

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 13 April, 2011,
Town Hall, Manchester**

Present:

Cllr Tim Knowles (Chair) – Cumbria County Council
Cllr Neil Swannick (Vice Chair) – Manchester City Council
Cllr Mike Davidson - Allerdale Borough Council
Cllr Allan Holliday - Copeland Borough Council
Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council
Cllr Ken Williams – Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council
Cllr Penny Wride – Stroud District Council
Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council
Fred Barker – NuLeAF
Tom Britcliffe – Hartlepool Borough Council
Robin Carton – Plymouth County Council
Catherine Draper – NuLeAF
Gillian Ellis-King – South Gloucestershire Council
Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council
Stewart Kemp – Cumbria County Council
Sean Morris – Manchester City Council
John Pitchford - Suffolk County Council
Andrew Smith – Lancashire County Council
Steve Smith – Copeland Borough Council

In the afternoon a presentation and discussion was held with Bruce Cairns of DECC regarding the structure and work of the Office for Nuclear Development.

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	Cllr Knowles welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially first time attendees.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Sasha Wynn Davies – Anglesey County Council, Lesley Stenhouse and Shelley Bailey – Essex County Council, Katherine Dove – Kent County Council, Cllr Clare Whelan and Cllr Clyde Loakes – LGA, Mark Woodger – Maldon District Council, Peter Day, Oxfordshire County Council, Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council, Alyn Jones and Barry James – Somerset County Council, Cllr Richard Smith – Suffolk County Council, Cllr Andrew Nunn and Bob Chamberlain – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Adrian Dyer – West Somerset Council.	

2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 15 JULY, 2010	
2.1	The Minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting and would be posted on the website.	CD
3	MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	All actions have been completed and were covered elsewhere on the agenda with the exception of 5.2. On the latter, FB had reviewed the CIP report and could find no substantial reference to consolidated storage arrangements.	
4	FUKUSHIMA NUCLEAR ACCIDENT: UK GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	
4.1	FB introduced the report which outlined the steps being undertaken by the UK government to consider the implications of the Fukushima nuclear accident for the UK.	
4.2	Points raised during discussion included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if recovered fuel from damaged reactors was sent to the UK for reprocessing the nature of the fuel may have implications for wastes retained in the UK for geological disposal; • the accident had not impacted significantly on local opinion at proposed new build sites, but it will be very important that lessons are learnt; and • it is difficult to evaluate the implications at this stage as the crisis is far from over, 	
4.3	It was proposed that NuLeAF should make a submission to the Weightman review welcoming the review and highlighting areas of concern to NuLeAF members. Mr Weightman should also be invited to present to a future meeting of the SG.	
4.4	The Chairman proposed that NuLeAF should identify and contact its counterpart(s) in Japan to offer sympathy and solidarity.	
4.5	The Steering Group agreed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • send comments for inclusion in the Weightman review; • invite Mr Weightman to a future meeting of the SG; • identify and contact counterparts in Japan to offer sympathy and solidarity; and • take a report at the July meeting which would give 	TK/NS/FB FB CD FB

	<p>further consideration to the implications for nuclear legacy management.</p>	
5	DRAFT RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON PLUTONIUM MANAGEMENT	
5.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the current position on plutonium management options for plutonium management the government's preliminary policy view a draft response to the government's consultation questions. 	
5.2	<p>In considering the draft responses, the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q3 – emphasis should be placed on the first two conditions; Q4 – DECC should publish a clear statement setting out the reasons for its preferred approach; Q5 – include reference to engagement with the host community for any new MOX fabrication plant; and Q6 – indicate NuLeAF members hold both positive and negative views on the Government's preliminary preference. 	
5.3	<p>The Steering Group agreed the proposed response subject to the amendments. Chair and Vice Chair would give final approval before the response was submitted.</p>	TK/NS/FB
6	LOW LEVEL WASTE (LLW) MANAGEMENT	
6.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> discussion at the NuLeAF seminar on LLW management and spatial planning on 22 March, and the implications for LLW disposal of government proposals for changes to the nuclear third party liability regime. 	
6.2	<p>During discussion the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCC were taking legal advice on the adequacy of the assessment processes leading to regulatory permission to dispose of LLW to the landfill site at Lilly Hall; NuLeAF should consider how other member authorities might give support to CCC; there is continuing concern that LLW strategy leads to a 'free for all' in siting proposals; and 	

6.3	<p>NuLeAF should give further consideration to the wider implications of proposed changes to the nuclear third party liability regime.</p> <p>The Steering Group agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further discussions would be held between officers and LLWR Ltd to develop understanding of the scale, timing and location of LLW arisings and to assess the spatial planning implications; • in light of the outcomes of the above, the ED would enter into further discussions with firstly, Environment Agency, and subsequently NDA, to identify appropriate approaches to engagement with local communities and their local authorities about the development of facilities for LLW management; • the ED would seek clarification from government about the consideration which will be given to local community views in reaching decisions about approvals and appeals against refusal of planning permissions associated with LLW management: and • a future meeting should give further consideration to the wider implications of proposed changes to the nuclear third party liability regime. 	<p>FB/CD</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
7	COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
7.1	<p>FB introduced the report which provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an update on the representations that have been made to government about the need for a strategic approach to community benefits; • a preliminary review of the Community Benefits Protocol developed by Renewable UK for onshore wind farms; and • an outline of the potential relevance of business rate reform. 	
7.2	<p>Points made during discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed protocol would be useful but should be in addition to, not replacing, S106 agreements; • there is a need to maintain pressure on government; and • the landfill tax may provide a precedent on which to base a formula for calculating benefit for radioactive waste disposals. 	
7.3	<p>The Steering Group agreed to:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • endorse the preparation of a discussion paper exploring the case for a Community Benefits Protocol for radioactive waste management developments; and • authorise the ED to enter into further discussions with DECC about a potential protocol. 	FB FB
8	PROGRESS REPORT	
8.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA Strategy and meetings with local authorities • radioactive waste management and new nuclear power stations • the process for siting a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) • the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP); and • NuLeAF finances 	
8.2	RC gave the SG a brief update on SDP issues for Plymouth CC. PCC is likely to oppose any suggestion of storing the waste produced from SDP at the Devonport site.	
8.3	It was agreed that DECC would be approached again at an appropriate point regarding continued funding.	
8.4	The report was for noting	
9.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
9.1	The next meeting will be held at Birkbeck College, London on 6 July, 2011, 11.00 – 3.00.	
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
10.1	None	
11	PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION:	
11.1	<p>Bruce Cairns gave an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the Office for Nuclear Development, including: proposed changes to the nuclear third party liability regime; proposed plutonium management policy; GDF siting and the role of the Shareholder Executive.</p> <p>The following points were made during discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a need for continuity in dialogue on nuclear legacy management and new build so that fragmentation from industry is avoided; 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• the nuclear industry is free to consider moving towards centralised or regional storage for spent fuel from new nuclear stations, but they would have to go through a process of discussion with relevant parties; and• there is a need for Government/NDA to give greater consideration to the spatial dimensions of radioactive waste policies/strategies.	
--	---	--