

## **Sizewell A and B Stakeholder Group (SSG)**

**Minutes of the Sub-Group meeting held at 18.30 on Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> January 2015**

**at Sizewell Sports and Social Club**

### **Item 1. Chairman's Opening Comments**

- 1.1 Chair welcomed attendees, particularly those that have come from other Parish Councils, and provided details of the venue. Chair gave an overview of the SSG, describing their key role as providing a conduit of information between the public and the industry.
- 1.2 Chair advised that the main item for this sub group meeting was to enable a review of the information leaflet to be sent out by the Joint Emergency Planning Unit / Suffolk Resilience Forum. It was confirmed that comments and suggestions resulting from round table discussions would be collated into these minutes.

### **Item 2. Attendance**

- 2.1 Apologies: Dr Therese Coffey; Ms Pat Hogan; Cllr Maureen Jones; Dr Sheena Robertson; Cllr Nigel Smith; Cllr Richard Smith.
- 2.2 Attendees introduced themselves.
- 2.3 Members Present: Cllr Marianne Fellowes (MF) Chair; Cllr David Bailey (DB); Ms Joan Girling (JG); Mr Tom Griffith-Jones (TGJ); Cllr Terry Hodgson (TH); Cllr Bill Howard (BH); Mr Mike Taylor (MT); Mr Pete Wilkinson (PW).
- 2.4 In Attendance: Mike Caplin, Friston Parish Council  
Marguerite Finn, Shut Down Sizewell Campaign  
Louise Franks (LF), Minutes  
Haleana Knights (HK), SSG Secretariat  
Peter Lanyon (PL), Shut Down Sizewell Campaign  
Anthony Middleditch, Yoxford Parish Council  
Andy Osman (AO), Head of Emergency Planning, Suffolk County Council  
Alan Porter (AP), Melton Parish Council  
Russell Rainger (RR), Snape Parish Council  
Chas Taylor, Melton Parish Council  
Peter Watkiss, Friston Parish Council

### **Item 3. Information leaflet to be sent from the Joint Emergency Planning Unit (JEPU) / Suffolk Resilience Forum (SRF)**

- 3.01 AO explained the activities undertaken that have led to the production of the JEPU / SRF information leaflet. End of 2014, the nuclear site operators, EDF Energy and Magnox, produced revised information about arrangements in the event of a nuclear emergency for residents within the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ). This information is required by law to be sent to those residents within the DEPZ. The area covered by the DEPZ was determined by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR), is irregularly shaped and extends to between 3 and 4 km from the site. The law describes the minimum content of the information provided to those within the DEPZ and ONR check that the operators fulfil this statutory requirement.

- 3.02 AO clarified that the JEPU / SRF leaflet is aimed at those that live outside the DEPZ area up to a distance of 15kms from the site. Historically, emergency arrangements information has only been provided to those residents within the DEPZ. However, the outcomes of the public consultation held in 2013 regarding improvements to Sizewell emergency arrangements, indicated that enabling awareness for those living outside the DEPZ about what might happen in the event of a nuclear emergency to those within the DEPZ was a good idea. The leaflet provided for consideration was a draft of what this information may look like. This information is not required by law, has been totally driven locally, without a template and has been based upon what has been advised to those within the DEPZ. The 15km radius is the extended emergency area based upon the possible extent of hazard or risk in the event of a severe accident scenario.
- 3.03 The aim of the leaflet is to provide information to those outside of the DEPZ and within 15km of the site, despite the knowledge that most of these people may not have to do anything in the event of a nuclear emergency. The comments and suggestions about the contents of the leaflet are being sought from attendees tonight. Any questions seeking clarification were then invited.
- 3.04 AP questioned whether any other county produced a leaflet like this and AO confirmed that Suffolk is the first to produce this type of leaflet. Chair added that the SSG supported the provision of information to the wider community.
- 3.05 MT advised that the ONR had determined that all villages within 6.1km of the Sellafield site, and beach huts close to this area, are included in the off-site emergency planning area for that site. There is a public consultation for all villages concerned ongoing. MT acknowledged that the risks for Sellafield are different from those locally, however, he asserted that Sizewell B probably has the second largest concentration of nuclear material on any UK site. Chair added that emergency arrangements are based upon risk and that whilst there may be a dry fuel store in the future, the current arrangements are based upon current risk. She sought clarification of whether the 6.1km zone was the DEPZ and AO clarified that ONR refer to the DEPZ as the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001 (REPPPIR) off-site emergency planning area. AO advised that Sellafield was by far the largest civil nuclear site in the UK and is the repository for most of the nuclear waste generated in the UK. Additionally, it has structures that are old and challenging and there exist a number of risks.
- 3.06 Chair reminded attendees that the purpose of this meeting was to consider the information leaflet to be provided to the wider area and not to debate the ONR determination of the DEPZ.
- 3.07 PL expressed concern that there may be public confusion. He questioned whether the determination of the 15km area was based entirely upon the 2013 public consultation or whether the ONR had reconsidered emergency planning areas having been involved in the Heads of the European Radiological protection Competent Authorities (HERCA) deliberations. PL advised that ONR and Public Health England (PHE) representatives had attended a workshop to consider the HERCA WENRA (Western European Nuclear Regulators' Association) emergency preparedness approach. He suggested that REPPPIR was out of date. He questioned why there wasn't a delay until the REPPPIR was brought up to date in line with the HERCA WENRA guidance.
- 3.08 Chair reminded attendees that the HERCA WENRA guidance was an agenda item for consideration at this meeting. She gave her view that there had already been a delay since 2013 to provide information to the wider community. AO added that there was nothing forcing the pace of providing information, that there was no timeline for when REPPPIR was to be revised and that currently the wider community had no information. He lent his support to providing information to the wider community now and ensuring updated information is then circulated as legislation changes. He asked that the views of attendees about whether it was appropriate to pause the process of circulating information were captured when debating the content of the information.

- 3.09 PL advised that the HERCA WENRA guidelines suggested that emergency planning should be independent of the accident scenario. He explained that his interpretation of this is that the emergency planning arrangements should not be based upon what the operators say. He advised that one key area for confusion was that the Sizewell operators have produced three different letters for three different areas. PL suggested that waiting for the HERCA WENRA guidelines to be incorporated into REPIR would clarify what the information circulated should include and where it should be sent. Chairman added that it may be confusing to receive the leaflet having already received one of the operators' letters.
- 3.10 TH sought clarification of to whom the Sizewell operators' letters had been sent and heard that these letters had been sent to those resident within the DEPZ. AO clarified that by law the information had to be provided by the operator and sent to those within the DEPZ. It was noted that hard copies of each letter were available to attendees. AO referred to the information leaflet back page that has a map that describes the DEPZ area. AO advised that by law, nothing needs to be sent to those outside of the DEPZ, however, the intention was to provide the information leaflet to those resident outside the DEPZ and up to 15km from the site. In extreme circumstances, these residents may also be asked to do something. AO explained that the DEPZ is based upon a reasonably foreseeable accident as distinct from a severe accident. The information leaflet enables those that may be affected by a severe accident to have some information whilst nationally a decision is made upon what happens about REPIR. This debate was noted as ongoing over the last three years. The International Atomic Energy Authority recommends a two tier approach for emergency planning. The key issue is the planning assumption for each area, in terms of what risk numbers should be used, and this matter remains ongoing.
- 3.11 Chair sought clarification that the leaflet would go only to those outside of the DEPZ up to 15km and this was confirmed.
- 3.12 AO confirmed that in addition to the operator letter, those within the DEPZ will have received the Public Health England "Basics Concepts of Radiation" document. AO invited comments about whether this document should be included with the information leaflet to those residents outside the DEPZ and within 15km.
- 3.13 RR questioned how many residents there were in the area beyond the DEPZ up to 15km and AO advised circa 11,500 people. RR advised that this was a considerable number of people to move and AO added that this reinforces the need to raise awareness.
- 3.14 BH commented that he welcomed the provision of information to residents up to 15km. He commented that the DEPZ shape was strange and questioned why it did not include Thorpeness. AO advised that the ONR had determined the shape of the DEPZ and that this would only be changed if the risk was to change. He commented that the ONR had advised the SSG previously on how the determination was made and had given ample opportunity to SSG members to question this. BH drew attention to the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph under "Will I be affected and what should I do?" and Chair asked that all comments were captured during the round table discussions.
- 3.15 AP commented that the map showing the Emergency Planning Zone did not extend out to 15km and was therefore pointless. Chair concurred. AO explained that the map would be illegible if it did extend to 15km. This was debated further. AO concluded that the map was helpful to highlight the change in area designated the DEPZ.
- 3.16 PL suggested that the operators were in the difficult position of producing factual advice without propaganda and that the commercial propaganda obscures the message. He referred to the recent article in the EADT (circulated to all attendees). Chair invited PL to formulate a question that she would then pass to EDF Energy for reply.
- 3.17 JG questioned whether the information leaflet would be accompanied by a letter and when this was confirmed, added that an explanation that the leaflet was from the SRF and not the

operators was essential. AO added that the letter and leaflet would clarify that the operators' letter was sent only to residents within the DEPZ. Chair commented that the language in the operators' letter was not 'user friendly'. JG expressed concern that those within the DEPZ that did not understand the operators' letter and would not receive the leaflet and letter from SRF would remain confused. Chair asked that suggestions were captured in the round table discussions. AO asked that this concern was fed back to ONR as it was important that information provided to those within the DEPZ was easily understood.

- 3.18 JG questioned why the old DEPZ had been marked on the map. AO explained that it was to provide clarity about how the DEPZ area had changed, adding that there were no legal requirements informing this leaflet.
- 3.19 RR suggested that the letter and information leaflet were sent to Parish Councils before being sent to residents within those Parishes. Chair reminded the forum that the leaflet had previously been sent to local Parishes for comment. AO confirmed that this was also sent to Parishes within the DEPZ and that residents within the DEPZ could access the information leaflet online or be sent a hard copy on request. He added that press activity would also hi-light the leaflet and that by involving community groups in its formulation this should further spread awareness of the leaflet.
- 3.20 Chair commented that the SSG could decide to formulate an annual report. PW suggested that the SSG should send out a separate information leaflet based upon the content previously agreed by the SSG. He said the SRF leaflet was misleading. Chair asked that this was noted in the round table discussions. PW stated that the SRF leaflet was not worth the paper it was written on and that it should have been based upon the information previously agreed by the SSG and provided to the SRF. Chair reminded attendees that the information had been forwarded to AO and that the current draft of the leaflet included some of the comments made. She reminded attendees of the opportunity tonight to influence the final copy and PW commented that this was a waste of time.
- 3.21 TGJ sought clarification of the three different operators' letters and to whom they were sent. AO explained that as a result of the revised risk assessment from Sizewell A that the area where the advice would be to shelter and take stable Iodine has reduced from 2.4km to a 1km area. He advised that a different operators' letter was sent to those within 1km, to those that live 1km to 2.4km and to those that live 2.4km to the perimeter of the new DEPZ (3-4km). This was EDF Energy's decision supported by Magnox and ONR.
- 3.22 MT expressed concern that whatever is sent out is both honest and transparent. He expressed frustration that many of the regulators, citing ONR and DECC in particular, have approved the HERCA WENRA approach but that this has not been built into this leaflet. Chair clarified that this was guidance only and was not statutory. Chair reminded attendees that the HERCA WENRA approach is on this meeting's agenda.
- 3.23 PL commented that the PHE document was dated 2013 and should be updated. Chair reminded attendees that the PHE document had already been distributed to residents in the DEPZ and was not going to be distributed with the information leaflet to residents outside the DEPZ and within 15km.
- 3.24 PL commented that the HERCA WENRA guidance will inevitably bring about changes and Chair commented that despite the ONR signing up to this, that this hasn't yet informed their work. Chair advised that the SSG have asked Dr Coffey, the local MP, to ask DECC why the UK guidance does not match the European Guidance. This remains an outstanding issue on the SSG Action Tracker and despite this being a National issue, the SSG are taking a firm stance. Chair reminded attendees that the main purpose of tonight's meeting is to capture comments and suggestions about the information leaflet. PL advised that he was unable to separate the two matters.

- 3.25 PW asserted that the reply from DECC is that “this is under review”. He added that this matter takes away all the legitimacy for the information leaflet.
- 3.26 AO advised that he had asked the ONR and DECC what the UK position is on the HERCA WENRA guidance. The ONR confirmed that they had signed up to this approach but that the ONR are regulators of the legislation set by the Government department, DECC. DECC confirmed that it is up to the UK to implement the HERCA WENRA approach and there is later correspondence from the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group (ENSReg) that states that the approach should be implemented by National Government. This has been tied up in a review of REPPiR and there is no timeline for this and no indication whether the approach will be adopted in its entirety or only in part. AO concluded that it is up to DECC to change UK legislation.
- 3.27 JG commented that there had been a delay of two years already to produce this information leaflet and that, subject to some amendment, it should be sent out. She added that the National and International approach should be pursued and that the principle of informing the community should be considered a rolling programme that updates the local community as new legislation is agreed. Chair and AO concurred. AO added that in Suffolk the decision to adopt a two tier approach was analogous with the EU approach; the key difference is the distances involved. AO advised that a decision from the Government is needed about the criteria to be used to determine distances.
- 3.28 DB asked when the leaflet was likely to be sent out and heard that this was by the end of February.
- 3.29 Chair thanked AO for his contribution to this meeting and for his hard work over the last two years to incorporate what the SSG have said. Chair invited each table to now consider the leaflet. AO agreed to circulate amongst tables and MF, LF, HK and RR agreed to take notes at individual tables.
- 3.30 The meeting reconvened after approximately 1 hour. Chair thanked participants for their contribution and to the scribes for taking notes (attached in appendix 1). She reminded attendees that the comment about keeping local Parish Councils informed would be kept in mind and that she hoped a final draft of the leaflet would be distributed to them and the SSG prior to circulation to residents.
- 3.31 Chair reminded attendees of the remaining items on the agenda commenting that the HERCA WENRA item had been discussed already and any further questions could be addressed to AO or the Chair after the meeting. She reminded attendees that this was a sub-group meeting that enabled focus on particular items by a working party and that main SSG meetings were more fully attended and included the operators and regulators. Chair invited attendees to stay if they wanted to and several attendees left at this point.
- 3.32 Chair sought and gained members’ support for the principle of information being disseminated within the wider 15km area, with the proviso that this was part of an ongoing rolling programme.
- 3.33 Chair advised that she had an email address for DECC and would take an action to write to DECC to enquire when the UK will adopt the HERCA WENRA approach. This was agreed.

#### **Actions & Recommendations:**

- i Chair to submit to EDF Energy a written question from Peter Lanyon about factual advice being obscured by commercial propaganda.**
- ii Chair to write to DECC to enquire when the UK will adopt the HERCA WENRA approach**

**Item 4. Operators' Letters, the EDF Energy press release and the EADT Article**

- 4.1 Chair drew attention to the three operators' letters dated 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, the press release dated 16<sup>th</sup> December 2014 and the copy of the recent EADT article. She invited questions and comments.
- 4.2 MT questioned why the letters were circulated during the Christmas period and whether this was to meet legislative requirements. Chair responded it was because the letters accompanied an information calendar. MT expressed his disappointment that the operators had proceeded to send out their letter and information despite hearing of the public's concern about the HERCA WENRA approach not being adopted at the SSG meeting held 4<sup>th</sup> December. AO clarified that there was no legislative requirement for the information to be sent out over the Christmas period but as some information was provided on an annual calendar, this was driving distribution prior to 1<sup>st</sup> January. He added that this had always been the intention and the SSG had been briefed accordingly.
- 4.3 TGJ reported that he was only sent only one of the three letters and was not advised three versions had been distributed. Chair confirmed that she had received the three versions by email and TGJ advised that he had requested a hard copy of papers. Chair clarified that the secretariat had recently changed and that HK would be organising local arrangements, like venues, and Tracey Finn, based at Dungeness, would undertake circulation of materials. Chair reported that she has recently requested that hard copy mailings were undertaken locally by HK. MT commented that the mailing list may need updating.
- 4.4 Chair drew attention to the EADT article and in particular the sentence ending "once in every 300,000 years" commenting that this phrase was clearly indicated as a direct quote and yet did not appear in the EDF Energy press release. She invited questions and comments.
- 4.5 PL commented that he had written to the Editor of the EADT and encouraged the SSG to also write and ensure articles are responsible. Chair questioned who the EADT were quoting; EDF Energy, Jim Crawford (Sizewell B Site Director) or another source, suggesting that perhaps EDF Energy might seek to have this clarified. PW questioned what the issue was. He asked if this was a matter of accuracy of the quote and MT commented that the quoted words were nonsense and unnecessary. PW questioned why only that 'outrageous statement' was being highlighted asserting that everything that they say is questionable. He concluded by giving the view that the SSG should not take this up.

**Item 5. HERCA / WENRA Guidance**

- 5.1 PL drew attention to the guidance dated 24.11.14. and in particular Step 1 under the section titled "A three-step approach" which refers to testing arrangements. He questioned whether public testing would be undertaken. Chair clarified whether Mr Lanyon was referring to evacuations and PL confirmed this. Chair advised that modelling had been undertaken. AO sought clarification of the question and PL asked whether there will be a move towards testing arrangements in the rolling programme. AO confirmed that this would only be possible if the legislation changes to enable this. He explained that currently that there was no legislation available to enable residents to be instructed to leave their home to test evacuation procedures. This was debated further and AO reiterated that there was no legal power to enable any agency to enforce such a test. PL suggested that the public knowledge could be tested. AO advised that he had looked at whether evacuation had been tested in any other location. He reminded attendees that the SSG had stressed that the test would only be effective if everyone were involved in order to simulate the correct scale and challenge of that evacuation. He advised that other countries undertake evacuation testing, like Japan, but they have the legal framework to support this.

- 5.2 PW suggested setting the alarm off. AO advised that alerting the public was via TV and Radio and PW asserted that this should happen. AO advised that there was civil contingency legislation that states that the public must not be alarmed unnecessarily. This was met with several frustrated comments and PL again pointed to the guidance that suggests testing of arrangements. AO added that testing of severe accident emergency arrangements was one of the four key recommendations made in the UK Weightman report (post Fukushima). AO advised that DECC may be able to advise what progress has been made post Fukushima on improving the testing of emergency arrangements for a severe nuclear accident. SSG members considered this and asked Chair to write to DECC accordingly. PL emphasised that this should be practical testing.
- 5.3 MT advised that drones are a new technology identified as a potential threat in the wrong hands and may have an implication for the design of future power plants. AO clarified that drones are small, airborne vehicles, remotely controlled and suggested that the SSG may like to ask EDF Energy whether this risk has been included in their risk assessment. MT confirmed that he had already posed this question to EDF Energy.
- 5.4 MT asked whether the RIMNET system could be used to monitor a spectrum of radionuclides. AO advised that RIMNET was originally designed to monitor low level radiation from International accidents. He questioned whether MT was referring to the ten gamma monitors recently deployed around Sizewell provided by RIMNET and this was confirmed. AO stressed that they only detected gamma radiation. He advised that he was working on ensuring that the readings were made publicly available. MT advised that budget constraints had meant that radiological protection personnel in Scotland had been reduced and expressed concern that the same was happening in England, meaning that the facility for monitoring a severe accident was limited to RIMNET. AO advised that there were no plans to change Suffolk's capability. SSG members asked Chair to investigate with DECC how much progress has been made with the Weightman recommendation to review the UK's capability for radiation monitoring to ensure adequacy to manage the challenges of a severe accident.

#### **Actions & Recommendations:**

- i **Chair to write to DECC and question:**
- **what progress has been made on improving the testing of emergency arrangements for a severe nuclear accident.**
  - **whether a review has been undertaken of the UK's capability for radiation monitoring to ensure adequacy to manage the challenges of a severe accident.**

#### **Item 6.0 Any Other Business**

- 6.1 JG expressed concern that the website was still out of date and the papers were not accessible. Chair requested that JG provide a summary of required updates to action. Chair advised that in future there would be more opportunity for local updates. Chair agreed to advise the NDA that the website was not adequate.
- 6.2 Chair advised that the NDA are consulting on the guidance provided to site stakeholder groups and have convened a meeting on 24.02.15. for the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the site stakeholder groups to provide feedback. This guidance has informed the SSG Constitution. NDA has requested an indication from stakeholder groups about what is working well and not so well and for details of areas of good practice. Chair invited written feedback from attendees. Chair proposed that the SSG review their Constitution after the NDA consultation has closed. Chair emphasised that the SSG are well respected by the NDA and other stakeholder groups.
- 6.3 PW questioned whether the NDA had provided guidance at the last SSG meeting regarding voting. Chair advised that Jonathan Jenkin had commented, read out para 2483 of the 04.12.14. SSG minutes and concluded that voting should be discouraged. There was some

discussion about whether the SSG could show a majority position using a show of hands. Chair asserted that the SSG are an independent group and as such would consider the NDA guidance on how to operate. PW stressed the importance of knowing the majority position when negotiating with operators and regulators. Chair concurred and said that she intends to advise the NDA that the SSG position on a matter has previously been sought and whilst this may not have been unanimous, it had been known to be the majority.

- 6.4 MT suggested that an email communication is established to enable members to comment on the guidance and Chair agreed to action this.
- 6.5 JG commented that the SSG are not provided with an annual budget or given the opportunity to manage its expenditure. Chair advised she had repeatedly asked to see budget figures and to have control of how the budget is spent. Chair advised that the NDA have said that there is no set budget for the SSG and that if the SSG want to undertake a piece of work, they need to request funding from the NDA which may or may not be approved. Chair added that the operators have been asked to put aside funding for stakeholder work. TGJ requested that the Chair ask for financial autonomy and Chair agreed to ask that the guidance will include funding arrangements.
- 6.6 JG questioned how much EDF Energy contributes to the NDA to support the SSG. Chair advised her understanding that the two operators evenly split the cost unless the SSG are entirely focussed upon an issue that pertains to only one of them, when the associated costs are then met entirely by that operator.
- 6.7 MT expressed his wish that the NDA would provide a set format and asked for members' endorsement. Chair cautioned that this may be outside what this SSG feels is its best practice.
- 6.8 DB questioned how the SSG can continue to function without a voting system. He suggested that this was a basic requirement for any group framework. Chair concurred and concluded the meeting by advising that she would report back fully to the March SSG main meeting.

**Actions & Recommendations:**

- i JG to provide a summary of required website updates and Chair to advise the NDA that the website is currently inadequate.**
- ii Chair to establish an email communication to enable members to comment on the NDA guidance given to site stakeholder groups.**

The meeting closed at 9.10pm with a round of applause for Mr Osman

**SSG meetings: Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> March 2015 at 10am at the Riverside Centre, Stratford St Andrew**  
**AGM on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2015 at 18.30 at Saxmundham Market Hall.**

## **Appendix 1: Collated comments and views about the “Sizewell Safety Advice” leaflet arising from round table discussions**

### **SPECIFIC SECTIONS:**

#### **Front Cover**

The branding looks very much like that of the operator. As this is a JEPU document, should this have a separate identity?

Current design is a waste of space and don't think the image of EDF Sizewell B is appropriate (will confuse audience who may think this is from the Operator). Would prefer and suggest you use the image from the bottom of page 2 and 3 (centre) and run along the lower edge of front and back panels instead. Or use the image from the bottom of the Further advice page. With the SR logo higher up or at the top of the page and a short sentence describing SRF?

It should not read 'Sizewell Safety advice' as 'Sizewell' is a village and the information is for people away from Sizewell...so again could confuse the audience and they may 'bin it' without reading if they don't think it's for them – so it's important that the front cover tells the audience that this is for them!

Suggest – leave out Sizewell safety advice and just have: “Important information for those living in the Extended Emergency Planning Zone for the Sizewell Nuclear sites. Please read and keep this leaflet. “ (would rather not change wording to 'Public Information Zone' as this does not include the words emergency planning which is in reality what this is! And people are familiar with the other wording and were not consulted/ asked about a change.)

#### **Why am I getting this leaflet?**

Insert a paragraph to explain that as a substantial review is ongoing and EU guidance has yet to be incorporated into UK Law, the information contained in this leaflet may change in the future.

Change first 3 paragraphs to read:

“Information about what to do in the event of an emergency at the Sizewell Nuclear site is provided by EDF Energy and Magnox as the site operators as a statutory requirement to people who live within the area up to approximately 3-4kms from the site. This is called the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone or DEPZ and is determined by the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) based on the risk the stations pose.

As part of a public consultation in 2013 local people told us (or put Suffolk Resilience Forum and explain who you are here if not done on the front page....as you haven't said yet who 'us' is) they would like safety advice to be provided out to a wider area.

So, this document is being sent to people who live beyond the 3-4km area up to 15km from the site to provide awareness of emergency arrangements even though it is unlikely that will be asked to take immediate emergency actions. This is part of an ongoing programme of information which is updated as legislation or risk changes.”

If you are going to include a map or a list of postcode towns included then you should put it here! Map should be clearer and only show the 3-4km and 15km lines, with major towns named.

#### **How will I know if there is an incident?**

Increased use of smart phone / technology / apps. Improvement required in the mobile phone network

Will people assume there is an explosion? (particularly those that have been through bomb warnings during the war).

“Don't Panic” – more people injured in the stampede than anything else

Please include in here the opportunity for people to register with Police direct so they can get a text message, as THEY WILL NOT KNOW to turn on the TV or Radio!!! without some prompt.

We felt there should also be an alert message put out on the news media's such as BBC local and Radio Suffolk, and EADT websites as most people have the internet on, rather than TV. Radio is good too but again only if it's on!

### **Will I be affected and what should I do?**

4<sup>th</sup> paragraph talks of 1km actions – does this confuse the reader as 1km actions also detailed in “Should I leave the area” section?

Suggest move the first sentence of paragraph 4 to become the last sentence amended to start “It is only...” and end with “...indoors initially”.

Put this on the start of the next page (spread things out more) and don't repeat what is again in the paragraph on the next page. So this section to read:

If radiation is released... (para 1) OK as is

People can be exposed... (para 2) OK as is

Para 3 to read as follows:

“You may be advised to go indoors, or stay indoors with windows and doors closed. This is to reduce the risk of breathing in or coming into direct contact with any radioactive materials which may be deposited. “ Add at the end of this paragraph the following: “For further information about the risks from radiation please see then list Public Health England and any other useful websites which explain radiation (and SRF website).

Para 4 (Cut out the sentence about those within the 1km being told to stay indoors). “The emergency services will issue information, advice and instructions on what action (if any) you should take through local media (TV, radio and websites). Again could mention Police Direct as being a good source of up to date information IF Gold Command agree to use this service in this way?? Do think we should include something along the lines of..... “If you are vulnerable should you lose power supply please register with.....” or if you don't put this in the leaflet it should go in the letter!

We think that more information generally should be given about registering if you are disabled or vulnerable....so that SRF and emergency services have up to date information about those with disabilities or special needs in the event of an evacuation or loss of electricity...for example individuals who need generators (renal patients) etc.

We wondered (based on the flooding last year) IS there a role for Parish/Town councils who have an emergency plan to assist with the dissemination of information? Not to add this to the leaflets but to tell the Police/emergency services that they should ensure that Town/Parish councils are given information from Gold Command as the public do telephone, and go to council offices/representatives for information in an emergency.

We didn't like the attempt at humour in the ‘stay in’ and ‘tune in’...sounds a bit like WWII blitz days!

### **What can I eat and drink?**

Remove first paragraph and amend second paragraph to start “Don't wait for any announcement of any food ....”

Please change slightly to read: “If there are any restrictions on food and drink during or after an emergency at the Sizewell nuclear site, these will be communicated by local TV and radio and websites. Prior to any announcement, as a precaution you should avoid eating uncovered food, such as fresh vegetables from the garden.

### **Should I leave the area?**

Remove the words “and up to 4kms” from the second paragraph.

Insert the word “were” into the third paragraph so that it reads “If a wider evacuation were necessary...”

As this is written this is very confusing because we have not told them enough about the 1km inner zone or the old 3-4km and they (receiving this leaflet) are actually in the ‘up to 15km area.....’ so we suggest the following re-write: “It is unlikely that anyone who lives more than 1km from the Sizewell nuclear site will be advised to evacuate immediately. (People who live within 1km of the site are also pre-issued with Stable Iodine tablets to take immediately.) After assessing the hazard and the weather conditions (wind direction etc) the emergency services may subsequently advise people further away to evacuate. If a wider evacuation is needed you will be told via TV, radio or websites, or by someone knocking on the door – which routes to use to leave the area. Rest Centres would be set up to care for people unable to make their own arrangements.”

Cut the sentence about Police and loudspeakers 'Evacuation messages may also.....as it might be the Coastguard not the Police who knock on your door...and it is not as relevant to the audience up to 15km away as these actions would primarily be for local area/immediate evacuation...and we have added a few words to cover this above.

We think more advice and information should be provided here OR in the accompany letter -- about thinking ahead of any emergency about what to do with your pets, elderly relatives”.

Is there any emergency number for people with medical needs in an emergency like renal patients, pregnant mothers about to give birth??

### **School, care homes and child care providers**

Has the advice to schools gone out any further? Not at Coldfair Green Primary as far as a Governor there is aware.

Ask providers to disseminate the information they receive – or to advise that if there was an event then they would inform interested parties to avoid undue panic

Could attach leaflet to newsletters

Section will generate questions – list of involved Parishes, which schools informed etc.

Will less able / capable people be assisted with evacuation?

Add in the following line between the two paragraphs “If you have links to these providers you may wish to find out what information has been made available to them.”

### **Iodine tablets**

Why have this section? Not of use to the people receiving the leaflet and it will only add confusion. Some people are allergic to potassium – seek doctor’s advice?

Remove the words “should there be exposure to radioactive materials” from the end of the first paragraph.

Cut out this and put into the letter, as it is not relevant to up to 15km.

### **Further advice**

Move the Emergency Helpline number to the front cover

The single helpline number will clearly be overloaded. Are there other agencies who could be listed to redirect this burden?

Add “If you are visiting within the 1km zone when an emergency occurs you may need to take Stable Iodine tablets immediately or take other actions. If you are indoors, stay there and watch, listen or log in to local media. If you are outside go to....”add where you would suggest?? Obviously not the site – but if you are on the beach where do you go?? If you are walking in the fields near by what do you do??

Change heading for the rest of this para to Management of an incident or Roles in an incident and change to read: “During any emergency...social media” – cut this as it is repeated elsewhere on the leaflet already.

Start with...Suffolk Police, Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council working together, will lead on issuing information, with the support of other local organisations, Suffolk Health authorities, and the Environment Agency, and possibly national agencies who will be involved in responding to the incident. More detailed local plans for dealing with emergencies are available on the Suffolk Resilience Forum website. Then give the SRF website and 01473 telephone number, and Police direct and the other Suffolk Public Emergency Helpline and other emergency #

We don't think you should give the Magnox or EDF energy telephone number unless the will be able to answer these calls in an emergency??

Has the capacity for answering the SPEH # been tested?? Are there several lines/operators....or a recorded message??

Minutes from the SSG Sub-Group Meeting held 29.01.15.

### **New Sizewell Emergency Planning Zones and Areas map**

This map should go as it is illegible.

List the towns and villages within the extended area

Include a simplified map (graphic) plus a list of towns and villages in the extended area

Remove the old DEPZ black circle and associated writing as it confuses the reader.

The new DEPZ looks like a flood plain

The map looks like a target

Map should stay.

Suggest you remove completely the map and include a large map on the back of the letter

### **Responsible Agencies**

Don't need Responsible Agencies – as this information is in the new Management of an incident para. So ending with the telephone number which is the best way to end the leaflet!!

### **GENERAL COMMENTS:**

Include “this leaflet has been brought to you by”

Should dissemination of the leaflet be via Parish Councils? Need to avoid panicking the public. What will the accompanying letter say to reassure the public?

Great idea to produce this leaflet – good, simple language

Concerned about elderly and infirm residents

Perhaps include safety statistics?

Leaflet falls short on explaining all the risks behind a potential incident at a nuclear site i.e. those associated with nuclear power.

Leaflet assumes that people will stay indoors – the feeling is that people will act for themselves either fetching children or driving out of the area.

Leaflet is a start- recognising that more information will improve future versions.

This leaflet needs to link to the Parish Community Engagement Plan (CEP). CEP's are already advising people on self help things like battery radios. This leaflet needs to pick up these self help ideas via the CEP.

This needs to be circulated in cooperation with the Parish CEPs.

If you want people to stay at home you need to explain why. Need to encourage them to stay indoors or the roads will be in chaos.

I believe that something is better than nothing – it may provoke a discussion or even a preparation for a response

What is the logic of the sponsors on the bottom of the back page? The recycle one may encourage people to throw away the leaflet rather than retain it.

Like the font but think there still looks too much wording – need more white space between sections which the following notes hopefully help to achieve.

Some sections such as the information on Stable Iodine tablets would be better addressed in the letter that explains the other zones/previous actions NOT on this leaflet as this does not apply to people getting the leaflet anyway!

The leaflet must have an issue date on it. And we thought the recycle logo at the bottom of the SCC Another language box was very confusing!! We don't want people to put this leaflet into the recycle bin just yet!!

It's important what goes on the outside envelope (remember the previous SRF letter that went out looking like a circular...we want people to open it! Suggest it is not addressed to 'the householder' but use the electoral register or post office to address to each house address number on that street etc. The envelope should also clearly be marked with 'Important information from Suffolk Resilience Forum regarding emergency planning'.

Letter that goes with leaflet should introduce SRF, partners involved etc and purpose, as well as outlining what information was previously sent out by EDF/Magnox and the use/issue of Stable Iodine tablets etc from the leaflet.

We felt very strongly that every family with a child at a school within the 15km radius should get a personal letter direct from SRF not just rely on the schools to circulate (as they have not in the past). This also applies to families of those with a person in a care home in the 15km - they should be provided with information.

Suggest you include a Frequently Asked Questions in the letter as well – we would be happy to help write or you know what people ask regularly. What about my pets? Should I block up my chimney/air vents? Who gets Stable Iodine tablets and why? This is an easy way to cover the other information in a clear, concise way.