



Chairman – Dr. Brian Marker- brian@amarker.freemove.co.uk.

Secretary - Duncan Pollock - pollock25@talktalk.net.

Minutes of the Sixth Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The Geological Society, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London WC1A 1DU on Monday 22 September 2008 at 10.30am.

Present:-

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Natalie Bennett – Natural England
Andrew Bloodworth – BGS
Ruth Chambers – WCL/CNP
Tom Clarke - DoENI
Bob Fenton- CBIMG/MAUK
Richard Gill – DBERR
Chris Hall –CBIMG/BCC
Lester Hicks
David Highley
Nick Horsley- CBIMG/SAMSA/WBB
Jon Humble – English Heritage
Nigel Jackson –Lafarge/ CBIMG
Hugh Llewelyn -Defra
Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government
Richard Read HampshireCC/POS
Michael Rodd –Facilitator – LWM3
Andy Tickle- CPRE
Simon van der Byl – QPA
Paul Wilcox – Staffs CC/POS
David Wilkes -CLG

Apologies:

David Brewer-Coalpro
David Brock –Mills and Reeve
Dwight DeMorais – BCA/Lafarge
Chris Dobbs – CBIMG/QPA/Tarmac
Peter Doyle –English Stone Forum

Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IOM3
Bob LeClerc - CBIMG
Jeremy Murfitt – CBIMG/QPA/ AI
Ian Mitchell – Scottish Government
Chris Waite – SEERA/SEERAWP

6/1.Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed Michael Rodd and new members to their first meeting.

6/2. Minutes of the last Meeting (15.5.08)

These were agreed subject to the deletion of the Reference to MIRO on the top of page 4

6/3) Matters Arising, Not Dealt with Elsewhere

There were none

6.4 Working Group 1 – Security of Supply

Andrew Bloodworth reported on the outcome of the three meetings of WG1 and gave a powerpoint presentation of the agreed points.

The title of the presentation was – “Security of Supply – Is the UK’s Indigenous Supply of Minerals Secure?” The slides covered the following issues: -

- i. What is meant by security of supply?
- ii. Background to indigenous minerals.
- iii. Factors affecting security of supply of indigenous minerals
- iv. Resource availability.
- v. Investment and access
- vi. Environmental and planning policy.
- vii. Advocacy of need.
- viii. Mitigating security of supply.
- ix. Permitted reserve levels.
- x. Conclusions – changing times, national advocacy for minerals.

He then set out 5 draft questions: -

1. How important is indigenous minerals supply?
2. Are there critical security of supply issues for some indigenous minerals?
3. Need statements by HMG
4. Should there be a national advocate for minerals?
5. What are the most serious threats to security of supply?

In a wide ranging discussion members made the following key points: -

- “Transport” was a key issue not just “rail transport”
- The term “planning balance” was outmoded; it should be reported as “planning integration”.

- The issue of need needed sharpening up
- It was important to avoid use of jargon in the presentations to LWM3 delegates.
- Barrie Hedges was preparing a 6 page-briefing note for all the LWM 3 delegates.
- There was a need for better life of reserves data for all minerals, not just aggregates. These were essential to set the scene.
- All WG presentations would be time limited to 10 minutes; at present all were too long.
- LWM3 delegates would receive the 6 page briefing pack but the longer WG reports would be put on the UKMF web site.

In the debate of the draft questions, the following points emerged: -

- Question 1 was the first question of the Conference and needed sharpening up to set the tone
- Michael Rodd said his organisation would be able to improve the draft questions and their preambles. Members did not need to be over concerned with the fine print. He understood the thrust of the questions and would return to key concerns at the end of the Conference in his summing up.
- Members agreed that the questions should arise directly from the power point presentations.
- The voting system would record the pattern of voting according to membership background and this could be reported directly back to the delegates. The voting system could cope with more than just “a-b-c” type voting – up to 9 categories could be dealt with.

At the end of this broad discussion, it was agreed that members would respond in writing on all the presentations by 29.9.08, comments directly to the convenors.

Action – members

6/5 WG2 –“Mineral Extraction in National Parks and AONB s –Issues and Options to 2042”

Andrew Bloodworth reported on these issues. The final report paper had yet to be finalised. At LWM3, Ruth Chambers had agreed to give the presentation. A West Mendips AONB case study might be added.

Andrew Bloodworth then presented the following slides: -

- i. National Parks and AONB’s –background.
- ii. Mineral Extraction in National Parks and AONB’s –background statistics.
- iii. What are the National Parks and AONBs for?
- iv. Aggregate Sales and Reserves –metrics – England.
- v. Carboniferous Limestone statistics
- vi. Current life of aggregate quarries in Parks/AONBs.
- vii. Alternative aggregate supply options.
- viii. Planning background.

- ix. Government engagement and national supply issues.
- x. Clarity of policies.
- xi. Conclusions.

He then set out 5 draft questions: -

- 1. Confidentiality of statistics.
- 2. Supply options outside the Parks/AONBs
- 3. Planning and Natural Resources.
- 4. How clear is the role of Government?
- 5. What are the expectations of BERR sponsorship?

In the discussions, members made the following points: -

- The statistics needed to be checked for addition errors.
- Diagrams needed to be simplified for clarity.
- The MPS1 extract should be repeated in the main briefing pack.
- More text was needed on the issue of public perception of the role of the Parks/AONBs and on attitudes to quarrying in them.
- More data was needed on non-aggregate minerals –there was too much concentration on aggregates.
- The work of the group was close to issues aired on the Security of Supply group.
- Had the issue of safeguarding been discussed? – No.
- More care needed to be taken on the use of statistics for England,
- Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland and on devolution sensitivities.
- It was still unclear who determined “National Need” –who would advise inspectors on this issue at a major mineral extraction public inquiry.
- National supply considerations should be the key issue on this presentation.
- There was general agreement that more metrics were needed for non-aggregate minerals. This would pose confidentiality problems and delegates should be asked to debate the issue of FoI/confidentiality, which was a live issue with the industry at the present.

6/6 WG3 Carbon and Proximity

Lester Hicks reported on this issue. He pointed out that the Group had not covered downstream mineral processing much of which (e.g. cement, bricks, gypsum, potash, lime) was covered by the EU ETS and/or UK Climate Change Agreements. But it had considered downstream aggregates products like readymix concrete and asphalt not so covered. He set out the following key slides, each with a theme, storyline and draft questions.-

- 1. Title slide
- 2. Theme 1 – Present carbon footprints of land won extraction including processing and transport.
- 3. Theme 2 –Focus on voluntary action –advice to companies, managers, staff, drivers
- 4. Theme 3- Focus on voluntary action –case studies.

5. Theme 4-Proximity.
6. Theme 5 – Balance between carbon reduction and other regulatory objectives.
7. Future Actions by the UK Onshore Minerals Industry.

In the discussions members made the following key points:-

- There was a need to set out the regulatory requirements in addition to voluntary actions.
- Minerals could sometimes be the climate change solution e.g. mitigation through flood balancing, coastal defences etc.
- There were lots of ways for the industry to cut energy consumption- this should be an industry wide drive and not be done piecemeal, on which choice the proposed questions sought views.
- Use of crushed rock in concrete would use more cement than sand and gravel concrete and so embody more carbon.
- Further work was needed on downstream carbon issues (but that had not been the remit of this Group).
- Customers were pressing for carbon footprint data including carbon labelling of mineral products.
- Although the style of this presentation differed from those for WGs 1&2 this was not felt to be a problem –different styles of presentation added variety to the event –there was no need for a unified style.

6/7 WG4 – Cumulative Impact of policy, legislation and regulation

Simon van der Byl reported on this issue and apologised for the incompleteness of the report, which was still subject to members’ views. He presented the following slides on a similar basis to those of WG3: -

- .Theme 1 – Regulation and legislation- why it matters.
- Theme 2- Differences between minerals operations and other forms of development.
- Theme 3 Effects of uncertainty.
- Theme 4- Joining up the regulations and the regulators
- Theme 5 – RIA.

In the discussions on the above, members made the following key points: -

- All the WGs interacted and interrelated.
- The case studies might be difficult to present in the 10-minute time slot.
- There was a need also to cover the outside UK issues including Ireland.
- The problem of the roles of the MPAs/EA needed addressing.

6/8 Conclusions to WG’s Work

Agreed:-(i) –members’ views were needed on the drafts of WG 1-3 by 29.9.08
(ii) –members’ views were needed on the drafts of WG4 by 3.10.08.
(iii) – Michael Rodd would amend the questions now he knew what was wanted.

(iv) the briefing note for the LWM3 delegates need to be finalised by 3.10.08 and this needed to include the terms of reference for each WG

6/9 LWM 3 –Progress Report.

Reported by Nigel Jackson:-

All arrangements for the event had been booked. The list of speakers had changed as follows :-

- 1). John Cridland – Deputy DG CBI.
- 2). Ladislav Miko – Director EC DG Environment.
- 3). Helen Phillips –CEO- Natural England.
- 4). Prof. Aubrey Manning – natural resources speaker.

- Each speaker would have a 15-minute slot.
- 25 companies had signed up as exhibitors/sponsors.
- 200+ delegates had so far been booked.
- The credit crunch was hitting bookings –350 delegates were being planned for
- There would be a further e-mail shot this week.
- More planners/green groups were needed.
- The UKMF website would be launched at the event.
- An ALSF funded “Art in Quarries” project would be displayed.
- The evening reception arrangements had been finalised.
- The WG sessions would be 45 minute slots each including 10 minutes of PowerPoint and 35 minutes discussions/voting
- All outputs of LWM3 would be put on the website and sent to Government.

6/10 UKMF Website

Reported by Andrew Bloodworth – The website had been finalised, would be launched on 3.11.08 but would go live earlier.

6/11 –Other Issues.

The following issues were briefly discussed: -

- a) Mining Waste Directive - Reported – the industry was now in discussions with the EA as the competent authority. Lots of work needed doing –it was as yet unclear who was the key contact at EA. This remained an issue also for MPAs.
- b) Soils Directive – Reported –this was a “slow burn” issue for industry –there might be lots of regional/local rules, which would mitigate the concerns.
- c) Inert Wastes –discussions on this issue continued very slowly.
- d) Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group - -the next lunch meeting was planned for 7.10.08.

6/12 Any Other Business

Reported –An FoI issue had arisen in Staffordshire in relation to silica sand statistics. This had been copied also to DCLG, QPA, WBB, and POS. The secretary would circulate the correspondence to members for views.

6/13 Date and Place of Next Meeting.

Tuesday 2 December 2008 at 10.30am, at The Geological Society, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London, WC1A 1DU