

Bradwell Site

Draft Minutes of the 57th Local Community Liaison Council (LCLC) Meeting

The Lodge, Minerva Centre, Mundon
Wednesday 11th June 2014

Present:

LCLC Executive:

Brian Main
Cllr John White
Sophie Winter
Dr Louise Franks

LCLC Chairman
Deputy Chairman
LCLC Secretary
Clerk

LCLC Members:

Jo Baker
Cllr Les Barclay
Kathy Brown
Malcom Buckley
Cllr Paul Burgess
Michelle Curtis
John Daniels
Cllr Tim Drain
Kelly Duane
David Edwards
Ian Edwards
Cllr Peter Elliott
Stuart Fannin
Cllr Adrian Fluker
Mike Gull
Cllr Heather Glynn
Patrick Haley
Paul Hetherington
Brian Hughes
Jonathan Jenkin
Ivan Joslin
Bryan Ledger
Phil Lee
Karl Littlewood
Bradley McGuinness
Haf Morris
Cllr Anthony Pluckrose
Phillip Rowson
Charlie Sanders
Cllr Stephen Savage
Cllr Colin Travers
Cllr Tony Shrimpton
Paul Walker
Cllr Noelle Urquhart

Althorne Parish Council
Cold Norton Parish Council
Braintree District Council
Essex County Council
Althorne Parish Council
Tollesbury Parish Council
Environment Agency
Bradwell Parish Council
Cavendish Fluor Partnership
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Magnox Ltd
Burnham Town Council
Office for Nuclear Regulation
Asheldham and Dengie Parish Council
Bradwell Site
Rochford District Council
Bradwell Site
Magnox Ltd
Magnox Ltd
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
St Lawrence Parish Council
Asheldham and Dengie Parish Council
Environment Agency
Environment Agency
Braintree District Council
Magnox Ltd
Tillingham Parish Council
Maldon District Council
Magnox Ltd
Maldon Town Council
St Lawrence Parish Council
Maldon Town Council
Essex County Fire and Rescue Service
West Mersea Town Council

Bold type - denotes voting members



Local Community Liaison Council

Members of the public in attendance:

Andrew Blowers
Varrie Blowers
Charles Clark
Norma Creighton
Graham Farley
Lynn Hartley
John Harrison
Judy Lea
Ian Newton
Coral Newton
Gill Tuffy
Barry Turner

1. INTRODUCTION

2481 The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming those present, in particular new members and visitors including:

- Colin Travers – St. Lawrence Parish Councillor
- Michelle Curtis – Tollesbury Parish Council
- Stuart Fannin – Office for Nuclear Regulation
- Malcolm Buckley – Essex County Council
- Kelly Duane – Cavendish Fluor Partnership
- Charlie Sanders – Magnox Ltd
- Graham Farley – West Mersea resident
- Gill Tuffy – West Mersea resident
- Judy Lea – Maldon resident
- Phil Lee – Environment Agency

Chairman asked attendees to introduce themselves prior to speaking and then introduced himself and the Vice Chair.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2482 Sophie Winter confirmed apologies had been received from:

- Cllr Robert Boyce – Essex County Council
- Rosanna Briggs – Essex County Fire and Rescue Service
- Cllr Roy Bryant – Tillingham Parish Council
- Nigel Knee – EDF
- Cllr Robert Mitchell – Braintree District Council
- Dave Moore – Essex County Fire and Rescue Service
- Averil Price – Chelmsford City Council
- Pauline Rampling – Essex and Sussex Water
- Pauline Ward – St Cedd's Primary School
- Cllr Sylvia Wargent – West Mersea Town Council

3. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

2483 The minutes of the 56th Meeting of the LCLC held on 11th December 2013 were considered and approved subject to the following amendments:

- Delete repeat of John Harrison's name under 'members of the public in attendance'
- Para 2423: ~~Cllr~~ Jenny Lewsey
- Para 2467: ~~badge~~ barge



4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

- 2484 Cllr T Shrimpton referred to a recent article in the Maldon and Burnham Standard suggesting that station discharges have made the water unsafe for bathing. Cllr S Savage commented that the article was irresponsible journalism. Chairman advised this matter would be addressed during this meeting.

5. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

- 2485 Chairman advised this was reconfirmation of the current Chair and Vice-Chairman as the present incumbents had been elected at the AGM. This was proposed by Cllr H Glynn, seconded by Cllr T Drain and unanimously supported by members. Chairman thanked the members for their support, adding that this enabled the present incumbents to see the station enter the care and maintenance phase.

6. SITE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- 2486 Mike Gull, Site Director, was welcomed and Chairman advised that this would be Mr Gull's last meeting as a result of the Parent Body Organisation (PBO) transfer on 1st September. Mr M Gull explained that the site was actively engaged with The Cavendish Fluor Partnership, the incoming PBO, to enable a seamless transition. A presentation was provided and the following points were noted:

- Historical overview: photographic reminder of the lifecycle of the station approaching care and maintenance in 2015 until final site clearance scheduled for 2083 – 2097. Hazard reduction programme to manage liabilities resulting from 40 years generation.
- Safety: very intensive programme of work with no lost time accidents or serious non-compliances since last meeting. Magnox awarded the ROSPA Sir George Earle Trophy for Industrial Safety in the UK; Bradwell site significantly contributed to this achievement.
- Care & Maintenance (C&M) Preparations: £520 million, five year programme of work to accelerate entry to C&M by 12 years. Lead site for Magnox fleet to pioneer new approaches and add to the decommissioning toolkit. Five key programmes of work:
 - 1) Plant and Structures: photographic illustration of aluminium cladding being used for remaining civil structures. Almost all deplanting now completed with most waste recycled (pile cap generated 3,500 tonnes of waste of which 84 per cent was recycled).
 - 2) Ponds: building is now cold and dark, ready for C&M with active drain pipework removed and a new discharge line installed.
 - 3) Intermediate Level Waste (ILW): 95 per cent of ILW retrieved with completion by November 2014. Once retrieved, waste is conditioned (packaged, dried) and placed into the Interim Storage Facility (ISF). Waste sorting and segregating facility in use to ensure appropriate waste route utilised. Photographs of ISF describe appearance of store and yellow containers.
 - 4) Fuel Element Debris (FED):

Retrieval - six of 12 vaults now cleared, varying in activity level, with 1459 x 200l drums filled with gravel and FED. Pictures used to describe process.

Dissolution - turns reactive magnesium alloy into a considerably smaller volume of inert sludge that can be stored in the ISF. Pictorial comparison shows computer graphic and actual FED dissolution plant. Design expertise from around the world used to enable plant construction, commissioning and now active use. First active batch of FED now processed in line with design intent.

Aqueous Discharge Abatement Plant (ADAP) - dissolution produces an effluent stream that is passed through the ADAP to remove waste and activity. Chemical performance in line with design intent. Cost £25 million, three years from design to use.

Over next few months 2,500cdrums of FED reduced to 20 cylindrical yellow boxes.
 - 5) Closure Transition: good progress over last six months. Will become an unmanned site overseen by the Hub team. Agreed approach to C&M with ONR. Operators have reduced



Local Community Liaison Council

on site hazards such that off-site emergency plan is no longer needed - this to be agreed by regulators.

- Future Activities:
 - ILW conditioning continues
 - FED retrieval to clear remaining 6 vaults, dissolution and ADAP, storage of inactive sludge
 - Water treatment plant that looked after ponds water to be deplanted
 - Cladding to be completed
 - Admin block demolished
 - PBO transition
 - LC35 (plant in passive and safe state) and LC36 (demaning and handover to hub)
- Care & Maintenance: artist's impression of site displayed showing clad reactor building, a clad ILW store, clad ponds building, the turbine pit and a new security fence.

- 2487 Chairman led a vote of thanks to Mr M Gull supported with a round of applause. Questions were invited and Cllr A Fluker commented that he had found Mr M Gull to be open and honest. He questioned how many mosaik containers containing ILW were likely to be imported to the ISF from other sites. Mr M Gull advised this depended on the success level of the sorting and segregating process used to minimise Bradwell ILW, therefore possibly creating spare capacity. Any remaining capacity of the ISF will only be realised once all Bradwell ILW is contained therein. He noted this was part of a separate NDA engagement process.
- 2488 Mr J Harrison questioned why mosaik (round) and square containers are both used for the ISF. Mr M Gull explained that the different types of container have a different rating and require a different transport licence. The cubic containers have a much larger capacity (approx 5x greater than a mosaic) and are used to store high volume, lower activity waste. The mosaics enable different thicknesses of lead liner to be deployed to suit the activity of the contents and are used to store higher activity, low volumes of waste. In response to a comment about quality assurance, Mr M Gull clarified that every piece of waste is bar-coded and its final location logged. He advised that approximately 150 packages that are passively safe are anticipated.
- 2489 Mr G Farley advised that the Environmental Law Foundation (ELF) are contesting the legality of FED dumping in the Blackwater and that, despite freedom of information requests, the Environment Agency (EA) have not provided data about the nature of the discharge. He commented that it was safer to live in the power station than walk along the beach. The EA have confirmed that the dissolution process is experimental and that the makeup of the discharge will only be known once the process starts. He expressed concern that over the past 20-30 years that trials of sediment and coastal erosion have shown that the estuary is self-contained in that no sediment is exported. This means that all heavy metals being discharged will be trapped in the sediment and will not move into the sea but are more likely to move towards the sources of the Blackwater.

Chairman interrupted at this point and stated he understood that a public meeting was being held later this month with Tim Deere-Jones speaking about this topic. Chairman commented that the claims being made today could not be refuted or verified within the LCLC meeting but were to be examined in detail at the public meeting.

Mr G Farley closed by stating that the ELF was asking for an independent assessment and the EA were denying this.

- 2490 Mr M Gull reminded the forum he was responsible for health and safety and all the nuclear environmental discharges and that there was a framework of different guidance and regulations to work within to ensure the plant and operations were safe and compliant. The discharges are monitored and have to be within the very low levels set by the EA. Mr M Gull reiterated that the site have had no environmental nuclear safety non-compliances, that the site is safe and compliant and that he would not allow a discharge that would be damaging to the environment when his remit was to reduce the risk and hazard of the site.
- 2491 Mr G Farley questioned what Mr M Gull knew about the tide and the estuary itself and heard that there were experts employed on the site that considered the environment around the site.

Dr P Haley introduced himself as the Head of Environment at the site and advised that, as part of the permit application to the EA, a new study was undertaken by an independent body to model the



Local Community Liaison Council

estuary, immediate discharge, outer estuary, plume dispersion and tidal effects. All of this information is in the public domain on public registers.

Mr G Farley referred to the Essex Coastal Plan commissioned by the EA that examines tidal flow over the past 60 years that contradicts this and categorically states that no silt leaves the estuary. He clarified that essentially the tide comes in quicker than it leaves.

- 2492 Chairman intervened and explained that the remit of this meeting is the flow of concerns from the public to the operators and regulators and their corresponding explanation and responses and not a public debate about the accuracy of reports. A heated exchange ensued and Chairman requested that ELF address their continued concerns directly with the EA. Chairman advised that the LCLC was satisfied that the EA were already fully aware of the concerns being raised today.
- 2493 Mr A Blowers introduced himself as Chair of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG) and agreed that whilst this was not the correct forum, that a public meeting with the regulators had been requested and so far rejected, so it was the only forum available. He advised that a public meeting was being held out of frustration that an open meeting with the regulators and operators could not be convened. He encouraged individuals at the LCLC to attend.
- 2494 Mr A Blowers clarified the key issue as whether the process of FED dissolution should be undertaken at all, not whether Magnox will manage the process appropriately and that he has visited the site. Mr A Blowers expressed the following opinions:
- the unclear nature of the discharge and the complex behaviour of the estuary combine to create an unknown and unacceptable level of risk and that, as there is an alternative, the dissolution should not proceed.
 - the OSPAR regulations for 2020 will outlaw the dissolution process in the future.
 - the EA have altered the permit for discharges from the site to enable the dissolution to proceed.
 - there was no justification to continue discharging into the Blackwater during the decommissioning phase just because discharges had been undertaken during the operation phase of the site .
 - no independent assessment of this process had been undertaken.
- Mr A Blowers concluded that there was considerable public concern and that the public meeting convened for 23rd June will challenge and debate this matter.
- 2495 Mr A Blowers sought confirmation that the intention was to use spare capacity within the ISF to contain imported ILW. He asked whether this had now been agreed and whether the relevant permits from Essex County Council had been granted, adding that BANNG intend to challenge this use. Mr Gull advised that his remit was to deal with the Bradwell waste. He advised that there was likely to be capacity within the ISF and that there was an on-going lengthy consultation about storage of Magnox waste and that a final decision had not yet been made by the NDA. Subsequent to this formal applications to relevant authorities would be undertaken.
- 2496 Cllr H Glynn congratulated the site for providing local people at all levels with employment over the past 50 years. She questioned whether there would be an educational recording of the station's safe working and how the work had changed over the years. Cllr H Glynn thanked the station for answering concerns raised and for providing secure employment.
- 2497 Mrs V Blowers questioned how many of the free spaces in the ISF will be taken up with ILW from Dungeness. Mr M Gull explained that while it was anticipated that there would be capacity in the ISF, the decision about how this asset would be utilised had yet to be made. He advised that the NDA's recent preferred option consultation was that ILW from Dungeness would be given priority. He clarified that the efficacy of the sorting and segregation process will both determine the spare capacity within the ISF and the quantity of ILW at Dungeness that required storage.
- 2498 Mrs V Blowers suggested that the ISF could become a regional store. Mr M Gull reiterated that the only agreed plan was to retrieve and condition the Bradwell waste and store this in the ISF. Anything else had not been agreed.
- 2499 Mrs V Blowers asked if the Bradwell FED was not processed by dissolution whether it could be contained within the ISF. Mr M Gull explained that the store would have to be approximately twice its current size to contain all the unprocessed Bradwell FED.



Local Community Liaison Council

- 2500 On request, Mr M Gull clarified the changes in number of workers. For the 18 months up until February 2014 there were 900-1,000 people on site. Current numbers are 800-850 and this number is reducing daily as tasks are completed. During C&M the site will be unmanned.
- 2501 Mr P Burgess questioned what volume of aqueous waste was to be disposed of and over what period would it be discharged into the Blackwater. Dr P Haley advised that 20m³ would be discharged each day over the next 12-18 months. He added that in terms of the nature of the discharge the site had not increased their permit limits for aqueous discharges citing the aqueous limit for Tritium as 7TBq, Caesium as 0.7TBq and all other radionuclides combined as 0.7TBq, all on a 12 month rolling total.
- 2502 The credibility of the organisations being represented at the meeting was questioned. Mr G Farley advised that ELF is a substantial organisation whose president was Prince Charles.
- 2503 Ms G Tuffey asked when the operators planned to discharge the FED dissolution effluent into the Blackwater. Mr M Gull clarified that the dissolution effluent was treated in the ADAP prior to discharge. He advised that during commissioning several inactive discharges had been made and that the first discharge post commissioning could be any day.
- 2504 Mr P Rowson referred to para 2461 and asked if there was any update regarding an ISF at Sizewell A. Mr M Gull advised that Sizewell A would have relatively small quantity of ILW, that there remained potential shared storage opportunity with the adjacent Sizewell B site and possibly with new build. On request he confirmed that no store had been designed and that there were no plans to build an ISF at Sizewell A.
- 2505 Mr B Turner expressed the view that the public were led to believe that nothing of consequence would be discharged from site but that a document from DECC advised this was not the case. He suggested that enquiries made at meetings like the LCLC remained unanswered, commenting that over the past year he had sought but not gained reassurance that whatever was discharged would be as harmless as suggested. He stated that the EA measures discharges over a period of time and provided 'on average' data and yet the discharges will be made at high tide once a day for about 30minutes. Mr Turner suggested that unless there was an exclusion zone that this discharge could not be considered safe.
- 2506 Mr K Littlewood advised he was the lead site regulator at the EA and that he considered the radioactive properties of discharges. He advised that significant resource had been put in place to respond to enquiries and misleading media articles. He confirmed that when granting permits and considering environmental impact that the EA work with relevant competent authorities and use the most up to date and relevant information. He confirmed that the EA remain entirely satisfied that the discharges will not give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts. Mr K Littlewood confirmed that the EA are an independent assessor for the UK and that they carried out both prospective and retrospective assessments of impact and that these were available in the public domain.
- 2507 Chairman proposed a motion to move on from the topic of discharges to ensure that all matters on the agenda were discussed. In response to interruptions from the public, he reminded the forum that it was within the LCLC Constitution to limit the public contribution to a few minutes at the beginning or end of the meeting and that as Chairman he had enabled the public to contribute throughout. He sought the views of members and there was a clear majority vote to move onwards.

7. NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY UPDATE

- 2508 Jonathan Jenkin opened his presentation by offering his congratulations to Magnox for winning the George Earle trophy, advising that this was not just nuclear safety but across all industry categories and as such was a significant achievement.
- 2509 Mr J Jenkin drew attention to the NDA monthly update for June and in particular commented upon the following:
- New NDA website now been launched.
 - Second pilot report about NDA priority programmes now published.
 - Sellafield and Tokyo Electric Power Company have signed a co-operation statement to share



Local Community Liaison Council

good practice. Each face challenging clean-up operations.

- NDA has signed an agreement with Toshiba and GDF Suez regarding land near Sellafield and enabling this to be used for new nuclear power stations.
- NDA have published a report detailing the economic contribution Sellafield has made to the regional and national economy.
- Stakeholder Engagement Plan recently published that details opportunities for stakeholders to become involved with the work of the NDA.
- Magnox and RSRL Competition has resulted in a transition agreement being signed with the Cavendish Flour Partnership (CFP). This transfer will enable significant cost savings of approx £1 billion. The current PBO will remain in charge until share transfer on 1 September 2014.
- 2014-17 Business plan now published.
- Radioactive Waste Management Directorate became a wholly owned subsidiary of the NDA from 1 April 2014 and have been renamed RWM Ltd. This subsidiary will become responsible for delivering the Geological Disposal Facility (GDF).
- On 28th May DECC consultation on the management of overseas radioactive fuel closed.
- NDA Executive Board Chairman has been re-appointed for a further three year term.
- NDA Annual Report and Accounts published.
- Geological disposal white paper expected to be published July '14 that sets out proposed changes to the GDF siting process.

2510 Mr J Jenkin advised that discussions were underway about future stakeholder engagement once the site enters C&M. He sought permission to have this as an Agenda item at the next LCLC meeting and chairman concurred adding that LCLC meetings were likely to continue until 2016.

2511 Mr G Farley questioned why there had been no public consultation on FED. Mr J Jenkin sought clarification whether this referred to the operation of the dissolution process or to the options for FED dissolution and ILW storage. Mr G Farley clarified that he enquiry was specifically about discharges into the Blackwater. Mr J Jenkin advised that discharges from Bradwell were a localised rather than National matter. Mr M Gull advised that a consultation was conducted in 2006/7 that considered the best environmental practicable options for FED and waste that had included representatives from the LCLC.

2512 Mr G Farley questioned whether the LCLC represented the local public. Chairman advised that the LCLC was made up of democratically elected representatives from all the local Parishes and Councils and that they had attended over the last 50 years, the last ten under the patronage of the NDA. The Chairman concluded that members represented the public in this manner, adding that the station had also conducted local consultation.

Mr J Jenkin advised that the formal definition of public consultation existed and cited examples of consultation carried out regarding matters of national significance. He advised that the NDA think very carefully about whether a formal public consultation is run or whether there will be a different type of engagement. Mr J Jenkin reminded the forum of the ILW and FED consultation that whilst arguably not a formal public consultation, did enable everyone to submit their views over a period of three months.

2513 Chairman reminded the forum that the LCLC meetings were conducted in public and welcomed members of the local community and press to attend and express their views. He commented that very few members of the public attended and that members had attended frequently and represented the views of the public. He asked that the meeting now move on to the next agenda item. Mr A Blowers supported the chairman's view of representative democracy but insisted that participative and public engagement was equally as valid and that if the process undertaken in 2006/7 had begun today that it would have had to be conducted differently.

2514 Cllr A Pluckrose questioned whether any spare capacity in the ISF could be used to store overseas fuel. Mr Jenkin advised that storage of overseas fuel would only be stored at Sellafield and that categorically this would not be stored at Bradwell.



Local Community Liaison Council

2515 Mr G Farley and chairman entered into an exchange about the purpose of the LCLC resulting in Mr G Farley being asked to refrain from drawing the meeting to discuss FED dissolution process discharges any further.

7. OFFICE FOR NUCLEAR REGULATION (ONR) REPORT

2516 Mr Stuart Fannin drew attention to the quarterly report dated 1 January 2014. – 31 March 2014 advising the forum that he was the incoming ONR Site Inspector having taken over from 17 March 2014. and that his key focus had been understanding the decommissioning activities on the site.

2517 Mr S Fannin advised that there had been a safety system compliance inspection that considered how Intermediate level waste was created and managed and that the packages themselves were appropriately assembled and cared for. This was judged as adequate.

The other major inspection was undertaken by the ONR fire inspector. This was found to be adequate and identified the need to improve fire exit stairwells; site immediately responded and undertook appropriate corrective actions.

2518 The ONR permissioning process was described. Mr S Fannin explained that an application to allow the FED abatement plant to commence active commissioning was considered by ONR specialists to represent a low hazard and therefore given a letter of no objection to release the regulatory hold point.

2519 The ONR are in the process of making a determination under REPPIR whether to vary the emergency planning arrangements. A Project Assessment Report describing this process will be made available on the ONR website.

2520 From 1st April 2014 the ONR was established as a Public Corporation, an independent regulator for nuclear licensed sites under the Energy Act 2013. The legislative changes give ONR powers to regulate conventional health and safety, nuclear safety, security and transport of nuclear material. Mr S Fannin drew attention to the website details contained in the report as a useful source of information for those interested in understanding how regulatory decisions are made.

2521 Questions were invited and Judy Lea asked about the flood risk of the site. Mr S Fannin explained that the decommissioning programme was to ensure passive safety with all biohazard material adequately contained so that if there was a flood there would be no release of radioactive material. He confirmed that the safety case specifically includes a large flood on site.

8. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY (EA) REPORT

2522 Mr K Littlewood drew attention to his report dated Dec 2013 to May 2014 and commented that the EA have continued to undertake routine compliance inspections and have found no non-compliances since the last report. He added that the EA also work jointly on inspections and with the operator to provide regulatory support, advice and guidance to enable best practice and improve environmental performance.

2523 In terms of stakeholder communications, corporately the EA are committed to discharge duties in an open and transparent matter. The EA continue to consider how to do this in the most effective and efficient manner. Mr Littlewood recognised that there have been differences of opinion expressed about environmental matters and said that if there are ways to make improvements then the EA are keen to identify and implement these.

2524 Cllr H Glynn asked if longer term flood defences had been considered for the site. Mr K Littlewood advised that this was an example of joint working with key stakeholders. He advised that recent weather had washed away soil and concrete cladding to part of the flood defences at the front of the site. The EA has responsibility for maintenance of flood defences and in conjunction with the operator and ONR have brought forward appropriate remedial work. He added that the EA would keep under review assessments about flood risk. Mr S Fannin added that after moving into C&M the site would remain licensed and that a ten yearly periodic review of safety would continue to be undertaken and identify any required improvements.



- 2525 Mr C Clark sought clarification that, as the site was to become passively safe and that there were to be no flood wall improvements, this meant that the site may become flooded. Mr S Fannin reiterated that flooding of the site would not lead to a release of radioactive material. Chairman sought and received clarification that the current flood defences were adequate against a 1 in 10,000 event and that the periodic safety review would identify any future necessary improvements. Mr B Hughes explained that during C& M the hub would ensure maintenance of the flood defences to protect against a 1 in 10,000 event. He emphasised that the hub were responsible for ensuring that the safety case requirements were maintained at all times. Mr C Clark concluded that the site was not expected to flood.
- 2526 Mr A Blowers asked Mr K Littlewood to defend his statement that there are misleading media articles. He advised that BANNG simply try to put an alternative view point. Mr K Littlewood advised that he was not attributing the misleading articles to BANNG communications and was referring instead to media articles that referred to solid radioactive waste being dumped in the estuary, adding that this specifically was misleading and that corrective communication had since been published by the media involved.
- 2527 Cllr T Shrimpton asked whether this was now the point to discuss the letter to the Maldon and Burnham Standard to enable the meeting to endorse his refuting of the claims made. Chairman advised that it was for the site operators and regulators to refute the claims made and was outside of the remit of the LCLC to do so.
- 2528 Cllr S Savage confirmed that the irresponsible journalism in the local papers had been dealt with by the authorities in a letter to the paper, adding that public interest in the discharges from the site was miniscule compared to the raw sewage being dumped in the estuary.
- 2529 Mr J Harrison requested that Mr K Littlewood ensure that his name is included on future reports and this was agreed.
- 2530 Mr G Farley asked if it was possible to cite the tidal flow computer predictions used by the EA. Mr K Littlewood advised that the detailed assessment approach, including the assumptions made about the exchange rate of the Blackwater and specifically via the Bradwell outfall, was contained in published papers that have already been sent to Mr Farley.

10. SOCIO-ECONOMIC SCHEME

- 2531 Haf Morris introduced herself explaining that she looks after the Socio-Economic process for sites in England. She advised that £4,602 had recently been allocated within the local community and read out a list of recipients. Over £200,000 of fund applications are currently being processed with outcomes expected late July.

Mrs H Morris advised that an inaugural meeting had been held with the Bradwell Power Station Legacy Partnership that was looking long term for bigger projects to mitigate against the closure of the site. The next meeting was being convened during July.

Attention was drawn to an information pamphlet about socio-economic funding in the UK that detailed that since 2012 £255,290 has been allocated to the communities around Bradwell. Ms H Morris closed by encouraging applications.

- 2532 Cllr T Drain questioned how future dispersal of the fund was going to change with the change in PBO. Ms H Morris advised that current processes would continue until the incoming PBO were in place when future changes may be considered but no details are available yet.
- 2533 Mr J Harrison asked whether the forthcoming Bradwell Power Station Legacy Partnership meeting was opened to the public. Ms H Morris explained that this was a preliminary meeting held between Councillors, business representatives and the LCLC representative to consider initial ideas that would then be taken back to Council meetings. Mr P Rowson advised that the terms of reference for the Legacy Partnership was to be agreed at the next meeting and that the public were represented at



Local Community Liaison Council

the meeting in the form of elected councillors. Chairman encouraged attendees to bring ideas forward to the LCLC to take back to the Legacy Partnership meetings.

- 2534 Ms G Tuffey commented that whilst she had respect for the members that had regularly attended meetings over a long period that she hoped that the LCLC would welcome the opinions of newcomers. Chairman reiterated his welcome to all attendees.

11. CHAIRMAN'S FEEDBACK

- 2535 Chairman advised that he and the Vice-Chairman had attended a meeting held on 22 April that enabled site stakeholder Chairs to be introduced to the incoming PBO Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP). Chairman advised that their representative was in attendance today, signalling an intention to understand how the LCLC functions. Chairman said it was difficult to provide an overview of CFP but he felt confident that there would be no dramatic changes. He advised that all the stakeholder groups had broad representation and that CFP could disseminate new ideas via the stakeholder meetings. He added that CFP had expressed surprise at the level of technical understanding within the stakeholder groups.

Vice Chairman added that the new PBO had only been confirmed as CFP 3 weeks prior to the meeting and that overall the meeting had been a good introduction. He added that CFP was largely formed by Babcock, a company that had been involved with the nuclear power industry for some considerable time. The Chairman and Vice Chairman both expressed disappointment that the change in PBO would lead to a change of Site Director at Bradwell so close to care and maintenance.

- 2536 The EnergySolutions claim for damages against the NDA was questioned and Mr J Jenkin clarified that EnergySolutions had lodged a claim for damages and costs and that this would not impact on the transition or share transfer. Chairman clarified that EnergySolutions were not challenging the outcome.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 2537 Mr C Clark advertised a public meeting convened by BANNG on 23 June 2014 at 19.30 at MICA, West Mersea with Tim Deere-Jones addressing 'Radioactive Discharges into the Blackwater – Who knows what is going on?' Mr C Clark offered to email details to interested individuals adding that a printed flyer was available if required.
- 2538 Cllr T Shrimpton referred to those attendees affiliated to BANNG and expressed the view that he would be more confident of their representation if they stood for election at their local councils. This was met with audible approval.
- 2539 Ms Lea commented that she had found this meeting fascinating but felt that there was an unanswered question regarding the average measurement and a concentrated release at high tide. Mr K Littlewood explained that when agreeing permit levels that the EA considered the impact on the environment in terms of the effect of long term exposure rather than individual short term releases. That this was to capture the biggest environmental impact. Mr P Haley added that his assessments included consideration of the short term accumulative effects of a 30 minute release per day. He advised that these assessments considered the impact on an individual immersed in the river at the point of discharge for the duration of the discharge and found that the total impact would be up to 1µSv. To provide context the legal limit is 1000µSv. Mr K Littlewood advised that the EA do undertake detailed individual assessments.
- 2540 Chairman referred to the request for a public meeting about new build raised two meetings ago advising that he had written to EDF Energy and had now received a reply. In summary this reply said that EDF Energy recognise this is outside of the scope of the LCLC and that Bradwell is not being actively developed by them. Mr A Blowers advised that whilst this was correct, the Government were keeping five sites open for consideration of which Bradwell was one, so this situation may change in the future. Sophie Winter confirmed that copies of the EDF Energy communication were available on request.



Local Community Liaison Council

2541 Chairman advised that he had had several email exchanges with Mr I Clarke, a regular attendee that had been unable to attend today. Mr I Clarke had proposed that the FED discharge should not take place but should be piped into storage tanks and disposed of at sea. On discovering that this was forbidden as licensed sites can only discharge through a licensed pipe, he suggested that the discharge be transported to another Magnox site and discharged into the sea through their pipework. Mr M Gull confirmed that he had been copied into these communications.

13. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

2542 Preliminary date set for Wednesday 10th December at 10.30am.

14. LUNCH

2543 Chairman closed the meeting at 13.00.

The Bradwell Local Community Liaison Council (LCLC) is an independent, local community body acting as a link between the Bradwell Site and its neighbours.

All correspondence to the LCLC should be addressed to: The LCLC Secretariat,
C/O Communications Team, Bradwell Site, Bradwell-on-Sea,
Southminster, Essex, CM0 7HP.

Tel: 01621 873384 email: bradwell.communications@magnoxsites.com