

NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 21 October, 2011,
Town Hall, Manchester**

Present:

Cllr Tim Knowles, Cumbria County Council (Chairman)
Cllr Neil Swannick, Manchester City Council (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Carni McCarron-Holmes, Allerdale Borough Council
Cllr Allan Holliday, Copeland Borough Council
Cllr Geoff Lilley, Hartlepool Borough Council
Cllr Michael Green, Lancashire County Council
Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council
Cllr Penny Wride, Stroud District Council
Cllr Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr Richard Smith, Suffolk County Council
Cllr Julian Swainson, Waveney District Council
Charles Holmes, Allerdale Borough Council
Dylan Williams, Anglesey County Council
Steve Smith, Copeland Borough Council
Richard Evans, Cumbria County Council
David Haughian, Cumbria County Council
Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council
Richard Sharples, Lancashire County Council
Sean Morris, Manchester City Council
Bogus Zaba, Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
Robin Carton, Plymouth City Council
Barry James, Somerset County Council
Gillian Ellis-King, South Gloucestershire Council
John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council
Clive Pink, Suffolk Coastal District Council
Adrian Dyer, West Somerset Council
Fred Barker, NuLeAF
Catherine Draper, NuLeAF

In the afternoon, Dr Andy Hall of the Office for Nuclear Regulation gave a presentation and discussion on the Fukushima incident and its implications for the UK nuclear industry.

		ACTION
1	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
1.1	Cllr Knowles welcomed everyone to the meeting and participants introduced themselves.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Tony Markley &	

	Stewart Kemp – Cumbria County Council, Mike Garrity & Charlotte Lewis – Dorset County Council, Lesley Stenhouse – Essex County Council, Sasha Wynn Davies – Isle of Anglesey Council, Lillian Harrison & Katherine Dove – Kent County Council, Louise Nurser – Lancashire County Council, Peter Day - Oxfordshire County Council, Nicola Horne – Plymouth City Council, Richard Conway – Purbeck District Council, Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Cllr Clyde Loakes – Waltham Forest Council	
2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 6 JULY, 2011	
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	4.4 The proposed report on emergency arrangements in the event of a major nuclear incident in the UK had been overtaken by the presentation scheduled for the afternoon on the Fukushima incident. A report will be provided to the January Steering Group meeting and will reflect the afternoon discussions.	FB
3.2	10.3 On improving engagement with local authorities on proposed LLW developments, a presentation will be made to the next meeting of the LLW Programme Delivery Group. The ED will report back on outcomes at the next meeting.	FB
3.3	All other matters are covered within the meeting papers.	
4	SPATIAL PLANNING AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
4.1	FB introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developments in the Government’s approach to spatial planning; • NDA Strategy for managing radioactive wastes; • approaches to radioactive waste management in Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) policies; and • proposed interim advice on MWDF policies. 	
4.2	Points raised in discussion included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RS queried whether Government policy allowed the disposal of LLW to facilities developed at existing licensed nuclear sites. FB clarified that it did, but agreed to seek further clarification. • RE queried the status that NDA strategy should have 	FB FB

	<p>in planning terms, given that NDA also owned the wastes. FB agreed to pursue this point in discussion with the Planning Inspectorate, whose views were being sought on approaches to radioactive waste management in MWDFs.</p>	
4.3	<p>The Steering Group endorsed the interim advice on MWDF policies on radioactive waste management and agreed that a Briefing Paper on the advice be published on the NuLeAF website.</p>	FB
5	LOW LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT AND SEMINAR PROPOSAL	
5.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key developments reported to the LLW Programme Delivery Group; and • the proposal for a NuLeAF seminar on 'Spatial Planning and Implementation of Strategy for Managing LLW'. 	
5.2	<p>TK reported to the SG on the trip to Bure, France by a group from the West Cumbrian MRWS Partnership. On LLW management, it appears that standards in France are higher than in the UK. Cumbria CC are exploring the issue further and will make any outcomes available to the Steering Group.</p>	RE
5.3	<p>The Steering Group agreed that the seminar should be organised as proposed.</p>	FB/CD
6	COMMUNITY BENEFITS AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	
6.1	<p>FB introduced the report which provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an update on discussions that have taken place about a potential Radioactive Waste Community Benefits Protocol; and • a note summarising key points about a potential protocol that could provide the basis for discussion with NDA and Government. 	
6.2	<p>FB advised the SG that, following their meeting in Cumbria, the New Nuclear Local Authorities Group (NNLAG) had decided to seek adoption of a proposed community benefits protocol for new nuclear build, focusing at a high level on the principles that should be involved. FB added that he had liaised with NNLAG during the preparation of proposals</p>	
6.3	<p>Points raised during discussion included:</p>	

6.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC suggested that the proposed approach should also take account of the detriment associated with radioactive waste management developments. FB clarified that detrimental effects relevant to planning decisions can be dealt with by S106 Agreements. The proposed protocol seeks to go 'beyond S106' to ensure that regional or national needs in radioactive waste management are met in a way that is fair and reasonable at a local level. • AD pointed out that the S106 for Hinkley Point includes community impact mitigation (including less tangible impacts), and is not considered to be the same as a community benefits package. • JP asked 'where's the teeth' in voluntary agreement to a protocol. FB indicated that this could in principle come through NDA adoption of a protocol and through certification and audit arrangements. RE pointed to the importance of including policy on community benefits in local development plans. <p>The Steering Group agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the summary note of key points provided a suitable basis for discussion with NDA and Government; and • the ED should enter into discussions, initially with NDA and then Government, ensuring appropriate liaison with the NNLAG secretariat. 	
7	NDA STRATEGY FOR CONTRACTING, COMPETITION AND SUPPLY CHAIN DEVELOPMENT	
7.1	<p>FB introduced the report which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA strategy for contracting, competition and supply chain development; • representations about the nature of contracts to be let by Sellafield Ltd; and • the outcome of an NDA workshop on Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) access to SLC contracts 	
7.2	<p>Points made in discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SS provided an update on the consideration that is currently being given to including socio-economic criteria in Tier 2 contracts at Sellafield. • JP pointed to a strong read-across to new build developments, where it is important to ensure that opportunities are provided for SMEs to compete for contracts. • DW reported that the Welsh Government and Horizon were considering local employment clauses in high 	

	level contracts. AD reported that the Hinkley Point C S106 contains similar stipulations.	
7.3	FB asked attendees to supply details of the way SME access to contracts and local employment clauses are being addressed so that they could be shared more widely.	All
7.4	The Steering Group agreed that letters should be written to DECC, NDA and the Chair of the Select Committee on Public Administration to follow-up representations made to date.	FB
8	PROGRESS REPORT	
8.1	FB introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA Strategy and meetings with Local Authorities • the process for siting a geological disposal facility • the Submarine Dismantling Project • MoD nuclear liabilities management strategy • European Union radioactive waste directive 	
8.2	FB advised the SG that MoD would launch a 16 week period of consultation on Submarine Dismantling on 28 October. A proposed response to the consultation would be presented to the SG on 25 January.	FB
9	BRIEFING ON WEIGHTMAN REPORT	
9.1	FB introduced the Briefing Paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting to inform the discussion with Dr Andy Hall in the afternoon session. There were no questions arising.	
10	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
10.1	The next meeting will be held at Local Government House, Smith Square, London, 11.00 to 3.00 on 25 January, 2012.	
11	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	None.	
12	PRESENTATION	
	Dr Andy Hall, Deputy Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations, Office for Nuclear Regulation, gave an informative overview of report, 'The Japanese Earthquake and Tsunami: Implications for the UK Nuclear Industry'.	

Points in discussion included:

- clarification of why some information was not published (for example, where information could be used to identify vulnerabilities to the detriment of security);
- the size and extendability of Detailed Emergency Planning Zones is being reviewed; there are concerns about the implications for local authority emergency preparedness of siting new nuclear power stations next to existing nuclear facilities;
- in the event of plant failing to meet a stress test then the requirement will be to make improvements or if these are not possible the plant will cease to operate;
- key lessons are the need for 'continuous improvement' and acting on the findings of Periodic Safety Reviews; the relative merits of dry and wet storage or spent fuel needs further study; and the recommendation to pursue the decommissioning of sites with vigour and determination applies to all sites where facilities do not meet modern standards and still contain nuclear waste.

The Chairman thanked Dr Hall for his presentation and assistance in clarifying the points raised.