

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

**Minutes of the Sub-Group meeting held at 18.30 on Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2015**

**at Leiston Community Centre**

### **Item 1. WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE**

- 1.1 Chair welcomed attendees, advising that the main item for this sub group meeting was to consider the SSG Constitution and recommend revisions to the full SSG. There would also be opportunity to briefly discuss any matters arising in preparation for the next full meeting, the AGM, to be held on 04.06.15.
- 2.1 Members Present: Cllr Marianne Fellowes (MF) Chair; Cllr David Bailey (DB); Mr Trevor Branton (TB); Ms Joan Girling (JG); Mr Tom Griffith-Jones (TGJ); Cllr Terry Hodgson (TH); Ms Pat Hogan (PH); Cllr Bill Howard (BH); Cllr Nigel Smith (NS); Mr Mike Taylor (MT).
- 2.2 In Attendance: Louise Franks (LF), Minutes

### **Item 2. SSG CONSTITUTION**

#### **General comments**

- 2.01 Members considered the current SSG Constitution approved 05.06.14. in conjunction with the NDA Guidance for Site Stakeholder Groups (ref LAR 3.0) dated 27 March 2009. Chair advised that she had considered the Constitutions of the most of the other stakeholder groups and would advise attendees of distinctions accordingly. Chair invited comments.
- 2.02 JG drew attention to the NDA document LAR 3.0 paragraph 4.6 regarding the role and responsibilities of members, and expressed concern that when representatives are consistently absent from SSG meetings that the organisation neither had a voice or were formally updated with outcomes of the SSG meetings. JG suggested that the organisation should be contacted by the SSG to enable this flow of information. Chair questioned whether this should form part of the Constitution or whether this was a matter of good practice. Members agreed that this was a matter of good practice and that the Chair should consider the register of attendance and contact those organisations whose representative had missed two consecutive main meetings. Members also agreed that absence without apologies should be followed up by the Chair with the individual themselves. After further discussion, it was agreed to also send all organisations the Executive Summary, irrespective of attendance.
- 2.03 TGJ suggested that the Constitution contains the full content of LAR 3.0 para 4.6 which would enable the Chair / Deputy Chair to monitor enforce the role and responsibilities of members as appropriate. This was agreed.

#### **Membership**

- 2.04 Consideration of the types of membership described in the NDA guidance, the mix of membership described in other stakeholder group Constitutions and the current membership of the Sizewell SSG, led to the consensus view that the Sizewell SSG had a disproportionately large number of Local Authority groups represented within the membership. Chair expressed concern that there was limited opportunity for elected Councillors to gather local opinion about SSG matters and that whilst the SSG mitigated this by enabling focussed public meetings and holding SSG main and sub group meetings in public, suggested that the membership of local non-government organisations should be invited and encouraged.

- 2.05 Members debated who to approach and the WI and local schools were amongst those mentioned. Encouraging younger opinion was generally agreed as appropriate and MT suggested inviting the Suffolk Youth Parliament. Concern was expressed that the size of the membership would become unmanageable and overall this was felt to be unlikely although feasible. Members were encouraged to suggest local groups for the Chair to invite to join the SSG.
- 2.06 Members debated whether properly constituted local organisations that wished to become members should have automatic or elected membership. Members noted the NDA guidance (para 4.1) stated “should have provision to include”. Several concerns were expressed that membership should remain manageable and reflect the local community and not be dominated by particular focus groups that have a single agenda.
- 2.07 Chair referred to supplementary guidance from the NDA describing when voting was appropriate that she felt suggested that membership of groups should be automatic. Chair read out para 2483 from the Minutes of the SSG meeting held 04.12.14.:

*Mr J Jenkin, NDA, referred to the most recent guidance produced on Site Stakeholder Groups in 2009 – it states that the NDA discourages voting on things other than the election of the Chairman and Vice Chair. The reasons given are that SSGs were not set up to be executive decision making bodies, they are there to be a conduit of information between site operators and local communities and therefore a variety of views are expressed. Mr Jenkin went on to say that the NDA always encourages that a broader spread of views are represented at SSGs and cited Sizewell as an example of having quite a big variety of views, i.e. some in favour of nuclear and some against. All of those views should be expressed, recorded and represented as appropriate – however, Mr Jenkin confirmed, that as the SSG is not an executive or decision making body, the NDA has always preferred that voting was not used in that way, but they have not dictated that. Mr Jenkin said that the NDA have been discussing how business is run in other groups with the Sizewell Stakeholder Group Chair and has been sharing some of their thinking. Mr Jenkin thought that perhaps there will be an opportunity, given the guidance has not been reviewed for a number of years, to look again at that to see if the NDA can help clarify the guidance and the running of all the Site Stakeholder Groups. The NDA would welcome any views from members on how they can do that.*

- 2.08 Members disagreed about whether the NDA guidance / Mr Jenkin had given a clear steer about whether groups should have automatic or elected membership. During further debate, Chair advised that other SSG's have interpreted the guidance to enable properly constituted groups that represent the local community, whether minority or not, to join the membership without a vote, adding that in practice other SSG's have not been overwhelmed by requests to join the membership. TB pointed out that the SSG could hold more than one position and that the SSG currently functioned with disparate viewpoints. He suggested that voting had previously polarised opinion rather than enabling an acceptable way to move forwards.
- 2.09 Chair asked whether voting should be deployed for co-opted individuals. TB suggested increasing the number of co-opted members to 10 to enable representatives of groups to join the membership until the Constitution could be amended to list the group amongst the membership. Members debated how to amend the Constitution to enable properly constituted groups to join the membership at any main meeting without the Constitution requiring amendment.
- 2.10 With regard to co-opted membership, JG suggested the following wording ‘*Anyone wishing to be co-opted to the SSG should write to the Chairperson and explain their interest and experience. Their co-option will become an Agenda item at the next SSG main meeting. In the event that all co-opted places are full, the applicant will have their name added to the list of nominations for co-option at the SSG AGM.*’

- 2.11 Members debated whether persons wishing to be co-opted should be elected and if the maximum number had been met how to decide who should be given the co-opted places at the AGM. There were mixed views and whilst it was felt that co-opted membership did not require a vote if a vacancy existed, that an election was the appropriate mechanism if the number of applicants exceeded the number of places at the AGM. TGJ suggested that the option for an individual to be suggested for co-option by an existing member of the SSG should remain and this was agreed.
- 2.12 NS questioned whether individual Parish Councils that currently had joint membership would be able to choose to nominate their own representative in future, effectively increasing the number of members. Members considered this, recalled that joint membership had originally been agreed based on geographic distance from the site, and debated why some Local Authority members were able to have more than one representative, agreeing that size and proximity to site were determinant factors. Members debated this at some length wrestling with the principles being suggested for properly constituted groups and whether this applied to Local Authority members. The fact that ward boundaries have changed, further fuelled this debate.
- 2.13 Chair proposed to change the wording in section 2.1 to reflect that in the NDA LAR 3.0 para 4.1 and state: *'Membership of the SSG will consist of elected representatives within the local authorities, Sizewell A / B site staff and politicians, local community groups with an interest in the site and co-opted members.'* Section 2.2 will list membership of Parish, Town, District and County Councils, MP's and Site Staff. Section 2.3 to specify that *'Properly constituted organisations that represent local people that could include'* followed by a list of examples. Section 2.4 to detail co-opted membership numbers and how to become a co-opted member.
- 2.14 JG suggested an amendment to 2.3 to describe the local community groups as Non-Government Organisations, however, later it was agreed to retain 'local community groups' as this reflected the NDA LAR 3.0 guidance.
- 2.15 JG suggested that all local authorities could be invited to join the membership. The limit for membership was agreed as extending to those falling within the 15km zone used for extended emergency planning. Chair agreed to ensure that this action was undertaken.
- 2.16 Members discussed whether the current voting rights should be retained for MP's and consideration was given to whether MP's should be invited to be members of the SSG. Different views were expressed and discussed and there was general agreement that current voting rights should be retained and MP's should continue to form part of the SSG membership.
- 2.17 JG suggested adding the following wording into the Constitution: *"Local community groups who are properly constituted and have an interest in the work of Sizewell A and B sites should apply in writing to the Chairperson and it should be announced at the subsequent meeting of the SSG."*
- 2.18 NS questioned how the assessment of applicant groups would be undertaken to ensure that they were properly convened, represented local people and had an interest in the sites. Chair advised that the Chair would consider this and if there were any concerns, confer with the NDA. NS suggested that words to the effect that 'subject to scrutiny by the Chair' should be included in the Constitution. JG suggested that as the duties of the Chair included the proper running of the SSG as detailed within the Constitution, that writing to the Chair implied this already. Members generally agreed.

### **Purpose**

- 2.19 TB suggested adding section 1.1a 'or matters which may affect'. This was agreed.

### **Duties of Members**

- 2.20 JG suggested moving the entire section (currently section 8) to follow on after the Membership section and members concurred.

### **Duties of Chairman**

- 2.21 Chair suggested that this entire section (currently section 7) should be moved to follow Chairman and Deputy Chairman (currently section 3) and this was agreed.

### **Chairman and Deputy Chairman**

- 2.22 Chair advised that all other SSG Constitutions elected their Chairman and Deputy Chairman for either 3 or 5 years. NS concurred that 3 years would be appropriate but that present incumbents should consider their 3 or 5 year term to have commenced with their election to the role. Chair advised that after this fixed term existing incumbents were able to be re-elected, as per NDA guidance, if there were no other nominees. Chair added it could take almost a year to become familiar with the role, if the person had not served in this capacity before so a longer term was beneficial.
- 2.23 Chair advised that if any issues arose with the incumbents then the members would be able to hold a vote of no confidence.
- 2.24 TH questioned whether if an incumbent were to lose their place on the SSG, whether their role would be vacated. Several members commented and it was generally agreed that the role would be automatically vacated and a replacement would need to be elected at the subsequent main meeting.

### **Meetings**

- 2.25 JG suggested changing item 4.7 to replace 'All' to 'Any' and after some debate it was agreed to keep this as 'All'.
- 2.26 Members agreed to replace 'may' with 'should' in item 4.2, to capitalise 'decommissioning' in item 4.5 and to reduce the number of days for papers and agenda to be received from fourteen to seven in item 4.6.
- 2.27 Members discussed the frequency and timings of meetings at some length. There was a general consensus to retain a minimum of four main meetings, to hold these in March, June, September and December, to schedule the AGM for an evening meeting in June and hold the other main meetings during the day. Chair agreed to ask the secretariat to review attendance levels to establish whether the balance of daytime and evening meetings was appropriate. TB requested that the June meeting was moved from the first to the second Thursday.

### **Sub Group & Working Party Meetings**

- 2.28 Chair suggested amending item 5.1 as follows:
- deleting 'has a sub-group and'
  - changing 'committee' to 'group'
  - inserting '*Working party membership will be selected by the SSG Members. Working party meetings shall not be open to the public, press and broadcast media.*' at the end of item 5.1.
- These were all agreed as appropriate.
- 2.29 Chair suggested that the requirement for 5.4 and 5.5 were no negated as items 4.6 and 4.7 covered these matters. Members agreed.

### **Conduct of Business at Meetings**

- 2.30 TB questioned the protocol with enabling broadcast media to attend main and sub group meetings and, after discussion, it was agreed to add an item into this section regarding recording of meetings. Chair agreed to check the wording.
- 2.31 Chair suggested that this section was renamed by deleting 'at Meetings' and that items 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 should be moved to this section. Members agreed that this was a sensible change.
- 2.32 MT drew attention to item 6.3 and questioned whether the motion would need to be seconded. Members agreed that this section should remain as is.

### **Actions & Recommendations:**

- i **Recommendation that as a matter of good practice the Chair will:**
- **contact any member absent from main meetings without apology**
  - **contact the organisation if a member is absent without sending a representative for two consecutive main meetings**
  - **ensure that the Executive summary is sent to all organisations irrespective of attendance**
- ii **Members to suggest local groups for the Chair to invite to join the SSG**
- iii **Chair to write to all local authorities within 15km of the sites to invite them to join the SSG membership.**
- iv **Chair to ensure a review of attendance levels to establish whether the current ratio of day to evening main meetings was appropriate.**
- v **SSG members receive and consider the suggested changes to the Constitution and agree the final version.**

### **Item 3. CURRENT ISSUES AND MATTERS ARISING IN PREPARATION FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 3.01 Chair invited topics for discussion.

### **Minutes**

- 3.02 BH questioned whether the Minutes and/or the Executive Summary could be circulated to members more quickly than currently. Clerk clarified the process for returning the draft minutes to the secretariat and Chair within one week of the meeting and then preparing the Executive Summary thereafter. Clerk added that if regional Stakeholder group meetings were held consecutively then the minutes of the first meeting were completed before the minutes for the second commenced. Chair agreed to consider the dates for the other regional Stakeholder group meetings to ensure that this inevitable delay was avoided.

### **Information leaflet from the Joint Emergency Planning Unit & Suffolk Resilience Forum**

- 3.03 Chair advised that the version of the leaflet circulated to members was now in its final form but that the accompanying letter was under review. The leaflet and letter are scheduled to be circulated to the public from mid to end of May. Chair expressed her disappointment that not all of the changes suggested by SSG members had been incorporated into the leaflet. Members discussed this at some length and agreed that the leaflet had been improved and that it did serve to advise the community that there was the possibility of a nuclear emergency.
- 3.04 Chair asked members to email any comments about the leaflet to her within one week.

## **HERCA / WENRA**

- 3.05 MT expressed his confusion regarding land use planning, compliance with REPPIR and the scenario's for the declared EDF Energy reference accident, and that for a reasonably foreseeable accident. He expressed concern that Councillors were being asked to make decisions about land use planning applications in the detailed emergency planning zone (3-4km) and suggested that the ONR should provide guidance. Chair clarified that the ONR will provide a view up to 1km. MT advised that there was an unforeseen accident scenario that has been proposed by HERCA / WENRA that covers an area of potentially up to 100km. MT advised that REPPIR was under review and Chair questioned whether the SSG would be consulted. This was not clear. MT reminded members that he had an action to write to DECC and seek clarity about these matters.
- 3.06 JG suggested that these matters should be addressed to Central Government and not the Head of Emergency Planning. JG suggested keeping this matter as a SSG Agenda item to ensure that the SSG keep a 'watching brief'. JG added her concern that Councillors have to make planning decisions without appropriate support and guidance.

## **Order of items on the main meeting Agenda**

- 3.07 DB requested that the site reports are scheduled for early in the Agenda and Chair advised that this has been agreed and will be piloted at the next meeting. Chair added that election of Chairman and Deputy Chairman will be placed at the end of the meeting to enable the present incumbent to prepare for and manage the AGM before handing over to an incoming Chairman.
- 3.08 Chair advised her view that many questions for the site operators were raised during matters arising and that moving the site reports to earlier in the meeting simply meant that these would be raised during the site report presentations instead. TB suggested that receiving site reports earlier in the meeting would tease out many of the questions and prevent duplication. DB added that this would reduce frustration with, and criticism of, the operators and enable technical questions to be answered fully before those posing the question left the meeting.
- 3.09 PH asked if the public could be encouraged to ask questions after the site reports and remove the public forum entirely. TB added that the purpose of the public forum was to enable the asking of questions but was often used to make statements. Chair advised that the current schedule followed a local authority model.
- 3.10 Chair asked whether members felt that a public forum after each item was more appropriate than a single initial public forum. TB drew attention to the 'Purpose' section of the Constitution noting that the first purpose was to inform the public of activities on the Sizewell A and B sites. Chair asserted that it was two way communications and not just the receipt of reports. JG commented that it was vital to hear the concerns of the public and TGJ concurred that the public have raised some important matters previously.
- 3.11 JG commented on how useful she found it to be able to ask questions during each presentation to ensure clarity and understanding and that there would be a loss of continuity and flow if questions could only be posed after each presentation. She suggested that the public would also like this flexibility. Members discussed this more fully.
- 3.12 Chair suggested retaining the Public Forum at the outset of the meeting until the matter of sequence of items on the Agenda had been settled and members generally concurred.
- 3.13 Chair advised that during her meetings with the Site Directors that neither had expressed an issue with being heard later in the meeting. The only frustration was when the meetings went on into the afternoon and each had other commitments to attend. TB advised that after the meeting had lasted more than 3 hours that many people left and this was often prior to hearing the site reports. PH agreed advising that the public should be able to see and hear from the operators.

### **Reactor Pressure Vessel**

- 3.14 MT suggested that the SSG request robust evidence from Sizewell B that their Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) was not affected in the same way as that at Flamanville, France. TGJ advised that this technical problem was different from that encountered by the Belgian RPV's and concerned the carbon content of the steel. It was agreed that the Chair would action this request in advance of the AGM. Members generally agreed that posing questions in advance of meetings enabled answers to be shared at the meeting.
- 3.15 DB suggested that there were two aspects under consideration; the day to day running of the station itself and the impact on the community; the technical aspects of the plant. He stressed the importance of the former and suggested that this gets lost in the very technical discussions. Chair advised that the two aspects were linked and several members agreed. JG stated that those that had worked within the industry have a better understanding of technical matters than those that haven't and that clarifying technical matters enabled comprehension of any impact on the community. JG used an example of questioning whether it was safe to swim in the sea to illustrate her point. Chair commented that it was only if there was a problem with the day to day running of the site that the SSG needed to be informed.

### **Sizewell A Staffing Matters**

- 3.16 MT raised concern about plans for staff redundancies and this was agreed as a matter to seek clarification about. The link with the mitigating socio-economic support was briefly discussed. Chair agreed to ask that the Sizewell A site report covers staffing proposals in the future.

### **Sizewell B Living Wage**

- 3.17 BH reminded attendees that this matter had not been resolved and Chair advised that this was an ongoing item on the Action Tracker.

### **Co-opted Membership Applications**

- 3.18 TB sought clarification of when nominations would be sought for consideration at the AGM and heard that current co-opted members would be contacted shortly to ascertain whether they would like to stand for appointment again.

### **Communications**

- 3.19 Chair advised that she operates a principle of minimising the frequency of emails to members to send collated information rather than multiple emails sent every time a new piece of information becomes available. Members agreed that this was helpful.

### **Sizewell B Spent Fuel Management**

- 3.20 MT questioned the change of timeframe from 40 to 100 years for storing the spent fuel in casks. He questioned the legitimacy of this 100 year claim. Members questioned what extrapolations had been assumed and considered that nuclear fuel had not been stored for this length of time before. JG added that high burn up fuel may have a different profile. Deputy Chair and Chair agreed to formulate an appropriate question about this matter.

### **Geological Disposal Facility**

- 3.21 TGJ commented that the House of Lords had agreed a motion that the GDF will be a National Infrastructure Project. JG advised that this means that whilst the District and County Council will be consulted the decision will rest with the Secretary of State. Members debated this and expressed frustration that the MP had not kept the SSG informed about this matter when it passed through the House of Commons. Chair advised that she had discussed this matter with the MP when this went to the House of Lords. JG commented on related events in Cumbria.

Minutes from the SSG Sub-Group Meeting held 28.04.15.

**Actions & Recommendations:**

- i Members to email comments about the Emergency Planning leaflet to her by 6<sup>th</sup> May.**
- ii Chair to request robust evidence from Sizewell B that their Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) was not affected in the same way as that at Flanville, France.**
- iii Chair to ask that the Sizewell A site report provides clarity about plans for future staffing.**
- iv Deputy Chair and Chair agreed to formulate an appropriate question about the timeframe for Sizewell B Spent Fuel Management.**

The meeting closed at 9.15pm

**SSG meeting: AGM on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2015 at 18.30 at Saxmundham Market Hall.**