

### MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Title	Theddlethorpe GDF Community Partnership Meeting 23		
Date	Thursday 16 <sup>th</sup> January 2025		
Time	From:	14:00	To: 17:00
Location	Coastal Centre, Victoria Road, Mablethorpe, Lincolnshire, LN12 2AQ		
Independent Chair	David Fannin		
Note taker	Victoria Mana (Community Partnership Assistant)		
Invitees			
Community Partnership (CP) Members			
Sector	Name	Organisation	Role
Council	Cllr Martin Hill	Lincolnshire County Council	Leader
Council	Cllr Craig Leyland	East Lindsey District Council	Leader
Council	Cllr Simon Acklam	Theddlethorpe & Withern Parish Council	Parish Council Representative
Council	Cllr Claire Arnold	Mablethorpe & Sutton Town Council	Town Council Representative
Voluntary	Tammy Smalley*	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Head of Conservation
Voluntary	Rob Druce	Mablethorpe Coastwatch	Sector Manager
Business	Gareth Rowland	British Holiday & Home Parks Association (BHHPA)	Director for Lincolnshire
Business	Carl Richardson	Dunes Family Entertainment Centre Ltd Dunes Food Events Company Ltd	Director Managing Director
Business	Helen Fisher	We Are Carbon	Proprietor
Nuclear Waste Services (NWS)	Sarah Fletcher*	Nuclear Waste Services	Regional Manager – GDF Siting
Official Observers			
	Andy Gutherson	Lincolnshire County Council	Executive Director of Place
	Pranali Parikh	East Lindsey District Council	Director of Economic Development
Nuclear Waste Services			
	Nicky Kirkby	Nuclear Waste Services	Operations Manager
	Nicola Clarke	Nuclear Waste Services	Community Engagement Manager
	Anneline Wilson*	Nuclear Waste Services	Regional Communications Manager
	Joe Blissett	Nuclear Waste Services	Grants Manager
	Simon Hughes	Nuclear Waste Services	Siting & Communities Director
	Chris Keenan*	Nuclear Waste Services	Head of Community, Operations & Land
	Matt Swift*	Nuclear Waste Services	Senior Project Manager
	Martin Walkingshaw	Nuclear Waste Services	Chief Operating Officer

Guest Presenters			
	Prof Neil Hyatt	Nuclear Waste Services	Chief Scientific Adviser
	Prof Lucy Bailey	Nuclear Waste Services	Chief of Disposal Safety
	Fiona McEvoy	Nuclear Waste Services	Head of Site Characterisation and Research & Development
Other Observers			
	Claire Dobson*	Nuclear Waste Services	Assistant Project Manager
	Hazel Jordan*	Nuclear Waste Services	Community Engagement Worker
	Edward Wright*	Lincolnshire County Council	Senior Adviser for Energy
	Philip Matthews*	Nuleaf Representative	
Apologies			
	Cllr Martin Hill, Cllr Claire Arnold; Pranali Parikh Nicola Clarke; Joe Blissett; Simon Hughes;		
Notes			
	*Attended Meeting Online		

### **Agenda**

Item	Description
1	Welcome, apologies and declaration of interests (any new / changes)
2	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising
3	Safety, Storage and the Multi-barrier approach <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Waste treatment, inventory and storage, with a historical context, and the multi-barrier concept (inc. Q &amp; A)</li> <li>2. Post closure safety and why the GDF will be safe: building on meeting presentation and centred on three pillars of geological barrier, engineered barriers and passively safe waste (inc. Q &amp; A)</li> </ol>
4	Geology <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recap of geology of East Coast as previously presented</li> <li>2. What we have learned about geology of the East Coast over the last year</li> <li>3. Overview of the SDM (Site Descriptive Model)</li> <li>4. Next steps in understanding the geology and site characterisation</li> </ol>
5	Update on planned agenda topics
6	PoA Updates – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Engagement</li> <li>2. Communications</li> <li>3. Vision</li> </ol>
7	Action Log
8	AOB

**Notes**

Item	Notes for the record	Lead
1	Welcome, apologies and declaration of interests (any new / changes)	David Fannin
	Apologies from Cllr Martin Hill, Cllr Claire Arnold, Pranali Parikh, Nicola Clarke, Joe Blissett and Simon Hughes were noted. No new / updated declarations of interests.	
2	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising	David Fannin
2.1	Minutes from previous meeting were approved.	
2.2	DF noted that to allow time for comprehensive discussion of current storage and core GDF multi-barrier safety issues, 'safety and transportation' which was due to be covered in today's presentation is being re-scheduled the June meeting. Safety is a constant theme across the whole schedule of meeting topics. Rescheduling this part of the topic agenda means that safety and transportation will now be picked up in the discussion on transporting and handling packaged nuclear waste.	
2.3	The CP noted that the presentation slides had not been sent out ahead of the meeting. It was explained that this is being worked on but, on this occasion, there had not been time to get the volume of technical content into an easily understandable and shareable format in time to share in advance. The expectation is that non-technical summaries are to be provided in advance to enable CP members to frame thoughts and questions. <b>ACTION: Neil to arrange from February onwards</b>	
3	Storage, Safety and the Multi-barrier approach	
3.1	Waste treatment, inventory & storage	Prof Neil Hyatt (NH)
3.1.1	Prof Neil Hyatt, NWS Chief Safety Adviser, gave a detailed presentation on waste treatment, inventory and current storage within the historical context, lessons learned and advances in knowledge relating to the multi-barrier concept.	
3.1.2	Following comments on the presentation by the CP, NH undertook to review the slides, explain acronyms and make the technical language easier to understand and make the slides available for public consumption.	
3.1.3	The following questions/points were made: 1. NH said that it is important to convey that modelling and evidence shows that when packaged waste is disposed in the GDF, that is the end of any risk. The multi-barrier approach will remove the risk associated with the current handling and storing of waste above ground. 2. A CP Member recommended watching the documentary on BBC Four, 'Britain's Nuclear Secrets, Inside Sellafield', part of a series of BBC Four programmes ('BBC Four Goes Nuclear' presented by Prof Jim Al-Khalili)	

	<p>3. <u>Question</u> - A CP Member asked about the longevity of the drums used for storing high-level waste and how they can be checked and tested once they are placed in the GDF. <u>Response</u> – the drums currently in use have been in use since August 1989. Tests can be done on the behaviour and stability of these using physical science. During the operational phase of the GDF, tests will be done to ensure that the vaults and packages are stable, with inspection and monitoring. This could be in place until closure of the GDF.</p> <p>4. <u>Question</u> – the Chair raised a question which had been asked in the December meeting about the change in terminology from ‘high activity waste’ to ‘most hazardous waste’ in the UK Policy document and how that might affect the placement of waste (reference item 3.2, CP meeting minutes of 19.12.24). The policy update implies that not all high activity waste needs to be placed in a GDF. <u>Response</u> – NH replied that a risk-based approach is being adopted, and the placement of the waste will depend on the risk posed. In principle, some waste might be placed in a near surface facility rather than in the GDF, if it did not require the isolation and containment of a GDF. <u>Comment</u> – a CP Member observed that a consequence of the risk-based approach is that there might be less volume assigned for the GDF.</p> <p>5. <u>Question</u> - A CP Member asked when the cut off stage is for deciding that nuclear materials are declared as ‘waste’. The point was made that technologies are constantly developing, and a use may be identified at a future point which is currently unknown to us. If the waste is already in the GDF, it will be inaccessible and unretrievable. <u>Response</u> – To be disposed in a GDF material must be declared as waste by the owner. When waste packages are disposed of in a GDF, the ability to retrieve the waste packages reduces with increasing time. After the facility is backfilled, and plugs and seals installed, the barrier to access and retrieval of material will be very high, and it will likely be more attractive to, for example, produce fresh nuclear fuel.</p>	
3.2	Post Closure Safety	Prof Lucy Bailey
3.2.1	Prof Lucy Bailey, NWS Chief of Disposal Safety gave a detailed presentation on post closure safety and how modelling provides assurance that the GDF will be safe, based on the three pillars of geological barrier, engineered barriers and passively safe waste.	
3.2.2	<p>The following questions/points were raised:</p> <p>1. <u>Observation</u> made that clear and simple explanation of long-term storage and multi-barrier safety after the GDF is closed is important for public reassurance and must be easy to understand. It was helpful to have the timeframes around the decay rate of the material together with an understanding of how the multi-barrier system works explained so clearly.</p>	

	<p>2. <u>Question</u> – A CP Member asked if the GDF will be monitored throughout the operation process with ongoing assessments. <u>Response</u> – monitoring safety will be part of an iterative process.</p> <p>3. <u>Observation</u> – LB referred to Features, Events and Processes (FEPs) <a href="#">NEA FEP Database</a> which means anything that can affect the safety of the GDF. FEPs includes inadvertent human intrusion including disruption of the geological barrier protecting the GDF. The CP questioned hostile state action and how that might be a possible concern. <u>Response</u> – NWS to follow up and seek an answer from the UK government to how potential hostile state action towards a GDF is addressed as a risk at UK national level. <u>Observation</u> – many members of the public see the GDF proposal for this area as being in isolation. The CP noted that there is a lot of international collaboration around research, planning and regulation of GDFs.</p>	
4	Geology	Fiona McEvoy
4.1.1	<p>Presentation given by Fiona McEvoy, NWS Head of Site Characterisation and Research &amp; Development, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What we know about the geology of the east coast and why it is of special interest for a GDF.</li> <li>• The Site Descriptive Model process and its contribution to site evaluation.</li> <li>• Next steps and timeframe for understanding the geology and site characterisation if the east coast search area stays in the GDF search process.</li> </ul>	
4.1.2	<p>The following points/questions were raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Observation</u> was made that it would be informative to have presentations from other developers who have competing interest in the Search Area.</li> <li>2. <u>Request</u> was made for a presentation about the geology in Mid and South Copeland. This would help the CP to understand and compare the geology in Cumbria with that in Lincolnshire.</li> </ol>	
4.1.3	<p>The CP made the point that geological and engineered safety is a fundamental concern for local people and agreed that the presentations and discussion had clarified and provided reassurance on many aspects of the safety case. The CP thanked NH, LB and FM for their presentations and welcomed the greater clarity and reassurance provided.</p>	
4.1.4	<p>It was agreed that NH, LB and FM would produce a simplified version of the information presented at today’s meeting which can be distributed to the public. This should make the safety case and plans for the safety of the GDF relatable and easy for people to understand. All agreed that clear messaging about safety requirements and controls is needed in the local context so that people are better informed, and the information can be further examined. <b>ACTION: NH, LB and FM to produce this as soon as possible after the meeting.</b></p>	

5	Update on Planned Agenda Topics	David Fannin
5.1	Reminder given that meetings scheduled for March and April sit within the pre-election period. DF will take guidance about how to proceed with these meetings.	
5.2	The schedule of topics is flexible to circumstances including the anticipated announcement on Areas of Focus at the end of January. DF will keep the schedule under review and coordinate subject matter experts to give an aligned approach.	
5.3	It is important that information from the developer is provided for the community. CP Members requested that simplified versions of all presentations be produced for distribution to the public quickly after each meeting. <b>ACTION: NH to coordinate with NWS subject experts and communications team to ensure this happens (see also action 4.1.4).</b>	
6	PoA Updates	
6.1	<u>Communications and engagement workstream:</u> DF noted that the CP is moving into a new phase focussed on detailed presentation and discussion of core siting and evaluation issues and local concerns. Its work will also be shaped by the anticipated announcement on Areas of Focus. Communication and engagement will need to adapt and evolve to this new phase of CP activity.	Anneline Wilson / David Fannin
6.2	HF and CA have been workstream leads respectively for communications and community engagement. HF is stepping away to focus on her business commitments. DF thanked her for the contribution she has made to the CP.	
6.3	It was agreed to establish a task and finish group to take stock of current comms and engagement activity including topic related matters, Community Bridge editorial process and questions from the public, and bring forward recommendations that strengthen CP input and oversight. <b>ACTION: CP Members to contact David by Friday 24<sup>th</sup> January.</b>	
6.4	It was highlighted that an article in the Community Bridge newsletter contained information regarding the Test of Public Support that could potentially confuse the local authority position and the UK policy definition. The CP agreed that, to avoid unnecessary confusion, the newsletter should not be distributed.	
6.5	<u>Community vision workstream:</u> CR updated the CP that four workshops have taken place. Local authority officers supported the workstream sub-group and provided valuable insight and capacity. The workshops were themed on place, economy, environment and education. More work will follow to bring this together with the aim of publishing a pre-consultation report by the end of March.	Carl Richardson

7	Action Log	David Fannin
7.1	The CP received an update on progress relating to the process for recruiting new CP members and refreshing the Community Partnership Agreement. It was agreed to update the action log accordingly.	
8	AOB	All
8.1	A CP Member asked how the announcement about Areas of Focus scheduled for 30.01.25 will be actioned. Chris Keenan will arrange to brief DF and the CP before the anticipated public announcement in January.	