

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

### NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM

**Minutes of the special meeting of the Steering Group held on Monday 11 December 2006,  
Town Hall, Manchester**

Present:

Cllr Bill Risby, Manchester City Council (Vice Chair)  
Fred Barker, Executive Director, NuLeAF  
Sue Crisp, Cumbria County Council  
David Davies, Copeland Borough Council  
Frank Duffy, Copeland Borough Council  
Steve Giblin, Tameside Borough Council  
Shaun Gorman, Cumbria County Council  
John Hetherington, Cumbria County Council  
Adrian Hurst, Hartlepool Borough Council  
Stewart Kemp, Manchester City Council  
David Martin, Allerdale Borough Council  
Malcolm Perrins, Suffolk County Council

		<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>WELCOME</b>	
1.1	In the absence of Councillor Blackwell, Councillor Bill Risby acted as Chair.	
1.2	Councillor Risby welcomed everyone to the meeting. The meeting had been convened specifically to discuss the Government's response to the recommendations of the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM).	
<b>2</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
	Apologies were received from: Cllr Geoff Blackwell, Copeland Borough Council; Mel Fleming, Suffolk County Council; Peter Jackson, South Gloucestershire District Council; Cllr Tim Knowles, Cumbria County Council; Cllr Alan Matthews, Bury Metropolitan Borough Council; Les Netherton, Plymouth City Council; Cllr Roy Oldham, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council; John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council; Martin Riddle, South Gloucestershire District Council; Cllr Julian Swainson, Suffolk County Council; Cllr Ken Wyatt, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.	
<b>3</b>	<b>GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO CORWM AND SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS</b>	
3.1	FB outlined the contents of the report covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>the Government response to CoRWM (25 October)</li></ul>	

<p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the meeting with DEFRA/DTI officials (13 November)</li> <li>• discussion of long-term management of wastes at the NuLeAF regional seminars (25 October – 22 November)</li> <li>• a DEFRA workshop on implementation (23 November)</li> <li>• CoRWM’s work programme (Dec 06 – June 07)</li> <li>• recent Nirex papers on implementation issues (Sept – Oct 06)</li> <li>• EA/SEPA review of regulatory guidance on requirements for authorisation of disposal</li> </ul> <p>BR explained his concerns about the use of the word “disposal”, as emplacing wastes in a geological repository did not get rid of the wastes. FB explained that in the context of radioactive waste management, geological “disposal” has a specific meaning, which is burial in geological formations in a purpose built facility with no intention to retrieve the waste once the facility is closed. BR was concerned that the specific meaning of the term was not widely understood. It was agreed to consider the issue further at the Steering Group meeting on 25 January.</p> <p>It was also agreed that NuLeAF’s work on implementation issues should take account of the further outputs from CoRWM and from the EA/SEPA review of guidance on requirements for authorisation.</p>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><b>IMPLEMENTATION: KEY ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION</b></p>	
<p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.2.1</p> <p>4.2.2</p>	<p>FB outlined the contents of the report setting out the key issues for discussion. This was followed by discussion section by section, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• position on geological disposal</li> <li>• R&amp;D on long-term uncertainties</li> <li>• role of the NDA</li> <li>• the terms of reference for the advisory body</li> <li>• process for initial invitations and responses</li> <li>• partnership formation and working</li> <li>• participation and community packages</li> <li>• right of withdrawal</li> <li>• siting and planning</li> <li>• new build wastes</li> </ul> <p>The following points were agreed:</p> <p>Although supportive of CoRWM’s recommendations relating to geological disposal (best available approach in current state of knowledge, commitment to R&amp;D to reduce uncertainties, and flexibility to leave open the possibility of other practical alternatives), the SG’s position should be reviewed following further discussion of use of the word ‘disposal’.</p> <p>There is uncertainty about the functions and roles of Government, the NDA and new advisory committee (CoRWM 2) in the implementation programme. The next meeting of the SG should consider a report clarifying what is currently known and what further questions require answers.</p>	<p>FB</p> <p>FB</p>

4.2.3	Issues associated with (a) developing the NDA's role as implementing organisation and (b) developing the role of CoRWM 2, should be included on the agenda for the liaison meetings between NuLeAF and Government departments/NDA.	FB
4.2.4	<p>On the process for initial invites and responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CoRWM's suggestions that 'self-defining' communities should be able to volunteer and for 'special arrangements' for ratifying decisions are not supported.</li> <li>- Careful preparation prior to receipt of invitations will be required, including a wide 'breadth of conversation' between local stakeholders.</li> <li>- Different methods for identifying community views and concerns have different strengths and weaknesses.</li> </ul>	
4.2.5	A 'siting partnership' should take decisions about how it monitors and scrutinises developments in the siting process, what research it commissions relating to the siting process, how it informs and consults the wider public and how it goes about formulating proposals for community packages. However, key decisions, for example, relating to continued participation, right of withdrawal, the acceptability of community packages, acceptability of local sites for field investigation, and acceptability of increases in inventory, should be subject to local authority decision-making, informed by advice and recommendations from the siting partnership.	
4.2.6	CoRWM's position on the availability of support packages for new central or regional stores should be supported. Its definition of "well-being" should be supported, subject to the addition of a reference to the promotion of social cohesion.	
4.2.7	Rights of withdrawal need to be balanced with responsibilities. The conditions under which withdrawal is possible are likely to become more constrained as the siting process progresses.	
4.2.8	The contrast between the Government's likely approach to implementation of a geological repository and wider developments in planning should be discussed with Government.	FB
4.2.9	CoRWM's position on new build wastes should be re-affirmed.	
<b>5</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION: NUCLEAF'S FORWARD PROGRAMME</b>	
5.1	FB outlined proposals for the work programme on implementation.	
5.2	<p>The following recommendations were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To consider a revised draft policy statement at the SG meeting on 25 January 07.</li> <li>- To endorse the proposed approach to liaison with Government, including preparation of a series of four briefing papers.</li> </ul>	FB

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To seek meetings with the NDA, EA and CoRWM in the period Feb-April 07.</li> <li>- To endorse the proposed LGA conference and delegate authority to the Executive Director to agree an appropriate format with the LGA.</li> <li>- To prepare a draft set of comments on CoRWM's Implementation Report for consideration at its meeting on 25 January 07.</li> <li>- To circulate further issues of the e-bulletin to member authorities to keep them informed of developments and encourage feedback.</li> </ul>	
<b>6</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
	BR raised the question of the method of payment of expenses for attending events sponsored by external organisations. It was agreed to re-affirm that arrangements should be made with sponsors to enable members to re-claim expenses from NuLeAF.	CdelC
<b>7</b>	<b>FUTURE BUSINESS MEETINGS</b>	
	<p>Future meetings of the Steering Group are:</p> <p>25 January Ipswich  19 April Manchester  5 July TBC  18 October TBC</p>	