He was happy to share a report on his findings.	MC
<b>7</b>	<b>DISCUSSION WITH PROF. RICHARD TAYLOR, BEAM PROJECT, UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER</b>	
7.1	The Chair welcome Prof. Richard Taylor to the meeting.	
7.2	Prof. Taylor introduced himself and gave an overview of his experience in the nuclear industry having worked for BNFL, at Sellafield, and the National Nuclear Laboratory before joining the University of Manchester.	
7.3	BEAM is a research network looking at the social aspects of nuclear projects such as the GDF siting process, the development of Small Modular Reactors, the construction of Hinkley Point C and the transition of Sellafield from an operational site to decommissioning.	

7.4	BEAM aspires to opening up debate to new conversations. Prof. Taylor's experience is that meetings haven't changed much over the last 30 years with the same debate and the same rhetoric, which gives the same result. BEAM's intention is to demonstrate to the nuclear industry that there are other approaches such as ethnography and anthropology which will help them engage productively with the public.	
7.5	BEAM staff are currently embedded in the nuclear communities of Somerset, Copeland and in north Wales, undertaking a range of research. Other research is looking at the impact of new build not proceeding on Anglesey; and concerns around the impact of robotics and AI in the nuclear industry.	
7.6	Prof. Taylor would welcome the opportunity to engage directly with NuLeAF members. It was agreed that NuLeAF would circulate his email address, so that those interested could get in touch.	RT/CD
<b>8</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>	
8.1	The next meeting will be held at Leaf, 113-115 Portland Street, Manchester on 3 <sup>rd</sup> September, 2019, 11.00 – 15.00.	
<b>9</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
9.1	John Pitchford advised the meeting that this would be his last meeting as he was retiring from the role of Head of Planning at Suffolk County Council. He reflected on his time engaging with NuLeAF – he felt it was a good model of a Special Interest Group and had been consistently effective.	
9.2	The Chair thanked John for his input to NuLeAF, and Philip Matthews thanked him for his support of the NuLeAF staff.	
<b>10</b>	<b>PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION WITH JOHN McNAMARA, HEAD OF STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, NDA</b>	
10.1	The Chair welcomed John McNamara (JM) to the meeting.	
10.2	JM introduced himself to the meeting. He had been in post for seven weeks, taking over the role from Bill Hamilton who had moved on to work for the new Magnox subsidiary. JM had previously worked for Sizewell C and Nugen projects. He had also worked at the Nuclear Industry Association and for British Energy.	
10.3	JM gave a presentation: 'NDA – people and place ... our changing culture and communities.'	
10.4	During discussion the following points were made:	
10.4.1	Concerns were raised about NDA's track record of not following through issues highlighted and commitments given as part of stakeholder engagement. Also, that the 'open window' and	

	<p>transparency that David Peattie had talked about at the first Stakeholder Summit had not been demonstrated in reality. JM felt that the impact of the challenge to the Magnox PBO contract had affected a change in NDA's culture and that it had to be more open, transparent and joined up in its approach in the future.</p>	
10.4.2	<p>There was considerable discussion over the format of the Stakeholder Summits. Whilst some members liked the new format, it was also felt that there was a lack of engagement with the audience and the Summit was merely an opportunity for NDA to tell people about the positive aspects of their work. It lacked the opportunity to challenge NDA or for NDA to listen to stakeholder concerns. JM advised the meeting that he would be taking over the organising of the Summit from 2020.</p>	
10.4.3	<p>The issue of transparency and communications was raised, and examples given of the lack of information or response from NDA on issues such as transport and the handling of wastes from the MoD Submarine Dismantling Project. JM said he could not comment on the issue of transport as it was not something he had yet dealt with, but he would take the issue away.</p>	JM
10.4.4	<p>It was felt that NDA needed to co-ordinate more with others in the energy sector, especially in terms of socio-economics and community benefits. An example was given of what was happening at Sizewell with other energy providers. JM said he agreed that NDA should be part of the discussions at Sizewell and would take that back to NDA and hopefully participate in the forthcoming meeting.</p>	JM
10.4.5	<p>A question was asked about socio-economic provision for sites which had entered Care and Maintenance, especially where they will be hosting ILW for many decades to come. JM said that NDA Strategy should still reflect the need to support and engage with the communities around sites in Care and Maintenance.</p>	
10.4.6	<p>The example of the lack of published documentation on lifetime plans, and the on-going failure of NDA/Magnox to produce anything which local authorities could use to support the development of Local Plans was given.</p>	
10.4.7	<p>A question was raised regarding the disposal of NDA non-core assets – would local authorities and communities be consulted before disposal as some may have benefit to the community. JM would find out.</p>	JM
10.5	<p>The Chair thanked John McNamara for his presentation, and the meeting closed at 2.41 p.m.</p>	

## ACTION LIST

<b>12<sup>th</sup> June 2019</b>			
EGM 4.1	Write to Brendan Sweeney expressing thanks for service	PM	Done
2.1	Post Minutes of Meeting on 20 <sup>th</sup> March on NuLeAF website	CD	Done 13 <sup>th</sup> June 2019
4.4	Update socio-economic position paper following Stakeholder Summit	PM	Done
4.5	Circulate socio-economic position paper for comment to economic development teams. Comments back to PM by 27 <sup>th</sup> June	All	Done
5.4	Incorporate comments on PS3 and BP19 and publish.	PM	Done
6.3	Write to NDA re omission of travel to work from Transport Strategy and need to expedite this workstream.	PM	Done
6.4	Share report on visit to Hunterston	MC	Circulated 5 <sup>th</sup> September
7.6	Circulate Prof. Taylor's email address	RT/CD	Done
10.4.3	Report back to NuLeAF on NDA transport strategy	JM	Letter received 19 August. NDA speaking to Sept. 19 meeting on Transport.
10.4.4	Feedback to NDA need to engage with other energy sector companies especially in terms of socio-economic impact.	JM	
10.4.7	Report back to NuLeAF on whether NDA would consult local communities before disposal of non-core assets	JM	Tony Smithers confirmed that he would be working with Andrew van der Lem on looking for opportunities to provide value to communities.
<b>20<sup>th</sup> March 2019</b>			
3.1	Seek further response from RWM regarding business rates	PM	This issue is raised with RWM in ongoing discussions on socio-economics.
4.6	Write to NDA regarding reporting on socio-economic activity	PM	Letter sent 22 <sup>nd</sup> May. Awaiting response.
4.10	Liaise with GMF re international comparison of community benefits	PM	Ongoing
4.11	Write to NDA regarding unspent socio-economic funds	PM	Letter sent 22 <sup>nd</sup> May. Awaiting response
9.5	Take examples of socio-economic issues to NDA Stakeholder Summit	PM	Noted. Will raise issues at the Summit.
<b>12<sup>th</sup> September, 2018</b>			

9.10	Provide feedback to NDA/NuLeAF on what topics local authorities wish to see covered in combined outcomes report.	All	Awaiting clarification from NDA and will then consult members.
<b>6<sup>th</sup> June, 2018</b>			
3.3	Follow up with Mike Caswell re meeting	DB	Email sent 21 June and MC said he would follow this up with Aled Morris Jones.
4.2.1	Include reference to GDF being for UK wastes only (inc substitutions) in revised PS3	PM	Done
4.2.6	Produce paper on impact of not finding host community for GDF	PM	Done
4.2.7	Find out what is the latest point in the construction phase of a GDF you need to decide if waste can be retrieved	PM	Done
9.13	Raise issue of need for Magnox to communicate with sites receiving Magnox waste.	PM	To be done once new Magnox structure in place post September.