

Sizewell A and B Stakeholder Group (SSG)

Minutes of the Sub-Group meeting held at 19.00 on Thursday 13th November 2014

at Leiston United Reform Church

Item 1. Chairman's Opening Comments

- 1.1 Chair welcomed attendees, provided details of the venue and invited everyone to introduce themselves prior to speaking.
- 1.2 Chair invited any initial comments from the public and none were forthcoming.
- 1.3 Chair referred to the members' Declarations of Interest (appendix 1 of 11.09.14. SSG Minutes) and invited members to add to this register. No additional items were raised.

Item 2. Attendance

- 2.1 Members Present: Cllr Marianne Fellowes (MF) Chair; Mr Trevor Branton (TB); Ms Joan Girling (JG); Mr Tom Griffith-Jones (TGJ); Cllr Terry Hodgson (TH); Ms Pat Hogan (PH); Cllr Bill Howard (BH); Cllr Maureen Jones (MJ); Dr Sheena Robertson (SR); Cllr Nigel Smith (NS); Mr Mike Taylor (MT); Mr Pete Wilkinson (PW).
- 2.2 In Attendance: Ms Jacqueline Brown (JB), Member of the Public
Dr Louise Franks (LF), Minutes
Mr Paul Hetherington (PHe), SSG Secretariat
Mr Jim Roberts (JR), SSG Secretariat
Mr Barry Skelcher (BS), Member of the Public
Ms Rachel Smith-Lyte (RSL), Member of the Public
Ms Janet Fendley (JF), Member of the Public
Four additional Members of the Public
- 2.3 Apologies: Cllr David Bailey, Mr Chris Betson, Dr Therese Coffey, Mr Tony Cooper, Ms Tracey Green, Cllr Richard Smith.

Item 3. Off Site Emergency Plan

- 3.01 Chair reminded attendees that a special meeting had been held on 10.09.14. at which Andy Osman, the site operators and the Suffolk Resilience Forum had provided presentations. Chair invited discussion about the subsequent written answers received in response to questions arising from that meeting and any remaining concerns.
- 3.02 Chair advised that she had attended a subsequent Emergency Planning Group meeting held last week with the following outcomes:
 - SSG invited to review the public information leaflet to be sent to householders
 - Agreement that the area in which this leaflet is to be distributed is extended to a 15km radius.
 - A letter, specific to the area in which the household falls, will accompany the leaflet
- 3.03 PW questioned what impact the SSG review of the leaflet would have and heard that there was a willingness to accept improvements and incorporate changes. PW reminded attendees that the suggestions of the SSG regarding off-site emergency planning had been submitted some 2.5years ago and ignored.
- 3.04 After some discussion, Chair clarified that there were three emergency planning zones: a 1km urgent countermeasures zone; a 3-4km detailed emergency planning zone that had an irregular

border to ensure complete inclusion of communities; an extendability zone with a 15km radius. JR provided copies of the proposed leaflet.

- 3.05 There remained some confusion about the difference between the 3-4km zone and the 15km zone and Chair clarified that information will be provided to all households within the 15km zone. Later it was further clarified that, in addition to households, schools and other facilities within a 15km radius would receive the prior information.
- 3.06 The following comments about the leaflet were noted at this time:
- Map is confusing; the red ring used to denote the historical Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) is unnecessary and the letters to be sent to those previously within the DEPZ should explain why the household no longer falls within the urgent countermeasures zone, as appropriate.
 - The need to mark the black urgent countermeasures zone was questioned and Chair noted that the text referred to the measures deployed within this area.
 - There is a need to clarify what is deemed appropriate shelter.
- 3.07 PW suggested that everyone within the 15km zone should be planned for equally. Chair reminded attendees that the emergency planning zones were now decided and reiterated the procedure for this decision.
- 3.08 MT commented that as the reference accident used to determine the urgent countermeasures zone was not one that would require Potassium Iodate tablets, that the distribution of these within the 1km zone was misleading. PH, a resident within the 1km zone, advised that the information contained on the calendar about the use of Potassium Iodate tablets was clear, adding that it was understood that their use does not protect against all eventualities. Chair advised that the calendar containing this information would be distributed to households in the 1km zone. PH later clarified that she understood that specific advice would be given if the need to take the tablets arose.
- 3.09 BS commented that Potassium Iodate tablets were only needed as a countermeasure in the event of a core meltdown. He questioned the assurance of Sizewell B that this event was not possible. He suggested that distribution of these tablets meant that this event was a possibility but that the outcomes had not been planned for. He added that other events were most likely to lead to the release of tritium, which was fairly innocuous except to young children.
- 3.10 JG referred to the section titled "Iodine tablets" and suggested that the first sentence was confusing. Chair proposed the wording should suggest referring to a doctor prior to use. JG later suggested that the details about the use of Potassium Iodate tablets should be included in a separate communication to those households in the urgent countermeasures zone rather than be part of the leaflet, as this affected so few households.
- 3.11 PH expressed her confusion that the group had expressed concern that the distribution of Potassium Iodate tablets was being reduced from the old 2.4km DEPZ to those in the 1km urgent countermeasures zone and yet now were arguing that they should not be distributed to anyone.
- 3.11 Chair asked PH whether she would follow the advice to shelter and heard that if there was opportunity to escape then this would be taken. BH added that the leaflet was ambiguous about evacuation, drawing attention to the paragraphs in the "Should I leave the area?" section. A member of the public suggested that in the light of Fukushima the information about evacuation was nonsense. Chair commented that the leaflet provided a position statement about what was very unlikely but may become necessary.
- 3.12 Chair urged members to take the opportunity to review and comment on the information to enable the public to become appropriately informed prior to an event, given that that the SSG have been requesting this for years. She advised that her request that the SSG have an accompanying communication to provide details of how members of the public could seek

further reassurance or information was being considered. Chair added that it would be helpful for the SSG to review the different letters to be sent out to households to ensure clarity.

- 3.13 JF drew attention to the third paragraph in the “Will I be affected and what should I do?” section, advising that there appeared to be words missing. NS later commented on the fourth paragraph under this heading questioning whether the advice to stay indoors would be expanded beyond the 1km zone if a larger incident were to occur. TB also commented on the fourth paragraph questioning whether nominated radio and TV channels were to be added and, if so, which stations these would be.
- 3.14 The SSG questioned the use of white and yellow text on a blue background, suggesting that black text on a white background would be more appropriate.
- 3.15 MT questioned the credibility of the emergency planning zones, commenting that planning developments would be based on the 3-4km zone and that the escape routes for communities immediately outside of this may be through the zone area. He detailed specific examples of affected villages and questioned whether evacuation was feasible.
- 3.16 A heated debate ensued about whether anything could be done at this time to influence the zone determination. Chair suggested listing these concerns, adding that the leaflet was being distributed in early January. PW suggested that the SSG could distribute a separate SSG-authored leaflet. TH questioned whether the meeting was considering the off-site emergency plan itself or discussing the prior information leaflet. Chair clarified that the SSG had been given the opportunity to comment on the leaflet, however, concerns about the plan could be collated and submitted separately. Chair advised that the plan would be reviewed in the future if circumstances on site changed and this impacted on the planning arrangements.
- 3.17 PW commented that he felt the views of the SSG had been consistently ignored and that the leaflet was a disgrace that should not be legitimised by the SSG. He reminded attendees that the views of the SSG, about the contents of prior information and about the size of a detailed emergency planning zone, had been submitted 2.5 years ago. He suggested that the SSG demand that the plan itself is properly debated. PH reminded attendees that a whole evening had been focussed upon this when concerns and questions had been raised.
- 3.18 Chair suggested re-iterating the views of the SSG expressed 2.5years ago and collating and submitting the concerns about the emergency plan itself. Chair re-iterated the importance of ensuring that the information in the leaflet was appropriate and encouraged attendees to consider the leaflet in more detail and submit other suggestions for improvement by email. NS suggested that feedback should state that the SSG still fundamentally disagrees with the plan (detailing why) but, within the context that the plan sets, the leaflet could be improved (detailing amendments).
- 3.19 Chair invited comments and questions from the public and RSL introduced herself as the parliamentary candidate for Suffolk Coastal Green Party, explaining that she was trying to understand the role of the SSG and questioning who was pro or anti Sizewell C. Chair explained that the SSG was a conduit of information between the public and the industry, regulators and operators, clarifying that the group did not routinely look at matters concerning new build unless this impacted on the A and B sites. Chair explained the purpose of this meeting was to progress matters on the action tracker. The membership of the stakeholder group was clarified as geographical representation of communities, local groups and individual co-opted members.
- 3.20 JF commented on the leaflet stating that the last paragraph under “Why am I getting this leaflet” was confusing.
- 3.21 JB commented that the map was ridiculous and looked like a flood area rather than helped to clarify what the zones are and what they mean. She questioned why the 3-4km zone was an

irregular shape and extended into the sea and the Chair clarified that the irregular shape enabled inclusion of whole communities. JB suggested that the map was too small and did not clarify what area was included in the 15km zone. Members discussed the possibility of listing postcodes but recognised that the zones may dissect postcodes. Members questioned whether a larger map or a map just showing a 15km zone would be an improvement.

- 3.22 Chair reminded attendees that the leaflet would be circulated to absent members with the request for suggestions for improvements. All comments and suggestions to be submitted by email by 21.11.14.
- 3.23 PW re-iterated his suggestion and Chair asked attendees to comment on the proposal that the SSG should advise the Joint Emergency Planning Unit that they were not going to comment upon the leaflet as it attempted to legitimise a plan that was impossible to implement. MJ stated the importance of having an input to ensure that the public were appropriately informed. PW commented that what should be included in the leaflet had already been advised and Chair reminded attendees that this would be sent with comments.
- 3.24 Chair advised that she had commented upon the recent loss of mobile phone signal in the Leiston at the Emergency Planning meeting and questioned the plan for communications if there was a loss of electricity. It was noted that the emergency services and operators are considering this matter.
- 3.25 Chair referred to the calendar, reminding attendees that this would only be distributed to households within the 1km zone, commenting that the information that it contained was useful and should be included within the letter or leaflet sent out. JG concurred. Members discussed this and PH commented that the leaflet did not include details of the rest centres or the evacuation zones.
- 3.26 BS commented that it was entirely possible that an event could cause a power failure and suggested a siren system, much like that deployed during the war, to advise people that an event had occurred and warn them to seek further advice. He stressed that it would not always be appropriate to evacuate as the route may take an individual into the outfall of the event, when sheltering at home would have meant they avoided the outfall.
- 3.27 Chair drew attention to the circulated response regarding Rimnet monitors adding that Mr Osman had advised that the real time monitoring is sent to the National Rimnet Monitoring organisation and shared with the site operators and regulators. She summarised that their purpose was to detect changes in background radiation levels in real time.
- 3.28 MT questioned why Rimnet had been installed, suggesting that a release of tritium was unlikely to be detected and that the monitors would only detect changes if an event in the order of an atom bomb exploding had occurred. Chair advised that Rimnet had originally been installed to detect changes in background radiation caused by events overseas. MT suggested that the monitors were of no use to the community locally. JG asked why they had been installed around the Suffolk Coastal area and why they had not been installed elsewhere. TB questioned who had decided to install them locally. Chair explained that it was a National network of monitors installed around all nuclear stations to detect changes in background radiation. TB suggested that the local community assume the monitors were linked to Sizewell B. Chair read from notes taken at the emergency planning group meeting confirming that Rimnet had been installed following Chernobyl to detect the impact of overseas accidents. More units were now available meaning that there were 10 in the local area. They are used in conjunction with fence monitors around the perimeter of the sites. Current consideration is being given to how this information can be shared with the public via the Resilience Direct website. This will enable the public to monitor background radiation near power stations in real time.

- 3.29 JB asked about the location of the monitors and how far out they extended. She questioned whether these were linked to the emergency planning zones. JG advised the location of several monitors and Chair summarised that they were installed in the Leiston and district area.
- 3.30 Chair raised the topic of the information to be sent to schools and questioned whether the SSG would like to review this. Members concurred that they would like to review this information and questioned how this information would be disseminated to those attending the schools. NS suggested that a note should be included in the leaflet to advise that parents can expect this information from their child's school.
- 3.31 TGJ drew attention to the circulated response received from Supt Paul Sharp regarding item 2108c on the action tracker. He sought clarification of the acronym CBRN and JR advised Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear. He questioned where the 60 CBRN trained officers were based and where the appropriate equipment was located. TGJ also questioned the provision within the other blue light services. Chair advised that all blue light services take part in the on-site emergency exercises.
- 3.32 PH reminded attendees that members had been given the opportunity to visit the Emergency Response Centre to understand the equipment and training available. TGJ advised that he was concerned specifically about the provision for the blue light services.
- 3.33 PW asked about where the blue light services were to be deployed. He questioned whether there would be sufficient services to cover the extendibility zone. Chair commented that neighbouring constabularies would be deployed to assist. PW said that as this would be a nuclear event the emergency services deployed would need appropriate training and equipment. TH commented that officers are trained and that he has experience of being trained with officers. MJ added that if the need arose the armed forces would be called upon.
- 3.34 JB expressed concern that if an event happened that there would be a mass evacuation that would lead to road chaos and that blue light services and the armed forces would be unable to move within the area. Chair advised that this point had been raised and modelling of evacuation had been provided. Chair expressed her grave concern, and other members concurred, that evacuation would not be practical. BS re-iterated that automatic evacuation was not appropriate as this may lead to exposure that would otherwise be avoided. He stressed that the immediate action should be to shelter until advised whether to evacuate and what route to use. JB suggested that first instincts would be to evacuate and questioned whether the emergency services were prepared to prevent evacuation through the use of road blocks.
- 3.35 PW summarised the recent discussion as a consensus that attendees had no faith in the off-site emergency plan and re-iterated that the SSG should not legitimise the plan by commenting on the leaflet. He forcefully expressed the view that evacuation was impossible. This led to several separate debates. Chair reminded attendees about the evacuation of Aldeburgh during the recent flood alert, expressing her lack of confidence in the process.
- 3.36 Chair reminded attendees that the question of what is appropriate shelter had not been addressed.
- 3.37 Chair advised the current status of her request to attend an on-site emergency exercise and it was noted that the ONR continued to refuse this request but that in principle both operators were content to allow her to attend. A list of emergency exercises that were not being observed by the ONR has been provided and the Chair anticipates an invitation to attend and observe these. BS suggested requesting that the exercise was filmed to enable this to be shared with the public, adding that an exercise had been filmed previously in 1976. TH commented that both on-site and off-site emergency exercises included the blue-light services.

- 3.38 A member of the public questioned whether the police were aware of emergency exercises, as her experience suggested otherwise; when alarms on site had sounded and she had called the police for reassurance that it was an exercise and not a real event, they had not known any information. Chair confirmed that she had been advised of the dates at a Emergency Planning meeting that had been attended by representatives of all blue light services, concluding that the all services were aware of when the emergency exercises were scheduled.

Actions & Recommendations:

- i To question why Potassium Iodate tablets were still being distributed if they were only needed in the event of a core meltdown at Sizewell B, yet the group have been assured that this could not happen.**
- ii To resubmit the SSG communication about the Off-site Emergency Plan.**
- iii The Chair to collate all comments and suggestions about the leaflet and submit these to the Joint Emergency Planning Unit.**
- iv To request that the information to be sent to schools is reviewed by the SSG and the procedure for dissemination by the schools thereafter, clarified.**

Item 4. Sizewell B Dry Fuel Store

- 4.1 Chair drew attention to the document received from EDF Energy (see appendix 1) with four reference attachments that were in response to all of the items on the action tracker that involved the Sizewell B operators. Members asked if these had been circulated to members and noted that all members would be sent this information via email but that hard copies were available at this meeting.
- 4.2 Chair read through the actions and responses in the EDF Energy document and the response to Action 2335 (planned date of April 2017 for staged safety case) was discussed further. Members questioned this date, given that the understanding was that the ponds would be full by end of 2015, and requested clarification of whether the safety case for the ponds would be affected.
- 4.3 The term 'dry fuel store' was queried and it was suggested that it should be called the 'dry radioactive fuel store'. Chair explained that as it was on a nuclear site the fuel was radioactive adding that as there was no alternative final waste repository that instead of 'store' the correct term was 'repository'.
- 4.4 PW questioned why the action for EDF energy to provide the radionuclide content and decay profile for the spent fuel in the wet store and the dry store agreed at the 17th July meeting had not been answered and it was noted that this had not been added to the action tracker. JR agreed to add this to the action tracker and seek a response from EDF Energy.
- 4.5 Chair drew attention to the Summary note for the Sizewell SSG received from the Environment Agency dated October 2014.

Actions & Recommendations:

- i That the SSG seek to clarify the response to action 2335 given that the ponds will be full by the end of 2015 and ask whether the safety case for the ponds will be affected.**
- ii JR to add "EDF Energy to provide the radionuclide content and decay profile for the spent fuel in the wet store and in the dry store" to the action tracker and seek a response.**

Item 5. Priority Actions from the Action Tracker

- 5.1 Chair drew attention to the circulated review from John Busby regarding Mr Tucker's response to Mr Busby's presentation recorded in appendix 2 of the Minutes of the 11.09.14. SSG meeting. NS suggested that Mr Tucker should be given the opportunity to reply to this review and members agreed this was an appropriate action. JG concurred and suggested that this was an agenda item for the next meeting
- 5.2 MT drew attention to the EA monitoring of discharges, explaining that this was controversial and reflected the need for additional monitoring. MT suggested this was sent to both the station and the EA. PW concurred.
- 5.3 Chair advised that the revised Action Tracker would be provided to all members before the next meeting. JG commented that the revised URL circulated to all members to enable access to electronic versions of meeting papers enabled fast retrieval of documents. Chair advised that website functionality had been raised at the National Stakeholder Group meeting.

Actions & Recommendations:

- i **Colin Tucker to be given a copy of Mr Busby's review and asked for comment and this item to be on the 4th December SSG Agenda.**
- ii **EA and EDF Energy to be asked to comment on EA monitoring of discharges during steam venting.**

Item 6. SSG Meeting Agenda and Communications

- 6.01 Chair introduced this item explaining that subsequent to the last meeting she had sought views on making the assumption that meeting attendees will have read all papers and have prepared questions in advance of the meeting. No opposition to this had been received. Chair suggested encouraging questions to be submitted in advance, particularly from those members unable to attend a meeting. Chair sought comments on this and on the order of the Agenda.
- 6.002 NS suggested that the public forum should be limited to questions or moved to the end of the agenda. TB later concurred and suggested that questions to be raised should be submitted prior to the meeting where possible. NS suggested that any items about membership or constitution should be at the start of the meeting. Chair supported retaining the public forum at the beginning of the meeting, as the remit of the SSG was to listen to the public and enable their questions and concerns to be considered, and agreed to try and ensure that the public forum was succinct.
- 6.03 Members discussed receiving the minutes and actions arising and Chair commented that the action tracker had enabled the time taken to review minutes and consider actions to be reduced. It was suggested that any amendments to the minutes could be submitted in advance of the meeting.
- 6.04 The verbal presentations from the operators and regulators were discussed and it was generally agreed that this should be exception reporting. The balance between receiving a report in time to enable attendees to consider this and formulate questions and being updated with most current information had been achieved previously by requesting a written report and a verbal update. NS suggested that the reports from the industry should be received earlier in the meeting and Chair suggested moving these on the agenda to immediately after consideration of previous Minutes with special items moved to the end of the agenda.
- 6.05 JG commented that the meetings were lengthy because of the sheer the volume of business being discussed. She supported keeping the agenda along current lines but for members to be as succinct as possible. Members debated this further and expressed frustration that meetings were lengthy, gave consideration to the principle that no-one had a right to waste other people's time and agreed that the role of the Chair was to ensure meetings were run efficiently. SR

expressed her faith in the chairmanship of MF advising that it was the volume of work that made meetings lengthy.

- 6.06 TB suggested that the reports from the operators and regulators were the most pertinent information and that these should be considered in the body of the meeting to enable SSG members that had to leave before the end of the meeting to hear them. TH commented that operators and regulators should attend for the duration of the meeting irrespective of when their reports were considered, to enable questions arising to be answered. Members concurred with both of these comments. JG stressed the particular importance of ensuring that the Station Directors were present for the duration of the meeting.
- 6.07 TB suggested giving additional speakers a guideline for the length of their presentation. JG suggested including timings on the Agenda and it was noted that the Chair did have guide times but that these were not detailed on the agenda.
- 6.08 Chair asked for members' views on increasing the number of full meetings to four meetings with a separate AGM. Chair pledged to encourage questions in advance and ensure that bulky additional items were spread over several meetings rather than on the same agenda.
- 6.09 MT asked whether the parent body organisation, Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP), would require a regular slot on future agenda's and heard this was unlikely.
- 6.10 Chair drew attention to the concern expressed regarding the co-option of a member under any other business at the last meeting. Members' attention was drawn to the letter sent by one member to the NDA regarding this matter. It was noted that one of the members that had raised concerns was unable to attend tonight but had asked that his view was expressed: co-option should be an agenda item and not considered under AOB.
- 6.11 Chair advised that TGJ had previously stood to represent CANE on the SSG but that when members had voted against CANE joining as a representative group, TGJ had been invited to apply to be a co-opted member. Chair referred to the SSG Constitution (section 2.6) which states that any request to be co-opted should be received by the Chairman at least six weeks before the meeting at which their co-option will be considered. Chair confirmed that subsequent to the June AGM she had received an email from TGJ formally requesting his consideration as a co-opted member. Chair apologised for not including this as an agenda item for the September meeting.
- 6.12 Chair reminded members that the Constitution did not provide guidelines for the process of co-option and that previously en bloc co-options as well as individual co-options had been agreed. Chair suggested that best practice for the future should be that any item requiring a vote should be an agenda item.
- 6.13 Chair advised that she had spoken to the NDA and had received an emailed transcript (appendix 2) that advised that the current SSG members should not be voting on whether other groups or individuals should join the membership and that other SSG's adhered to this practice. Members expressed concern about the SSG becoming too large and unmanageable. Chair read from the transcript and it was noted that the stated NDA view is that providing an individual is representing a local group that can demonstrate that it is a properly functioning group, there is no reason why they should not be a member of the SSG and there should be no reason for a vote to take place for them to join the SSG. Chair later advised that managing a large membership was the role of the Chair and that the Constitution had a section about conduct of business at meetings.
- 6.14 Chair asked each member to comment on the current membership situation and the following points were noted:
- NDA Guidance for Site Stakeholder groups (ref LAR3.0) not statutory. Guidance was used as basis for writing the SSG Constitution

- SSG Constitution has received NDA approval and includes voting on both co-opted and group membership
- Proposal that groups (meeting NDA requirements) were accepted without a vote
- Proposal that co-options were accepted unless the number of co-opted individuals exceeded that stated in the Constitution (eight)
- All individual co-options should be named in the agenda and time allowed for individuals to speak to this item.
- Membership applications should be considered early in a main meeting
- Concern expressed that the membership will become heavily anti-nuclear, however, a mix of views was considered healthy
- SSG does not represent the wider community and, for example, currently lacks expertise from landowners and farmers
- Declarations of interest considered vital to ensure members transparency
- Co-option of TGJ met current SSG Constitution requirements and should not be re-run.

6.15 Members debated the introduction of an attendance tracker to identify members that do not attend regularly to enable Chair to investigate, to ensure groups being represented can be sent minutes of meetings missed and to remove members if appropriate. This matter was contentious, however, ensuring that groups were kept informed was universally agreed.

6.16 Chair advised that the NDA have asked that members vote on whether the recommendation to the full group should be that the election for the co-option of TGJ should be re-run. The outcome was as follows:

- Abstentions: two
- For re-run: zero
- Against re-run: ten

The recommendation to the full SSG will be that the co-option is not re-run. Chair agreed to ensure that co-option of TGJ was an agenda item to enable members not present tonight to express their views.

Actions & Recommendations:

- Future Agenda to move site reports from the operators and regulators to the body of the meeting and prior to any additional special reports.**
- Recommendation that the co-option of Tom Griffith-Jones should NOT be re-run**
- Members consider any changes to the Constitution regarding future voting on membership applications.**

7.0 Any Other Business

7.1 TB expressed concern that the Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP), the parent body for Magnox, had expressed an ethos of a 'just' culture rather than a 'no blame' culture at the operating stations. Chair agreed to ask for clarification of what this change would entail.

7.2 MT requested confirmation that the CFP is a signatory on the Compensation Scheme for Radiation Linked Diseases. PHe clarified that Magnox employees remain employed by Magnox Ltd and that CFP employees have been seconded into the Magnox management.

Actions & Recommendations:

- Chair to request clarification from the Cavendish Fluor Partnership of what the move to a 'just' culture rather than a 'no blame' culture would entail.**

Minutes from the SSG Sub-Group Meeting held 13.11.14.

- ii **Chair to ask if CFP is a signatory on the Compensation Scheme for Radiation Linked Diseases.**

The meeting closed at 10.10pm

Next SSG meeting: 9.30 for 10.00 start on Thursday 4th December 2014 at Leiston Film Theatre.

Appendix 1: EDF Energy Responses to Outstanding Actions

Sizewell A and B Stakeholder Group Actions November 2014 Dry Fuel Store Actions:

Action 2222: Mr Benn agreed to update the group on how the contingency route from the Cemex plant to SZB was decided upon.

Answer: Contingency route from CEMEX plant not being used as stated at last SSG meeting in September.

Action 2363: EDF to provide hard copy of conditions for construction of Sizewell B

Answer: See Attachment No. 1 Sizewell B Planning consent and Attachment No. 2 Sizewell B Consent Plan

Action 2335: To ascertain the planned date for the staged safety case submission to the ONR for full operation

Answer: Planned date is April 2017

Action: EDF Energy to provide a copy of the documentation regarding the decision to have a DFS, including the consultation undertaken.

Answer: See Attachment No.3 which encompasses the various stages EDF Energy went through i.e. solutions/consultation/outcomes and planning. These were documents used in the Best Practical Environmental Option and Planning process in consultation with the public.

You can also find this information on the Suffolk Coastal District Council website at:

<http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/planning/devcontrol/applications/sizewelldfs/#plans>

Action: MC to ascertain and advise cost per unit of casks, HI-TRAC containers and transporters.

Answer: This information is commercially sensitive.

Action: NC to check and confirm whether SCDC have staged requirements for the DFS construction that must be met before construction is allowed to proceed.

Answer: Buildings on nuclear sites are exempt from building regulation approval unless the buildings are to be used for offices or canteen facilities. The Dry Fuel Store is therefore exempt.

We have produced safety case paperwork (called Engineering Change (EC's)) to justify the safety requirements of the building. These have been subject to assessment by internal and external regulators (INA and ONR). Both of these have staged hold points in the process that have to be cleared as the development progresses.

Action: NC to provide information to the SSG about the Suffolk Foundation funding.

Answer: The Suffolk Foundation is the local charity who operate and manage the Greater Gabbard Offshore Winds Limited ("GGOWL") fund. The areas of benefit for the fund are the parish of Sizewell and the town of Leiston.

The Suffolk Foundation manages and administers the fund. They deal with assessment of applications and dealing with enquiries for awards from the fund.

<http://suffolkcf.org.uk/>

Action: MC to ascertain and advise the carbon footprint for the DFS process.

Answer: Lifecycle Analysis (LCA) of the SZB Dry Fuel Store has not been assessed. Under planning condition there is no requirement to conduct an assessment.

The Sizewell Environmental Product Declaration updated document that was published in 2012 included the lifecycle impact of SZB dry fuel - per data at that time - but it does not look at the LCA of that project in isolation. (See Attachment No. 4)

E m e r g e n c y P l a n n i n g A c t i o n s :

Action 2108a: Item 3 Risks, Q6 - MC to provide written answer to question regarding how free hydrogen would be prevented from exploding during an accident.

Answer: Whilst the design of Sizewell B makes such an event very unlikely, the designers considered the possibility of Hydrogen being produced and adapted the plant design to ensure that the risk of Hydrogen explosion is extremely low. For example, the Containment Building is very large and contains few internal dividing walls. Most of the floors are open gratings. Simple design features such as these give excellent mixing of air inside the building through natural convection; and this would be boosted by Mixing Fans if electrical supplies were available. Any Hydrogen that was produced within the building could be removed by installed electrical Hydrogen Recombiners. Consequently, even if a significant fraction of the fuel were to be damaged, it would not be possible for Hydrogen levels within the building to reach an explosive concentration within such a large volume of air.

One of the lessons from Fukushima was to 'expect the unexpected'. We also recognise that engineering options change, and in some cases improve, as time moves on. One of the changes since Sizewell B was built has been the improvements in the design of Hydrogen Recombiners that do not require electrical supplies - Passive Auto-Catalytic Recombiners (PARs). So, to ensure Sizewell 'B's resilience to Hydrogen within the Containment Building, even for the most extreme (and hence most unlikely) events, the station has decided to fit PARs units in the Containment. These are being installed during the current Refuelling Outage.

Action 2018d: Item 6 Emergency Plan para 6.3, SA to provide copies of the PHE National leaflets to the SSG

Action 2108e: Item 6 Emergency Plan para 6.3, SSG to be involved in drafting communication letters.

Answer: The two operators, EDF Energy and Magnox, have produced a draft set of Operators' Prior Public Information. A period of consultation with the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee is just closing. Confirmation of several outstanding points will be made at the EPCC in November.

Once this is complete, a further draft of the Operators' Prior Public Information will be completed and sent to the SSG for consultation during November.

The Operators' Prior Public Information is made up of the letters, leaflets and (for those within 1km of the site) the calendar. Hence the leaflets will be sent with the letters and calendar text to allow all to be read in context.

O t h e r a c t i o n s :

Action 2149: Chair asked for all events reported to the ONR in 2012 to 2013 inclusive be clarified in writing and circulated to members.

Answer: EDF Energy, Sizewell B reports to the regulator on a regular base as required and this information can be found on the ONR website.

Action 2380: To provide a list of the volume and nature of the gaseous and liquid discharges during the forthcoming outage.

Answer: EDF Energy, Sizewell B power station will provide the same information for Refuelling Outage 13 as they did for Refuelling Outage 12, once the outage is complete.

Action 2385: To check information given to outage workers regarding accommodation.

Answer: Our contracting partners provide lists of available accommodation to their workforce in advance of refuelling outages, with details of rooms, hotels, guest houses and agencies - so individuals can book themselves.

Our contracting partner's administrators have built up relationships over the years with local accommodation owners and are regularly contacted to add new properties to the list.

Accommodation for our overseas workforce is booked in advance using letting agents.

Appendix 2: Emailed transcript of NDA response regarding membership of SSG

Membership of SSGs

Sections 4.1 and 4.7 of the NDA Guidance for Site Stakeholder Groups state the following in relation to membership:

4.1 Members. SSG membership should reflect the local community and its interests, as well as the operational status of the site and the needs of the NDA. On that basis the SSG should have provision to include members from:

- Elected representatives and politicians at all levels
- Local community groups with an interest in the site, including environmental groups
- Other local interests such as businesses and the voluntary sector

The precise criteria for membership is a matter for each SSG and should be included in the SSG constitution.

4.7 Criteria for membership. From time to time the SSG may wish to introduce new members to the group. New members should:

- Represent an organisation or community of interest that warrants inclusion on the SSG
- Be willing to fulfil the roles and responsibilities set out in this Guidance
- Adhere to the SSG's Constitution and Code of Conduct

In line with the extracts above, NDA's view is that as long as an individual is representing a local group that can demonstrate that it is a properly functioning group with members, regular meetings and a constitution, there is no reason why they shouldn't be members of the SSG. This means that as long as a potential new member can demonstrate that he/she meets these requirements, there should be no reason for a vote to take place for them to join the SSG.

Voting at SSGs

Section 4.8 of the NDA Guidance for Site Stakeholder Groups states the following:

4.8 Decision-making. Given that the SSG does not have responsibility for decision-making on site, voting should be avoided. However any matters such as changes to the constitution, election of the Chair/Deputy Chair etc that require formal resolution should be put to the vote on the basis of simple majority. In the event of a deadlock, the Chair has a casting vote. Voting rights will be determined at local level and enshrined in constitution.

In line with the extract above, NDA's view is that voting should be avoided in all cases other than those specified above. For example, if at the end of a discussion on an issue there are a range of views expressed, it is the chair's role to articulate those views giving everyone who wishes to participate an opportunity to make their view known. Given our position (above) on the membership of SSGs there should be no need to vote on allowing new members to join the SSG except in exceptional circumstances.

Finally, if there is less reliance on voting, it doesn't matter who is a member of the group and who isn't. It should also mean less potential for issues to arise regarding voting processes.