

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT LEISTON FILM THEATRE, IP16 4BZ
ON THURSDAY 4TH DECEMBER 2014 AT 10.00**

PRESENT

Ms M Fellowes, MBE	-	Aldeburg Town Council	<i>SSG Chairman</i>
Mr M Taylor	-	Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth	<i>SSG Deputy Chairman</i>
Cllr D Bailey	-	Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Mr T Branton	-	Co-opted member 2014/15	
Mr T Cooper	-	Co-opted member 2014/15	
Ms J Girling	-	Co-opted member 2014/15	
Ms T Green	-	representing Dr T Coffey (MP for Suffolk Coastal)	
Mr T Griffith-Jones	-	Co-opted member 2014/15	
Cllr T Hodgson	-	Suffolk Association of Local Councils	
Ms Pat Hogan	-	Sizewell Residents' Association	
Cllr W H Howard	-	Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Cllr S Robertson	-	Westleton Parish Council	
Cllr N Smith	-	Middleton-cum-Fordley & Eastbridge and Theberton Parish Councils	
Mr P Wilkinson	-	Co-opted member 2014/15	

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr M Cubitt	-	Sizewell B, Plant Manager
Mr T Watkins	-	Sizewell A, Site Director
Mrs J Sparkhall	-	SSG Clerk – for Dr L Franks
Mr S Parr	-	Environment Agency
Mr G Moorcroft	-	ONR Operating Nuclear Reactors Inspection Team
Mrs N Rousseau	-	Sizewell B, Internal Communications
Mr J Jenkin	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr P Hetherington	-	Magnox Communications
Mr J Roberts	-	Sizewell SSG Secretariat, Magnox Communications
Ms L Chandler	-	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Mrs K Potts	-	Suffolk Coastal District Council – for Cllr A Nunn
Mr J Dalton	-	Radioactive Waste Management, NDA

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Mr P Lanyon	-	Shut Down Sizewell Campaign
Mr R M ^{ac} Gibbon and other members of the public		

CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS

2408 Chair welcomed all attendees to the last meeting of the year by wishing everyone a healthy and peaceful Christmas and 2015 and a welcome to the quarterly Sizewell Stakeholder Group. Chair thanked Leiston Film Theatre and Leiston Town Council for the use of the building. Chair provided domestic arrangements and asked all speakers to introduce themselves. For purposes of the minutes only, Chair advised that the meeting will be recorded.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

2409 Mr R M^{ac}Gibbon from Westleton drew attention to action 2248 which is so far unresolved on the issue of the living wage and asked where have the negotiations got to on the Sizewell site, with particular reference to Aramark – they have agreed to stop zero-contract hours but there is still the unresolved issue of living wage, and also the whole site. Further answer was given during Sizewell B report, later (para 2519, below).

2410 Mr P Lanyon introduced himself as speaking on behalf of the Shutdown Sizewell Campaign (SDSC) and was grateful to Chair for advising in the recent SSG sub-group meeting, item 6.002, that the remit of the SSG is to listen to the public and enable their questions and concerns to be considered. To this end and to assist the SSG, the SDSC has provided copies of their bimonthly newsletter.

2411 Mr Lanyon went on to raise concern about the Off Site Emergency Plan, particularly the draft public information leaflet. SDSC is concerned that the proposed leaflet lacks integrity, is misleading, inaccurate and inappropriate.

2412 Mr Lanyon asked the following question, which takes into account the HERCA-WENRA Approach documents recently distributed to the SSG – Why does the ONR and the Suffolk Resilience Forum (SRF) still insist on basing its Emergency Planning and Response (EP&R) on what it calls 'a reasonably foreseeable nuclear emergency', when the head of the ONR has within Heads of the European Radiological Protection Competent Authorities (HERCA) been thoughtfully moving away from that basis for a year or more? Mr Lanyon advised that the HERCA-WENRA Approach stresses that:

- it is 'independent of the scenario of the accident',
- it includes 'the highly unlikely event of a severe accident ... while little or no confirmed information is available',
- that 'uncertainties cannot be excluded',
- that 'a severe nuclear accident cannot be completely excluded anywhere in the world, including Europe',
- that its Step One, called Preparedness, includes 'pre-defined simplified structures for protective action that may be applied in these cases, improbable as they might be',
- most of these basis were the result of a HERCA workshop held in September 2013, at which an ONR and a Public Health England (PHE) representatives were present. HERCA, which includes the Head of the ONR, agreed the Approach in June 2014. HERCA-WENRA published its Approach on 24th November 2014.

Mr Lanyon told the group that all of these points contradict what the ONR and the SRF continually promote and that is, an unfit EP&R based on an inappropriate 'reasonably foreseeable nuclear emergency'.

2413 Regarding the offsite emergency plan, Chair commented that a letter with the leaflet has been circulated to members of the SSG and there was the opportunity to briefly comment – the timeframe was quite limited but the SSG have been able to comment over the last few weeks – the next round of consultations on the draft have taken place with representatives of the emergency consultative committee and the Chair has distributed these to members of the SSG. Chair advised that the draft cannot be majorly changed because it is in line to go out in January with the calendar that has been provided to the public. Mr Steve Ardern, chairing the Emergency Planning Group (EPG) has advised that the SSG will have an opportunity to comment. The SSG also has an opportunity to put out their own leaflet to assist the public in understanding the issues.

- 2414 Chair went on to say that she has forwarded a letter to Dr Thérèse Coffey MP, asking, although currently within UK guidance, why the ONR and SRF Emergency Planning regulations don't take at the wider EU approach. The ONR and SRF responsibilities are within the UK requirement and they do not cover the EU directive presently. Chair pointed out that Suffolk will be the first area to go through this process, and is hopeful that other areas and districts will be able to benefit from the work this SSG has done.
- 2415 Mr G Moorcroft, Officer of Nuclear Regulation advised that the ONR is committed to high standards and improving on standards in the area of Emergency Planning – he went on to say that the ONR welcomed being able to contribute to the SSG subgroup and recognise the outcome of the recommendations and findings from the SSG subgroup, but Mr Moorcroft pointed out that they have to look at the country's national policy and work within that wider policy and legislative framework – it is down to individual countries to satisfy themselves that their arrangements are adequate. The ONR do review the arrangements and are continually making improvements. They are working alongside DECC on policy in this area and it is currently work in progress on development of REPPIR and national planning.
- 2416 Mr Lanyon was pleased to hear that the ONR are going to review this, but it is worth reminding the ONR and the SRF that in the HERCA-WENRA Approach, a compromise has been made by the joint body which reduces considerably the size of the various circles around the nuclear accident, and so many members of HERCA and WENRA want far bigger emergency zones and have compromised with a smaller one, although it is still far bigger than ours.
- 2417 Mr Lanyon raised his second question in relation to the first: Will the ONR and the SRF go back to basics and start afresh with a realistic EP&R using the HERCA-WENRA Approach which includes four things:
- pre-definition,
 - mutual trust,
 - understanding,
 - and the testing of arrangements – in order to regain the public trust – which at present they have lost?
- Chair advised that this would be a national change away from current policy.
- 2418 Chair introduced Ms Tracey Green, administrator for Dr Thérèse Coffey MP, based at the Felixstowe constituency office. With reference to a communication from the SSG regarding the HERCA-WENRA application, Ms Green confirmed that they have sent a letter to the CEO of ONR and have requested a response. Chair advised that the letter should also go to DECC because ONR respond to what DECC has asked them to deliver. Chair then established that it is DECC and the national government that needs to answer why the UK is not in line with EU directive currently. If there is a European directive and ONR are members of the organisation that have signed up to this directive, then the SSG would expect that the UK would be included as well. **Chair confirmed that the SSG will circulate any answer received from the ONR – nationally, locally and from DECC to members. Chair will send out the full transcript of the WENRA document to all members.**
- 2419 Mr Moorcroft did not believe that the paper was at the point of being an EU directive at this stage – he believes it is at the guidance and recommendation stage at the moment.
- 2420 Chair noted that the document was titled as: 'Approach' – European Approach for Cross Border Emergency Preparedness. Chair then went on to read the first sentence: 'the heads of the national nuclear and radiation safety regulators in Europe have developed and agreed a new approach'.
- 2421 Mr T Branton, Co-opted member, noted that Mr Lanyon was using a large number of acronyms that he was sure that some of the members would not be aware of. Chair confirmed that HERCA is the Heads of European Radiological Protection Competent Authorities and WENRA is the Western European Nuclear Regulators Association – Chair established that ONR are members of HERCA-WENRA.

- 2422 Mr P Wilkinson, Co-opted member, pointed out that as there are so many uncertainties, should the SSG put everything on hold in order to re-think or re-issue their position that was captured two years ago in light of the HERCA-WENRA directive or approach that has now been negotiated through DECC? The SSG's current position appears to be redundant because it has been taken up by a higher authority. Chair personally believes that it is good idea to go ahead and issue the information to the public because it will be distributed to a wider radius and to more people than ever before, which is a move forward and in the direction that the SSG want to go. However Chair agrees that it doesn't match what the SSG asked for in their position statement or in the comments which were forwarded more recently to Mr Andy Osman and the Suffolk Resilience Forum. She reiterated that the SSG are not giving up on those and rather than putting everything on hold, the SSG should work with the SRF in getting this information out to the public and also work with them on trying to make it better in the future. Mr Wilkinson disagreed entirely with this point. Chair asked if other members would like to comment.
- 2423 Ms P Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association, agrees that rather than putting everything on hold, local arrangements could still feed into the newer approach.
- 2424 Mr N Smith, Middleton-cum-Fordley & Eastbridge and Theberton Parish Councils, share Chair's view that although the information leaflet was very far from ideal, something was better than nothing.
- 2425 Mr T Griffith-Jones, co-opted member, agrees with Mr Wilkinson that the document produced is worthless in its current form. He does, however, agree with the Chair that an agreed document should go out to the members of the public to ensure they are alerted to it, but the SSG are in a new situation in which it is clear that the current stand it is taking is different from that of the ONR and therefore, Mr Griffith-Jones feels that the SSG should drive the ONR and the SRF into understanding and accepting that the Emergency Zones should be much wider before sending out a public document. As it is, to send one document out now and then another in a few months does not give the SSG or the SRF much credibility and as Mr Lanyon had pointed out and Chair read out, it is in accordance with the EU approach that has been developed and agreed between all the parties.
- 2426 Chair restated that Suffolk is the first to go forward with this review and if they had not, the SSG might have benefited from any changes in the future. But, the SSG have gone through this process and there was a large consultative element to that process and pamphlets are set to go out to the public in the next few weeks. The Chair did ask on the SSG member's behalf if everything could stop in order to consider the EU approach, but the publications are ready to be sent out.
- 2427 Mr Wilkinson asked as to what reasons were given. Chair advised that the leaflets were all ready to go and it was better than not having any information at all.
- 2428 Cllr T Hodgson, Suffolk Association of Local Councils, listened to the discussion and offered his opinion that as it is a continuous evolving process and there will be an on-going dialogue between the regulators and operators, they will always be developing new ways and new approaches, and therefore, he believes that the SSG should go ahead and give opinions on the leaflet as it is in the present and allow it to be produced.
- 2429 Ms J Girling, co-opted member, recognised that the leaflet will be altered for clarity and there may be some more changes at the end of next year because of shifting circumstances at Sizewell. Ms Girling was pleased to learn that the leaflet was going out to a 15km radius which is an improvement but believes that this subject should be an item on the SSG agenda for next year so it can be discussed again.
- 2430 Ms Girling went on to mention the HERCA-WENRA papers and the European approach and is hopeful that the ONR will be working with others within Europe to develop an emergency preparedness that sits across the whole of the European countries. So, although far from satisfactory and in need of some alteration, Ms Girling recommends that the leaflet is sent out to everybody but advise the public that it is a watching brief and that things will change and develop as the situation at Sizewell transforms.

- 2431 Chair emphasised that the SSG's remit is to facilitate as a conduit of information which is the whole point of the group and therefore it should not be preventing information from going out but part of the group's role is to highlight where they feel information is inadequate.
- 2432 Mr M Taylor, Deputy Chair, raised the matter with Leiston Town Council at their meeting following a presentation from a Leiston resident – he went on to say that he made the point quite clear that it is not a reflection on the nuclear industry, it is purely the fact that the European authorities have recognised the need for a cohesive nuclear emergency planning policy across Europe following Fukushima.
- 2433 Chair recognised Ms Girling's helpful suggestion that the SSG need time to work with the SRF over the next coming months to see how they can move this project forward.
- 2434 Mr Lanyon was grateful for the comments back and was particularly interested in the idea that something is better than nothing, if it wasn't for the fact that the SRF and the ONR have known about this since September 2013. Mr Lanyon believes that the leaflet should be worked on over Christmas in order to get something meaningful out in the New Year.
- 2435 Mr Moorcroft from the ONR appreciated the comments and concerns from the group but reiterated that it is currently a matter for policy and a potential change to legislation which may take some time to achieve.
- 2436 Chair advised members who have yet to voice their opinion on this topic to let her know by email. **The SSG will contact Mr Andy Osman, who was absent today, and set up a Sub Group meeting with representatives from the ONR, to give him the opportunity to explain and to understand the group's views on this.**
- 2437 Chair summarised that the public is being issued with information on emergency planning that falls within UK guidance. The members of the group have had the opportunity to correct errors and provide some framework to the documents. It was noted that all members have a copy of the leaflet and the three letters, and if there are any other comments, Chair will need to receive them by 5th December 2014.
- 2438 Ms Girling advised that the majority of the problems lie with REPIR legislation from central government and asked whether that was mentioned in the letter to the Member of Parliament? Ms Girling was concerned that the ONR carry out work in government legislation that seems to differ with the approach that other European countries are taking. Ms Girling requested that if it has not been done already, to point this out to the Member of Parliament as there is a problem that REPIR legislation is not fit for purpose. **Chair confirmed that she did not specifically mention REPIR in the correspondence, but will certainly draw that to the MP's attention.**
- 2439 Mr M^{ac}Gibbon, member of the public from Westleton raised an issue of commuter traffic speeding through stakeholder villages, some of which must be Sizewell staff. Specifically referring to the B1125 on the way from Blythburgh into Westleton, Mr M^{ac}Gibbon advised that very often traffic goes through there at around 45-50mph between the times of 6am and 8am and asked whether EDF can have any influence on Sizewell staff and advise them that they must comply with the speed limits. Mr M^{ac}Gibbon stressed that apart from being dangerous, it is incredibly noisy.
- 2440 Chair advised that it cannot be confirmed whether the speeding traffic is from EDF, Magnox Ltd or individuals going about their normal daily business, but **the group can forward any concerns to the Suffolk Constabulary and advise them that communities in the area are experiencing problems with speeding traffic** – Chair is certain that information regarding speeding is provided to both staff and contractors.
- 2441 Mr M Cubitt, Plant Manager at Sizewell B recognises that during the outage periods there is a potential issue with larger numbers of individuals travelling to and from Sizewell B – Mr Cubitt confirmed that all staff and contractors are briefed as part of the induction about how they should behave driving to and from work and part of that is compliance with the law and speed limits. Mr Cubitt acknowledged that some cases of speeding may be attributed to workers

travelling to and from the site, and, in recognition of this, Suffolk Constabulary are contacted when Sizewell B are about to commence an outage. Mr Cubitt was happy to implement any suggestions that the group could think of that was over and above what the site already do to try and alleviate the situation.

- 2442 Cllr N Smith, representing Middleton-cum-Fordley echoed the sentiments of Mr M^{ac}Gibbon. In a recent traffic survey it was noted that traffic was travelling through the 30mph limit at speeds of up to 82mph. Cllr Smith advised that during the outage periods, the situation is exacerbated and contractor's lorries are a real danger.
- 2443 **Chair reiterated that the group will ask Suffolk Constabulary to comment and see what can be done.**
- 2444 Mr M^{ac}Gibbon thanked the group, and advised that it is a major issue of public relations with all the people who live round Sizewell and now there is confirmation that Middleton are just as concerned. Mr M^{ac}Gibbon confirmed that Westleton Village Parish is in consultation with Suffolk Police, however, as the Constabulary seem a bit reluctant to put in more forceful measures, the community have purchased a speed sensitive '30mph' sign which will be circulated around the village from month to month. Mr M^{ac}Gibbon also advised that they are going to reinstate community sessions with a speed gun to capture and record speeding vehicles. Mr M^{ac}Gibbon asked if a notice can go out to Sizewell staff to warn them that the local community is trying to pinpoint those individuals who are disregarding speed limits.
- 2445 Mr T Watkins, Site Director, Sizewell A Power Station had been talking with Mr Cubitt and recognises that traffic and speed does get worse during the outage period but that Sizewell A Station must take its share of responsibility as well. Mr Watkins went on to say that they do take this issue very seriously and it is worth having a conversation with both sites beforehand as it may be possible that they can help with the purchase of a speed sign.
- 2446 Mr M^{ac}Gibbon thanked Mr Watkins and will feed the information back to the Westleton Village Parish.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2447 Apologies for absence were received from Mr C Betson (Leiston Business Association); Dr T Coffey (represented by Ms T Green); Cllr M Jones (Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Council); Cllr A Nunn (Suffolk Coastal District Council); Cllr R Smith (Suffolk County Council); Mr C Tucker (Sizewell B Staff representative); Mr D West (Suffolk Wildlife Trust); Dr C Barnes (Suffolk Coastal District Council); Mr D Gregory (ONR Operating Nuclear Reactors Inspection Team); Mr A Osman (Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit); Mr A Pynn (Environment Agency)
- 2448 Chair advised members that attendance had been recorded over the last few months and it was noted that a few organisations have not been able to attend. The group will be in touch with various organisations to ask if they would like to send another representative or if there are any barriers to their attendance. Chair highlighted that it was unusual to have this many apologies at the meeting and stated that although all papers were sent out, non-attendance can make it difficult to feedback on issues if members have not been involved with the debate. Chair was grateful to people who have attended or have sent substitutes today.
- 2449 Chair invited declarations of interest and these were noted as follows:
- Ms J Girling: joint proprietor of Wood Farm Holiday Cottages – this is a first time declaration – Ms Girling confirmed that it is a business which she has never declared before because she does not provide accommodation for Sizewell workers – Ms Girling explained that this was not being discriminatory, but reasons that it does not fit in with her planning consent and because of potential disruption to holiday makers.

- Mr M Taylor: confirmed that he is also co-owner of Wood Farm Holiday Cottages and is now the Treasurer of Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) – however, he emphasised that this is not a paid post.

3. MEETINGS AND MINUTES

a) SUB-GROUP MEETING HELD ON 10 SEPTEMBER, OFF-SITE EMERGENCY PLANNING

- 2450 Chair advised that an email was sent on the agreed approach that members should, if at all possible, forward questions prior to meetings so answers can be obtained beforehand in order to speed up efficiency of meetings – Chair confirmed that no questions were received.
- 2451 With regard to the minutes of the sub-group meeting held on 10th September about the off-site emergency planning – Chair highlighted the fact that there have been discussions during the public forum about the emergency plan concerning the leaflets, letters and the principle about the EU approach in the future and asked whether there were any other matters that needed to be raised such as corrections.
- 2452 Mr T Griffith-Jones noted a correction regarding Question 7 on Page 7 – Mr Griffith-Jones wanted to make the point clear that the report related, not just to the Fukushima site, but to all nuclear power stations in Japan – it was looking at the possible speed of evacuation from all the sites in Japan and that varied from 12 hours to 5½ days to get out of the 30km zone. Please delete: ‘the site’ in line 4 of the question and replace with ‘all the nuclear power stations in Japan’. The Group agreed to this correction.

b) MAIN MEETING HELD ON 11 SEPTEMBER

- 2453 Chair requested corrections with regard to the minutes of the main quarterly meeting held on 11th September at Yoxford Village Hall.
- 2454 Ms T Green, representing Dr T Coffey, wanted to know what the basis of the amendment was to page 3, the second bullet in paragraph 2353, with reference to paragraph 2284 and whether there was a sound recording or a recollection of who had actually proposed the amendment. Chair confirmed that it was a direct quote from a sound recording that was independently double checked by the secretariat.
- 2455 Mr Griffith-Jones drew attention to page 11, item 2401 in Any Other Business – Mr Griffith-Jones corrected that he did not apply for co-option, but rather that he was invited by a member of the SSG to apply to be co-opted.
- 2456 Mr Griffith-Jones wanted to correct paragraph 2402 on page 11. Mr Griffith-Jones said that it was not his intention to hold the nuclear power industry to account but merely that he considered that the SSG already knew who he was and he didn’t need to say any more than that.
- 2457 Mr S Parr, Environment Agency noted page 10, paragraph 2396 that action 1911 was closed and confirmed by the Chair, but the action tracker still has it marked as ‘on-going’. Chair confirmed that it would be closed. The SSG can confirm that they have received the information from the Environment Agency that fulfils action 1911, but it is subject to a potential presentation by Mr Deere-Jones who has been invited to attend a meeting in the future. In order that this can be scheduled, the SSG need to make sure that other people could attend as well.
- 2458 Mr Griffith-Jones broached a matter arising from these minutes that goes back to the previous discussion on page 3, paragraph 2353 and again at what Thérèse Coffey said – as Mr Griffith-Jones understood, this was changed in the minutes and is therefore an accepted position which was confirmed by Cllr Nigel Smith at the meeting on 11th September. Mr Griffith-Jones expressed confusion and wanted an explanation as to why Thérèse Coffey should say that and then vote against his co-option. Chair believes that this is something that Mr Griffith-Jones should raise directly with Dr Coffey, but pointed out that each member should be voting on the

views of the people they represent and not their own personal opinion. In the meantime, Chair has asked Ms Green to feed that question back to Dr Coffey. Chair explained that Mr Griffith-Jones was referring to an email vote that took place of all members after the main meeting in September where Dr Coffey responded in requesting that the matter was subject to another vote.

- 2459 Cllr D Bailey, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council, observed paragraph 2406 on page 11, and was concerned that members are not receiving the reports as noted in the constitution, which does not give members time to consider them. Mr J Roberts, SSG Secretariat, advised that he had to strike a balance of whether to send out a multitude of single emails or group them together. He would be happy to change this practice if it was not the view of the members. Chair stated that the bulk of the papers were sent out in the timeframe except reports from the Environment Agency and NDA as well as the leaflet from the EPCC which arrived late and went out the day before this meeting. Chair noted the problem of requesting reports too soon is that they will not be current, but did mention that the SSG have got plans going forward for support both nationally from Cavendish Fluor, Magnox and the Secretariat to the SSG and also locally and it is hopeful that there will be two people that will be sharing that role going forward. The Chair pledged to continue to work with the SSG Secretariat to make sure that papers go out as promptly as they are received. The Secretariat does chase organisations for reports and requested that the officers at the meeting please assist the SSG and ensure all papers are received well before the meeting dates, even if they are subject to change on the day, and that the SSG need to observe the 14 day cut off.
- 2460 Cllr Bailey noted that the SSG Sub-Group Minutes were also only received the day before the meeting. Chair noted that this was an error and the Sub-Group minutes should have been included in the main bundle that went out originally. Mr P Hetherington, Magnox Communications, apologised for the delay but explained that largely the mailings are based on when the reports are received. In support of the Secretariat and looking at the practices of different Stakeholder Groups around the country, some nominate to receive individual reports the minute they arrive and some, such as the Sizewell Stakeholder Group, gather the information to avoid filling up members' mailboxes – it is a preference practice and Communications are happy to support the group however they want to receive information going forward. Chair noted that it was a dilemma that all organisations and committees struggle with in terms of getting information out to members. Chair confirmed that the SSG will standardise and work efficiently as much as they can to ensure that the information is parted promptly and then it is the members' responsibility to read the information in order to disseminate it back to their organisations. Chair has recently introduced the executive summary that is provided very promptly after each meeting which enables members to go back to their organisation and give a distilled version of the minutes. Members also have access to the website where the minutes are uploaded.
- 2461 Mr Griffith-Jones was concerned that he had not received the HERCA-WENRA report – Chair advised that the report has not been sent out yet. The report was published 24 November 2014. Chair had a few copies of a three page executive summary of the document that members could take after the meeting but the full document and executive summary will be sent out with the minutes.
- 2462 Ms Girling, regarding the difficulties with receiving papers, stated that some members of the public do not have access to computers and requested that papers are sent out as promptly as possible by Royal Mail. Chair confirmed that there is a list of people that receive hard copy documents and these usually go out the same day as the email. Chair reported that Mr Charles Barnett from the Shut Down Sizewell Campaign was grateful to receive his papers promptly, but if there are any examples of particular people, who are not receiving them in the post, please let the Secretariat know as there may be a problem with the address. Chair also commented that she does not expect members to print out large documents, for instance, the action tracker is difficult to print because it is produced on an A3 size sheet of paper – the Chair requested individuals get in touch with the Secretariat should they require a hard copies.
- 2463 Chair wondered whether this had answered the question. Mr Bailey advised that it had because he was very concerned that perhaps the Secretariat was not getting the allocated time

to prepare for the meeting. Chair advised that in her dealings with the Secretariat, in preparation for meetings and post meetings, she always asks whether they have enough time to get things done and whether she can offer support. Chair went on to say that sites are aware that leading up to a meeting and post meeting there is more work for the Secretariat to do, and that's why there will be two people covering the role going forward so there is back up as well.

c) SUB-GROUP MEETING HELD ON 13 NOVEMBER

- 2464 Chair read a correction from Mr Andy Osman. He requested that paragraph 3.04 of the minutes from 13 November was clarified and corrected to read two zones. There are, however, three types of action to three different audiences and there are three letters going out, but there are only two official zones, Chair then read out the following: Suffolk County Council has subsequently confirmed that there are two emergency planning zones around Sizewell as detailed within Sizewell Offsite Emergency Plan. The first is a 3-4km detailed emergency planning zone as determined by ONR and the second, a 15km extended emergency plan zone as agreed by Suffolk Resilience Forum. There is no urgent countermeasures zone around the site of 1km. Chair looked to Mr Moorcroft of ONR to enquire if there are different actions that apply in the 1km area. Mr Moorcroft confirmed that there are some urgent countermeasures within that area which have been determined by Suffolk Director of Public Health NHS England. Chair clarified that: there are some urgent countermeasures that would apply in the 1km area that have been agreed by Public Health England – but it is not a 'zone'.
- 2465 Cllr N Smith pointed out that it contradicts the map. Chair agreed that the map had three zones.
- 2466 Ms Girling thought that the map was being altered. **Chair advised that she had not seen the new map but will double check that it only shows two radiuses.** Ms Girling urged that the map is changed. On this point, Chair hopes that the industry will take this as a positive comment because it shows it has not been explained in a way that the public can understand it.
- 2467 Mr Wilkinson asked if it can be explained what sort of letters are going out to each of those zones. Chair briefly explained that there are three letters that have been circulated to members – one letter goes to residents who could potentially receive urgent countermeasures in the 1km area. Another goes out to residents, identified as group B, that were in the old DEPZ and are now in the wider public information 3-4km zone and the third letter goes out to residents who were previously not in the DEPZ and so never received any information at all, but are now in the extended zone up to 15km.
- 2468 Mr Wilkinson enquired as to the possibility of the SSG sending out its own pamphlet to the 1km area and wondered whether there is a 'mood' within the SSG to support that the group write their own pamphlet to go alongside, or substitute, or separate from the one that is going out officially. As background information, Mr Wilkinson went on to explain that two years ago the SSG did offer the ONR, SRF and Suffolk County Council (SCC) to work collaboratively with them in order to word an appropriate pamphlet. This was denied at the time and therefore the group could use this opportunity to send out an alternative pamphlet and Mr Wilkinson wondered whether members of the SSG were likely to support that.
- 2469 Chair advised that as a result of the SSG's request to assist the preparation of those materials, she did attend a joint meeting and did get the opportunity to contribute, although late in the process, she was confident that it will get better going forward. Before putting the suggestion to the members, Chair, in support of Mr Wilkinson's proposal, took the opportunity to clarify that this is the role of the SSG, to provide and act as a conduit of information. From time to time, the SSG does send out annual reports and the group could put a leaflet out to every household. Chair confirmed that the group has the budget to do so and they have enough material and content to share with the public and could make emergency plan the major topic. Chair was reluctant to put out a separate emergency planning leaflet because she wanted to make sure that the public do not think that the group was replacing the statutory official industry information due to the fact that the group cannot provide a role in an emergency, for instance, they cannot man a phone or give guidance – so there is a need to be clear about roles and responsibilities. On the whole, Chair supports Mr Wilkinson, and proposes that the group publishes something

in the New Year, following the Sub Group meeting, that will cover the SSG's work and provide additional information to help the public understand what the situation is, the concerns of the group and where to go for more information.

- 2470 Mr Wilkinson clarified his proposal that the group send out a separate leaflet on emergency planning only and Chair proposed to send out a leaflet about the SSG's work with the bulk of the content on emergency planning. Chair sought other views from members.
- 2471 Mr Bailey thought it was very dangerous to produce a separate pamphlet concerning the emergency planning in parallel to the official guidance. If the group's leaflet contradicts the official pamphlet, then it will create more confusion. Mr Bailey also felt that the group needed to press the issue of being involved in the actual formation of the official pamphlets and then many of the aspects the group are concerned about will be covered.
- 2472 Mr Griffith-Jones supports Mr Wilkinson because if the document cannot be stopped, then he feels that it is the group's duty to send something alongside it explaining what the SSG has been pressing for over the last two years. Mr Griffith-Jones went on to say that the document as it is currently drafted is not adequate and agrees with Mr Wilkinson that it is misleading. So if it cannot be changed, then Mr Griffith-Jones feels that there is a need to put something out to give the public information they need specifically on the emergency zones.
- 2473 Cllr N Smith believes that whatever the result of the discussion about the leaflet, the group ought to put out a press notice to say how unhappy they are with the outcome of the consultation. Cllr Smith considers that this may give the group more credibility as the SSG comprises of both pro-nuclear and anti-nuclear organisations with most members agreeing that the document going out is thoroughly unsatisfactory and deeply flawed.
- 2474 Cllr W Howard, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council, agrees that the draft document presented was deeply flawed, but was not sure that the group can send out anything else without receiving the final document.
- 2475 Mr T Branton, co-opted member, believes the way forward is to seek addressing an amendment to the document before it is published and for the group to look at issuing a report sometime after the document has been distributed, because having two documents arriving within a short space of time of each other may create confusion. Hopefully then, the later report can offer further guidance or clarification if needed, which is the reason for the first document.
- 2476 Cllr S Robertson, Westleton Parish Council agrees that it will cause confusion to send out two documents at the same time. Cllr Robertson thinks it would be better to see what the document states when it comes out and then put a report of the group's views on the document.
- 2477 Chair summarised that virtually everyone has a slightly different version of what to do.
- 2478 Ms Girling was concerned that this topic had not been given the time that it should and would prefer to see it as a Sub Group Meeting, looking at it as a single agenda item. Ms Girling recommended that the SSG sets up a meeting early next year or as soon as the ONR and SRF official documents are published to enable the group to form a much better opinion of the type of information that the SSG can issue without confusing the public. Ms Girling went on to say that there is a lot more information that could go into the document and the public would be interested in who the Radioactivity Incident Monitoring Network (RIMNET) are and why they are here monitoring.
- 2479 Cllr T Hodgson, Suffolk Association of Local Councils, said that he had listened to the discussion and the group were able to put their views into this document, but he has heard very little constructive ideas come forward to put into the document. The only item that Cllr Hodgson believes the SSG can put forward for the emergency planning is to increase the DEPZ but there has been no suggestions as to what happens within that DEPZ. Cllr Hodgson was concerned that as an organisation, the group cannot put anything forward because they have not come up with anything tangible.

- 2480 Chair corrected Cllr Hodgson and advised that individual members did provide comments which she then forwarded to Mr Steve Ardern – some of those have been incorporated and some haven't. Chair went on to give examples of items incorporated, such as helpful changes to the wording to lead the public to a better understanding and some requested changes around information have not been incorporated. There have been constructive observations from members and some members have spent a great deal of time in providing comments of a supportive and challenging nature which have gone forward.
- 2481 **Chair proposed that the group have a Special Sub Group Meeting in the New Year, looking at the materials that have gone out to the public at that point and then seeing if the group can formulate information that they feel they need to provide to the public in helping them understand the issues.** Chair advised that there would not be a vote on this, because the NDA and the SSG's constitution are leading the group to have a show of hands or a consensus approach rather than actual votes. Chair went on to explain that most other SSGs do not have a voting process like Sizewell's group.
- 2482 Mr Wilkinson was concerned that the NDA was dictating how the group conduct their business and felt that the group should vote if they wanted to. Chair clarified that the NDA was the driving force behind setting up stakeholder groups and provided guidance to what constitutions could include – they do not dictate, however they have pointed out that voting on too many matters is not best practice
- 2483 Mr J Jenkin, NDA, referred to the most recent guidance produced on Site Stakeholder Groups in 2009 – it states that the NDA discourages voting on things other than the election of the Chairman and Vice Chair. The reasons given are that SSGs were not set up to be executive decision making bodies, they are there to be a conduit of information between site operators and local communities and therefore a variety of views are expressed. Mr Jenkin went on to say that the NDA always encourages that a broader spread of views are represented at SSGs and cited Sizewell as an example of having quite a big variety of views, i.e. some in favour of nuclear and some against. All of those views should be expressed, recorded and represented as appropriate – however, Mr Jenkin confirmed, that as the SSG is not an executive or decision making body, the NDA has always preferred that voting was not used in that way, but they have not dictated that. Mr Jenkin said that the NDA have been discussing how business is run in other groups with the Sizewell Stakeholder Group Chair and has been sharing some of their thinking. Mr Jenkin thought that perhaps there will be an opportunity, given the guidance has not been reviewed for a number of years, to look again at that to see if the NDA can help clarify the guidance and the running of all the Site Stakeholder Groups. The NDA would welcome any views from members on how they can do that.
- 2484 Mr Wilkinson disagreed entirely and wanted to know how the NDA arrived at that position – Mr Jenkin advised that there may be more than one position and clarified that the groups were not originally set up to reach a position on matters if there were two or three very different views which should be noted. Mr Jenkin didn't think that the group should have one position if there is a divided opinion.
- 2485 Chair interjected to bring order back to the meeting and respectfully requested that all members and officers raise their hand in asking to speak.
- 2486 Mr Jenkin reiterated that it wasn't a question of stifling any views expressed. They should all be communicated and recorded in whatever way that the group feels is appropriate, but the NDA doesn't feel that it is necessarily right that the group should reach one position if there are a number of views expressed.
- 2487 Mr Wilkinson wondered how the SSG can arrive at the decision to do something as a group if that group does not have the majority of members in favour or against a matter.
- 2488 Cllr N Smith considered that the group should put out a press statement shortly after or at the same time of the issue of the pamphlet. Cllr Smith thought it may not be possible to get everyone together but it might be sensible to form a small group.

- 2489 Chair went back to Mr Jenkin's comments and stated that there are some best practices from other SSGs that the group may need to look at and guidance from the NDA will be forthcoming in the future as to roles, SSGs and constitutions. The Chair also added that the group have some best practices here that other SSGs may want to look at and she personally has found that a show of hands and recording how people feel is an effective mechanism in judging the mood of the group and gives confidence to the Chair to carry out a certain action. This group may not be decision makers, but they do have actions that are progressed on behalf of the public when concerns are raised, so the Chair would ask members for a show of hands to move forward otherwise it could be seen as the Chair dictating. Chair said that unfortunately this is what has happened at some SSGs and has happened in the past at this SSG when it was not chaired in an appropriate way and this should not be allowed to happen. Chair confirmed that she is here to facilitate the role of the SSG and to do so she needs members to tell her how they feel and voting or showing of hands to indicate how members feel is helpful. Chair assured the NDA that the group will try and stick to the NDA guidance that the SSG should not have a formal vote on a lot of matters, because that too can become cumbersome, but as a mechanism to get a view expressed is effective and helpful.
- 2490 Chair, going back to Cllr N Smith's comment that the group should release a press statement either at the same time or following the production of information from the SRF, again that is something that some members will agree to and some members may not wish to do that – the wording of that would have to be agreed and it would have to be on behalf of the majority of the members.
- 2491 For the efficiency of this meeting, **Chair proposed to send out an email to Mr Andy Osman at the Suffolk Resilience Forum capturing the discussions and asking for the distribution of the leaflet and information letters to be considered again, then asking members to a meeting to discuss what the group puts out to the public in the New Year.** The majority of members agreed. Mr Wilkinson's suggestion to send a single leaflet out just about emergency planning could be an action from the meeting in the New Year. No decision has been made to send out a single issue or a joint leaflet with an annual report and information on emergency planning – the agreement is the group meet and send something out. Chair wanted members to work collaboratively together to put something out that is meaningful to their intended audience.
- 2492 Ms Green, with regard to the proposal of an additional Sub Group Meeting in January, enquired whether there was an opportunity to obtain information from other nuclear sites and other SSGs prior to the meeting – Chair advised that one of the leaflets is National pamphlet published by Public Health, but can look into what other SSGs are sending out. Chair highlighted that Suffolk will be the first to do this exercise and unfortunately there isn't a model that the group can use, which emphasises the difficulties and challenges surrounding this ground breaking work. **Ms Green then went on to ask if there are models that the SSG could use from other European sites. Chair said she would find out.**
- 2493 Mr Moorcroft observed that prior information leaflets were sent out which was a specific requirement under REPPiR and that the operator had to do, a second leaflet from the Resilience Forum is being sent out by Suffolk County Council to the wider area, so careful consideration should be given if the SSG want to send out a third leaflet. Chair advised that the ONR would be invited to comment.
- 2494 Mr Lanyon considered that if the public knew of these difficulties, they would be thoroughly sympathetic with the SSG and the very awkward position it is in and this is due, in his opinion, to the inadequacy of the ONR and the SRF.

d) OUTCOME FROM EMAIL OF 19 NOVEMBER CONCERNING CO-OPTION OF TOM GRIFFITH-JONES

- 2495 Chair summarised the concern by some members with regard to the outcome of the co-option of Tom Griffith-Jones. All members were given the opportunity to express their views and overwhelmingly the response was that the co-option of Tom Griffith-Jones did not need to be revisited. The NDA confirmed that the group had not done anything outside the constitution, but

looking forward, the SSG may want to think about not having formal votes – Chair shared that best practice from other SSGs is that they do not vote on whether an organisation should join their group and stated that if a group is representing people in the area, they should be encouraged to attend and therefore the co-option of Tom Griffith-Jones did not really need to take place.

- 2496 Cllr N Smith suggested that the group revisit their constitution – **Chair agreed that from this outcome, a separate Sub Group meeting will be held to look at the constitution in line with NDA guidance.** Chair emphasised that she has pledged that matters regarding co-option or group membership is flagged up to all members so they are aware of it and they will have the opportunity to provide comment, but, in line with other SSGs, the group will not have a vote which prevents an organisation joining.
- 2497 Cllr Howard raised the issue of ‘individual’ co-opted members. Chair pointed out that all SSGs have co-opted members that apply to join if they feel that they can make relevant contributions – Chair confirmed that she will be looking to the NDA for advice on how they do that going forward. The constitution, as it is now, is in place until the next AGM – at the next meeting, if members wish to propose changes to the constitution, they can do. **In the meantime, Chair thought it would be helpful to obtain copies of constitutions from other SSGs.**
- 2498 Cllr Bailey believes the election carried out was flawed and goes against the group’s normal procedures. He clarified that his observations were not political and had nothing against the elected member or his views. However, the co-opted member did not indicate that he was seeking co-option at the previous meeting and he stated today that he did not indicate that. Chair answered and advised that the co-opted member nodded during the meeting and Chair took it that he was intending to apply.
- 2499 Cllr Bailey went on to say that it was stated that the group did not need to have this as an item on the agenda as it is not in the constitution. However, Cllr Bailey advised that the constitution was formed on the grounds that the group would adopt normal committee procedures – these procedures have been carried out since the formation of the SSG and election of members is an item on the agenda and at the beginning of the meeting to enable the member to take part in the meeting and therefore precedent of the way the committee operates has already been set. Chair accepted responsibility and apologised if members thought the way the issue was handled was flawed and ensured that if there are matters in the future concerning co-opting members or organisations into the group, it will go onto the agenda. However, it was within the constitution and there was no requirement within the constitution to do so. Chair accepted the comments about precedents and how other local authority meetings are run, but emphasised that this is not a local authority meeting.
- 2500 Ms Girling spoke at great length on her views of the SSG and the justification on her application for the co-option of Tom Griffith-Jones representing CANE. She went on to clarify that the group works better with all members being able to contribute from whatever viewpoint they hold and it was not a question of being anti-nuclear but about the subject matter which is the Sizewell stations and how they work. Ms Girling concluded that the group should accept and have respect for every member. Chair thanked Ms Girling for her comments and reiterated and clarified that the group overwhelmingly up-held the decision to welcome and include Tom Griffith-Jones into the group.

4. REVIEW OF ACTION TRACKER

- 2501 Chair summarised the discussion of minutes and the matters arising from those. Chair commented that it had been a helpful discussion. Chair noted that she had not received any questions regarding the action tracker and there were some actions going forward that were still open requiring responses from different agencies. If members are concerned about the action tracker, please email the Chair. Actions where responses have been provided will be closed.

A short comfort break was taken at this point

SIZEWELL A REPORTS

5. TIM WATKINS (SITE DIRECTOR, MAGNOX)

2502 Mr T Watkins provided a presentation that covered the following areas:

- **Safety:**
 - Injured worker making good progress with rehabilitation
 - Magnox investigation completed
 - Comprehensive company and site briefings on lessons learned
- **Projects:**
 - Fuel-free verification
 - o Close examination of pond floor and skips
 - o Remotely operated vehicle
 - o Camera and radiation probe
 - Pile cap deplant
 - o Fuelling machine 2 fully dismantled
 - o Large number of components classed as free- release
 - o Remainder is Low Level Waste
 - o Fuelling machine 1 next
 - o Maximised re-use of skills
 - Turbine hall roof
 - o Poor condition, multiple leaks
 - o Storm damaged
 - o Fully repaired, fit for remaining life
 - o Over 7,000 new fasteners used
- **What happens next?:**
 - Turbine hall asbestos removal
 - o Recovery period now complete
 - o Good progress being made
 - Electrical overlay project
 - o 11kV supplies commissioned
 - o Important enabling work for future demolition tasks
 - New owners from 1 September, Cavendish Fluor Partnership
- **Community:**
 - Socio-economic scheme update
 - o www.magnoxsocioeconomic.com
 - Eastbridge Pentanque Club
 - o Rechargeable floodlights
 - Framlingham Business Association
 - o Children's entertainment at Christmas fair

2503 Ms Girling asked where the very low level waste is taken to – **Mr Watkins will confirm where the low level waste is taken to.**

2504 In their presentation, Cavendish Fluor spoke about a 'just' rather than a 'no blame' culture – Ms Girling asked whether this could be explained. Mr Watkins clarified that the nuclear industry operated a 'no blame' culture, but the problem being it was a misleading title – it led you to believe that you could never be blamed for any event that you were party to. When the new owners, Cavendish Fluor took over, they have called it something different, a 'just' culture – the implication being that if you are partly responsible for an incident or an event, you would be held accountable for it. Mr Watkins explained that this was not a policy change and will not affect people's behaviours – so, if you make a genuine mistake and you report it, you are not held responsible, but if you are part responsible because you have ignored procedures and you should not have, you would still be expected to report it, and that would be taken into consideration, but you might be held to account. Mr Watkins went on to say that since his tenure at Sizewell, he has disciplined two people and the reason being was not necessarily the event, but because they were slow to report it.

6. DANIEL GREGORY (SITE INSPECTOR, OFFICE FOR NUCLEAR REGULATION)

2505 Chair advised that Mr D Gregory was absent and that Mr Moorcroft will take comments for Sizewell A after he has presented the Sizewell B report.

7. ANDREW PYNN (SITE INSPECTOR, ENVIRONMENT AGENCY)

2506 Chair advised that Mr A Pynn was absent and that Mr Parr will take comments after his Sizewell B report.

8. JONATHAN JENKIN (NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY)

2507 Mr J Jenkin apologised for the lateness of the December update and will endeavour to get information to the group in time.

2508 Mr Jenkin reported that the Berkeley boilers, fifteen in total, were transported to a smelting facility in Sweden – the overwhelming majority of that material which was Low Level Waste or very Low Level Waste has now been recycled for free release and around just over 4,000 tonnes of metal has been recycled and is available for alternative use. The programme is now complete and had two key benefits – one, it saved a lot of very valuable capacity in the Low Level Waste depositary in West Cumbria and secondly the amount of material that has been recycled is an important environmental prudential in itself. A number of commemorative plaques have been made from the material and images can be found on the website story.

2509 Mr Jenkin reported an interesting innovation at Dounreay in the north of Scotland, where a local dressmaker in Thurso, using ironing board fabric and a 7.0 tog duvet, created an insulated hood for a camera device which is going to be used in the Dounreay fast reactor vault. The majority of the very hazardous material that was used as coolant during the operation of the reactor, sodium-potassium alloy, known as NaK was removed, but there could be some residual contamination left, so this insulated hood will protect the camera from heat as it goes into the vault to detect the residual bit of contamination – not only is this an important part of the clean-up process, it is a simple solution that can be used in the industry.

2510 Mr Jenkin reported an important milestone in the decommissioning of the Windscale Pile which is now an integrated part of the Sellafield site. Sir John Cockcroft recommended putting filters on top of the Pile chimneys and that paid a crucial role in preventing the contamination from the 1957 Windscale fire from spreading further. The filter gallery has now been removed and there was ceremony at the Windscale site where Sir John's son, Christopher, now 72, was able to attend. The site has been marked with a commemorative plaque – a good tribute to some very important work at the time.

2511 Mr Jenkin advised that last month the NDA held their fourth annual national Supply Chain event in Manchester – it was the biggest and most successful to date – 1,400 visitors attended. This year featured 260 business stands and a range of presentations from industry groups and governments and it provided a great opportunity for small/medium enterprises in particular to network and find out about opportunities coming up to bid for.

2512 Mr Jenkin reported that recently £13 million of research and development funding was announced – this is a collaboration between Innovate UK (formerly the Technology Strategy Board), the NDA and the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) – that will benefit 15 collaborative research and development projects as well as 26 small scale feasibility studies which covers a lot of facets of nuclear including decommissioning research.

2513 Mr Jenkin announced that just over half of the fuel has been removed from the Oldbury reactor – this is a very important hazard reduction progress and hopes Oldbury to complete defuelling by 2016.

2514 Mr Jenkin revealed socio economic news in West Cumbria – in collaboration with partners in West Cumbria, the NDA opened the Albion Square development in Whitehaven town centre – this development will house around 1,000 workers from the Sellafield site, taking them off the licenced site and basing them in the town centre which should also bring spin-off economic benefits to the town.

- 2515 Lastly, Mr Jenkin reported the extension of generation at Wylfa – Wylfa is the last generating Magnox station in Anglesey, originally scheduled to cease generation in 2010. There have been a number of extensions and most recently the regulator, ONR, has accepted in its most recent view of the safety case for extending Wylfa's life further until the end of 2015. This is good news for jobs in Anglesey and good news for the security of energy supply. The NDA estimate the extension from 2010 to 2015 will generate an additional £785m which will go towards its decommissioning and clean-up work.
- 2516 Mr Jenkin briefly showed the NDA Contract Model slide for the new Parent Body Organisation and was happy to take questions on the new contract.
- 2517 Ms Girling was interested in the statement about the national risk forum and Sellafield being 'the UK's most challenging nuclear complex'. After reading all the information in the Guardian just recently about the state of some of the ponds at Sellafield, Ms Girling felt quite responsible because Sizewell's waste went there and wondered if in some future date, that the group could have a briefing about Sellafield in order to have a better understanding of the current situation, especially as there has been a proposal for having three more power plants there. Mr Jenkin clarified that it was spent fuel that was sent from Sizewell A but confirmed that he would be happy to speak to the group about the progress at Sellafield.
- 2518 Mr Taylor raised the issue of the Magnox operating plant and the effect of continuing to run Wylfa. Mr Jenkin clarified that the Magnox reprocessing facility at Sellafield is very old and has encountered a number of operational problems. The NDA updated the Magnox Operating Plan last year with a range of scenarios as it was impossible, given the risks, to confirm one completion date. Therefore, depending on the throughput rate at the facility, there are a range of end dates. Mr Jenkin added that clearly the NDA are focussing on getting the programme completed safely and as quickly as possible and reiterated that he was happy to update the group in the future.

SIZEWELL B REPORTS

9. MARTIN CUBITT (PLANT MANAGER, EDF ENERGY NUCLEAR GENERATION)

- 2519 Mr Cubitt began answering the question on Aramark – this was raised a couple of meetings ago and EDF have been in negotiations with Workplace Solutions (Aramark is the subcontractor). Mr Cubitt explained that this is happening on a companywide level rather than at local level because these contracts are run across the whole organisation. Negotiations are still on-going and EDF remain hopeful of a timely outcome – Mr Cubitt will update the group at the next meeting.
- 2520 Mr M Cubitt provided a presentation that covered the following areas:
- **Safety performance and staffing:**
 - **1206 days** (1799 previously) since our last EDF Energy Lost Time Incident (LTI) (over 3 years)
 - **16 days** since our last contractor Lost Time Incident (LTI)
 - **1472 days** since last Nuclear Reportable Event (over 4 years)
 - **10 days** (1640 previously) since our last Environmental Reportable Event
 - **528** EDF Energy staff and **37** Apprentices
 - **250** year round contracting partners
 - **Lost Time Incident:**
 - Tuesday 18 November whilst working on Generator Transformer 1, one of our contracting partners, fell from a ladder attached to a scaffold platform
 - An investigation is underway to better understand the cause of the fall. However, the initial investigation has confirmed that the ladder and the scaffold were both compliant, within their inspection dates and the ladder was suitably lashed to the scaffold with adequate safety gates.
 - The Injured Person (IP) suffered a fractured collar bone as a consequence of the fall.

- Duty first aiders immediately attended the scene of the accident and an ambulance was called to site. The IP was taken to the local hospital where he was treated and discharged in 36 hours.
- The IP has travelled back to his home in Doncaster and is recovering well.
- The accident has been reported to the HSE within our normal arrangements.
- **Environmental Reportable Event:**
 - Monday 24 November a level control and alarm fault occurred on the station's Hypochlorination plant, which led to an overflow of the plant's disenchantment tank.
 - The tank overflowed into the bund, which overflowed a quantity of seawater dosed with sodium hypochlorite onto the ground in the local area (at the south east corner of the site). The approximate strength of the hypochlorite was 0.1% (1000 ppm) in the Hypochlorination Plant.
 - We use Sodium Hypochlorite as a chemical to deter and prevent marine organisms (e.g. Mussels) from building up in our sea-water cooling systems. This is required to prevent blockage of some of our coolers. It is akin to dosing tap water with Chlorine. It therefore has a relatively benign impact on the environment.
 - The Environment Agency was immediately informed and they attended the site a few days later.
 - An investigation is underway to establish the cause of the event.
 - The area was cleaned very quickly and as a precautionary measure, we continue to monitor the local ground water to ensure there is no impact to the environment.
- **Refuelling Outage 13:**
 - The reactor and Turbine 2 at the power station were resynchronised to the national grid at 05:00 hours on 3 December 2014 bringing to the end refuelling outage thirteen.
 - Maintenance work on Turbine 1 is progressing well and is planned to be brought back on line in the coming days.
 - 13,000 tasks were carried out in addition to refuelling reactor
 - o Extra 1200 contracting partners on site
 - An estimated additional £20m is invested in the local community through the accommodation of additional workers and in areas such as salaries.
 - Refuelling outages are always busy periods for us and for the area, so I thank you and all our neighbours in the local community for your support and patience over the last few weeks.
- **Work carried out in Refuelling Outage 13:**
 - Turbine 1 work:
 - o Generator Transformer Phase Exchange x 3
 - o Generator Protection Scheme Replacement
 - o Gas Insulated Switchgear refurbishment
 - o Turbine Low Pressure Rotor replacement x 3
 - Turbine 2 work:
 - o Investigation and repair of Governor Valve
 - o Replacement of Fire Resistant Fluid
 - Major items of work:
 - o Stripping and maintaining Reactor Coolant Pump 'D' motor lower oil bearing
 - o Electrical Separation Group 1 Maintenance
 - o In Service Inspection (weld checks of primary circuit)
 - o Equipment Qualification replacements
 - o Japanese Earthquake Response (JER) Improvements
 - Mechanical work in containment
 - Passive Hydrogen Re-combiners in containment
- **Dry Fuel Store Update:**
 - We have commenced the concrete pour of the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) base slab which is a significant step towards the building construction.
 - Enabling works to separate the electrical systems between the A and B sites has completed which allows the clearing of a legacy national grid transformer and the preparation of the remainder of the DFS building area.
 - Commissioning of the DFS is expected to be leading up to and following the next refuelling outage in 2016, the station is operating well within the safety case and until that date fuel will continue to be safely stored on site in the fuel pond.
 - Work is continuing on the manufacture of the DFS equipment and storage casks.

- **Emergency Planning Changes:**
 - There was a SSG special meeting on 10 September regarding the changes to the emergency plan taking place from 1 January 2015. The meeting brought together the operators, regulators, Public Health England and Suffolk County Council.
 - This meeting was followed up with a SSG sub group meeting on 13 November where we provided the information due to be sent to the public regarding the changes to the emergency plan. The information looks at three specific groups of people:
 - o People within the 1km area where countermeasures may be required.
 - o People who live within 2.4km of the area who are no longer in the area for countermeasures.
 - o People in the new public information zone.
 - This information will be issued in the coming weeks in readiness for the new plan coming into action on 1 January 2015
- **Community News:**
 - Visitor Centre runs energy workshop for Leiston Primary School.
 - LabLive Event 26 November:
 - o 800 pupils from across Suffolk celebrated science, held at Snape Maltings.
 - o Key Stage 3 – Year 7, 8 and 9 students.
 - o Courtesy of The Times Cheltenham Science Festival in partnership with EDF Energy.
 - o Two scientists Simon Watt, biologist and Suze Kundu, Teaching Fellow in the Department of Materials at Imperial College London.
- **Sizewell B Staff News:**
 - Northgate High School – Lewis Bedwell, a fourth year apprentice at Sizewell B, is using his training in mechanical engineering to mentor the group of 11-16 year old pupils from Ipswich in an electric car challenge.
- **Engineering Maintenance Apprenticeship Information Day:**
 - Saturday 6 December 2014 at 10:30 hours or 13:30 hours.

2521 Mr Branton wanted to know if anything significant was found with reactor coolant pump 'D' which had previously caused the two shutdowns. Mr Cubitt confirmed that the issue was with the rubber ring seal and it has now been repaired. Mr Cubitt went on to say that they understood why it was faulty and there is no necessity to look at the other pumps.

2522 Mr Howard advised that the group were recently told the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) was needed by 2015 and now the SSG has learnt that it will be completed by 2017. Mr Howard wanted to know what impact that is going to have on Sizewell B's ability to run the station after 2015. Mr Cubitt clarified that the first of the concrete pours of the Store is behind programme which has just moved the active commissioning date into the following calendar year – that will not have any impact on the operation of the station and EDF will remain within their safety case for the ponds. Mr Howard queried the response as he thought that Sizewell B needed to get the fuel out of the ponds by 2015. Mr Cubitt explained that the DFS date was based on outages and part of the safety case and in order to carry on operating, there is a need to have enough space to defuel the reactor and enough space to receive fuel to carry out the refuelling process which is all lined to the outage. Mr Cubitt confirmed that the next outage will be at the beginning of 2016 and by that time, the active commissioning would be complete to allow the station to move some fuel. Mr Howard then asked when the safety case for full operation of the DFS will be in place. Mr Cubitt explained that there is a stage submission for active commissioning which will allow for the removal of a very small amount of fuel in 2016 and the full safety case will be in place by 2017. Chair requested more information before the March meeting with assistance from the ONR so the group can understand the process better. **Mr Cubitt agreed to supply a couple of presentation slides with some points to talk through the stages of commissioning and what each stage means.** Mr Moorcroft confirmed that it is general practice to have stage submissions in safety cases to incorporate lessons learned and move forward to the next active commissioning stage.

2523 Mr Taylor asked if any of the work within the fuel building will be carried out at this outage or the next. Mr Cubitt advised that within the fuel building, half of the work to upgrade the crane is complete and commissioning has been done, the second half of the work is still on-going, but it is not work that is associated with the refuelling outage.

- 2524 Mr Taylor recently checked the station data and it showed that Sizewell B was using 14 MW on Turbine 1 and 27 MW on Turbine 2. Mr Cubitt advised that EDF may be the biggest producer of electricity in Suffolk, but when it shuts down, they are the biggest user. He went on to explain that the data shown was the amount of power the station was using to operate. Mr Taylor queried the fact that the station only needed 8 MW when there was a blackout. Mr Cubitt explained that during a blackout, reactor coolant pumps and CW pumps are not operated – it is the difference between running a commercial plant and running the safety related plant.
- 2525 Ms Girling wanted to know how far the production of the storage casks were, the route of the replacement transformer, because it was understood it came from Lowestoft and not from the South and why was there so much steam generated from the station at this outage, was that due to the weather conditions? Mr Cubitt advised that the steam in the last couple of days was being produced as the station started up which took a little longer than normal as they needed to reset something in the Turbine to put the steam to the condenser. Mr Cubitt confirmed that the transformer came to site about three or four months ago from Lowestoft port and was transported via the A12 along a designated route. Storage casks are currently being manufactured in America. The containers will be made of stainless steel. **Mr Cubitt will send a link to a YouTube video of casks being manufactured by Holtec and although not identical to the ones currently being produced for Sizewell B, will give an overall impression of the manufacturing process.**
- 2526 Mr Lanyon wanted to view the slide on the Japanese Earthquake Response Improvements again and enquired whether Mr Cubitt knew anything about the Japanese secrecy act that becomes law in a week or two. Mr Lanyon went on to explain that it will enable the nuclear industry in Japan to keep secret, any sort of detail it wants and will place the most colossal penalties on whistleblowers. Mr Lanyon wanted assurance that the station disapproves it and agrees that it would not be an improvement. Mr Cubitt advised that the stations operate an open reporting culture both internally and externally because it is believed that it is the best way of improving their performance.

10. GRAHAM MOORCROFT (SITE INSPECTOR, OFFICE FOR NUCLEAR REGULATION)

- 2527 Mr G Moorcroft provided a presentation that covered the following areas:
- **Report for period 1 July to 30 September 2014:**
 - Period of safe operation with maintenance of Reactor Coolant Pump in July
 - No significant findings following site licence compliance inspections and system based inspections
 - ONR follow up emergency charging pump event
 - Operator exercise of enhanced capability against severe accidents scenarios.
 - **Compliance Inspections:**
 - Licence Condition compliance inspections – there are 36 licence conditions
 - o Construction of new plant and commissioning (LC19 and 21) – Dry Fuel Store
 - Systems based inspections:
 - o Emergency Core Cooling Systems
 - o Local Leakage Rate Testing Systems
 - o Main Steam and Blowdown Systems
 - **Emergency Charging Pump:**
 - March 2014 – fault identified on an Emergency Charging Pump
 - Prompt immediate action taken by Station to secure safety and rectify fault
 - Full internal investigation undertaken by Station
 - ONR follow up inspection of findings of event
 - Station identified the root and contributing causes of the event
 - Corrective actions identified to secure compliance and prevent a recurrence
 - No further enforcement action by ONR in relation to this incident
 - **Japanese Earthquake Response**
 - Operator programme of improvements to enhance the stations capability against severe accidents scenarios
 - Observed exercise to demonstrate elements of this enhanced capability, including the deployment of new equipment and activation of facilities

- Exercise judged to be successful with some opportunities for learning and improvement
- ONR are monitoring and supporting on-going development and introduction of Operator's enhanced capability

2528 Mr Howard, in relation to the systems inspections, wanted to know what the identified 'areas for improvements' were on page three of the report and on page four, wondered if priority given to the six areas of Licence Condition inspections. Mr Moorcroft advised the ONR use inspection guidance that informs what the arrangements should be and what is good practice. The guidance is published on the website. During inspections the ONR will have a range of findings, some of them might be quite low level, perhaps just relating to procedural use, adherence type issues or a document that needs correcting – for these actions, the ONR generally allow the operator to use their own corrective tracking system and it is reviewed again to ensure that they have been completed. If it is a significant action that the ONR want to follow in more detail, then they would track that themselves through their own processes and follow up. Mr Howard wanted to know what areas of improvement are needed. Mr Moorcroft advised that this level of detail would not be provided in the report but the ONR do produce an intervention record that details the inspection and has a rating scheme from 1-6. Generally if it is adequate, a rating of 3 would be given, with 6 being inadequate and 1 being exemplary – these findings are published on the website. Mr Howard was concerned that the report is meaningless without this information – Mr Moorcroft advised that it is a question of getting the right balance of detail in the reports.

2529 Mr Lanyon suggested that the breakdown of the pump and the Japanese earthquake were foreseeable, but has the ONR ever had to deal with problems that are not foreseeable? Mr Moorcroft advised that the reason of the systems based inspections is to look at the implementation of the safety case. Safety cases are put in place to identify faults on the plant, fault sequences within the design basis of the plant, identify faults and put in appropriate protective measures. The investigation beyond the design based analysis goes into studies of a probabilistic nature and is built into the safety case. Generally the ONR look at the safety case for the plant.

11. STUART PARR (SITE INSPECTOR, ENVIRONMENT AGENCY)

2530 Mr S Parr is the Environment Agency (EA) Nuclear Regulator for the 'B' station. Mr Parr apologised for the late report and summarised the two interim reports on environmental monitoring and a short paper on how the EA work with ONR particularly on assessing safety cases where there is an environmental waste management interest from the EA. The report explains which bits of the dry fuel store safety case that the EA are interested in such as discharges and waste management.

2531 Mr Taylor was concerned about the emergency planning was the potential health issue and monitoring of tritium. How is the monitoring done? **Mr Parr will prepare and provide information on monitoring that covers operations and emergency response.**

2532 Mr Lanyon wondered whether the EA had heard of the local organisation called CURIE - Coastal Unit Recording Irradiation of the Environment – Mr Parr confirmed that he had not heard of the group. Mr Lanyon went on to say that CURIE has been monitoring radiation around the Sizewell sites since the late 80s. Chair interjected and thought that this could be a specific question that could go to the EA so they could provide comment, but asking them to comment on an organisation unless there is a question behind that as to why SDSC needs to know what the EA's views on CURIE is. Mr Lanyon agreed and suggested EA and CURIE could liaise as the equipment CURIE use is good but some of it is ageing.

SPECIAL REPORT

12. RWM PLANS FOR ENGAGEMENT ON GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY

2533 Chair advised that when she attended the last national stakeholder group meeting, there was one whole day hosted by RWM (Radioactive Waste Management) about deep geological disposal and there is a lot of information that will be provided after today's session.

- 2534 Chair introduced Mr John Dalton, Stakeholder Engagement Advisor for the NDA.
- 2535 Mr Dalton thanked everyone for attending and aimed to provide a quick update on geological disposal to cover three areas: background, Managing Radioactive Waste Safely programme and finally concentrate on the white paper.
- 2536 Mr Dalton commented that the Radioactive Waste Management is a relatively new organisation, established on 1 April 2014. It has a dual purpose: charged with delivering geological disposal and also to provide radioactive management solutions. RWM are a wholly-owned subsidiary of the NDA and employs around 100 people and spends around £20m per annum. It operates as a 'prospective' Site Licence Company – this is to do with licence arrangements that will need to be in place when a geological disposal facility is operating. The decommissioning process is all about interim storage, but a long-term solution is needed.
- 2537 The government put in place the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) programme which started in 2001 and there were various consultations – it established a Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) in 2003 – followed by a whole series of engagements around the country and looked at the evidence around the world. A series of recommendations were formed on how to manage the higher activity waste. Geological disposal was the main conclusion but it was recognised that there must be a safe and robust store, continued research and development activities and staged decision making. In 2008 after a series of consultations, government produced a white paper that set in process a way of finding a suitable location – in 2013 the MRWS process was halted.
- 2538 Mr Dalton continued that a new process followed but the government remained committed to the idea of voluntarism and a community willing to accept and host such a facility which is at the heart of the process – the government had a Call for Evidence from May to June 2013 then they produced a consultation document, consultation ran from September to December 2013 – the responses were published in February 2014 and in July 2014 the White Paper was published, which is available from the government website. This in effect sets out the new process of finding a suitable location. Mr Dalton went on to say that this is an 'enabling' document which sets out a clear plan.
- 2539 Mr Dalton mentioned that the willingness of a community to participate is still at the heart of the white paper, but it also recognised the importance of providing some information upfront to help inform the debate that will take place in due course in communities around the country. It explains that there is a need for a number of Initial Actions to take place, one of the comments received was the need for a geological screening across the country, also the recognition that there would need to be amendments to the land-use planning act and a much greater clarity on how government is going to work with communities. It references RWM leading the communications with potential communities and stakeholders and also the necessary work needed to provide the ONR with a change of their responsibilities so they can licence the geological facility in due course.
- 2540 Mr Dalton talked about the Working with Communities brief which is an activity that will be led by the DECC – they are going to be setting up a working group to think about such questions as: What is a community? Who should be representing that community? Should it be MPs; County Councillors; Borough Councillors; District Councillors or some other set up? Mr Dalton explained that it is a large infrastructure investment programme and funds will be available – who should be responsible for allowing that money to be spent? Who should be acting on behalf of the community? What should the test of public support actually entail? These are all big questions and the reason why the government requires a working group to look at it. It was also made clear that the final policy decisions will remain with government.
- 2541 Mr Dalton mentioned that the RWM organisation is responsible for looking at the available information on national geological screening in the UK to date – Mr Dalton clarified that it is not about drilling new bore holes, it's not about finding out new information – its pulling together all the existing data to produce some guidance, in an open and transparent way, to enable communities to have a discussion about whether they are interested in moving forward with this.

Mr Dalton thought it was important to recognise what it will not do – it is not going to rule out areas as either ‘suitable’ or ‘unsuitable’, as there would probably be no data available for that – it would just be broad indication – it will not be targeting individual sites or selecting areas.

- 2542 Mr Dalton drew attention to page 29 of the white paper document. An info-graphic shows how DECC are proposing to move forward and they recognise that it will probably take around 2-3 years to pull all the Initial Actions together. They then recognise that it will probably take a further 15-20 years of engagement with communities. It will be during this period when a more detailed site investigation will take place before coming to an agreement on when and where to build a facility that will operate for 100+ years. Mr Dalton emphasised that it was important that they have this first 2-3 year period to gather and distribute information so that local communities can make informed decisions.
- 2543 Mr Dalton highlighted a further info-graphic within the document that shows the steps envisaged that need to take place. Mr Dalton then summarised his presentation and made the group aware that the White Paper is available on the DECC website and the web address to subscribe for further information: www.nda.gov.uk/rwm/subscribe. Mr Dalton offered to give a more in-depth briefing in due course should the group find it appropriate.
- 2544 Chair raised concerns if DECC or RWM were leading on the consultation with the public and reasoned that a developer would have been told that it needs to create it and the government has made it national policy that it will be doing it, so there is no real consultation with the public unless the communication is led and facilitated by an independent body.
- 2545 Mr Dalton explained that if an organisation was going to build a supermarket or developing anything, it would be that organisation that would do the consultation.
- 2546 Chair disagreed and went on to explain that the local authority would put a notice out and would seek views. The local authority is not the developer nor is the organisation that has set the policy and that is what missing. Mr Dalton advised that the process will go ahead according to the planning legislation and RWM were not trying to subvert or change that.
- 2547 Chair said that the policy decision will be at national level and not a local policy decision. Mr Dalton explained that it was creating a geological disposal facility as a nationally significant infrastructure project. Chair agreed and said that this will be determined by government and not local planning.
- 2548 Mr Taylor was concerned that the ONR are not involved, they are involved locally in deciding what goes into the Dry Fuel Store and what can be safely contained within a cask and he believes they have the key role in trying to keep the local community safe. Chair included the Environment Agency as well.
- 2549 Mr Dalton took Mr Taylor’s point and reassured the group that RWM will put together a safety case that will be submitted to the regulators before approval will be given to build it. If the ONR and the EA are not content with anything that is proposed, they will not have the permission to build it.
- 2550 **Ms Girling proposed that this is put on the agenda for the emergency planning Sub Group, to discuss the presentation and submit questions directly.** Ms Girling also said that she would appreciate Mr Dalton returning to the group for further information. Ms Girling has looked at the website and was amazed to find out that national parks have not been ruled out and is concerned that there is a complete conflict of interest. Mistakes have been made in the past and they should not be making the same mistakes again. Chair would welcome RWM’s return with further information and an update in the future.
- 2551 Chair asked whether the consultation to the white paper had finished. Mr Dalton confirmed that the responses to the consultation that ran from September to December 2013 informed the white paper. Mr Dalton believed that it did change significantly between the consultation paper and the actual publication. Chair agreed and confirmed that the group provided comments which were taken on board.

13. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT AND CORRESPONDENCE

2552 Chair confirmed that the most recent up to date correspondence was forwarded to the group yesterday. The Chairman's report was provided, Chair noted that it had been a very busy 18 months and invited members to get in touch should they have any questions about it. Chair thanked everyone for attending and apologised for going over schedule – but believed that time was well spent on items that were important to the group and valued contributions.

Meeting closed at 13:50