

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)
HELD AT SAXMUNDHAM MARKET HALL, 29 HIGH STREET, SAXMUNDHAM, IP17 1AF
ON THURSDAY 4TH JUNE 2015 AT 7.00 PM**

PRESENT

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| Ms M Fellowes, MBE | - | Independent co-opted member | <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 | |
| Ms J Girling | - | Co-opted member 2014/15 | |
| Mr J Abbott | - | 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 G McGregor | - | Suffolk County Council | |
| Cllr I Pratt | - | Suffolk Coastal District Council | |
| Cllr R Rainger | - | Snape Parish Council | |
| Cllr N Smith | - | Middleton-cum-Fordley & Eastbridge and Theberton Parish Councils | |
| Cllr H Williams | - | Westleton Parish Council | |
| Mr P Wilkinson | - | Co-opted member 2014/15 | |
| Cllr J Fisher | - | Saxmundham Town Council | |
| Cllr M Jones | - | Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Councils | |

IN ATTENDANCE

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Mr M Cubitt | - | Sizewell B, Plant Manager |
| Mr T Watkins | - | Sizewell A, Site Director |
| Ms H Morris | - | Communications Officer, Dungeness A |
| Mr G Moorcroft | - | Office of Nuclear Regulation Sizewell B Inspector |
| Mr A Jakeways | - | Office of Nuclear Regulation Sizewell A Inspector |
| Mr A Pynn | - | Environment Agency Sizewell A Inspector |
| Mr J Jenkin | - | Nuclear Decommissioning Authority |
| Mr D Foy | - | Staff representative, Sizewell B |
| Mr C Tucker | - | Staff representative, Sizewell B |
| Mr P Hetherington | - | Magnox Communications |
| Dr C Barnes | - | Suffolk Coastal District Council |
| Sgt D Thompson | - | Civil Nuclear Constabulary |

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Mr C Barnett | - | Shut Down Sizewell Campaign |
| Mr R Hoggar | | |
| Mr M Whitby | - | Member of the Parish at Dunwich |
| Mr J Busby | | |
| Mr D Collier | | |
| Mr S Sugawara | - | Electric Power Industry, Japan |
| Mr K San | - | Electric Power Company, Japan |
| Ms Pilkington and other members of the public | | |

CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS

2698 Chair welcomed all attendees especially all members of the public and visitors and thanked all officers for all their hard work in preparation for this AGM. There was also a special welcome to returning members and new members that were joining the SSG – they will be formally welcomed by name later in the programme. Chair went on to provide domestic arrangements and asked all speakers to introduce themselves for the purpose of recording the minutes.

1. PUBLIC FORUM

2699 Mr C Barnett introduced himself as Chairman of the Shutdown Sizewell Campaign (SDSC). He went on to advise that for the last two years SDSC has been concerned about the integrity of the Sizewell B Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV).

2700 Mr Barnett told members that previously two Belgian reactors were stood down because of apparent hydrogen flaking which was not present at the time of the construction of Sizewell B's RPVs. It is now the opinion of the Belgian authorities, the Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC), that the possible RPV failure was due primarily to wet corrosion and very little to do with hydrogen flaking during construction.

2701 Mr Barnett advised that FANC, together with their experts, recommended that this corrosion was a serious matter which could affect any Pressurised Water Reactors (PWR) throughout the entire world and all 430 PWRs should be examined for structural integrity through wet corrosion.

2702 Mr Barnett has been in touch with the Corrosion Institute who advised that corrosion can happen with hot water as well as cold – RPVs are subject to extreme fluctuations of temperature, premeditated on and off. Mr Barnett concluded that there is an alarming prospect that there may be something wrong with the RPV at Sizewell B and it is essential that the SSG put pressure on Sizewell B to have a proper structural examination of their RPV as soon as possible. Mr Barnett feels that it is not suitable to wait for the 10 year periodic safety review date set for March 2016.

2703 To illustrate Mr Barnett's concern, he reiterated correspondence he received from the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) in 2013 – Mr Colin Patchett, Chief Engineer at the time, advised that if there was a failure of the RPV, then effectively, nothing could be done and this was the reason that the industry takes every precaution during the RPV manufacture to ensure it is structurally sound – but, in light of this new information, Mr Barnett felt that it was imprudent to rely on metallurgy and other various construction techniques, testing and inspections that happen at the time of building an RPV – if, as Mr Patchett advised, there are no safety devices that can be brought into operation if a RPV fails, it is important to push the ONR and EDF for a safety review and inspection as soon as possible – unfortunately, it is Mr Barnett's opinion, that the ONR have not been very effective so far.

2704 Mr Barnett explained that as he had not received a response from the ONR, he wrote to the SSG Chair on 10th April 2015 providing reasonable proof as requested at the last meeting in March, so far, he has not had a reply.

2705 Mr Barnett advised that he had only received the tracker today and noticed that Mr Jakeways has been assigned to deal with this action.

2706 Mr Barnett mentioned that the previous ONR inspector, Daniel Gregory, contradicted him about the safety issue and said that they would issue a formal statement in reply to the request and suggestions from FANC, the Belgian equivalent of the ONR – to date, Mr Barnett has not seen a statement that deals with the matter of corrosion in service and is dissatisfied that the Chair has not chased this matter that could affect the safety of the RPV.

2707 Chair clarified that Mr Andrew Jakeways is the Sizewell A Site Inspector for the ONR but the matter is primarily a Sizewell B issue and Sizewell B will be addressing the subject in their report tonight. At that point, Chair will ask Mr Jakeways to comment, should he wish to add

anything else in particular, but confirmed that this is not his area of responsibility and had taken the action due to the absence of the Sizewell B Site Inspector at the last meeting.

- 2708 Chair went on to say that members of the group can advise if they wish to take further actions or if the group requires further information and a copy of the action tracker was circulated to all members. Chair clarified that Mr Barnett received a hard-copy tonight as he does not receive emails.
- 2709 Mr Graham Moorcroft, Site Inspector at Sizewell B clarified the potential misunderstanding with the action due to his absence at the previous SSG meeting when the issue was raised and placed with the Sizewell A Site Inspector. Mr Moorcroft confirmed that he will be taking the action as Sizewell B Site Inspector.
- 2710 Mr Moorcroft pointed out that there was also a misunderstanding on what the action was – the action was looking for a response to the article by the Nuclear Free Local Authorities Steering Group presented a number of weeks ago, which Mr Moorcroft had provided this week.
- 2711 Mr Moorcroft assured Mr Barnett that the ONR do take this very seriously and safety of the installation is paramount. Mr Moorcroft clarified that there will be a full inspection next year during the planned shutdown of the internal and external RPVs – but Mr Moorcroft was unsure what article Mr Barnett had received.
- 2712 Mr Barnett confirmed that he would like a formal response from the ONR regarding FANC's recommendation that all 430 PWRs worldwide should be examined to see if they have the same condition as the Belgian reactors.
- 2713 Chair clarified the FANC article was quoted by the Nuclear Free Authorities – and that is why the two organisational terms are being used – **so the question is, at the full inspection next year could the SSG ask the ONR to confirm that the new information about concerns with corrosion are included in that response.**
- 2714 Mr Barnett would welcome a formal statement from the ONR as promised by the ONR Inspector at the last meeting and was unhappy at the further delay.
- 2715 Mr Moorcroft reiterated that the ONR do take this matter seriously and have their own specialist in the organisation who is closely monitoring it and working with the Belgian regulator.
- 2716 Chair thanked Mr Barnett and was very grateful for his question tonight and concerns – to that end, **the SSG have asked the ONR for a formal response.**
- 2717 Mr R Hoggar, after gathering information from the Internet and seeing images of Sellafield, was concerned at the decision to store spent fuel at Sizewell A. He wanted to know how long the spent fuel will be stored and was worried that Sizewell could become a new Sellafield.
- 2718 Chair thanked Mr Hoggar for the question and advised that there is quite a lot of information about the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) in the previous minutes and invited Mr M Cubitt from Sizewell B to comment briefly on the question with regard to timeframes.
- 2719 Mr M Cubitt, Plant Manager at Sizewell B confirmed that Sizewell B's current life is 40 years with potential to extend to 60 years. The DFS is sized for the complete proposed life of 60 years and the potential life of the DFS beyond that is up to 100 years with it being reviewed every 10 years – this information was contained in the last set of minutes.
- 2720 Chair pointed out that the DFS and Mr Barnett's previous question about the RPV are ongoing actions on the action tracker which are still going through this group for information.
- 2721 Mr Cubitt confirmed Mr Hoggar's understanding that the reactors would be shut down next year and refuelled. Mr Cubitt went on to say that EDF refuel the reactors every 18 months and they are out of service for approximately 2 months where a significant amount of local personnel and an international contingent carry out the necessary work.

- 2722 Mr Barnett cited another information sheet from the Nuclear Free Local Authorities Steering Committee saying that serious new safety issues for Areva's (the French manufacturer) European Pressurised Reactor (EPR) design at Flamanville suggest this may have a bearing on what happens not only at Hinkley C but also at Sizewell C (should it be built). Mr Barnett requested that the article is circulated to all members of the SSG for information – the editorial is dated 13th April 2015 and Mr Barnett feels that it is an important document which raises yet further questions about the safety of the industry. **Chair took the action to circulate the document from the Nuclear Free Local Authorities to members of the SSG and Mr Moorcroft took an action to respond to it.**
- 2723 Mr M Whitby, a member of the Parish at Dunwich, raised the issue that Dunwich was not represented on the SSG minutes and wondered whether a request can be made to the Parish of Dunwich that they might want to volunteer a representative on the SSG.
- 2724 Chair advised that the SSG look to broaden and expand their membership to ensure that it is representative of the local communities. She went on to explain the process of ensuring representation is relevant – Parishes that are most adjacent to Sizewell get one representative per Parish; those Parishes that are slightly further away geographically get one representative between two Parishes; and Parishes beyond that are represented by their MP. However, the SSG are more than happy to entertain requests from other Parish Councils and in fact want to suggest that all Parishes up to 15km are represented on the SSG as 15km is now the recognised extended information area.
- 2725 Mr Whitby advised that the Parish of Dunwich extends all the way down to the Heath at Dunwich and is possibly one of the nearest to Sizewell. On that basis, Mr Whitby suggests that it probably deserves a representative.
- 2726 Mr J Busby mentioned that Mr S Parr, the Environment Agency (EA) representative, advised that keeping proper records of steam venting occurrences were a statutory requirement. Mr Busby requested that when there is a steam venting incident, all the parameters are recorded such as the wind direction, the strength of the wind, the duration of the steam venting etc. and would like to complete this request with a list or a schedule of the records that would be kept. When this subject was raised three years ago, it took quite a lot of work by Mr C Tucker to assemble these records – Mr Busby would like assurance that all the parameters associated with a steam vent occurrence are properly recorded.
- 2728 Chair thanked Mr Busby and to formally recognise the information he had given the SSG over a period of time last year to help them understand these issues. **As Mr Parr was absent this evening, Chair suggested that the SSG forward Mr Busby's request and ask that the parameters are formalised to show what will be recorded during steam venting.**
- 2729 Mr C Tucker, staff representative at Sizewell B, confirmed that he helped put data together on steam venting for historical purposes but clarified that the EA Inspector did not commit to the station keeping records on steam venting and believes the station is not committed to it either.
- 2730 Chair wanted confirmation as to whether the EA Inspector did not commit to keeping records or did not commit to setting the parameters? Mr Tucker referred to minute item 2650 from the March meeting paraphrasing that clearly Sizewell B have a statutory duty to keep records of any radioactive waste disposal into the environment and those records are inspected but they have not specifically been asked to keep records of steam venting by the EA. Mr Tucker clarified that the Inspector did not make a commitment for Sizewell B to keep or produce such records and Sizewell B have not made that commitment either.
- 2731 Mr P Wilkinson, co-opted member, was concerned that after months of hearing about steam venting, the potential vapours, deposition pattern and the wind strength, can the SSG ask the operator and the regulators to commit to giving that information and make sure they keep records of that information so the public have a clear understanding of when it happens, the wind strength at the time, where the deposition might be and what is going on underneath that deposition.

- 2732 Chair referred Mr Wilkinson to minute item 2658 from the last meeting where a similar question was asked of Mr Parr and he reiterated the current monitoring arrangements. As a group, the SSG can ask the EA to look again at those arrangements, but at the moment, the answer is that the current arrangements do not involve the level of monitoring that Mr Busby is requesting.
- 2733 Mr Wilkinson stated that it was at the will of the SSG for the EA and the operators to do this monitoring and whether the EA do it as a matter of course or not is beside the point, the public and members are not satisfied with the current arrangements. Mr Wilkinson went on to say that it is the public environment – people living underneath that deposition pattern need to know and the SSG and the public have a right to know. Mr Wilkinson reiterated the request that the EA keep the monitoring parameters requested by the SSG and occasionally bring to the meeting information the SSG has asked them to provide. **Chair did not think it was necessary to put this request to a vote as it is obviously what the public would like to happen and was happy to put a request to the EA, operators and regulators to consider their current regime and whether that might be extended to include the concerns that have been raised.**
- 2734 Chair pointed out that when the SSG ask the regulators to consider what they are doing the SSG are no means challenging them personally, it is a request based on public concerns and if anything it demonstrates that there is a dissonance or a gap in the knowledge that is out there on the understanding of that information – so even if the regime is not changed, it raises the awareness that the SSG need to provide more information and understanding to match the perception and concern of the public.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2735 Apologies for absence were received from Mr T Branton, co-opted member; Mr J Carey, Sizewell A staff representative; Dr T Coffey, MP for Suffolk Coastal and Niki Rousseau, Sizewell B Internal Communications.

3. SIZEWELL A REPORTS

a) Mr Tim Watkins (Site Director, Magnox)

- 2736 Mr T Watkins clarified with Mr Hoggar that Sizewell B's fuel will not be stored on Sizewell A site. It is Sizewell B's fuel that will be stored on Sizewell B site. Sizewell A is highly independent from Sizewell B and there is no fuel now at the Sizewell A site. Both stations are separate entities.
- 2737 Mr Watkins reported a general good safety performance, with a few issues across the patch – one of the things noted throughout the company and at the site is an increase in slips, trips and falls which have resulted in some quite serious injuries – so there is a company focus on that ... after a brief interruption during the meeting about the reporting of trivial accidents, Mr Watkins continued and clarified that the site does care about nuclear safety and conventional safety. He went on to say that in many respects the two go hand in hand because it is about the culture and philosophy of the site staff. Mr Watkins explained that accidents and safety are looked at the lowest possible level because by driving these down (and the target is always zero) the company does not expect to have bigger accidents and that is why it is reported at that level. Mr Watkins advised that the company was also worried about distractions because of workforce reductions and organisation transition
- 2738 Mr Watkins reminded the group that Sizewell A shipped all its fuel off site last year and explained that when the fuel goes, a significant hazard goes with it. In March this year, Sizewell A transitioned into a decommissioning site and that is a structure Magnox use to enable them to retire the site – Mr Watkins advised that this new structure has had a significant effect on Sizewell A's arrangements which affected Sizewell B, who had to take on the duties that Sizewell A previously did but no longer needed to do. Mr Watkins went on to say that in just over a period of one month about 80 personnel left the organisation which meant a very significant rework on how the site operates.

- 2739 Mr Watkins displayed an old photograph of Sizewell A's main control room and explained that the room was de-manned in March for the first time in 50 years. Over that 50 year period there had always been someone there, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year manning the control room. This was a historical moment and a film crew were interested to talk about it and was shown in an article on ITV.
- 2740 Mr Watkins advised that this is not the only transition – Sizewell A has a new parent body, a new owner, and one of their missions is to save the taxpayer money which they aim to do by doing things more efficiently. The decommissioning programme is scheduled up to 2028 and it is expected that the 4,500 personnel employed now will reduce progressively through to 2028 when all sites are due to be in interim care and maintenance. So because of the nature of the business, Sizewell A will be dismantled and put in a safe condition and the workforce will drop with time.
- 2741 Mr Watkins raised another issue that with a new parent body and new contractual arrangements, the company want to drive efficiencies and it was announced last week there will be a reduction of 1,400-1,600 people across the industry – Mr Watkins put that in context saying that there are 4,500 people on 12 sites – 10 Magnox sites plus Winfrith and Harwell which are now part of the same group. So out of the 1,400-1,600 staff reduction announced, 1,000 would be staff and 400-600 will be made up of agency or contractors – Mr Watkins believes this makes about 30% of the workforce. In some areas, staff reduction may naturally happen anyway, and Mr Watkins gave the example of Wylfa in Wales that will cease generation at the end of this year and for a period of 100 days after there will be some work, but after that the people numbers drop very significantly. Part of that number is by natural reductions and part would be from efficiency on how the company operates. Last year when Sizewell A had their transition, Mr Watkins advised that they managed to get a very good result as the company managed to fit the aspirations of people almost exactly to the organisation that they needed – unfortunately, that would be very difficult to do this time. The majority of Sizewell A personnel will stay but a significant minority will go – Mr Watkins confirmed that Sizewell A has around 210 people and they will be given the opportunity to stay, go through a severance programme or join the company's new parent body. Mr Watkins went on to say that one partner of the parent body is Babcock and Cavendish – Babcock is a very similar organisation and currently has 300 vacancies and will offer preferential treatment to Sizewell A staff, the other parent company is Fluor. Fluor is a big international company who will also offer opportunities to Sizewell A staff. Mr Watkins stated that Sizewell A have a valuable, skilled workforce that will not necessarily be able to stay in Suffolk at Sizewell A. Mr Watkins advised that the process of consultation with trade unions and individuals has only just started.
- 2742 Mr Watkins presented a photograph of the pile cap which is the top of the reactor and explained that when the Magnox reactors were operating, personnel could still walk around on the top of it. One of the projects was to take the machinery apart once the site had removed all the fuel from the reactors and the picture displays some of the component parts of the machines – most of which are clean and most of which will be recycled. Interestingly, Mr Watkins advised that some of the parts shown in the photograph were actually made of wood – the shielding was a composite of wood material which was very hard and very dense. The project is virtually complete with just a few waste items to dispose of.
- 2743 Mr Watkins went on to say that asbestos is by far the biggest hazard on site as is on many an old conventional site and so Sizewell A have just completed a project to strip all the asbestos out of the Turbine Hall – in fact the project is just finishing this week – Mr Watkins advised that a significant amount of asbestos was removed and therefore a significant amount of hazard has been removed.
- 2744 Mr Watkins talked about the strategy for Sizewell A and confirmed that there will be no Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) store at Sizewell A because there is very little ILW waste the site will produce, perhaps just a dozen or so packages – so it is intended to store those packages at Bradwell because there is room and there is a store already there.

- 2745 In the past, spent fuel elements were stripped of magnesium and held in storage at Sizewell A – this waste is called Fuel Element Debris (FED). Bradwell's FED was dissolved in acid, but Sizewell A will not go through this dissolution process. Instead, Mr Watkins explained that as part of the waste strategy, Sizewell A's FED will be encapsulated and probably disposed of as Low Level Waste (LLW).
- 2746 Mr Watkins advised that the site is intending to put divers in their Ponds – this is a well proven technology but one that Sizewell A had not used themselves so they are currently undergoing some trials.
- 2747 Mr Watkins briefly mentioned that work is going on to discuss the 'End State' of Sizewell A – for instance, how much material is removed from the site and how much remain is currently under consideration and where that will go in the future.
- 2748 Cllr N Smith wanted to know what the divers were going to do in the Ponds. Mr Watkins explained that the Ponds were about 20 feet deep and contained items of 'furniture' which are mechanical components and debris that may be bolted to the floor of the Ponds which need to be unbolted and possibly cut up into manageable sized chunks. These activities can be carried out underwater. Mr Watkins went on to say that paint and sealant can be applied underwater, but the site probably would not carry out this kind of activity. In terms of efficiency, this way of working is very effective and the United States were further ahead with this technology than the UK.
- 2749 Chair queried whether the work would be subject to a safety case to the ONR at this stage – Mr Watkins confirmed that it would be and some work was already going on in that area.
- 2750 Mr M Taylor wanted to know if the workforce would get a relocation package should they decide to move to other parts of the organisation. Mr Watkins responded that it might be available depending on circumstances.
- 2751 Mr Taylor advised that he had come across an ONR report into Hinkley A's Periodic Safety Review (PSR) and there were a number of issues that had arisen – from this, Mr Taylor wondered whether the station would take any learning from other station's PSRs. Mr Watkins explained that PSRs are done every 10 years to review where it is from a safety perspective – the report is not just seen by the regulator, but also an independent Nuclear Safety Committee (NSC) that consists of people with the relevant knowledge who can give advice on what is put forward. Mr Watkins confirmed that information is shared from the wider NSC who work across the industry to identify issues and trends.
- 2752 Cllr W Howard was concerned that the railway was going to fall into disuse now that all the fuel has been shipped out of Sizewell A. Cllr Howard went on to say that the community has an interest in establishing a passenger link through Saxmundham and Ipswich and wanted to know who has responsibility for the railway line. Mr Watkins stated that in the shorter term it is in the site's interest to keep the railway running because there will possibly be some flask shipments – they will not contain fuel, but they could contain items that the site wants to transport but these shipments may be 1-2 flasks in a year or 18 months. Mr Watkins went on to confirm that the responsibility of the railway lies with Network Rail.
- 2753 Chair wanted clarification on what sort of items would be transported if not fuel. Mr Watkins confirmed that the site does not have any fuel but has items such as cartridges and filters that are used at the bottom of the Ponds that filter out caesium etc. and it is possible that the site will transport them to another place for processing. Chair wanted to know if the waste materials would be processed at Sellafield, but Mr Watkins advised that it may not necessarily be Sellafield, it could be another site or location, but the option remains open.
- 2754 Chair was concerned about any communication or information gap and explained that the public and those that live near the sites were used to seeing flask movements on a regular basis when there was fuel at the station, but now that Sizewell A is decommissioned, it may cause concern to the public if they were to see a flask again. Chair went on to say that the members of the public would be keen to know if the railways are going to be used or not and who will retain the

responsibility of the railway. Mr Watkins reiterated that the responsibility of the railway remains with Network Rail and in terms of flask shipping, the site would make sure the community knew about any movements. Chair confirmed that previously the SSG were informed when tests were being arranged by Magnox on the railway.

- 2755 Ms J Girling wanted confirmation that FED was not going to be dissolved at Sizewell A and would instead be encapsulated. Mr Watkins confirmed that FED is being dissolved at Bradwell but explained that Sizewell A's current strategy is to look at encapsulating their FED in ISO (International Standards Organisation) containers to be disposed of as LLW. Ms Girling wanted to know where the LLW will go – Mr Watkins advised that the waste will be transported to the Drigg LLW disposal facility. Ms Girling wanted to know if it will be stored at Sizewell A in the meantime – Mr Watkins advised that the FED is already at the site but would be recovered and stored into containers where it would stay on site for a short period of time prior to transport. Ms Girling wanted to know if it would be transported via the railway line – Mr Watkins confirmed that it would normally go by road – but stressed that it was not a huge amount of waste and would therefore not generate high heavy traffic. Ms Girling was pleased to learn that the waste would be encapsulated. Chair recalled the fact that members were against dissolution at Sizewell, but do feel concerned that it is still occurring at other places.
- 2756 Chair on behalf of the SSG, said that their thoughts are with the workforce as they approach the next stage of transition and it is a subject that the SSG need to be kept updated on in terms of socio-economic need and what they can do as a community to look at possible opportunities to encourage and support staff – Chair confirmed that the Sizewell A staff representative offered their apologies for this evening, but hoped that Mr Watkins would convey that to them.
- 2757 A member of the public and local resident wanted to know how long will it take before Sizewell A gets turned into something more attractive for the coast – when is the 'end state'? Mr Watkins advised that the current programme for Sizewell A is 2027 when it goes into a position called Care and Maintenance but a cladded reactor building will still be visible. The current strategy for final clearance of the site occurs much later than that and will probably be after a passive state of around 85 years. Chair asked whether this was currently under review with the new parent body organisation – Mr Watkins advised that this was unlikely to change.
- 2758 A local resident wanted to know why cladding is put around the reactor building if it is no longer a nuclear building and the fuel has been removed? Mr Watkins advised that there is still radioactive material on site in various forms and went on to explain that although 99% of the radioactive material goes with the fuel, the reactor itself still contains steel that has become radioactive during operation and becomes active mostly by working with cobalt-60, a radioactive substance which has a 5 year half-life. Calculations reveal that giving the reactor a clearance of 85 years, most of the radioactive material invested in that steel would have disappeared and would be much easier to take apart – almost clean waste. Mr Watkins went on to explain that there are other forms of radioactivity on site including FED which is currently in storage and although not highly radioactive, is nonetheless radioactive, so there needs to be special precautions in place before it can be disposed of. It is important, therefore, that the reactor building remains intact for 85 years because of those reasons.
- 2759 A member of the public, wanted to know how the water in the Ponds will be disposed of eventually. Mr Watkins advised that the Ponds water will probably go through the normal disposal route which means it will be filtered, treated and then discharged into the sea. Mr Watkins confirmed that the water will be filtered to current discharge authorisation levels set by the regulators and it will be slightly radioactive on release.
- 2760 A member of the public, wanted to know if there was any fire risk to the graphite blocks that remain? Mr Watkins explained that graphite is quite difficult to ignite, however, it will burn but it would need a significant heat source within the reactor which is almost impossible to envision. Fire risk remains the same with any buildings in any facility whether nuclear or not.
- 2761 Chair advised that members would welcome information or videos on the proposed future of Sizewell A. Mr Watkins said that that it would be useful to spend more time and supply more information on Sizewell A's future and confirmed he would be happy to do that.

2762 Mr Hoggar, member of the public, raised the issue of the original proposal regarding accelerated decommissioning. Chair clarified that the accelerated decommissioning discussions took place around 8-10 years ago when that aspiration or expectation was raised. Since then the decommissioning funding has changed and during these times of austerity there is less money for the NDA to bid for and carry out those works.

b) Ms Haf Morris (Communications Officer, Dungeness A)

2763 Ms Morris presented a breakdown of the funding and what had been spent for Sizewell A during the last 12 months from the Magnox socio-economic scheme. A total of £3,852 had been allocated to various local good neighbours schemes.

2764 Ms Morris went on to say that from April 2015, there are going to be some changes from the good neighbours' scheme. The original 10 Magnox sites became 12 with the introduction of Research Sites Restoration Limited (RSRL) into the scheme – the Magnox socio-economic scheme still has the same funding of £1m, but now needs to be shared between 12 sites – this will mitigate against the impact of the closures and one of the aims is how Magnox can lessen the impact of the job losses in the area.

2765 Ms Morris advised that the proposal is that there is a cap of £6,000 per site for socio-economic local good neighbour scheme. She went on to say that if they received a lot of good neighbour scheme applications that totalled above the £6,000 cap there is a mechanism for taking the applications forward.

2766 Ms Morris confirmed that there are priority sites that warrant larger funding but Sizewell A is not one of them. Ms Morris then listed Dungeness A, Bradwell and Trawsfynydd that are currently the priority sites. However, she did advise that if there was a good project put forward locally, it will be considered on its merit and the long-term effects it would have on mitigating the closure of the sites.

2767 Ms Morris advised that the scheme is split into three areas: up to £1,000 for local good neighbour schemes and issues – people on the Sizewell local funding panel would include Mr Watkins, Chair and other local representatives from site and it will be the same process across each site with a panel who have local and working knowledge of the area – Ms Morris also highlighted that the decision process will be a lot quicker than it used to be, so requests come directly to the local panel to get an agreement and through local knowledge, they can get that funding to where it is needed locally.

2768 Ms Morris went on to say that the second level of funding up to £10,000 is capital expenditure, not used for revenue or for running costs but for sustainability of smaller projects that have regular applications, so applicants can look at these projects as a whole and understand the benefits to apply for an overall bigger project.

2769 The third level, Ms Morris explained, was funding for over £10,000 to support larger transformational projects that make a significant contribution towards mitigating the impact of decommissioning of the sites. Ms Morris went on to advise that there are no big projects in the Sizewell area at the moment, but that does not mean that it cannot be planned and good projects would be considered.

2770 Ms Morris advised that applications can be submitted via the web portal: <https://magnoxsocioeconomic.com/> if anyone would like to apply for a suitable project but recommended that applicants read the guidelines first because there is clear advice on what can and cannot be supported within this scheme.

2771 Ms Morris advised that her contact details appear on the same web page, so applicants can contact Ms Morris direct if they need further clarification about the scheme. Site Panel Meetings are held every 4-6 weeks – applications for more than £10,000 will go to the Magnox Executive review panel for comment and final approval then fed back to the SSG periodically.

- 2772 Chair welcomed that the process for smaller funding for certain projects would be streamlined, but thinks there is a perception that Suffolk is not an area of deprivation and therefore support is not needed. Chair went on to say that there are needs that are unmet in the vicinity and thinks that local organisations in the area should start to think about what grants and projects the region want to put forward.
- 2773 Ms Girling wanted to know the criteria for how the scheme prioritises each site. Ms Morris advised that the scheme looks at the index of the deprivation in the area and the priority at that time – but stressed that just because Sizewell A is not a priority site, does not mean that good projects applied for will be put to one side. Chair wondered if such projects could include training for young people or enabling community groups to be more involved in local decision making and empowering activity to support growth and development of jobs in the area.
- 2774 Mr Hoggar informed the group about a recent debate in The Ecologist on a learning paper that nuclear power might not quite have the carbon credentials that have been ascribed to it and suggests that perhaps an application for funds to go towards calculating the true carbonisation of nuclear power should be put forward. Chair advised increasing and raising awareness of communities and issues is something that the SSG can do and if a few members would like to get together or share ideas on what the group could do in the future to support an increase of knowledge to residents in the area of those topics. Ms Morris advised to look at the criteria in the first instance and if it meets the criteria then it will be considered. Chair went on to confirm that Magnox, the District Council and the County Council have pledged that any projects not funded by Magnox socio-economic scheme, will be signposted through to other funding streams.

c) Mr Andrew Jakeways (Site Inspector, Office of Nuclear Regulation)

- 2775 Mr A Jakeways highlighted a couple of points from the ONR report – the first covering a number of Licence Conditions associated with waste, leakage and decommissioning. The ONR also carried out a systems inspection of the Active Effluent Water Treatment Plant. Both of those inspections were shown to be adequate so a reasonable outcome for the licensee ensuring it is complying with the standards. There was one Licence Instrument issued in the period to approve a revision to the emergency plan – this revision was to reflect the nature of the site now it has been defuelled. Mr Jakeways mentioned that since the report the site successfully completed a level one demonstration of emergency response, this was a very positive outcome as it was the first time the new emergency plan had been exercised.

d) Mr Andrew Pynn (Environment Agency Inspector)

- 2776 Mr Pynn briefly summarised the EA's role, they are the environmental regulator for the Sizewell site which involves issuing authorisations known as environmental permits that control radioactive waste disposal from sites to include waste in the form of solid, gaseous and liquid that are discharged. In addition to conducting routine inspections to check on compliance with permit conditions, the EA also require the operator to undertake environmental monitoring programme. The EA also carry out their own independent environmental monitoring programme to check levels of radioactivity directly in the environment to ensure that discharges from site are not having any noticeable impact on the local environment.
- 2777 Mr Pynn went on to highlight a visit to Sizewell A site following the transition into a decommissioning structure where the focus had changed entirely from generating electricity and managing the fuel through to generating smaller activities but larger volumes of radioactive waste for disposal off site. The EA were pleased with the progress the site had made and were pleased with the transition and that the senior management team have got the appropriate knowledge and the appropriate skills and resources in place. Mr Pynn was hopeful that the site would continue to have the appropriate resources in place following the next restructuring phase in order to progress their decommissioning plans through to care and maintenance.
- 2778 Mr Pynn informed the group that following the issue of some guidance on environmental monitoring, they undertook a review of their own programme to make sure that it was as thorough as it could be, bearing in mind the resources available. Mr Pynn advised that this was

driven in part through national priorities but also through some concerns that have been raised by the SSG in the past which has resulted in some changes to the programme that have been summarised in the report.

- 2779 Mr Pynn also mentioned the Sizewell Habits Survey which will be conducted shortly and will question locals in the area to find out what sort of foods they eat and where they spend their time in relation to the site. This will enable the EA to conduct a check at the end of the year on the amount of exposure the worst case individual has had to radioactivity that may be present in the environment.
- 2780 **Mr Pynn confirmed that he will take the request from the SSG on steam venting monitoring back to Mr S Parr and hopefully have a response by the next meeting.**
- 2781 Mr Wilkinson questioned Mr Pynn about improving processes in the light of criticisms partly from the SSG. One of the criticisms Mr Wilkinson mentioned was that the EA only actually monitor around 40% of the radionuclides that are discharged from the station and the monitoring goes on mostly in the wrong places and at the wrong depths. Mr Wilkinson therefore asked how the EA improved their monitoring process and wondered whether the EA now screen a wider range of radionuclides at the right depths and at the right places. Mr Pynn advised the criticism that they only monitor for certain number of radionuclides is not highly accurate – the EA subject all samples they collect to a full gamma spectrometry analysis and only report radionuclides that they actually find – so if the gamma spectrometry comes back as no detection then the EA will not record them. Mr Pynn went on to say that the EA also carry out a full beta and alpha count on all samples collected.
- 2782 Chair pointed out that in terms of the information received by the public, it indicates that if certain aspects of monitoring are not reported then it may appear that it had not be monitored. Chair went on that the public probably need greater reassurance with that information built in to the report. Mr Pynn highlighted an action placed on his previous EA colleague, Mr R Macgregor to provide a response to an article in The Ecologist by Mr T Deere-Jones – this was prepared and circulated and the EA clarified in that response that they do monitor a full spectrum rather than specific radionuclides.
- 2783 Mr Wilkinson questioned the purpose of the Habit Survey if the discharges that the EA authorise are safe – what was the point of knowing how much people are ingesting or inhaling? Mr Pynn responded by saying that the EA are required to report the worst case dose the public receive in the vicinity of all nuclear installations around the country and this was the mechanism by which the EA produce that assessment. Mr Wilkinson wanted to know, then, if the EA were just carrying out a mandatory procedure. Mr Pynn advised that, in part yes, but the Survey also helps for reassurance purposes that the EA and the community know from the worst case dose, what the public are receiving near sites. Mr Wilkinson asked whether the EA accept that there is not a great deal of relationship between the dose and the impact in terms of health, but the linkage has been there for years and the threshold argument had been discredited a long time ago. Mr Pynn recognised that this argument had been on-going for some time and could only offer a stock response that the EA take their advice from Public Health England (PHE) who are the EA's specialist advisors on health impact.
- 2784 Chair considered the issue to be an interesting one that has been debated for a very long time. There may or may not be a direct correlation between dose, time and limits because if the measurements are so low and are not recorded, there is no proof that there is no harm and it is something that the public need more information and support on. It is a real concern for people and there is a need to acknowledge that concern. Mr Pynn respectfully suggested that question is asked to PHE. Chair advised that there is an open ongoing action on the action tracker and the SSG are going to seek government help in getting a response because it remains unanswered by PHE.
- 2785 Ms Girling enquired as to why so many of the coastal towns have been awarded a blue flag recently and noted that there was nothing between Aldeburgh and Southwold. Ms Girling wanted to know if the EA do bacterial and viral monitoring along this stretch of coast and if they did and it was clear, why didn't they get a blue flag award. Chair intervened as this was a

District Council issue and called Dr C Barnes from Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) to respond. Dr Barnes advised that the blue flag was expensive to apply for and the decision was taken, in the current financial climate, that SCDC would not submit an application for it.

- 2786 Ms Girling thought that the blue flag scheme depended on bacterial and viral monitoring and wanted to know if the EA does this as a matter of course during sampling at Sizewell. **Mr Pynn advised that monitoring for bacterial and viral content of sea water is not an area he is involved with but will take the query back to the EA and provide feedback at the next meeting. Chair confirmed that the group would like to know what bacterial and viral monitoring takes place with the sea water around Sizewell and clarification from the District Council on the criteria and process of the blue flag award.**
- 2787 A local resident, wanted to know if she could access the PHE and EA websites to find the frequency of the monitoring exercises, the size of the area which the EA take samples from and any outcomes of Habits Surveys done previously. Mr Pynn clarified that the monitoring performed by the operator is all public information and is on the public register. The EA monitoring results are summarised in an annual report called: 'Radioactivity in Food and the Environment' (RIFE) which is referenced in Mr Pynn's report and previous Habits Surveys can be found on the EA website.
- 2788 Mr Hoggar, local resident, considers it rather important to have a blue flag award along this stretch of coastline – other beaches in the area are getting the benefit of this award but the District Council have decided that it is too expensive for this section. Mr Hoggar wanted to know if it is something that EDF/Magnox might consider an annual project through the socio-economic scheme to consider a blue flag requirement along the beaches close to Sizewell to reassure the public that the area is clean and clear. Chair clarified that Ms Morris represents Magnox which is the Sizewell A site and EDF have their own project funds available for socio-economic projects. Chair went on to say that it is something that the SSG could explore, for instance having a blue flag would help the area in terms of social or economics such as tourism.
- 2789 Ms Pilkington, local resident, wanted the EA to comment on changes to its monitoring programme with particular concern about adding seaweed into the programme and also where grass samples were taken. Mr Pynn advised that the EA does not release the exact location of sample collection.
- 2790 Ms Pilkington wanted to know why the EA have taken the decision to make these adjustments and also whether this sampling is within a certain distance from the power station. Mr Pynn advised that the EA chose sample locations that they felt would represent the worst case for collection of radioactivity – looking at predominant wind direction; wind speed; predicted deposition and distances from site. Ms Pilkington was not satisfied that her question was answered and didn't make her feel fully confident on what the EA was doing. She reiterated why the EA had suddenly decided to make these changes and why has the EA suddenly decided to start testing seaweed and how far away from the power station would the EA be conducting this monitoring? Chair also wondered what had triggered the change and whether it was based on any trend? Ms Pilkington went on that as a member of the public, she would like answers and so far the EA have been quite vague. Mr Pynn apologised and explained that the EA produced a national guidance note which specifies on how environmental monitoring programmes should be designed and carried out, contained within that was a minimum requirement for certain samples that included grass and seaweed. Mr Pynn went on to say that the Sizewell check monitoring programme did not previously include those, however, the operators programme did, so they had been sampled previously. Mr Pynn can confirm that the changes to the programme do not in any way represent an increased trend and do not represent any findings that the EA had in its programme – this was purely a national review of all nuclear sites and the monitoring that the EA conduct to have a more consistent approach.
- 2791 Ms Pilkington wondered why Sizewell was left out previously – Mr Pynn advised that it was not specific to Sizewell and grass and soil were not previously monitored at many sites. Chair advised that the group would welcome additional monitoring, but just wanted to understand perhaps why the change was initiated and would like further written information for the group from Mr Pynn at the next meeting. Mr Pynn advised that this information was released early to

the SSG and that the EA are going to be formally reporting findings in written form to all SSGs in due course. Mr Pynn went on to say that the further sampling is quite a recent exercise so the EA were just giving the SSG a headline finding for the time being. Mr Pynn clarified that this exercise was to achieve national consistency and was not based on any worrying findings that they may have picked up and advised that the trend is decreasing all the time around Sizewell.

e) Mr Jonathan Jenkin (Nuclear Decommissioning Authority)

- 2792 Mr J Jenkin advised the group that the registration for this year's National NDA Estate Supply Chain event have opened – the event will take place on 4th November in Manchester. The NDA are also inviting entries to this year's NDA's Estate Supply Chain Awards – these were set up to recognise outstanding contributions to nuclear clean up technology – this year in particular there is an additional focus on innovation and technology that will contribute towards exports – further information can be found on the NDA website (www.nda.gov.uk).
- 2793 Mr Jenkin went on to talk about the announcement from Magnox on its new organisational structure and wanted to reiterate two points: firstly, safety; security and the environment will remain paramount – the regulators are and will remain closely involved in discussions with Magnox on the structure and the final structure that is put in place. Secondly, Mr Jenkin reiterated Mr Watkin's point on the support that will be given to Magnox staff including the efforts to mitigate those workforce reductions and job losses which will include retraining and alternative employment opportunities.
- 2794 Mr Jenkin went on to mention the very important step forward in the clean-up of Sellafield – it is the NDA's biggest and most complex site by some way and contains by far the biggest hazards in the NDA Estate and consequently it is the NDA's number one hazard reduction decommissioning priority. Mr Jenkin advised that Sellafield is a legacy facility and contains legacy Ponds and Silos. The facility goes back to the Cold War period when the first atomic programme was established. This particular development relates to the First Generation Magnox Storage Pond (FGMSP), a legacy Pond that contains spent Magnox fuel from various sites. It is one of the legacies that the NDA inherited and were grappling with in the earlier days of the nuclear programme when different regulatory standards applied. Mr Jenkin informed the group that one of the biggest challenges the NDA have in their Estate is to reduce that hazard and decommission the facilities. For the first time, quantities of the radioactive sludge in this Pond have been removed and pumped out into a new interim store called the Sludge Packaging Plant (SPP1) via a pipe bridge. Mr Jenkin reiterated that this was a significant step forward and is an essential part in pressing with the plans next year to continue with the retrieval of that sludge and to make important hazard reduction progress.
- 2795 Mr Jenkin advised that the NDA have published their Business Plan in April that sets out the key milestones across all NDA sites and how much money the NDA will have to spend in the next three years. It also features the high level objectives over the next twenty years. This plan is available on the NDA website. Mr Jenkin also mentioned that the NDA will be publishing their Annual Report of Accounts at the end of this month – this looks back on how the NDA performed on the previous financial year and will be made available on the website.
- 2796 Mr Jenkin informed the group that the NDA have been given the go-ahead to set up a nuclear archive in Caithness near the Dounreay site. It is an important socio-economic activity for the local community there which is heavily dependent on the Dounreay site for its employment. It is also an important part of the NDA records management which will include more than 70 years' worth of material relating to the history of the nuclear industry – online resources will also be made available.
- 2797 Mr Jenkin stated that the government has set a target for all public bodies to devote at least 20% of its spend with Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) – Mr Jenkin was pleased to report that the NDA exceeded that across the NDA Estates spending 21% – the target now by the end of the current parliament is to spend at least 25% and the NDA believes they are on track to deliver that.

- 2798 Mr Jenkin finally touched on an example of a socio-economics project that was funded in North Wales where the two remote sites, Wylfa in Anglesey and Trawsfynydd in Gwyneth are heading towards closure. The more advanced is Trawsfynydd that is already in its decommissioning programme and Wylfa will be ending generation at the end of this year. The NDA have been involved with other partners in a workforce transition programme that involves targeted training and reskilling of just over 1,400 members of the workforce at these two sites. The project is about making opportunities for alternative employment within that region for members of the sites' workforce whose jobs will be going in the next few years. A database of skills, talent and new qualifications that staff have acquired will be actively managed in partnership with other agencies so that prospective employers can see what is available – Mr Jenkin advised that this is an example of what the NDA are doing to try and mitigate the impact of site closures.
- 2799 Chair asked whether the published Business Plan is subject to a government spending review and based on a certain figure being made available to the NDA to spend. Mr Jenkin clarified that the Business Plan covers this financial year but there will be another budget in July and all government departments have been asked to make some efficiency savings in this year in the order of around 5% of revenue spend. Mr Jenkin was confident that the NDA can make that saving without any impact on the sites this year. The government spending review will set out the NDA's funding for the next three, four or five years. Chair wondered whether Mr Jenkin would encourage members of the public and the SSG, if they feel strongly that funds should be made available to continue decommissioning the sites and clean-up at Sellafield, should make a statement to the government. Mr Jenkin would urge people to make their own representations – the NDA will be making the best possible case they can to government to secure funding for its programme, but reiterated that everybody is free to make their own representations on behalf of this very important mission.
- 2800 Mr Wilkinson believes that the NDA owes the SSG and the country an apology. He went on to cite the fact that the NDA has had £30 billion of public money since it was established in 2005, the CEO earns a salary of £600,000 per year, and considers it a disgrace that the removal of some sludge out of one Pond this year amounts to a success story. Mr Wilkinson felt very strongly on how the NDA have appointed an American company, Nuclear Management Partners (NMP) for another £5 billion contract and if it wasn't for the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) looking into their spending activities, the country would be worse off and seeing little results all courtesy of the NDA. Mr Wilkinson believes that the NDA has an obligation to give a balanced picture of the NDA management and what really goes on with public money. Chair agreed with Mr Wilkinson that the public do want to know all situations and that this meeting was the NDA's opportunity to be honest and transparent when things go wrong as well as when things go right because the public will believe and be led by what is written in the press since the NDA have not told them any different.
- 2801 Mr Jenkin explained about the changes at Sellafield at the last meeting. He went on to say that the NDA work under the scrutiny of PAC on behalf of parliament, the public and the taxpayer and although often uncomfortable, it is absolutely right the NDA are held accountable. PAC made a number of recommendations in the reports they published alongside the National Audit Office (NAO) and the NDA have accepted them. Mr Jenkin advised that there were some expenses that were wrongly claimed by NMP but understands that the taxpayer was reimbursed for those adding, it should not have happened.
- 2802 On the owner arrangements, Mr Jenkin advised that the changes the NDA were making were designed to achieve better value for the taxpayer. The Parent Body model that applies to Magnox and Dounreay and of the LLW repository, in effect provides incentives for delivering accelerated clean-up and better value for the taxpayer over the longer term, but confidence in the programme is needed to be sure those benefits are going to be delivered to justify the rewards that private owners get. The NDA are making these changes essentially because the challenges and the degree of uncertainty at Sellafield is such that the NDA do not believe it is in the long term best interests of taxpayers to continue with the Parent Body model for that site and that is why the NDA announced those changes.
- 2803 Chair intervened and directed the members of the public to an open action number 2517/2694 on the tracker which is to find out more information about the current situation at Sellafield – this

was raised at the last meeting and Chair wanted a bit more information on that from Mr Jenkin. Mr Jenkin advised that he would be happy to do that and if necessary to invite a colleague who can talk more about Sellafield.

- 2804 Finally, Mr Jenkin made a point that there are huge challenges at Sellafield and this year has seen a number of really significant successes at the site, but there is still a vast amount to do – these programmes are incredibly challenging and complex and this is an important milestone on that journey to having a better plan and to making progress by reducing the hazard and making those sites and the material therein passively safe. Mr Jenkin did take Mr Wilkinson's point and advised if the SSG think the NDA are not giving a balanced enough account through the updates he will be happy to think of different ways to report information.
- 2805 Chair stated that although some very good things are being done, it is the things that are not reported that hit the headlines and it is those things that get remembered by the public. Chair felt sensitive about this issue and reminded Mr Jenkin that last year the SSG requested permission from the NDA to spend part of their budget in getting information from somebody who the SSG felt could provide more knowledgeable information to them that they required. The NDA turned down that request because the information provided would scrutinise one of the regulators and yet money has been carelessly spent by other organisations without such close scrutiny.
- 2806 Mr Busby thought it would be beneficial if the SSG could hold a special meeting to talk about Sellafield. Mr Busby offered to write a paper to give the SSG some of the issues that need to be raised – but advised the big question that could be presented at the meeting is whether Sellafield is an asset to be used in the future for generation or a liability? Chair advised that the plutonium strategy is something that is being worked on but noted the fact that there could be another meeting arranged for this as it is an important issue.
- 2807 Mr Jenkin advised that the NDA has provided updates to the meeting in the past, but it is a government policy decision and it is the elements of the Sellafield plan that need to be resolved. Government is considering those options and the NDA are doing work on behalf of the government as part of that.
- 2808 Mr Busby mentioned a programme on Radio 4 called 'Dismantling a Nuclear Power Station' – there were eminent scientists from around the world being interviewed and said they were working to the limits of their knowledge with what to do next at Sellafield.
- 2809 A member of the public, added what he overheard at a meeting that the total cost of cleaning up Sellafield when divided by the total electricity produced by all the Nuclear Power Stations in all the time to date would produce a cost of about 4p per kWh. Mr Jenkin could not comment on the figures as he did not recognise them.
- 2810 Chair said that the SSG has an open action with regard to the DFS Safety Case and Mr Parr from the EA was very helpful at the last meeting and subsequently because there was a concern that the DFS as a principle would be seen as part of regular operations and fuel will be stored in the DFS and not classified as waste. When the group asked Mr Parr about it, he confirmed that current government policy is that spent fuel is not categorised as waste and therefore the EA have no jurisdiction over it. The public believe that because spent fuel from Sizewell A went to Sellafield to be processed as waste, spent fuel coming out of Sizewell B was also waste. Chair felt that the SSG would want to explore that in greater detail.
- 2811 Mr Jenkin clarified that government policy classifies spent fuel as a zero rated asset so it had not been sent to Sellafield to be processed as waste, but to be reprocessed into nuclear materials such as: plutonium; uranium and an amount of waste that is a by-product of that. Mr Jenkin went on to say that is a government policy position and that is why it is considered and treated as an asset rather than waste and depending on government policy decisions on how to use that fuel, there are potentially reusable assets in it.
- 2812 Chair believes that spent fuel is not categorised as waste because certain other criteria would have to be met. If the public accept it as waste being stored at Sizewell for hundreds of years,

there would need to be different arrangements regarding its storage and also there would be different packages of compensation to the community. Chair felt that if it is classed as a zero rated asset it should be waste because it has no value to it, it is zero rated. Mr Jenkin clarified that essentially, waste is something that has to be managed and ultimately disposed of in accordance with policy and regulations. Spent fuel is an asset because there are materials that can be recovered through reprocessing that could be reused in a fuel programme if that becomes a government policy decision.

2813 Mr Jenkin went on to say that he could not comment on the DFS because it is on an EDF site, but as he understands it, it is an interim store and not a permanent disposal facility and there will ultimately be a disposal route. Chair clarified that she was not mentioning specifically the Sizewell B site but wanted to raise the principle of how a name associated with objects determines what actions follow and wanted to make it clear that there is some unease with the term 'zero rated asset'.

4. SIZEWELL B REPORTS

a) Mr Martin Cubitt (Plant Manager, Sizewell B)

2814 Mr M Cubitt presented the safety performance data covering industrial, nuclear and environment safety at Sizewell B and advised that there were currently 521 EDF Energy staff, 36 Apprentices and 250 year round contracting partners. Mr Cubitt also mentioned that the station had operated at the nominal 100% output with no shutdowns.

2815 Mr Cubitt looked again at the issues of slips, trips and falls and why recording them were important highlighting an accident that happened to a Security Guard who was checking that a door had been locked. During that activity, the Guard slipped on a step, twisted and fractured his ankle – this was a fairly significant injury for that individual who was then off site for a number of weeks from a simple slip which is why both sites, place a lot of attention to industrial safety and this type of injury.

2816 Mr Cubitt then went on to talk about an injury to a Chemistry Technician's hand in the Chemistry Lab explaining that during the disassembly of some damaged glassware, the item broke in the Technician's hand causing cuts to their left index finger and thumb. This injury could have easily been mitigated by wearing the correct gloves. A reminder was given to all staff to highlight the importance of wearing the correct protective equipment and taking precautionary measures to make sure they are aware of their surroundings.

2817 Mr Cubitt gave an update on the DFS. The base slab is now complete. During April there was a delivery of the structural steel work and that will be erected over the summer months. Manufacturing and factory testing of the DFS process equipment is underway. A hauling transporter is already on site; this is the lifting transporter and is currently undergoing commissioning testing. Mr Cubitt went on to present and describe photographs on the construction of the DFS which also included pictures of the HI-STORM (Holtec International Storage Module) storage containers and the MPC (Multi-Purpose Canister) containers which hold the fuel – there is currently one trial MPC on site.

2818 Mr Cubitt advised that Sizewell B are about to receive a RoSPA (Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents) award for their safety performance and aside from the two previously reported accidents the actual safety performance of Sizewell B is extremely good and the site will receive The Order of Distinction which recognises 17 years of consecutive Gold awards.

2819 Mr Cubitt mentioned that there is a shortage of engineering people and the problem that some apprentice schemes have languished a bit over the years. Sizewell B are very fortunate that they have a very good and active apprentice scheme. The site has recently employed four more apprentices and they will go for their first years engineering training at Royal Navy Base at HMS Sultan. Mr Cubitt stated that the training is very good and they return very confident individuals.

- 2820 Mr Cubitt went on to discuss British Science Week with over 1,000 visitors to the Sizewell B Visitor Centre in the last couple of months and 8,500 since the opening of the centre in 2012. Mr Cubitt also highlighted some of the work Sizewell B organised with local schools for British Science Week.
- 2821 Cllr Howard wanted to know if the NDA or EDF Energy are paying for the DFS. Mr Cubitt clarified that the NDA pay for qualifying work and EDF Energy are paying for non-qualifying work. Mr Cubitt confirmed that the majority is qualifying work. Chair explained that this work was being progressed through mutual nuclear liabilities and added that there is an open action on the action tracker to confirm how the sum of money was arrived at and potential costs.
- 2822 Mr Wilkinson would like to know what Sizewell B's predictions are for the final inventory of the DFS in terms of volume of waste, radionuclide content, half-lives etc. and also, is Sizewell B keeping a track of the CO₂ they are producing in construction and long-term operation of the DFS so the group can have a CO₂ footprint figure at some point. Mr Wilkinson explained that he had asked these questions before but could not see them on the action tracker. Chair clarified that there is a partially completed action on the action tracker – in terms of DFS, a hard-copy of the conditions for construction is still outstanding together with the final inventory question and a copy of the sustainability report that was added last and which was emailed on the afternoon of this meeting. Chair had not had the opportunity to read it yet and although it was published on the website for some time, the group was not made aware of that fact. Mr Cubitt confirmed that he would be happy to take any questions back.
- 2823 Mr Cubitt explained that the sustainability report includes the CO₂ emissions arising from the construction and operation of the DFS. With regards to the inventory question, Mr Cubitt confirmed that he had received guidance from ONR Security which he believes could preclude him from answering that question. Mr Wilkinson was disappointed that Sizewell B could not advise how much waste they plan to store in the middle of the community. Mr Cubitt advised that it was the radionuclide composition that was confidential. **Chair intervened and would look to the ONR representative to comment on why that information is commercially sensitive and cannot be released to the SSG.** Chair then went on to say that the EA could not comment on the radionuclides and the potential harm to the environment unless the DFS was a waste store. Mr Cubitt didn't think that the classification made any difference on the regulation of the DFS. Mr Pynn clarified that storage and accumulation of waste within the boundary of a site is an ONR issue and not EA. EA only deal with disposals.
- 2824 Mr Wilkinson wanted to know if information would be given on the radionuclide content and also wanted a list of radionuclides and the volume that had still not been provided. Mr Wilkinson went on to consider the CO₂ information and wondered if the report is specifically on the DFS or over the fuel cycle. Mr Cubitt confirmed CO₂ emissions due to the construction and operation of the DFS were included in the overall CO₂ contribution from electricity generation at Sizewell B – Mr Wilkinson said that information was problematic because it includes uranium mining to waste management. He suggested that they are not actual figures and could only be based on assumptions as Sizewell B did not know what they were going to do with the waste, or how big the mine was going to be, or what they were going to clad it with and knew nothing about where the waste will end up or transport implications. Mr Cubitt advised that the back end disposal is a small part of the cycle. Mr Wilkinson strongly suggested that it was not a small part and highlighted the fact that if it is going to be clad in copper, the mining of copper deposits and fashioning into cylinders to put over spent fuel needs to be taken into consideration. Mr Cubitt said that assumptions need to be made about that as it had not occurred yet. He advised Mr Wilkinson to read the report as it is based on recognised standards and if he had any questions, then Mr Cubitt will refer them back to the sustainability co-ordinator and come back to the meeting with an answer. **Mr Wilkinson said that he had asked these questions at the last three meetings – he wanted to know the carbon footprint of the DFS. Mr Cubitt confirmed that he will get this information to him for the next meeting.**
- 2825 Chair wanted to know when the full CO₂ emissions figures were established. Mr Cubitt advised that as Sizewell B have not finished constructing the DFS, the report, with the knowledge of the design of the DFS, makes an assumptions about the volume of concrete etc. that will be poured and used. Chair asked if it could be more. Mr Cubitt said that he did not think it would be that

much more as there have been very few design changes in, for example, the depth of the concrete pad – but added that when the DFS is constructed, the next report would be updated with the actual figures used.

- 2826 Mr T Griffith-Jones, co-opted member, confirmed that he had written to the Chair over a month ago chasing up the whereabouts of the report. Mr Cubitt apologised for the late arrival of the report but had been away for the last six weeks. Mr Griffith-Jones stated that this was entirely unsatisfactory and if the SSG had asked for something they should get it as soon as possible, particularly if it was already on the website.
- 2827 Mr Taylor referred to a press report that suggested the Chinese might be supplying reactor components for the Hinkley Point C project and wanted to know if there is a potential threat or if EDF may come under pressure for using products from a different country of origin that may not use the same quality standards. Mr Cubitt advised that EDF apply the same quality standard no matter where they buy a component from. **Mr Taylor wanted EDF to confirm in writing what the quality standard was. Mr Cubitt responded that he would do that.**
- 2828 A member of the public, wondered about quality standards and asked if EDF are buying components from elsewhere, do they actually test them over here or do they believe what they are told? Mr Cubitt advised that EDF have a whole variety of arrangements under quality and added that EDF would send people out to the manufacturing works to check that they are compliant with their procedures and EDF can trace a materials origin, for example, steels, through the certification right back to the root of where it is manufactured. Mr Cubitt went on to say that they do rely, to some extent on certification that arrives at the power station but have a quality group at the site and corporately which they send out to manufacturers and suppliers to ensure the quality of the parts. They added that EDF must be incredibly worried about the steel problems with the reactors. Mr Cubitt advised that he would be happy to take an action outside this meeting but feels that this line of questioning may impinge on the New Build Forum. Chair agreed and explained that EDF have elected to set up a separate forum for New Build chaired by another individual which has created a cross-over of questions that perhaps can be taken to that forum as well.

b) Mr Graham Moorcroft (Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation)

- 2829 Mr G Moorcroft gave a brief overview of the quarterly report from 1st January to 31st March – advising that there had been a period of safe operation with the completion of the periodic 10 yearly safety review for the facility – it was a comprehensive report provided to the ONR a year in advance.
- 2830 Mr Moorcroft advised that there were no significant findings from the planned licence compliance inspections and the system based inspections that the ONR undertake on site.
- 2831 During this period, Mr Moorcroft reported that the site undertook a level one exercise demonstration of the new on-site emergency arrangements. This was the first exercise of those arrangements. Mr Moorcroft added that there was also a counter terrorism exercise that was observed by the ONR's Civil Nuclear Security (CNS) programme.
- 2832 Mr Moorcroft went on to advise that the ONR undertook Licence Condition compliance inspections during the period – one of the major projects is the construction of the DFS. The ONR conduct regular inspections of that construction and during this period they undertook a compliance inspection against the commissioning and construction arrangements which they found adequate.
- 2833 Mr Moorcroft said that there were three systems based inspections this period and explained that these inspections were introduced recently. The ONR look at all the nuclear safety related systems across the site over a 5 year period to inspect the adequacy of those. During the period, the ONR looked at the Essential Electrical Systems; the Secondary Protection System (which is one of two reactor protection systems) and High Integrity Control System.

- 2834 Mr Moorcroft spoke about the Periodic Safety Review (PSR) which is the 10 yearly assessment of the safety case in which a team of 12 specialists from the ONR looked at this report. From this assessment, the ONR found no issues of major nuclear safety significance. A number of high priority observations were identified by EDF during the review and there were 12 ONR findings which were reported – to address those observations and findings, there has been an agreed programme of further work which will continue to January 2017.
- 2835 Mr Moorcroft advised that the ONR gave their decision to allow safe operation to continue over the next 10 years, pending the ongoing compliance inspections and regulations that the ONR undertake including future PSRs. The ONR will continue to monitor the implementation of those improvements and will provide a report on their progress. Further details of the assessment findings are provided in the report at: <http://www.onr.org.uk/pars/2015/sizewell-b-14-020.pdf>.
- 2836 Mr Moorcroft explained in more detail the requirement of the level one exercise called 'Tiger', under Licence Condition 11. This was an out of hours shift response on minimum manning levels – it involved severe weather conditions which were causing access restrictions to site and it was a scenario that would have had an off-site release leading to declaration of a nuclear emergency. The ONR took the advantage to utilise the new Emergency Response Centre (ERC) which was constructed following the Japanese Earthquake Response (JER). There were a number of changes in the arrangements because of the handover of some duties from Sizewell A to Sizewell B such as the off-site survey. A team of ONR inspectors observed the exercise and judged that it was successful with a number of points identified for learning and improvement as well as good practice – the ONR provide their findings to the Station Director and a commitment is received to address those findings.
- 2837 Mr Moorcroft went on to discuss the counter terrorism (CTX) exercise that took place during the period and which is required under the new nuclear security regulations. This is a demonstration of the site arrangements specifically for dealing with a security threat at the site. It was responded to by the Civil Nuclear Constabulary (CNC) and command and control affected through the central control room and emergency control centre. It was observed by the ONR's Civil Nuclear Programme inspectors and found to be adequate.
- 2838 Mr Wilkinson appreciated that the ONR could not discuss any issues with regard to the CTX exercise but wondered if the work that they did on the Licence Conditions and other work that was done on plant, is open for public scrutiny, particularly the 12 issues the ONR found that could be improved on. Mr Moorcroft confirmed that the report is available from the above link.
- 2839 Mr Wilkinson understood that the ONR are going through a review of the Site Licence Conditions. Mr Moorcroft confirmed that this is a programme being instigated at the moment that will be open to consultation from the stakeholder review.
- 2840 Mr Wilkinson wanted to know when the ONR review EDF's maximum foreseeable credible accident in terms of setting up the Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) do they take into account for future reference the existence of the DFS with its 300 tonnes or more of spent fuel and the possibility of, say, a direct hit from a passenger jet. Mr Moorcroft advised that with the construction of the DFS there are a number of safety cases that will be produced and they are incorporated in to the overall site safety case that will be taken into account. Mr Wilkinson went on to ask that in respect of a major accident like that or incident and the consequent release of radioactivity which would obviously be off site, was the ONR happy that the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) that is currently agreed on and the extendibility zone was sufficient to cover all eventualities? Mr Moorcroft affirmed that he was.
- 2841 Cllr Howard mentioned that the reports finish very vague and although tell the group that there are further improvements; it is really meaningless if the ONR do not clarify what the further improvements are. Chair asked Mr Moorcroft and he confirmed that the areas for improvement appeared in the report linked above.
- 2842 Chair wanted clarification on the two terms used to describe the outcome of the two exercises – the level one exercise, Tiger was judged to be 'successful' and the CTX exercise was judged as being 'adequate'. Chair wondered whether those words actually met some criteria. Mr

Moorcroft advised that 'adequate' is a term used for judging the standard of compliance and 'successful' is adequate. For information, Mr Moorcroft explained that the ONR have a six tier rating scheme from 'exemplar' to 'unacceptable' – the middle rating being 'adequate'. Mr Moorcroft confirmed that the rating scheme is available on the ONR website.

- 2843 A member of the public, asked if Sizewell C goes ahead, what extra security provisions will the ONR be putting in place around Sizewell B to keep the huge workforce safe? Mr Moorcroft advised that he did not have that information yet. They enquired whether the ONR had them as part of a safety case? Mr Moorcroft clarified that the plans for Sizewell C have not been submitted to the ONR yet. Chair explained that the ONR has done some work on a generic design but has not done any work specifically for Sizewell. They wondered what the impact would be on the emergency planning for Sizewell and what extra security measures would need to be put in place? Sgt P Thompson, CNC, advised that if Sizewell C goes ahead there will be a certain amount of increased security but that will be negotiated with the CNC chief constable and the ONR. It will then cascade down to the CNC to deal with, but until they have contact with the ONR the CNC were unable to comment. Chair thanked Sgt Thompson for being part of the group and being able to directly feedback that concern.
- 2845 Mr D Collier, member of the public, understood the Licence Condition compliance audit was a standard procedure but wanted to know if the system based inspections were a relatively new innovation and what the difference was. Mr Moorcroft said that it had been in place for about 18 months to two years. The ONR look at a sub-set of the licence compliance requirements for each of the systems. Practically it involves normally a two day inspection level that looks in detail at the safety equipment and the safety case for that equipment, making sure that the design is being maintained and operated to the standard that is required by the safety case. Mr Moorcroft went on to say that they would generally take a specialist with them depending on what the system was to get a view on that system and make a judgement on its adequacy to give a rating similar to the scoring system mentioned previously.
- 2846 Mr Collier wanted two or three examples of minor issues that the ONR had captured. Mr Moorcroft listed instances of improvement such as in housekeeping; minor improvements in procedures to enhance them and some can be improvements to a safety case where more justification could be provided.

c) Mr Stuart Parr (Environment Agency)

- 2847 Chair advised that as Mr Parr was absent wondered whether there were any specific questions for the EA from members with regards to Sizewell B:
- 2848 Mr Busby, regarding the recording of steam venting occurrences, understood from Mr Parr that there was a statutory requirement to record all emissions from the station. The public have been asking for a more comprehensive nature of the recording by the fact that they want to know when the steam venting happens, how long it takes and how much steam is likely to have been issued with particular reference to the strength and direction of the wind. Mr Busby went on to say that the reason for this is if there is a complaint about contamination from steam venting, then at least the station would know which direction it went and could verify whether a claim was valid or not and so could be beneficial to both sides for reassurance. However, it transpires from information from Mr Tucker, that the station has no intention of keeping any records of steam venting. Mr Busby briefly explained that this all started when he contacted Mr A Hall, the Chief Nuclear Inspector, to see if he could institute this type of record keeping, but Mr Hall confirmed that the ONR had no powers to do this, but the EA had. Mr Busby emailed Mr Parr to get this started and now it is understood that there is no intention to do this recording at all. **Chair advised that Mr Parr is not here to answer that, but she has fully noted that there is some confusion and there is an appetite to ask the EA to change their current system and look at further monitoring. Chair will seek clarification and make the EA aware of the pressing request from members of the public and some members of the SSG that this is looked at.**
- 2849 Mr Wilkinson raised a point of order in that the members have not expressed an 'appetite' – they have expressly asked a question of the EA, the operators and the other regulators to

please keep records and inform the group of their records so that they can see the wind direction details etc. Chair apologised for her phraseology.

5. Information on the habits survey by Cefas – Ms Fiona Clyne, Cefas

- 2850 Ms F Clyne from Cefas (The Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science) and based in Lowestoft had come to the meeting to let members know about the habit survey and provide more information. The habit survey is conducted on behalf of the EA, Food Standards Agency (FSA) and the ONR and it covers both sites because of the close proximity of them. It starts next Tuesday 9th June and will run for 10 days until the following Friday 19th June. Ms Clyne said the survey looks at individual habits of what they eat and what activities people undertake within the vicinity of the nuclear site. The information is used to estimate the doses to the public and is available in the Radioactivity in Food and the Environment (RIFE) report which can be accessed from the Cefas website.
- 2851 Ms Clyne advised that the habit surveys are conducted around all of the nuclear licensed sites on a roaming programme and the last one at Sizewell was five years ago in 2010. It involves interviewing people rather than taking samples. The survey looks to find out what people eat and where they spend their time. There are three defined survey areas that are investigated – for liquid discharges, these are included within the aquatic survey area – this covers the intertidal areas between Southwold and the southern tip or Orfordness. The survey looks at any activities within this area and the foods consumed. They also look out to 10km off shore, and that covers any activities in or under water and any foods consumed within that area. Ms Clyne added that the kinds of people Cefas are interested in interviewing are fisherman, shellfish collectors and anyone doing any activities in the intertidal areas.
- 2852 Ms Clyne went on to talk about the deposition of gaseous discharges that are covered in the terrestrial survey area. Cefas investigate the area within 5km of the site and within this area they look at terrestrial foods that people consume. They will interview farmers to find out what kind of foodstuffs they are producing and more importantly what they are consuming such as milk, meat, eggs and crops. Cefas also interview allotment holders because they produce their own vegetables and fruit and anyone consuming wild foods in that area.
- 2853 For the direct radiation survey area, Ms Clyne advised that Cefas target people within 1km from the nuclear licence site boundary. They find out how long people spend within the area such as living, working and undertaking any leisure activities there. The survey focuses on people that are likely to be consuming the most and the highest amounts per head of foods or are spending the most time in this area to find out, potentially, the most exposed people.
- 2854 Ms Clyne went on to say that for each person they interview they work out how many kilograms per year of foodstuffs they eat and how many hours per year for occupancy and extra activities. Ms Clyne added that the survey does rely on local people and are grateful for all the help the public give them.
- 2855 Ms Clyne pointed out the contact details that appear on the back of the information leaflet if anyone wants to take part or if know of anyone who may be interested in taking part in the survey.
- 2856 Mr Wilkinson raised the issue that if Cefas did not know the deposition patterns from the steam venting and the tritium levels, the deposition patterns from the outages and the radionuclides, they cannot know what the contamination levels are – how is the survey going to estimate the dose? Mr Wilkinson went on to enquire whether Cefas accepts that there is no relationship between dose and impact. What was the value of this survey if depositions and contamination levels are unknown and the impact of radionuclides are unknown? Ms Clyne advised that the survey was looking at the primary area of deposition and there are standard methods that Cefas use by looking at the people who live closest to the site and consume the foods from the closer areas of the site. Mr Wilkinson asked if Cefas does not know where the deposition is (and there could be a deposition in one direction for a long period of time and therefore contain high concentrations), how can they estimate what the levels are. Ms Clyne clarified that Cefas were working out the activities of people and the rest is not her area of expertise. Mr Wilkinson

thought that the purpose of the survey was to estimate the dose. Ms Clyne advised that they collect the data on the activities and consumption details of members of the public and the survey is not estimating dose per se, it is collecting the data to estimate the dose. Mr Wilkinson said that someone along the line has to estimate the dose and if the contamination levels and the whereabouts of the contamination are unknown, it cannot be estimated. Ms Clyne advised that the way they estimate the dosage is by the concentrations in the monitoring data from RIFE and Cefas use consumption rates and occupancy rates and combine them with the monitoring data in order to estimate the dose.

- 2857 Chair clarified Mr Wilkinson's point in that Cefas have decided to question people who live quite near the site but say, with plume activity it could be people down-wind from the site for many miles are not being interviewed. Ms Clyne advised that although within 5km, the terrestrial survey area covers a lot of activities and foodstuffs and Cefas find that there are high rates of all foodstuffs and could argue that even though it is a slightly smaller area, all the foodstuffs are covered and they do collect high rate information from local people – so even if more information was collected further out, it is more about the monitoring data from RIFE that is robust. Chair wanted it clarified that when Ms Clyne uses the phrase 'high rate', she does not mean high rate of radioactivity. Ms Clyne confirmed that the phrase was used to indicate a high rate of consumption.
- 2858 Mr Pynn added that this information is all detailed in the opening few pages of RIFE report if anyone is interested. But essentially, Cefas find out that within a defined period, 5km in this case, how much food of a particular type people are eating and they will present that as a worst case. Using potatoes as an example, Mr Pynn went on to say that Cefas would present the highest proportion of potatoes eaten in 5km as so many kilograms per year. The FSA can monitor radioactivity levels in potatoes and multiply that by the number of kilograms by that consumed by the worst case person in a year and will present that as a worst case dose a person can get through eating that particular food. These figures are then all multiplied together with all the different foodstuffs then added to the direct dose that someone living close by might get from sites themselves and presented as the representative dose for a person (and always the worst case) will get from Sizewell.
- 2859 Ms Pilkington was concerned about the growing or killing of things that are being sold commercially within that region and how that would affect the statistics, for instance, produce sold outside of the area and not being included in the statistics. Ms Clyne advised that this is actually covered by the people they interview because they are looking for people that are consuming the most foods in order to assess the data, so even though produce might be sold, Cefas are looking at people who are eating the most in order to estimate the dose. Chair suggested that Cefas could always ask farmers about their supply chain. Ms Clyne confirmed that this is factored in and it is in the report.

6. Review and agree the following previously circulated:

a) Minutes of the last Main meeting held on 5th March 2015

- 2860 Mr Griffith-Jones advised that he has still not received a response from Dr Coffey relating to item 2568 on the minutes at the last meeting – Mr Griffith-Jones said that he will continue to chase the matter until he gets a response explaining the situation.
- 2861 The following minor alterations were noted from the last set of minutes:
- Item 2627: **Holtec** not Haltec (*trade name*)
 - Item 2628: Mr Busby asked if the dry fuel store was not ready by **the end of 2016** (*this clarifies that end 2016 is the target completion date*)
 - Item 2633: **reactor** (*spelling*)
 - Item 2637: **bolts** (*not vaults*)

b) Minutes of the last Sub-Group meeting held on 28th April 2015

- 2862 The following minor alteration was noted from the last set of minutes:
- Item 3.14: **Flamanville** (*spelling*)

c) Action tracker

2863 Chair drew attention to each item on the action tracker and the following items were discussed:

- Item 1942: added a new action for the EA to consider their current regime of monitoring
- Item 2108: Andy Osman updated Chair – the letter and new leaflet has been delayed and awaiting re-draft – Chair will chase. Copies of a letter sent to Rt Hon Amber Rudd – new Secretary of State for DECC were handed out to members
- Item 2248 Mr D Foy confirmed that individuals relating to this issue are now paid on or above the living wage due to their annual pay increase this year – Chair was pleased and said that one of the benefits of the SSG is to raise issues that have a wider impact
- Item 2556: this action has now gone to Mr Moorcroft and Mr Barnett’s question will be added from this meeting

2864 Mr Wilkinson asked about closing some actions as they have been ongoing since September 2014. Chair confirmed that the SSG chase up actions on a routine basis but did not think that it was best practice to close items that are not fully answered. Having the tracker maintains awareness of issues that need to be discussed and Chair recognised that some actions will take a while to finalise.

7. Review of Constitution

2865 **Chair advised that Dr Coffey helpfully raised some questions about the constitution and Chair has answered those. The document to be circulated will include them.**

2866 Chair advised that there were a number of suggested changes to the constitution document that had been printed and left with the Track Changes on – she went on to give a background to the modification of the constitution: the NDA have always offered guidance to SSGs as to their structure and their constitution and all the different SSGs (LCLC at Bradwell) have developed their own criteria over the years. In order to bring greater parity between the SSGs but also to tidy up the documents, changes were made and Chair drew attention to each change in the constitution with the following items discussed:

- Item 2.2 Mr Whitby wanted to include Dunwich parish meeting as a separate representative on the list of elected representatives within the local authorities – Cllr T Hodgson advised that Mr Michael Clark was from Dunwich but did not represent Dunwich parish meeting. Chair advised that the SSG will need a letter from the Parish for inclusion.
- Item 2.4 Chair advised that the group of the change of co-opted members from 8 to 10. Mr Griffith-Jones noticed that the document appears to omit a requirement to give six weeks’ notice – Chair asked members if they would be happy with the inclusion of four weeks’ notice – this was agreed and will be added to the changes. Mr Tucker was concerned that ‘co-optees will be elected by a show of hands’ had been removed from item 2.7. Chair advised that this was moved to the last line in item 2.4 but would prefer word ‘voting’ rather than ‘election’. After much discussion, Chair clarified that in line with the NDA guidance around voting and acceptance of members into the constitution, and as an inclusive body, the SSG should not be in judgement as to who joins them if they can demonstrate an interest through written application to the Chair. Mr Tucker was concerned that it would not be controlled and unfair to put that burden on the Chair. Ms Morris advised that Dungeness SSG have a similar situation and if someone wants to be a member they can write to the Chair and, so far, they have not had a refusal. However, Ms Morris went on to say that the individual is not able to vote as they are co-opted for their interest and perhaps knowledge, but are not a voting member because they are not representative of the group. Chair advised that she, the vice chair and the secretariat would seek guidance from the NDA to ensure there is a balance. Ms Girling was concerned with the

wording as it does not reflect what was said at the Sub-Group, she went on to say that as a co-opted member, she would not contribute if she did not have voting rights. Ms Girling wanted a correction to the sentence ‘... SSG should write to the Chairperson and explain their interest and experience’ should be changed to ‘... SSG should write to the Chairperson, in the first instance ...’. Chair was happy to include the addition, but they still need to write to the Chair with all that information and will distribute out to members. Chair wanted it known that there will not be many occasions where they do not progress with that request.

- Item 4.1 Chair highlighted the change to the election of the Chair and Deputy Chair to tri-annually. Chair mentioned that Sizewell was the only group that elected annually – Dr Coffey questioned this, but the change was to bring the group in line with other SSGs. The Chair made a counter-proposal to change the election to four years to match the electoral cycles, with the caveat that at the AGM at any year, there can be a vote of no confidence if members have concerns about the chairmanship. Suggested wording: ‘following a term of four years another nominations will be sought’
- Item 4.2 Mr Griffith-Jones was concerned that there should be some process in case of disruptive behaviour of perhaps one individual and that there should be a minimum number of, say, five people objecting. After much discussion, Chair suggested the following wording: ‘Members may hold a vote of no confidence for either incumbent at any point if they are supported by another four members’
- Item 7.3 Discussions were held on the way that recommendations were decided upon. Chair advised that paragraph 7.3 was not subject to change but if the group is still unhappy about the wording, it can be discussed at another meeting with clarification from the NDA.

Ms Girling proposed that the group adopt the constitution as amended at this meeting, Cllr Howard seconded the proposal. A vote was cast by a show of hands for the adoption of the constitution with 11 for and one against. The adoption of the amended constitution was carried.

8. Chairman’s Report

- 2867 Chair informed the group that since the last meeting she has attended the NDA Strategy meeting and notes from that will be made available to the group as soon as they are received. Chair also attended a Magnox Chair’s meeting and the main issues discussed was the ILW, FED and potential impact on end states; the changing organisation from post transition to care and maintenance at each of the Magnox sites and the inclusion of new ways of working by the parent body organisation such as Pond divers etc. Chair reported that there was not much activity in the last three months due to the election and a period of purdah but Chair had received numerous emails and telephone calls about progressing matters on the action tracker with the secretariat – at this point, Chair thanked the secretariat, members and officers for the work they have done throughout the year.

9. MEMBERSHIP

a) Review of organisational membership

- 2868 Chair wanted members to advise her if they knew of other organisations they feel need to be represented by this group so they can be proactively invited to make sure that the group are representing views of the people in this area.

b) Welcome new individual members representing Town/Parish, District & County Councils

- 2869 Chair will send out a full list of all members and who they have replaced.

c) Election of co-opted members for 2015/16

- 2870 Chair informed the group that she has withdrawn her name as co-opted member as she is the Town Council representative.
- 2871 Chair confirmed requests from Mr Trevor Branton; Ms Joan Girling; Mr Pete Wilkinson and Mr Tom Griffith-Jones and those members were welcomed and will be added to the group.

10. Election of a Chairman and Deputy Chairman

- 2872 Cllr Howard nominated Cllr Marianne Fellowes as Chairman of the SSG, adding that she has represented this group both locally and nationally very well and has been inclusive and patient in her role. This was seconded by Mr D Foy. A show of hands recorded: 11 for re-election and two abstentions – Chair thanked the group and will do her best to support the group and look forward to working again for the SSG.
- 2874 Chair nominated Mr M Taylor as the Deputy Chairman as he has been a great support to Chair during her role. Mr P Wilkinson seconded that adding that Mr Taylor has been an absolute asset to the SSG; he is always available, very knowledgeable and very helpful. A show of hands recorded: 11 for re-election and three abstentions. Chair welcomed Mr Taylor and thanked him for his help.

11. Any other business

- 2875 Chair did not receive any other business from the group. Tonight's agenda was a pilot to deliver the reports first and get through the programme quicker. Although this did not happen, Chair felt it seemed better to have the reports earlier so that members of the public were able to ask questions. Chair thanked the officers, visitors and members for their attendance.

Meeting closed at 11.00 pm

Next meeting:

Wednesday 9th September at 10:00am at Yoxford Village Hall