

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 25 January, 2011,
Local Government House, Smith Square, London**

Present:

Cllr Tim Knowles (Chair) – Cumbria County Council
Cllr Neil Swannick (Vice Chair) – Manchester City Council
Cllr Mike Davidson - Allerdale Borough Council
Cllr Terry Fraser – Vale of White Horse District Council
Cllr Allan Holliday - Copeland Borough Council
Cllr Allan Nunn – Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr Penny Wride – Stroud District Council
Shelley Bailey – Essex County Council
Fred Barker – NuLeAF
John Bennett – Dorset County Council
Robin Carton – Plymouth County Council
Sasha Davies – Isle of Anglesey County Council
Katherine Dove – Kent County Council
Catherine Draper – NuLeAF
Gillian Ellis-King – South Gloucestershire Council
Nicola Horne – Plymouth City Council
Adrian Hurst – Hartlepool Borough Council
Barry James – Somerset District Council
Stewart Kemp – Cumbria County Council
Clive Pink – Suffolk Coastal District Council
John Pitchford - Suffolk County Council
Kerry Rickards – Sedgemoor District Council
Steve Smith – Copeland Borough Council

In the afternoon a presentation and discussion was held with Peter Haslam of the Nuclear Industry Association (NIA) and Tony Free (NIA Technical Adviser) on the study commissioned from the NDA on options for spent fuel management for new nuclear power stations.

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	Cllr Knowles welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially first time attendees.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Ken Williams – Barrow Borough Council, Cllr Tony Markley – Cumbria County Council, Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council, Andrew Smith – Lancashire County Council, Mark Woodger – Maldon District Council, Sean Morris – Manchester City Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside	

	Environmental Advisory Service, Peter Day, Oxfordshire County Council, Karen Ledger – Northumberland County Council, Cllr Richard Smith – Suffolk County Council, Bob Chamberlain – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Adrian Dyer – West Somerset Council.	
2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 15 JULY, 2010	
2.1	Subject to the amendment of some formatting errors, 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 matters arising were dealt with in the papers for the meeting.	
3.2	TK sought member views on the discussion with NDA on LLW management at the previous SG meeting. It was agreed that the discussion had been robust but fair.	
4	RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NEW NUCLEAR BUILD	
4.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proposed responses to consultation on the Government's revised guidance on the Funded Decommissioning Programme (FDP) and an updated methodology for Waste Transfer Pricing (WTP) for the disposal of higher activity waste; NuLeAF's response to the radioactive waste management aspects of the draft revised Nuclear National Policy Statement; and NuLeAF input to the Somerset authorities. 	
4.2	<p>During discussion regarding the FDP it was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the fund would be held separately and could not be used for other purposes; a dispute resolution procedure would be triggered in the event that a contribution schedule could not be agreed. <p>It was agreed that the response to FDP should include a request that further clarification should be given as to how the risk to taxpayers would be minimised, particularly in the event that a nuclear operator goes out of business.</p>	FB

4.3	In response to concerns that the WTP is predicated on the assumption that the construction of a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) will proceed to schedule, it was agreed that the response should seek clarification on how funding provision would cover a collapse of the GDF programme and alternative arrangements.	FB
4.4	BJ gave a verbal update on the current status of the Somerset authorities' work on Hinkley Point C. EdF is reviewing all the proposed work packages. A role for NuLeAF in a work package on radioactive waste management is still anticipated.	
	BJ undertook to advise of any concerns EdF might have regarding a work programme on radioactive waste which may affect the approach that Suffolk CC takes to the issue. JP advised the SG that Suffolk CC intended to seek advice from NuLeAF regarding radioactive waste issues at Sizewell C.	BJ
4.5	The Steering Group agreed to delegate authority to the Chair and Vice Chair to approve final comments on the FDP guidance and WTP methodology.	TK/NS/FB
5	NDA STRATEGY, BUSINESS PLAN AND ENGAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS	
5.1	FB introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NuLeAF's comments on the NDA's draft Strategy; • proposed comments on the NDA's draft Business Plan (BP); and • exploratory discussion about proposals for improving engagement between NDA, Site Licensee Companies (SLCs), regulators and local authorities on site restoration at NDA sites. 	
5.2	Points raised in discussion regarding the NDA BP included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concerns about the consolidation of wastes at a smaller number of sites. In response to a query from AH, FB undertook to review the CoWAM report to see whether there had been a substantive agreement regarding approaches to consolidated storage; • that funds for socio-economic projects, knowledge management, skills and R&D had been amalgamated whereas in the previous BP each area had an individual budget. Cumbria CC had requested a 	FB FB

	<p>meeting with NDA to clarify the situation. It was agreed that NuLeAF's response would reflect the concern;</p>	
5.3	<p>Points raised in discussion regarding improved engagement with the NDA et al, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to ensure that local authorities in the wider area with an interest in the issue are appropriately engaged and informed; • recognition that there needed to be a degree of flexibility in the arrangements in the early stages; • that site specific meetings could flow out of the regional groups to deal with site specific issues; • there should be a mechanism for feedback between the groups and to the SG. 	
5.4	<p>The Steering Group agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • subject to the agreed addition, to approve the proposed response to the NDA's draft Business Plan; and • to endorse the proposed approach for encouraging greater engagement between NDA, SLCs, regulators and local authorities on site restoration at NDA sites. 	<p>FB</p> <p>FB/CD</p>
6	STRATEGIES FOR LOW LEVEL WASTE (LLW) MANAGEMENT	
6.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues to address in a response to proposed strategy for managing LLW from non-nuclear industries (NNIs); • an update on issues relevant to the implementation of strategy for managing LLW from the nuclear industry; and • plans for the NuLeAF seminar on 22 March, 2011. 	
6.2	<p>During discussion regarding the proposed response to the NNI consultation GEK raised concern that not all member authorities would support a more localised approach to LLW disposal. FB agreed to rephrase the appropriate sentence. The draft would be re-circulated to all attendees for comment.</p>	FB
6.3	<p>The Steering Group agreed to delegate authority to the Chair and Vice Chair to approve the response to consultation on a strategy for managing LLW from NNIs following recirculation and comment.</p>	TK/NS/FB

7	COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
7.1	<p>FB introduced the report which provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a high level summary of the contents of NuLeAF Briefing Paper 16 (BP16) • an overview of the developments that need to be taken into account in revising BP16; and • a question about whether to make representations to Government about the need for a strategic approach to community benefits. 	
7.2	<p>KR verbally updated the SG about activities to secure an appropriate level of community benefits for Hinkley Point C. He highlighted the importance of addressing indirect impacts, as well as direct impacts, and the need for the Nuclear NPS to adequately address the issue. GEK expressed support for Sedgemoor DC's approach. SD pointed out that benefit payments spread over the lifetime of a station should be more palatable to an operator.</p> <p>The Steering Group agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to make representations to Government about the need for a strategic approach to community benefits for radioactive waste management developments; and • to postpone revising BP16 until outcome of discussions known. 	TK/NS/FB
8	PROGRESS REPORT	
8.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Localism Bill • the process for siting a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) • the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP); and • NuLeAF finances <p>On the SDP, RC reported that officers in Plymouth CC were reviewing the position. The authority was likely to be particularly concerned about the possibility of long-term interim storage at Devonport.</p> <p>The report was for noting</p>	

9.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
9.1	The next meeting will be held at Manchester Town Hall on 13 April, 2011, 11.00 – 3.00.	
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
10.1	None	
11	PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION:	
11.1	<p>The afternoon presentation was given by Peter Haslam and Tony Free on behalf of the NIA on the outcomes of the study in to options for new build spent fuel management and disposal.</p> <p>Much of the discussion focused on the potential process for moving from the base case (spent fuel storage and encapsulation at each new build site) to a centralised approach. TF explained that currently EdF has to proceed with the base case. To do otherwise would require a Government policy change to the base case, and development of a demonstrable case for a centralised approach, which were matters for the MRWS process. FB observed that it was not clear how and when the MRWS process might address these issues. Further discussion with DECC would be required to clarify a potential way forward.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the NIA should consider how to address the question of community benefits and what to say to Government on this matter.</p>	