

# MANAGING THE NUCLEAR LEGACY – ISSUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Regional Seminars Report,  
December 06



## Introduction

This report provides an overview of the regional seminars and the main points from discussion.

The report has the following structure:

- Aims, programme, agenda and participants
- Implementing policy for the long-term management of higher activity radioactive wastes
- Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) strategy
- The role of NuLeAF
- Way Forward
- Summary of Feedback
- Appendix 1: Table of speakers
- Appendix 2: Seminar participants

## Aims, Programme, Agenda and Participants

The aims of the seminars were to:

- Brief participants on key developments in nuclear legacy management
- Exchange information about local authority initiatives
- Identify initiatives that NuLeAF should undertake on behalf of member authorities

The programme of seminars was:

East of England	25 October	Ipswich [Endeavour House]
South East England	30 October	London [LGA House]
South West England	9 November	Taunton [County Hall]
North West England	15 November	Preston [County Hall]
Wales	22 November	Llandudno [Venue Cymru]

The programme was focussed in the areas containing the greatest concentration of major nuclear sites and NuLeAF Member Authorities.

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p1

The agenda was in two parts. The morning sessions considered the long-term management of higher activity wastes<sup>1</sup>. The afternoon sessions considered the strategy of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA).

The agenda was as follows:

- 9.30 Introduction
- 9.40 Overview of CoRWM Recommendations (Ipswich and London) or Overview of Govt reponse to CoRWM recommendations (Taunton, Preston and Llandudno)
- 10.20 Local Partnerships and Community Packages
- 10.50 The Siting Process and Planning Requirements
- 11.15 Tea/coffee
- 11.35 Group discussions
- 12.30 Reports to plenary
  
- 1.30 Overview of NDA Strategy
- 1.50 Site End States
- 2.15 The Management of Low Level and Intermediate Level Waste (LLW and ILW)
- 2.40 Socio-Economic Initiatives
- 3.05 Tea/coffee
- 3.20 Group discussions
- 4.15 Reports to plenary
- 4.30 Way Forward

Presentations were made by speakers from the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM), the Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Galson Sciences, the NDA and NuLeAF. Appendix 1 contains a table of speakers. NuLeAF is very grateful to those organisations for providing speakers.

Each presentation was followed by questions and answers in plenary session. Copies of the presentations are available on request from NuLeAF ([christine.delcorral@nuleaf.org.uk](mailto:christine.delcorral@nuleaf.org.uk)).

The group discussions focussed on the following questions:

*Morning: implementing long-term management policy*

- How can proposals for implementation be made to work in practice?
- How should local authority expertise be brought to bear in developing proposals for implementation?
- How can NuLeAF help?

*Afternoon: NDA Strategy*

- What are the main concerns from a local authority perspective?

---

<sup>1</sup> This includes Intermediate and High Level Wastes, and material such as spent fuel and plutonium that may be defined as waste in the future.

- How are authorities responding, or how should they respond?
- How can NuLeAF help?

Nearly 100 people participated in the seminars, including representatives from 30 local authorities (24 NuLeAF member authorities and 6 non-member authorities), the Wales Assembly Government, 3 Regional Assemblies and a Regional Development Agency. Appendix 2 provides a full list of participants.

## **Implementing Long-Term Management Policy for Higher Activity Wastes**

The context was provided by the Government and Devolved Administrations announcement of new policy on the long-term management of higher activity radioactive wastes<sup>2</sup>. As anticipated, Government accepted the recommendations of CoRWM that geological disposal coupled with safe and secure interim storage is the way forward.

Expressing the view that the circumstances surrounding geological disposal are “unique”, Government stated that it is supportive of exploring how an approach based on “willingness to participate” and “partnership” with local communities could be made to work in practice. To this end, it invited local authorities to participate in early discussions to inform development of an implementation framework. A draft framework will be put out for consultation in the middle of 2007.

The Government also announced that the NDA will be given responsibility for developing and ensuring delivery and implementation of the programmes for interim storage and geological disposal. It argues that this has the advantage of allowing one organisation to take an “integrated view across the waste management chain”. The NDA has been given the initial task of drafting an “outline repository development plan”, which will also be consulted upon next year.

To enable the NDA to undertake its new responsibilities, Government is pushing forward with the transfer of Nirex into the NDA. Following this, Nirex will be wound up as a separate company. Government adds that NDA will use a competitive tendering exercise to appoint a contractor to undertake repository development.

Recognising the value of “visible independent scrutiny and advice”, the Government is reconstituting CoRWM with modified terms of reference and membership. The new committee will be expected to scrutinise the implementation programme and provide independent advice.

Government expects the reconstituted committee to be in place by the middle of 2007. It expects to take decisions on the implementation framework and outline repository development plan in late 2007. The implementation programme will start in 2008.

---

<sup>2</sup> The announcement was made at lunchtime on October 25, the day of the Ipswich seminar.

Against this backdrop, the main points from discussion were:

### ***Profile of the Issue***

Some participants expressed concern that the issue was not on the 'radar screen' of most senior politicians and officers in local government, regional assemblies, or the Wales Assembly, and that the visibility of the issue should be increased. A high level LGA event was suggested, possibly involving the Secretary of State.

It was pointed out that there is considerable variation between local authorities in terms of understanding of, and involvement in, nuclear legacy management. Most local authorities currently have only modest capacity to engage with nuclear legacy issues.

### ***Local Government Role***

Nonetheless, participants considered that local authorities would have a central role to play in a siting process for a geological repository.

They pointed to the importance of local authority:

- experience in disseminating information, engaging their communities and seeking local views (particularly in the development of local plans)
- understanding of local communities
- understanding of how their areas could be developed and
- experience in handling planning applications.

Some participants expressed concern about the potential for disagreement between district/borough and county tiers of local government and highlighted the need to develop effective ways of working in partnership.

Some participants pointed out that further moves towards unitary authorities could impact on the siting process.

### ***Initial Screening of the UK***

There is a widespread view that an initial geological screening should take place prior to issuing invitations to participate in a siting process for a geological repository so that local authorities outside potentially suitable areas are not unnecessarily involved in the initial steps.

Additional screening criteria should be determined following consultation. These might include population density, designated land, environmental constraints (climate change etc), and transport infrastructure.

The screening process should be open and transparent. Information about those areas not likely to be suitable for geological disposal should be published.

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p4

### ***Initial Invitations to Participate in the Siting Process***

Participants pointed to the need for initial invitations to participate to be preceded or accompanied by opportunities for the briefing of members and officers, and by high quality public information about the nature of radioactivity, radioactive waste management, geological repositories, potential impacts and benefits and the siting process. There was stated to be a need for a clear account of 'what the project is, and what impacts it could have'.

Some participants in Wales suggested that the position of the Assembly would need to be clear and supportive prior to the issue of invitations to participate.

Local authorities that receive invites will want to be in a position to be able to respond to public concerns so will need high quality information and briefing. This suggests the need for some form of 'pre-invitation' briefing programme.

Some participants suggested that a national information campaign will be needed to help counter misleading or alarmist information from campaigning groups.

Some participants thought there might be a need for a local referendum to identify whether a community supported participation in the siting process. This could inform a local authority decision about whether to participate.

Participants pointed to the need for an 'evaluation period' following receipt of invitations to allow authorities that might wish to participate to engage with local communities and assess the pros and cons. Particular effort should be made to engage with young people.

Participants pointed out that sufficient time and resources should be provided to enable this initial engagement and evaluation to be undertaken effectively. Involvement packages should cover the costs incurred at this step.

### ***National Framework and Guidance to Planners***

Participants called for a very clear national framework to be established. Some participants suggested that this should outline the steps that would be followed once a community had expressed an interest in participating, but that the process should be flexible and subject to negotiation between partners. Others pointed to the need for clarity about the mechanisms that would be used to provide Involvement and Community Packages.

Participants called for guidance to planners about how a siting process based on 'willingness to participate' and 'partnership' can be integrated with planning requirements. Some participants considered that Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Plans should be amended to include reference to repository siting once a clear willingness to participate had been established. It was pointed out that reference to potential sites in local plans could provide some protection against other uses. Some participants thought that Government should provide guidance on the scope and timing of reference to potential repository development in local plans. Others were not sure that the RSS/LDP route should be followed given the unique nature of a geological repository.

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p5

Some participants pointed to the contrast between the proposed approach to siting a geological repository (willingness to participate and partnership) and proposals to reduce local involvement in decisions about major infrastructure projects. It was argued that the contrast should be addressed and explained.

### ***Involvement and Community Packages***

Participants considered that Involvement Packages should be available to meet the costs incurred by local authorities in undertaking initial community engagement and evaluation of whether to participate in the siting process.

For those authorities that participate, participants pointed to the need for Involvement Packages to cover the costs of briefing, training and, potentially, recruiting staff.

Participants expressed the view that Community Packages will need to be substantial enough to enable local judgements to be reached that the benefits of repository developed outweigh the costs.

Views were expressed that Community Packages should:

- provide for the longer term as well as current generations (including sustainable jobs and trust funds);
- focus on the local area containing the site but make some provision for benefits across a larger area (including infrastructure); and
- provide some initial benefits prior to repository construction (to provide early incentive and address interim impacts).

Some participants pointed to the need for Government to clarify whether any forms of Community Packages could fall foul of EC rules on state aids. Some considered that Government should explain why the provision of Community Packages would not be setting a precedent for other major developments.

Some participants referred to negotiations about community support associated with the LLW repository near Drigg in Cumbria. It was suggested that this might provide learning that could be drawn upon.

### ***Siting Partnerships***

Participants supported the concept of partnership working and the need for a specific focussed vehicle to undertake that role.

Participants made the point that a 'siting partnership' should link into or liaise with local strategic partnerships. Some participants were concerned that LSPs were not sufficiently resourced or did not have sufficient public profile to be the primary vehicle.

The point was made that a 'siting partnership' would need to be representative of a wide range of local interests. Some argued that there should be regional representation on a siting partnership. Others preferred a more local focus.

Some participants pointed out that the transport of wastes to a repository could impact on a wide range of communities. Thought needed to be given to how such communities might be consulted.

Some participants questioned how a siting partnership would relate to Site Stakeholder Groups. They considered that SSGs did not provide the right model for a siting partnership.

Some participants pointed to the value of a partnership approach that would be able to undertake 'joint fact finding', rather than foster an adversarial approach.

It was pointed out that a siting partnership must be able to sustain its work over long timescales. Thought needs to be given to 'change management', for example, involving personnel or partner organisations (eg local government re-organisation).

### ***Implementing Organisation***

Some participants expressed concern that a separate implementing organisation was not being set up, and that the NDA was being given the role. They thought that there should have been consultation on this issue. It was pointed out that the NDA will have to develop the capacity to work in partnership with local communities.

### ***Overall Process***

Participants thought it unlikely that many authorities would volunteer to participate. Some asked whether there was a 'plan B'. The point was made that an approach based on willingness to participate and partnership should be made to work, through learning and adaptation as the process proceeds. There was a view that Government should not revert to a Decide Announce Defend approach.

Some participants pointed to the need for the siting process to be supported over time and to be robust against political change. It was suggested that various steps could help, including development of cross-party consensus, inclusion in RSS/LDPs, and sustaining the role of siting partnerships.

## **NDA Strategy**

The context was provided by an overview of NDA strategy, covering the decommissioning and clean-up all public sector civil nuclear sites in the UK. The NDA published its approved strategy at the end of March 2006.

Against this backdrop, the main points from discussion were:

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p7

## ***Site End States***

The NDA is reviewing site End States with stakeholders. The review aims to identify the physical condition that a nuclear site should be left in when the NDA has finished its business. The End State (or states) will influence the end uses that are possible on a site. Site Stakeholder Groups (SSGs) are leading local consultation as part of the review. The outcome of the review will be incorporated into revised NDA strategy during 2008.

There is a mixed picture of local authority involvement in the End States review. Some participants pointed to the advantages of direct local authority involvement. For example, Lancashire County Council is closely involved with the review of the Springfields end-state. A County Councillor chairs the SSG Sub-Group, key players are being engaged (eg the Fylde Strategic Partnership), and the County Council is providing specialist analysis of consultation outputs.

Other participants were concerned that in some areas local authorities, particularly at County level, were not being directly engaged in the review by local SSGs. It was suggested that SSGs should be provided with guidance or a 'protocol' about which organisations to consult.

It was stressed that the local planning authority should be a major player in the process, as it is likely to have a key role in decision-making about the future use of a site. Local authority planners should be involved upfront in the process, not at the end.

Some participants expressed concern about the process that will be used to reconcile local community views with national considerations. In some cases, community aspirations may be constrained by cost considerations. It was thought important that the 'reconciliation process' should be open and transparent. Some participants suggested that the process should address 'sustainability' issues.

Some participants recognised that mixed end states might be appropriate, with different parts of a site being used for different purposes and cleaned-up to different standards. For example, one part of a site might be used to manage contaminated land from across the site. Given service connections (gas, water, sewage, road, rail etc), it might be appropriate for some sites or parts of a site to be used for industry or other initiatives aimed at economic regeneration.

Participants suggested that local authorities with NDA sites should be provided with information about the consultation processes and outputs from other sites. It was important that there is a clear audit trail of engagement and decision making on the issue.

Some participants pointed out that whatever the preferred end use and state, there would be a need to validate that required standards of clean-up had been met.

Some participants queried what opportunity there would be for review of preferred end uses/states some years from now. It was suggested that local views could change in the decades before an end state was achieved.

### ***Interim Storage of ILW***

The NDA is developing plans for engaging stakeholders in its review of options for rationalising the interim storage of intermediate level wastes (ILW). This review could impact on the location of the site or sites for storing operational ILW from Berkeley, Bradwell, Culham, Dungeness, Harwell, Oldbury, Sizewell, Winfrith and Wylfa, which amounts to about 5% of the NDA's ILW inventory. It is likely that four basic options will be assessed:

- Building stores at each or most of the listed sites
- Building an enhanced store at one of the existing sites in the south
- Building enhanced stores at two of the existing sites (one in the SW and one in the SE/East)
- Taking a centralised approach (eg storage of the wastes at Sellafield)

Some participants expressed surprise that the NDA was looking to rationalise ILW storage at a smaller number of sites. Some pointed out that planning permissions for existing ILW stores (for example at Hinkley Point) were for local wastes, and that agreement would not necessarily be forthcoming for use of such facilities for wastes from other sites. Others thought that the use of an existing store for ILW from another site "worthy of discussion", although the possibility had not yet been discussed in the SSGs or by the planning authorities.

Participants pointed out that it was important for potentially affected local authorities to be involved as early as possible in these option assessments. Some participants pointed to the need to see a cost-benefit analysis of the different storage options.

Some participants asked whether a regional store at an existing site would attract the sort of Community Packages being discussed for geological disposal. In principle, community benefits could be made available as a result of savings derived from consolidating storage at a smaller number of sites.

For some participants, transport of ILW was seen as an important issue, raising public concerns about safety (although there was a good transport safety record). Some pointed to the need for 'transport links' to be included as a criterion in options assessment.

### ***Assessment of Options for Managing LLW from Nuclear Sites***

Magnox Electric is undertaking a project to determine the most appropriate means of managing and disposing of decommissioning LLW, focusing on the LLW at the lower activity end of the range. The 20% or so of higher activity LLW might be disposed of at the surface repository near Drigg or to a geological repository.

The options being considered for the lower activity LLW are:

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p9

- disposal on existing Magnox sites
- near-surface disposal at a site-specific facility near to site
- near-surface disposal in a national or regional facility appropriate for LLW
- near-surface disposal in a national facility designed to accept wastes suitable for the repository near Drigg

Site-specific workshops have taken place at Bradwell, Dungeness, Hinkley Point and Sizewell, with stakeholders from Site Stakeholder Groups and representatives of Local Planning Authorities. In the main, option assessments are pointing towards some form of disposal on existing Magnox sites as the preferred option from a technical perspective.

Some participants welcomed these developments and felt that the EA policy of favouring the use of the repository near Drigg in Cumbria for LLW from outside the area should be challenged, particularly in the light of severe capacity constraints. They felt there was a need for a higher profile discussion about the future of LLW management across the UK, and that the NDA should learn from the CoRWM process in terms of involving stakeholders in such discussions.

Others asked what the timetable was for discussions about the management of decommissioning LLW from other NDA sites.

In some areas, concern was expressed about the potential impact of coastal erosion and sea level rises, and whether this might undermine the safety case for on-site disposal.

Some officers that had been involved in the option assessment workshops stressed that Magnox Electric should not assume that councillors would take the same view as their officers on the findings.

Some participants highlighted the capacity constraints on the use of controlled burial to landfill for Very LLW and the need to look for alternatives. Other participants highlighted that 'community acceptance' of landfill and incineration for conventional wastes could be jeopardised by attempts to use these routes for VLLW disposal.

### ***Draft Socio-Economic Policy***

This was published on 5 October with a request for comments by 19 January. The draft policy sets out how the NDA intends to work with partners to help mitigate the impacts of decommissioning programmes. It seeks to provide the framework within which organisations near NDA sites will be able to bid for funds for projects that will bring long lasting benefits to communities.

Although participants welcomed the NDA's approach, some pointed out that it is very challenging to meet aspirations to move away from the dependency culture that exists around some sites. They pointed to problems arising from a lack of entrepreneurship, outward migration and the need for major investment in infrastructure. Difficulties arise in identifying projects that are appropriate to very remote areas. Concerns were also expressed about the limited scale of support that might be available and the approach of

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p10

relying on cost savings in decommissioning and clean-up to generate funds for socio-economic initiatives.

Some participants highlighted that projects must be coordinated with other initiatives (for example through local Partnerships), support sustainable development, and bring added value. They favoured initiatives that were 'owned' by local communities, and generated good quality jobs. Suggestions included developing local business skills so local firms could compete for contracts. Local authorities might also be encouraged to undertake feasibility studies into 'transformational' projects.

Other participants suggested that in addition to 'transformational' projects that meshed with local and regional development strategies, there should be scope for supporting community-based initiatives generated at local level. It was pointed out that some local authorities are split into community areas, each with its own action plan and budget for local decisions, and that in some areas these might provide a framework for community-based initiatives.

Participants also highlighted the need for the NDA to make sure people know of the opportunity to apply for support, and to publicise examples of good projects. It was suggested that information should be published on the web and be circulated via contractors, SSGs, local strategic partnerships and local authorities.

### ***Stakeholder Engagement***

Some participants expressed concerns about the NDA's main mechanisms for stakeholder engagement – the SSGs at a local level and the National Stakeholder Group (and associated working groups).

Points included:

- Neither the SSGs nor NSG are fully representative. In particular, some SSGs do not have active involvement from both tiers of local government in their area.
- Attendance at SSGs by councillors cannot always be taken to mean that their local authority will be briefed about developments and discussion. Additional steps may need to be taken to ensure that local authorities are informed and engaged.
- SSGs are no substitute for direct engagement with local planning authorities.
- A more systematic approach needs to be taken to engaging key local stakeholders on strategic issues.
- A review of SSGs is needed to ensure more consistent representation and outreach.
- Regular meetings with officers from local authorities should be held, either on a site basis or regional basis.
- Inter-site engagement of SSG representatives is unlikely to involve all the key stakeholders that need to be involved in regional or national discussions.
- The NSG working groups are self-selecting and do not involve representatives from all relevant organisations.
- The NSG working groups are not effective at communicating the output of their discussions to SSGs and local authorities with sites.
- For some areas there is a disconnection between local (SSG) and national (NSG) engagement.

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p11

## The Role of NuLeAF

This theme was addressed in the at-table discussions and in feedback forms. The main points made were that NuLeAF should:

- Ensure member authorities are kept informed about developments, including consultations by Government, the NDA and industry
- Explain issues, developments and processes for engagement to member authorities
- Track industry option assessments and feed back information to member authorities
- Provide guides to existing information
- Provide briefings that enable officers to respond to member and public enquiries
- Provide information about best practice and case studies from the UK and abroad
- Seek to engage with and brief member and officer leaderships in all local authorities
- Motivate and engage member authorities
- Provide fora for discussions between member authorities
- Undertake a consensus building role between authorities affected by the consolidation of waste management at a smaller number of sites
- Consider opportunities for twinning between nuclear site authorities and international counterparts
- Interface with national bodies
- Collate local authority views for input to national bodies
- Encourage national bodies to develop good processes for stakeholder engagement
- Establish a relationship with the Wales Local Government Association.
- Maintain independence and a balanced approach
- Ensure that all local authorities are aware that it is not an anti-nuclear organisation

## Way Forward

NuLeAF will use the seminar outputs to shape its work programme over the coming months.

On the long-term management of higher activity wastes, NuLeAF will use the outputs to inform the preparation of further briefing papers. These will be discussed in liaison meetings with Government so that a local government perspective helps shape the implementation framework. In addition, following an approach from NuLeAF, the LGA is likely to organise a high profile conference on the issue in September 2007.

On NDA strategy, NuLeAF will discuss the outputs with the NDA so that an understanding of local authority views and concerns inform its approach to stakeholder engagement and the development of key aspects of strategy.

On the role of NuLeAF, the seminar outputs will be taken into account in developing services to member authorities, including information materials, advice and guidance, and future events.

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p12

NuLeAF seeks to keep member authorities up to date with developments through circulation of an e-bulletin. Further information about NuLeAF initiatives can be found on its website ([www.nuleaf.org.uk](http://www.nuleaf.org.uk)).

Finally, local authorities are encouraged to provide regular feedback to NuLeAF about their involvement in local discussions about nuclear legacy management. This feedback will help inform NuLeAF's work and future activities.

## Summary of Feedback

Participants were asked to complete feedback forms. Forty forms were returned. Overall a large majority of participants found the seminars of considerable value and welcomed the opportunity to discuss issues with colleagues from other local authorities and from national bodies. Responses are summarised in the table below:

<b>SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Comments and numbers</b>
What worked well?	At-table discussions 19 Good mix of presentations and discussion 6 Presentations 5 Morning presentations 4 Opportunity for networking 2 Level of participation in discussion 1 Seminar pack 1
What could be improved?	Some afternoon presentations too long and technical 8 Better attendance (wider invites) 7 More focussed questions for at-table discussions 5 More advance information about legacy management 4 Slightly later start time 2 Introductory overview to legacy management 1 Option to discuss more than one topic at tables 1 Prompt more debate in Q&A 1 Clearer objectives re what NuLeAF wants out of event 1
Future topics for NuLeAF events?	Key developments in nuclear legacy management 10 Case studies and best practice 5 Engaging and informing the public 5 Methods of stakeholder and community engagement 4 Interim ILW storage 4 Transport of wastes 4 SE impacts/initiatives 3 LLW policy and strategy 3 Potential for re-use/recycle 2 Linkage of issues to planning function 2 Site end states 1 Nuclear incident planning 1
Should future events be regional or national?	Both 22 Regional 14 National 2
Would a seminar fee prevent attendance?	No 20 Yes 8
What would be the maximum appropriate fee?	£200 1 £100 8 £60-70 1 £50 3 £15 (just cover costs) 2
Would you be willing to participate in NuLeAF Officer Groups?	Yes 18

## Appendix 1: Table of Speakers

	<b>Ipswich, 25 Oct</b>	<b>London, 30 Oct</b>	<b>Taunton, 9 Nov</b>	<b>Preston, 15 Nov</b>	<b>Llandudno, 22 Nov</b>
9.40 CoRWM recs or Govt response	CoRWM – Andy Blowers	CoRWM – Andy Blowers	DEFRA – Robert Jackson	DEFRA – Robert Jackson	DEFRA – Robert Jackson
10.20 Partnerships and Community Packages	CoRWM – Pete Wilkinson	CoRWM – Mark Dutton	Galson Sciences – Phil Richardson	CoRWM – Mark Dutton	CoRWM – Mark Dutton
10.50 Siting and planning	NuLeAF – Fred Barker	NuLeAF – Fred Barker	NuLeAF – Fred Barker	NuLeAF – Fred Barker	NuLeAF – Fred Barker
1.30 NDA strategy	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki
1.50 End States	NDA – Paul Milne	NDA – Peter Wallis	NDA – Andrew Smart	NDA – Peter Harrop	NDA – Tony Godley
2.15 LLW and ILW management	NDA – Paul Milne	NDA – Peter Wallis	NDA – Andrew Smart	NDA – Joanne Fisher	NDA – Martin Robb
2.40 Socio-economic	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki	NDA – Richard Mrowicki

## Appendix 2: Participants

### IPSWICH: 25 October 2006

Broadland District Council  
Essex County Council  
Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Maldon District Council:

Norfolk County Council:

Suffolk Coastal District Council:

Suffolk County Council:

Suffolk Fire Service

East of England Regional Assembly  
Friends of the Earth, East of England  
Coordinator

NDA

CoRWM

NuLeAF

Stewart Moore, Pollution Control Officer  
David Wallis, Planning Development Control  
Glenn Buck Senior EHO  
Richard Alger, Technical Officer  
Shirley Hall, Economic Development Team  
Leader  
Nick Johnson, Planning Services Manager  
James Ward-Jackson, Senior Planner  
Bob Chamberlain, Principal Planner  
Clive Pink, Environmental Health Officer  
Malcolm Perrins, Economic Regeneration Mgr  
John Pitchford, Strategic Policy Manager  
Vimmi Hayes, Econ Development Project  
Officer  
Cllr Inga Lockington  
Cllr Julian Swainson  
Cllr John Goodwin  
Mike Topliss, Emergency Planning Officer  
Peter Chaplin, Resilience Manager

Jo Worley, Policy Officer  
Mary Edwards, Regional Campaigns

Richard Mrowicki  
Richard Flynn  
Sara Johnston  
Paul Milne

Pete Wilkinson  
Andy Blowers

Fred Barker  
Christine del Corral

### LONDON: 30 October 2006

Kent County Council

Wolverhampton City Council  
Worcestershire County Council

South East England Regional Assembly

Martin King, Senior Planner (Strategy &  
Planning)  
Jerry Crossley, Principal Planning Officer  
Sharon Thompson, Principal Planning Officer  
Katie Dickson, Planning Officer  
Nick D Dean, Team Leader Minerals &  
Wastes Policy

David Payne, Planning Manager

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p16

Chartered Institute of Environmental Health  
Environment Agency:

Howard Price, Principal Policy Officer  
Dr Paul Mountford-Lister, Nuclear Regulator  
Andrew Stone, Nuclear Regulator

NDA

Richard Mrowicki  
Richard Flynn  
Sara Johnston  
Peter Wallis

CoRWM

Mark Dutton  
Andy Blowers

NuLeAF

Fred Barker  
Stewart Kemp  
Christine del Corral

## **TAUNTON: 9 November 2006**

Dorset County Council

Donna George, Emergency Planning Officer  
Simon Parker, Chief Emergency Planning  
Officer

Gloucester City Council

Denise Powell, EHO  
Stephen Moreby, Contaminated Land Officer  
Les Netherton, Head Environmental  
Regulation

Plymouth City Council

Purbeck District Council

Bill Davidson, Head of Environmental  
Services

Somerset County Council

Gerald Hudd, Grp Mgr, Scientific Services  
Paula Hewitt, Hd of Environmental  
Regeneration and Regulation  
George Stephenson, Head of Community  
Protection  
Ian Bright, Renewable Energy Officer  
Andy Roberts, Principal Scientist  
Cllr Cathy Bakewell, Leader (afternoon only)  
Cllr Paul Buchanan, Deputy Leader  
(welcome)

South Gloucestershire Council

Cllr Jim Mochnacz  
Dinah Wooley, Senior EHO  
Peter Jackson, Director of Planning,  
Transport and Strategic Environment  
Pete Smith, EHO

South Hams District Council

Environment Agency:  
South West Regional Development Agency

Doug Withey  
Paul Hardman, Energy Adviser

NDA

Richard Mrowicki  
Andy Smart

DEFRA

Robert Jackson

NuLeAF

Fred Barker

'Managing the Nuclear Legacy', Regional Seminars Report, p17

Galson Sciences

Christine del Corral

Phil Richardson

## **PRESTON: 15 November 2006**

Blackpool Borough Council  
Chester City Council

Dave Docherty, Public Protection Officer  
Karan Warburton, Senior Planning Officer  
Fiona Edwards, Development Control  
Manager

Copeland Borough Council

Frank Duffy, Nuclear Issues Manager  
David Davies, Head Nuclear and  
Sustainability Unit

Cumbria County Council

John Hetherington  
Shaun Gorman, Head of Environmental  
Regulation

Fylde Borough Council  
Hyndburn Borough Council

Cllr Tim Knowles  
Cllr Bill Thompson  
Tony Akrigg, Environmental Protection  
Manager

Lake District National Park Authority

Katrina Rice, Community Development  
Planner

Lancashire County Council

Nicola Gough, Planning Officer  
Debbie King, Environment Policy  
Andy Mullaney, Head Environment Policy  
Mike Ainscough, Deputy County Analyst  
Cllr Bernard Whittle  
Cllr Clive Grunshaw  
Cllr Miles Parkinson  
Cllr Wendy Dwyer

Salford City Council

Nigel Powell, Regulatory Services Manager

North West Regional Assembly

Catherine Monaghan, Sustainable  
Development Mgr  
Cath Giel, Stakeholder Relations Manager

British Nuclear Group

NDA

Richard Mrowicki  
Peter Harrop  
Joanne Fisher

DEFRA

Robert Jackson

CoRWM

Mark Dutton  
Pete Wilkinson

NuLeAF

Fred Barker  
Sue Crisp  
Christine del Corral

## LLANDUDNO: 22 November 2006

Flintshire County Council

Gwynedd Council

Isle of Anglesey County Council

Snowdonia National Park Authority

Trawsfynydd Site Stakeholder Group  
Welsh Assembly Government

NDA

DEFRA

CoRWM

NuLeAF

Andy Macbeth

Cllr Kevin Jones

Dylan Rhys Griffiths, Regeneration  
Programmes Mgr

Llyr Jones

Sioned E Williams, Head of Economy &  
Regeneration

Arthur W Owen, Corporate Director  
Environment and Technical Services

Eleri Salisbury, Emergency Planning

Dylan Williams, Strategic Development and  
Funding Manager

Keith O'Brien, Sustainability & Community  
Officer

J Isgoed Williams

John Humphreys, Regeneration Manager

Richard Mrowicki

Richard Flynn

Martin Robb

Tony Godley

Robert Jackson

Mark Dutton

Fred Barker

Christine del Corral

Sue Crisp