

## **Note of the NuLeAF/GMF meeting held at Berkeley Green Campus, Berkeley, Gloucestershire, 10<sup>th</sup> July 2018.**

1. For the attendance list please see Annex A.

2. The Chair welcomed delegates to the meeting and gave a brief overview of NuLeAF. He went on to explain NuLeAF's engagement with GMF and the role of the group. The Chair thanked those who would be speaking and the staff who had made the logistical arrangements.

3. The Chair welcomed David Peattie, CEO of NDA. Mr Peattie's presentation followed four themes:

- NDA performance in the last 12 months;
- Priorities for the coming year;
- Magnox sites; and
- Geological Disposal Facility.

3.1 NDA Performance: NDA had had its best year for safety, and a safety share system whereby news and learning from any incident is shared around the NDA sites within a few days has been put in place. Expenditure is on budget, and Mr Peattie will be attending the Public Accounts Committee hearing on the National Audit Office report on progress at Sellafield on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> July. 75% of specific operational targets have been met. Defueling of Wylfa is still in progress.

3.2 Sellafield remains the biggest project absorbing two-thirds of spend. Focus there is moving to storage of wastes. Discussions are going well regarding the withdrawal from Euratom, and there is a lot of goodwill with member states for work on bi-lateral arrangements to succeed.

3.3 The Parent Body Organisation contract with Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP) for the Magnox sites will end, and Magnox will become a wholly owned subsidiary of NDA in September 2019. This will raise the amount of the estate under direct control of NDA, and thereby the government, to 85%. The management team will report direct to Mr Peattie. NDA will not be the site licensee. CFP has been set 49 milestones to achieve before the contract ends, there are a handful at risk which may not be completed. NDA will then focus on understanding the sites so they can move to the next stage of clean-up. NDA is looking at a change of pace in decommissioning sites, but need help from BEIS. The impact on spending on accelerated decommissioning will arise in later years, rather than early on. No decisions have yet been made.

3.4 The Geological Disposal Facility is an exciting project and we are seeking a willing host community. It will be at least 20 years from now before it is operational.

3.5 The meeting opened up to questions.

*Q: Could you please explain the role of NDA, and what Magnox is?*

A: NDA is the body set up by UK parliament to be responsible for the closure and decommissioning of civil power stations and research sites. Magnox is a type of reactor, though none of the sites produce electricity anymore and all are in various phases of decommissioning.

*Q: What lessons has NDA learnt from getting Bradwell into Care and Maintenance (C&M), and what has happened to decommissioning at Trawsfynydd which was due to go into C&M at the same time as Bradwell?*

A: We learnt about weather cladding – this is the first time someone has done this on such a scale. We learnt about building the scaffolding on that scale, and the rainwater guttering and power supply associated with the project. After this, we need to consider is there a better way,

and do we need to put cladding on at all? Trawsfynydd is not far behind Bradwell – there were more technical problems because of the complicated history of the site. We are pleased and proud of the work at Bradwell.

*Q: From what you have already said, is it right to infer that you will not be in a position to do anything positive about accelerated decommissioning until next summer?*

A: Getting decisions through government is a slow process. But before that even takes place we need to get our thinking clear first. We are looking at continuous decommissioning as a way of maintaining skills in the workforce. We also need to consider how far we want to take these sites back to nature. Will it be acceptable to leave industrial buildings on the site?

*Q: Could you please explain how you engage with the people who live around your sites?*

A: NDA engages with NuLeAF, and it has Site Stakeholder Groups which represent the local communities. We are keen on having apprentices from the local population, and in encouraging school groups to visit sites. We invest heavily in local community groups, but do not have an unlimited budget. We try to be part of the community and have a dedicated team working on this.

4. The Chair welcomed Ann McCall, Siting and Engagement Director of Radioactive Waste Management Ltd.

4.1 Ms McCall was pleased that there were delegates from all over Europe to talk about radioactive waste management. It showed that it was a big issue internationally.

4.2 Ms McCall gave an overview of RWM Ltd. It is a subsidiary of NDA. There are Higher Activity Wastes at 30 sites around the UK. Finding a solution to the disposal of this waste is critical to NDA's mission. The waste has arisen over generations, and it needs to be dealt with now for the benefit of future generations. It is not simply a technical issue, but also social and ethical. Although geological disposal has been accepted as the most appropriate way to deal with the wastes, because of the long timescales involved a willing community is needed. RWM recognises that it needs to be a good neighbour to local communities to encourage them to participate, and the NDA summit is a good opportunity for it to meet people.

4.3 There has been significant progress in the project in the UK this year. BEIS consulted on two policy documents earlier in the year. We hope that the final policy document will be produced before Brexit dominates the parliamentary agenda. We hope that the document will show that we have taken on board people's concerns and lessons learned from previous processes.

4.4 The main focus is now providing information and engaging with communities. We have been recruiting staff from civil society organisations, planning and from other sectors. We are trying to be more outward facing and have developed an outreach team. Training on communication and engagement skills has been given to our scientists and engineers, and they have been teamed with staff from the Comms team. We've been working with schools, been to the Big Bang Fair, and the enthusiasm of young people is encouraging. The longer we talk to people about the project the more interest there is and acceptance, which is encouraging for us.

4.5 The next stage for us will be the launch of the siting process and forming partnerships with interested communities. Each partnership will be different, and tailored to the needs of the community. Each will have a different vision and different expectations.

5. The Chair welcomed Marie Berggren from Östhammar, Sweden.

5.1 Ms Berggren hoped to share with the delegates some of the experience her community had in the process of volunteering to become the host for the Spent Nuclear Fuel repository.

5.2 In Sweden, there is no regional level of government, and national government deals directly with local government. The government needs to consider environmental legislation and nuclear safety when dealing with issues relating to the repository. These are regulated by two different authorities: the National Radioactive Safety Authority (NRSA), and the Environmental Court. The application for the repository was submitted by the developer, SKB six years ago, and it has been scrutinised by these two bodies, and the two communities involved in the process: Östhammar and Oskarshamn, both of whom have the right of veto over the process. The results were presented in January 2018. Both the NRSA and Oskarshamn have votes yes to the project proceeding. Östhammar has yet to make a decision, and the Environmental Court has said "maybe". A questionnaire has been created by government on the issues raised by the Environmental Court and sent to SKB, which has until 2019 to respond.

The Environmental Court has not made a definite decision because it only has one opportunity to approve the application, and issues around the corrosion of the copper canisters needs to be resolved. In contrast, the NRSA process is phased, and so there will be opportunities for the Authority to halt the process at a later date should it feel that is necessary. The Environmental Court is an open process, whereas the NRSA process is more closed.

5.3 Involvement in the siting process has always been on a voluntary basis, and local politicians can trigger the right to withdraw at any point. We think this freedom is very important. There are clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The politicians representing the local communities have other full-time jobs, and it is important that the local government is properly resourced to support their ability to scrutinise the process.

5.4 Factors we think important for the process include:

- The municipality must have the capability to understand the issues;
- Two municipalities are stronger than one when dealing with national government;
- It is important to stand up for issues which are important to the community
- Think long term when making decisions affecting the municipality.

5.5 One of the big issues for us is who is responsible for the waste after the site has closed and the developer has gone. Who will take responsibility for the repository. It is very important the repository does not become the responsibility of the municipality at any point. Government and SKB are looking into this issue, but have yet to report.

5.6 It is good to hear that RWM Ltd has a broad base of perspectives within their company as they can learn from them.

5.7 Things which have proved important to the community and general public include whether the repository only takes Sweden's waste, or if it accepts imports, the long term safety of the repository, monitoring after closure (the project is currently based on no monitoring), the loss of energy from the waste as it is not reprocessed, corrosion of the copper canisters, transport of materials (all by boat), the inventory and employment (the area is currently short of people for the jobs available).

5.8 A local referendum had been planned in Östhammar for March 2018, as we had expected the Environmental Court and NRSA to agree. As this has not happened, the referendum has been stopped, and we think it is unlikely to go ahead before 2020. This delay is an issue, as local politicians believe there is momentum behind the decision to go ahead in the community at the

moment. If the process becomes too drawn out, then material in the application which was submitted in 2011 is out of date. There have already been generational changes amongst those involved in the process, as those who began the process in 1995 have retired. There needs to be handover between generations, and attracting students into the right university programmes so they have the requisite skills is important.

5.9 The meeting opened up to questions

*Q: Assuming the policy papers goes through when do you expect to move to the next stage.*

A: As soon as the policy papers are done, we are trying to get them in before Brexit, and when the government has a window.

*Q: How much knowledge is there regarding capacity in a GDF for waste from new nuclear build.*

A: We do not have this issue in Sweden as we do not have a new nuclear programme. In the UK waste from new nuclear power stations will be included.

*Q: The process in Sweden started in 1995 and you anticipate the referendum taking place in 2020. In retrospect is there anything you could have done to shorten the 25 year period?*

A: I'm not sure that there is as you need to give time to interact with the community – time to answer all the questions. Experts need enough time to scrutinise the application thoroughly. It is important that those involved in entering the process are prepared for the long haul.

6 The Chair thanked the presenters and the meeting closed.

## **Annex A – Attendance List**

### **NuLeAF meeting, 9.00 – 10.30 Berkeley Green Campus**

#### **Presenters**

David Peattie	Chief Executive	NDA
Ann McCall	Siting & Engagement Director	RWM
Marie Berggren	Head of Unit	Municipality of Östhammar, Sweden

#### **NuLeAF members**

Doug Bamsey	Corporate Director	Sedgemoor District Council
Jon Beckett		Stroud District Council
Nia Carys Boden	High Value Jobs Scheme Manager	Gwynedd County Council
Christian Branch	Service Business Manager	Isle of Anglesey County Council
Terry Burns		Essex County Council
Richard Conway	Environment Manager	Purbeck District Council
Peter Downing	Councillor	Sedgemoor District Council
Catherine Draper	Director's Assistant	NuLeAF
Gillian Elliott	Area Manager, Copeland	Cumbria County Council
Gillian Ellis-King	Strategic Projects Manager	South Gloucestershire Council
David Godfrey	Councillor	Folkestone & Hythe District Council
Richard Griffin	Policy Manager, Nuclear	Allerdale Borough Council
Geoff Holdcroft	Councillor	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Carwyn Jones	Councillor	Isle of Anglesey County Council
Nigel Moor	Councillor	Gloucestershire County Council
David Moore	Councillor	Copeland Borough Council
Chris Morgan	Councillor	West Somerset Council
Clive Pink	Environmental Health Officer	Suffolk Coastal District Council
John Pitchford	Head of Planning	Suffolk County Council
Sarah Povall	Senior Planning Policy Officer	Somerset County Council
Matthew Riddle	Leader of the Council	South Gloucestershire Council
Charlotte Rushmere	Principal Planning Officer	Dorset County Council
Richard Smith	Councillor	Suffolk County Council
Steve Smith	Nuclear Projects and Programme Manager	Copeland Borough Council

David Southward	Councillor	Cumbria County Council
Brendan Sweeney	Councillor/Chair	Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council
Ioan Thomas	Councillor	Gwynedd County Council
Linda Townsend	Senior Planner	Gloucestershire County Council

### **GMF delegation**

Benjamin Abilio Jimenez	Teniente de Alcalde	Ayuntamiento de Almaraz, Spain
Pia Almström	Mayor	Kävlinge Kommun, Sweden
Lorena Álvarez Delgado	Mayor	GMF, Spain
Dr. Magdolna Babinka	Notary of Penc	Local Government of Penc, Hungary
Józsefné Bakó	Notary	TETT Association, Hungary
Erzsébet Barta	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
József Bátyi	Mayor of Püspökhatvan	Local Government of Püspökhatvan, Hungary
Erzsébet Bechli	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
Zoltan Beke	Municipal Representative	Local Government of Bakonya, Hungary
Alfredo Beltrán	Mayor	GMF, Spain
Laszlo Benes	Mayor of Ibafa	Local Government of Ibafa, Hungary
Anna Bergsten	Tecnical Analyst	Municipality of Östhammar, Sweden
Lucio Bodega	Mayor	GMF, Spain
Gyula Bogdan	Municipal Representative	Local Government of Cserdi, Hungary
Dr Róbert Bozsolik	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
Zsolt Budai	Mayor of Bükkösd	Local Government of Bükkösd, Hungary
Józsefné Darabos	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
Gizella Demenyne Varga	Municipal Representative	Local Government of Püspökszilágy, Hungary
Teresa Duran Caballero,	Councillor	GMF, Spain
Stefan Edelsvärd	International Coordinator	Municipality of Östhammar, Sweden
Fernando Jorge García Martínez	Mayor	GMF, Spain
Henrik Glöckner	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
Joana Gonzalez Fernandez	Concejalia de Medio ambiente	Ayuntamiento de Almaraz, Spain
Raquel González Gómez	Mayor	GMF, Spain
Csaba Haures	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
Agnes Hegyi	Notary of Kisémedi	Local Government of Kisémedi, Hungary
Attila József Hideg	Expert for deep geological repository research program	Local Government of Boda
Marianna Horgasz	Municipal Representative	Local Government of Váchartyán, Hungary
Norbert Kelenfi	Municipal Representative	Local Government of Cserkút, Hungary
Dezső Győzőné Kosztolányi	Vice Mayor of Kővágótöttös	Local Government of Kővágótöttös, Hungary
Gyozo Kovacs	Mayor of Boda &	Local Government of Boda, Hungary

	President of Western Mecsek Information Association	
Elemér Krachun	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
Gabor Lieszkovszki	Mayor of Rád	Local Government of Rád, Hungary
Szilvia Lovas	Regional expert and advisor	Local Government of Órbottyán & Isotope Information Controlling Association, Hungary
Laszlo Makkos	Mayor of Vácduka	Local Government of Vácduka, Hungary
Merixell Martell	Director	Merience, Spain
Gil Martí	Mayor	GMF, Spain
Peter Nyemecz	Vice Mayor of Galgagyörk	Local Government of Galgagyörk, Hungary
Tibor Ronai	Journalist	Western Mecsek Information Association, Hungary
Aránzazu Rosado Sánchez	Coordinator	AMAC/GMF, Spain
Mats Rosen	Secretary of Local Safety Committee	Barsebäck NPP, Kävlinge Kommun, Sweden
Dr Gyula Elek Sajó	Mayor of Váckisújfalu	Local Government of Váckisújfalu, Hungary
Juan Pedro Sánchez Yebra	Mayor	GMF, Spain
Tibor Antal Sandor	Mayor of Kővágószőlős	Local Government of Kővágószőlős, Hungary
Péter Tillmann	Mayor	TETT Association, Hungary
Angéla Misnyovszkiné Toth	Vice Mayor	Local Government of Kisnémedi
Noemi Matild Varga	Economic Expert	Local Government of Helesfa, Hungary
Mariano Vila D'abadal	General Secretary	GMF, Spain
Antal Jzsef Wagner	Mayor of Hetvehely	Local Government of Hetvehely, Hungary