

**MINUTES OF THE QUARTERLY MEETING OF THE  
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)  
HELD AT ALDEBURGH COMMUNITY CENTRE  
ON THURSDAY 3<sup>rd</sup> DECEMBER 2015 AT 10.00**

**PRESENT**

Cllr M Fellowes	- Aldeburgh Town Council	<i>SSG Chairman</i>
Mr M Taylor	- Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth	<i>SSG Deputy Chairman</i>
Mrs S Betson	- representing Mr C Betson (Leiston Business Association)	
Mr T Branton	- Co-opted Member	
Mr J Carey	- Sizewell A Staff Representative	
Cllr J Fisher	- Saxmundham Town Council	
Mr D Foy	- Sizewell B Staff Representative	
Ms J Girling	- Co-opted Member	
Cllr T Hodgson	- Suffolk Association of Local Councils	
Cllr W Howard	- Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Cllr M Jones	- Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Councils	
Cllr R Rainger	- Snape Parish Council	
Mr C Tucker	- Sizewell B Staff Representative	
Mr M Whitby	- Dunwich Parish Meeting	
Mr P Wilkinson	- Co-opted Member	
Cllr H Williams	- Westleton Parish Council	
Mr T Woodward	- The Country Land and Business Association East	

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr A Anderson	- EdF Energy Sizewell B
Dr C Barnes	- Suffolk Coastal District Council
Mr M Cubitt	- Sizewell B Plant Manager
Mr P Fahey	- Environment Agency Sizewell A Inspector
Dr L Franks	- SSG Clerk
Mr P Hetherington	- SSG Secretariat
Mr A Jakeways	- Office for Nuclear Regulation Sizewell A Inspector
Mr J Jenkin	- Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr P Knollmeyer	- Magnox Deputy Managing Director
Mr P Langford	- Suffolk County Council
Mr P Montague	- Sizewell A Closure Director
Mr G Moorcroft	- Office for Nuclear Regulation Sizewell B Inspector
Mr A Osman	- Suffolk County Council Head of Emergency Planning
Mr S Parr	- Environment Agency Sizewell B Inspector
Ms N Rousseau	- Sizewell B Community Liaison Officer

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Mr C Barnett	- Shut Down Sizewell Campaign (SDSC)
Mr D Green	- East Anglian Daily Times

## **CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS**

2957 Chair welcomed all attendees, provided domestic arrangements and asked all speakers to use the microphones and to introduce themselves.

### **I PUBLIC FORUM**

2958 Mr Barnett introduced himself as speaking on behalf of the Shut Down Sizewell Campaign (SDSC) representing 200-300 members. He reminded attendees that the SDSC produced a bi-monthly newsletter and suggested that it was the public duty of representatives to read this information. He referred to the current newsletter advising that content within provided the rationale for disagreeing with the disposal of higher activity nuclear waste in a deep geological facility (GDF) (current Government policy) and instead suggested long term storage with the possibility of retrieval in the future.

2959 Mr Barnett reminded attendees of his concerns (SSG meeting 09.09.15. para 2877) re the recommendation of the Belgian Nuclear Regulator (FANC) to implement worldwide, accurate inspections of all 430 RPV nuclear power plants. He commented that in the past four years there had been five Chief Inspectors at the ONR since the departure of Mr Weightman and that his letters to the ONR had met with obfuscation. He referred to the SSG Action Tracker and questioned whether Mr Moorcroft (ONR Sizewell B Inspector) was going to provide the meeting today with a further briefing as indicated.

2960 Mr Barnett referred to his concerns raised at the 09.09.15. meeting (para 2878) re faulty valves in the new-generation EPR nuclear reactors, asserting that it was a similar fault that caused the Three Mile Island event. He added that the possibility of RPV structural failure has led to the rejection of an RPV at Flamanville, France. He advised that this was the design proposed for use at new build in the UK, adding that EDF Energy had announced a new RPV design that was cheaper and easier to build. He asked what was being done about the faulty valves.

2961 Mr Barnett stated that whilst the SSG were raising these issues with the operator and the nuclear regulator it appeared to be to no avail.

2962 Chair addressed the comment that all elected representatives should read the SDSC newsletter by stating that all relevant available information should be considered to ensure that representatives are fully informed. Chair commented that the Radioactive Waste Management arm of the NDA is consulting regarding the GDF and that the recent SSG subgroup (meeting held 24.11.15.) had considered their response. She encouraged attendees to respond on an individual basis, advising that the closing date is 04.01.15. Chair commented that French Government policy is to make nuclear waste retrievable.

2963 Regarding the concerns about the RPV, Chair commented that the SSG welcome dialogue with the ONR and in particular the assistance that Mr Moorcroft has given to provide the SSG with information. She drew attention to the information provided by EDF Energy available in hard copy at this meeting regarding the testing regime utilised for the Sizewell B RPV, requested in response to concerns about the RPV at Flamanville. Chair advised that Sizewell B presentations were the next main section on the agenda and requested that these concerns were addressed during that part of the meeting.

2964 Mr Barnett said that this was wholly unsatisfactory, that this meeting was just a 'talking shop' and did not get anything done. Chair advised that the SSG remit was to act as conduit of information between the industry and the community and that the Action Tracker enabled concerns to be addressed.

2965 Mr Tucker provided a point of information stating that FANC had given permission for the Belgian RPV's to be restarted in mid-November.

2966 Mr Taylor advised that he had met with Cllr Fellowes (SSG Chair) and Mr Crawford (Site Director at Sizewell B) to discuss concerns that the manufacture of the Sizewell B RPV replacement head may have coincided with the manufacture of the potentially faulty manufacture of components on the Flamanville reactor. He reported that it had been confirmed that the replacement head had been manufactured in 2006, earlier than had been thought, and at a different time to the Flamanville components. He added that components were being destructively tested to ensure that those deployed at Flamanville were safe.

## 2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2967 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr D Bailey, Ms L Baker, Mr T Griffith-Jones Cllr G McGregor and Cllr N Smith.

## 3 SIZEWELL B REPORTS

### 3a. Plant Manager's Report

2968 Martin Cubitt introduced himself as the Plant Manager at Sizewell B and drew attention to the written report dated December 2015. He provided a presentation that covered the following points:

- Safety: No significant safety events.
- Operation: Station recently achieved a full year of continuous operation since the last refuelling outage.
- Operational Safety Review Team (OSART): 3 week review undertaken on site during October. Team of 16 International experts measured performance against internationally accepted standards. Summary report will be published by the International Atomic Energy Agency early 2016. OSART follow up visit expected in 18 months.
- Dry Fuel Store (DFS) Update: [picture] progressing well and the safety case to enable inactive commissioning has been achieved. Mechanical and electrical systems are currently being installed. Completion of building works, including construction of an equipment store building, expected within 3 months. Carbon footprint report produced by Royal Haskoning DHV dated 24.11.15. submitted 01.12.15. to secretariat for circulation to SSG members. Written questions regarding this document were invited.
- Amenity and Accessibility Fund (AAF): eight projects supported in 2015 totalling £25,321. Further information, including a map of AAF eligible areas, at [www.suffolkcoastandheaths.org](http://www.suffolkcoastandheaths.org)
- Local Community: Lablive Science Event 08.12.15. Engineering Maintenance Apprenticeship information day 05.12.15.

2969 Mr Barnett questioned whether the full OSART report will be available to the public. It was confirmed that a summary report will be produced by the IAEA and published on the IAEA website. Chair suggested that a FOI request, or a request via the MP, may enable additional information to be made available. **Cllr Howard questioned whether the OSART recommendations could be made available to the SSG once available and Mr Cubitt agreed to take this action.**

2970 Mr Wilkinson sought clarification that the carbon footprint report would be circulated to members and this was confirmed.

- 2971 Chair suggested that the section 106 compensation resulting from the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) was regarding the building itself and did not consider the proposed contents. Chair commented that as Leiston sits outside of the AONB that the Leiston community are unable to benefit from the compensation, yet they will be hosting the spent fuel storage for some considerable time. She questioned whether the Greater Gabbard compensation scheme would be administered along similar lines. Ms Rousseau advised that the latter (Leiston and Sizewell Community Benefit Fund) was being administered by the Suffolk Community Foundation (<http://suffolkcf.org.uk/grants/leiston-and-sizewell-community-benefit-fund/>) and that this was not restricted to projects within the AONB area. Chair reiterated her concern that Leiston were not receiving any compensation for the long term storage of spent fuel at Sizewell B. Cllr Howard commented that this concern was frequently raised at Leiston Town Council meetings.
- 2972 Mr Taylor advised his initial understanding that the latest wind farm, Galloper, compensation scheme followed the same principle as the DFS scheme, effectively restricting funding of projects only within the AONB. Yesterday Leiston Town Council received notification that the area in which projects would be funded extended 5km from the substation which includes some of Leiston. He questioned whether any compensation for Sizewell C would be restricted to the AONB. Ms Rousseau advised that the radius was actually 10km and that applications for funding would invited from the community from January 2016. Chair questioned who would administer this fund and make decisions about which projects to support. Ms Rousseau advised that the board would include representatives from EDF Energy and Galliper and that any other interested individuals would be considered. Chair suggested that the community should be represented on the board and that this should be an elected individual and not an officer.
- 2973 Mr Whitby reiterated his question posed at the 09.09.15. meeting (para 2938) regarding the rateable value of the DFS. He questioned what impact the DFS had had on the business rates for the site. He also questioned how the decommissioning of Sizewell A site would impact upon the business rates for that site. Dr Barnes advised that it was the Valuation Office that determined rateable values and as such this question should be asked of them and not Suffolk Coastal District Council. Chair questioned whether the current value of business rates for each site could be shared and Dr Barnes advised that she had asked for this information and the answer had been to ask the Valuation Office. Chair suggested the use of a FOI request to ascertain this information. Mr Cubitt advised he did not know the current rateable value or whether the DFS had had an effect upon this and offered to check. Chair commented that income from business rates benefit the whole community. Cllr Hodgson advised his recollection that business rates for both sites were based upon their outputs and as Sizewell A was no longer generating energy, their business rate was likely to be very modest. Mr Branton advised that when Sizewell A had been generating 420 megawatts the business rates were circa £2million.
- 2974 Chair asked Mr Jenkin to comment on the principle of planning compensation as distinct from storage compensation. Mr Jenkin sought clarification of what was being asked of the NDA given that the DFS was at Sizewell B, a generating and not decommissioning site. Chair explained that in the absence of a DECC representative that the NDA were the closest body to represent National policy. Mr Jenkin advised he could not comment about matters outside of the NDA remit. He referred to the compensation package for the GDF commenting that this was to recognise that a community were agreeing to permanently host a nuclear waste disposal facility for UK higher and intermediate level waste. This would entail appropriate infrastructure upgrades and a financial benefits package. Mr Jenkin advised that he was unable to comment upon individual planning consent compensation. Chair expressed her view that by hosting the DFS, the local community were assisting the Nation in enabling Sizewell B to continue generating energy. Chair asserted that it was a failure of the District Council to secure proper community benefit for hosting the spent fuel.
- 2975 Mr Whitby suggested that the DFS presented a greater risk than the GDF as the former was above ground. Mr Wilkinson commented that this was not necessarily the case.

- 2976 Mr Taylor advised that at the time when Sizewell B itself was approved, it was not envisaged that spent fuel would be stored on site for longer than 7 years.
- 2977 Mr Wilkinson reminded attendees that the CoRWM report recommended a compensation package for all communities that host nuclear waste. He cautioned that the implications of the spent fuel generated by the proposed Sizewell C need careful consideration.

### **3b. Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) Report**

- 2978 Mr Moorcroft, Sizewell B Inspector, introduced himself and drew attention to his quarterly report dated 01.07.15 – 30.09.15. In response to matters raised earlier in this meeting, Mr Moorcroft clarified the following:
- Organisational Changes: Three changes of Chief Nuclear Inspector since Dr Weightman. Present incumbent, Dr Andy Hall, has recently retired on grounds of ill health and Dr Richard Savage is now serving as the Acting Chief Nuclear Inspector. Adrienne Kelbie has been appointed Chief Executive of the ONR to commence January 2016.
  - RPV Integrity: several queries have been raised in the last two years that specialists have responded to in writing or by providing detailed presentations. Current position remains unchanged in that the ONR remain confident that the station continues to operate safely and are awaiting the planned inspections to be carried out during the outage in April 2016. ONR Specialists will be engaged in monitoring this process. The ONR will update the SSG with the outcomes of these inspections.
  - Belgian Reactors: FANC have consented for these reactors to be restarted and operate for the original 40 year design life.
  - Flamanville Issues: these are being monitored by the new build team. As Sizewell B RPV is very different in design and date of manufacture, these issues give no reason for concern about the RPV at Sizewell B.
- 2979 Attention was drawn to the quarterly site report, previously circulated and available in hard copy, and Mr Moorcroft provided a presentation to summarise findings. The following points were noted:
- Period of safe and secure operation
  - No significant findings from planned inspections, three of which related to the construction of the DFS
  - Mid-cycle review of the operation of the station was attended by the Superintendent Inspector and involved Safety, Security and Environment Agency Inspectors. Outcome was that no issues of major significance were identified and the review demonstrated that the site was being operated safely and securely.
  - Annual review of emergency arrangements demonstrated that on site arrangements were all suitable and adequate.
  - Intervention records and reports available on the ONR website ([www.onr.org.uk](http://www.onr.org.uk))
- 2980 Questions were invited. Mr Wilkinson advised that there had been an intention to review the site licence conditions. He questioned what had prompted this review and why this review had now been dropped. Mr Moorcroft advised that the review is currently underway and the next phase will involve consultation with stakeholders. Chair interjected that understanding a timeline for this review would be helpful.
- 2981 Mr Wilkinson advised that Central Government have recommended that Regulators should encourage businesses that they monitor to grow. He questioned what the practical implications of this would be for the ONR and Chair questioned whether this meant that the

work of the ONR would be compromised. Mr Moorcroft advised that he was unaware of any impact on the current regulatory approach.

- 2982 Ms Girling suggested that the **SSG send a letter of thanks to Dr Hall (outgoing Chief Nuclear Inspector) and Chair agreed to take this action.**
- 2983 Ms Girling drew attention to p5 of the ONR quarterly report and sought clarification of the description of the DFS as providing the 'safe on-site storage of new and irradiated fuel' given that it was designed to host only dry spent fuel. Mr Moorcroft advised that the facility being described as the 'fuel storage system' referred to the fuel storage ponds and specifically not the DFS.
- 2984 Ms Girling questioned whether the fire safety inspection had considered the fire station facilities based in the local community and whether these were able to assist the site if required. Mr Moorcroft advised that an ONR Fire Safety Inspector had undertaken this inspection and, whilst he was unsure what this involved, believes that it was primarily focussed on provision on site. Ms Girling expressed her concern that local facilities were being reduced due to budget constraints and this could impact on their ability to assist with an emergency on site. It was clarified that it was SCC and not ONR that were responsible for the Fire and Rescue Service in the community and that reductions to blue light services was a National issue. Mr Moorcroft advised that under REPPiR, blue light services are required to be involved in testing emergency arrangements at least once every three years. The operators test on site emergency arrangements more frequently, up to twelve times per annum, and the blue light services may not be able to support all of these exercises. Ms Girling expressed her concern that a site event may occur at a time when the blue light services are attending another incident. Chair suggested that Mr Osman address this question as it was SCC that was responsible for blue light services in the community.
- 2985 Chair questioned whether the reports resulting from the Licence Condition Compliance Inspections would be made public and heard that these would be published on the ONR website.
- 2986 Cllr Whitby questioned whether the inspectors received reports from the operators about the number and duration of steam venting events. Mr Moorcroft explained that the licence holder was required to report events that breach set criteria and that steam venting was part of the normal operation of the site.
- 2987 Cllr Howard questioned what specific recommendations had been made to the site following inspections. Mr Moorcroft gave examples (maintenance of life jackets, review of maintenance strategy for fuel storage system) explaining that these were all minor observations.
- 2988 Cllr Hodgson questioned whether off-site emergency arrangements were inspected. Mr Moorcroft clarified that neither on-site nor off-site emergency arrangements were tested during this quarter. He added that the last on-site test had been undertaken during Feb 2015, last off-site test during 2014.
- 2989 Mr Branton questioned whether any ONR staff were involved in the OSART review. Mr Moorcroft advised that ONR were invited to hear feedback of findings from the review and clarified that the OSART review was undertaken at the invitation of DECC. Mr Branton questioned what recommendations were made. Mr Moorcroft advised that the recommendations were to undertake appropriate improvements and that these would be reviewed in the follow up visit scheduled for 18months time.

### 3c. Environment Agency Report

- 2990 Stuart Parr introduced himself as the Environment Agency Inspector for Sizewell B and described this quarter as a quiet period for the station without any issues or concerns. He drew attention to the combined Environment Agency Report dated December 2015 and invited questions.
- 2991 Chair advised that there were still concerns about operational discharges from the DFS. Mr Parr reassured the SSG that permits covered all discharges from the station and that none of the permits or the quarterly notification levels had been breached. Chair questioned what involvement the EA had in the final commissioning of the DFS and Mr Parr referred to the paper he had written for the SSG about a year ago explaining the involvement of the EA. The Operators produce a safety case for ONR consideration and ONR consult with the EA prior to permissioning. Currently the EA are considering the safety case and will provide details of findings and recommendations to the ONR for inclusion within the ONR approval documentation. Chair questioned the timeline for this and heard that ONR will publish within the next two months. Chair asked if the EA input could be shared with the SSG. Mr Parr advised that a technical trail document would be available separately.
- 2992 Mr Wilkinson questioned whether the regulators were in any way moved by the growing body of evidence that low level radiation exposure led to both Leukaemia and solid cancers. He asked if the EA were aware of two recent reports (<http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanhae/article/PIIS2352-3026%2815%2900094-0/fulltext> <http://www.bmj.com/content/351/bmj.h5359.long>) and if they felt it was now time to reconsider the body of evidence linking dose and impact. Mr Wilkinson asserted that this was at the core of community concerns about nuclear power. Chair reminded Mr Parr that these reports had been forward to him for comment. Mr Parr advised that he had discussed the reports with colleagues and that the final answer should come from Public Health England. Mr Parr advised that the EA were supportive of this study, felt it was robust and that it fundamentally supports the regulatory process currently in use. Mr Wilkinson questioned whether it increased EA concerns. Mr Parr advised that they took advice from PHE and that the current model used is conservative. Chair advised that there was an outstanding action for PHE regarding dose/impact concerns. **Mr Parr agreed to take an action to provide written clarification of the different dose models. Chair suggested that the SSG may hold a separate meeting to consider this.** Mr Parr suggested that PHE was invited to speak about this and Chair explained the numerous attempts taken over the past 18 months to engage with PHE.
- 2993 Cllr Whitby and Chair raised the matter of steam venting and asked whether the EA were minded to ask the Sizewell B operators to report fully about steam venting events. Mr Parr advised that steam venting was part of the normal operation of the site and that the operators were already required to report if the steam had a radioactive component under the conditions of their permit. Cllr Whitby asked to see these records suggesting that tritium was particularly toxic when dissolved in water. There was an exchange of views about the toxicity and radioactive characteristics of different forms of Tritium and **Mr Parr agreed to meet interested members on site to clarify the monitoring of steam venting.** Mr Wilkinson reiterated concerns about monitoring of deposition areas. Chair advised that EDF Energy are doing what they are required to do by the EA and that the Site Director had advised her that additional monitoring was unnecessary and would require a disproportionate amount of resources. Chair stated that the SSG cannot take this any further and that it is only if the regulator changed the requirements that additional monitoring will be undertaken. She suggested that this was an example of where the regulator and the industry needed to enable a better understanding of the regulations by the public. Mr Wilkinson vehemently expressed his frustration.
- 2994 Mr Taylor sought clarification of where the main vent was located and Mr Tucker advised that this was the outlet for the main ventilation system for any operations undertaken when handling the fuel. It was located on the main plant and specifically was not connected to

the DFS. Chair sought clarification that the DFS was a store open to the free exchange of air and not a sealed unit vented through a monitor. This was confirmed by Mr Parr. Mr Cubitt reminded the SSG that the spent fuel was contained in sealed containers that were welded shut and had a slight over pressure of inert gas within. The free flow of air around the outside of the containers had no way to interact with the contents of the containers.

- 2995 Chair asked whether the containers produced any 'shine'. Mr Cubitt explained that this was direct radiation and Mr Parr advised that the operators had to monitor and report all shine as part of their environmental permit. He confirmed that the operators monitor this and that it was not monitored independently, adding that the EA do monitor the environment independently, including direct radiation measurements.
- 2996 Cllr Howard asked if the air from the stack was monitored and the Chair sought clarification that Cllr Howard was asking about air from the DFS. This was confirmed. Mr Parr advised that there was no monitoring undertaken of the DFS as no radiation was released from the DFS. There was some confusion and it was clarified that the DFS did not have a 'stack', it had open air exchange via vents in the wall of the building. Mr Tucker explained that the casks containing the fuel were rigorously tested to ensure that they were sealed prior to being stored in the DFS.
- 2997 Cllr Whitby asked for clarification of the refuelling process. Mr Cubitt explained that this was carried out remotely entirely underwater and that the air that was monitored for contamination was the ventilation system for the operators. Cllr Whitby asked how the spent fuel was loaded into the casks and Mr Cubitt confirmed that this process was undertaken entirely underwater. The cask was then drained, pressurised and welded shut before being tested to ensure it was totally sealed.

*The meeting had a short comfort break at this point.*

## **6. Emergency Planning Update**

- 2998 Mr Osman, Head of Emergency Planning, introduced himself and **agreed to seek clarification of what the Fire and Rescue Service are planning, including any implications for the Sizewell sites, from the Chief Fire Officer.**
- 2999 Mr Osman provided an update with progress on emergency planning since the Fukushima event advising the following key points:
- In 2014 the area covered by the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) for the Sizewell sites changed. The new DEPZ was determined by ONR. The changes in the DEPZ led to the site operators fulfilling their statutory duty by providing written information to local residents and the off-site emergency arrangements were amended to ensure that detailed plans covered the new area.
  - The automatic measures that are put into place in the event of an emergency were amended to reflect the risk posed by each site. This resulted in a change from a 2.4km area to a 1km area for the pre-issue of Potassium Iodate tablets and the immediate recommendation to shelter indoors if an event occurred.
  - Suffolk elected to improve local arrangements by putting in a second emergency planning zone beyond the DEPZ, stretching out to a 15km radius from the B site. This enables preparedness in the event of a more severe accident to evacuate people in an area up to 4km and to issue stable iodine for those sheltering up to 15km. This is not required by legislation and resulted primarily from public consultation. It means that in Suffolk there are two emergency planning zones, the DEPZ in which action can be taken very quickly and a second zone that stretches out to 15km where actions can be extended once the nature of the event has been better understood. A further step to provide additional information, beyond that required by law from the operators, has culminated in a leaflet sent to all residents and businesses within the 15km area during

October 2015. Again, this was in response to local concern and in conjunction with local interest groups, including the SSG.

- Next steps are to consider the impact of Sizewell C and ensure compliance with the legal requirement to consider whether any construction activity can be accommodated within the existing emergency arrangements.

3000 Mr Taylor questioned how the Suffolk Resilience plans conform to the ONR thinking about the off-site emergency plans. He read out the following excerpt from the ONR Project Assessment Report titled 'ONR's statutory determination of the off-site emergency planning and public information area for Sizewell A & B nuclear licensed sites in accordance with the requirements of the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001 (REPPIR) Regulations 9 and 16.':

*"Conclusion 4: It is my opinion, and given the immediate proximity of Leiston, that a REPPIR off-site emergency planning area of 2 km or less would not provide for a credible or effective plan to secure the protection of the public, or restriction of exposures so far as is reasonably practicable, in the event of a reasonably foreseeable radiation emergency. Consequently, the REPPIR off-site emergency planning area should extend to include at least a part of Leiston."*

Mr Taylor asked why SCC had a different plan that did not include Leiston.

3001 Mr Osman sought clarification of the question posed and Mr Taylor questioned why there was a smaller zone being described for immediate response. Mr Osman explained that it was confusion over terminology, that there was only one DEPZ and that within this area there were requirements that had to be met. These include having a map of the location of vulnerable groups, having an understanding of how the DEPZ area could be cordoned in the event of an emergency to balance day to day activity without increasing population numbers etc. and was not simply limited to public countermeasures. The 1km area is risk based relative to Sizewell B site and it is where stable iodine will be pre-issued. This means that in the event of a reasonably foreseeable accident the operator and ONR have agreed that a hazard requiring shelter or the use of stable iodine would not extend beyond 1km. The 1km area is not a defined emergency planning area, it is simply determined by the risk as the area in which it has been pre-agreed to issue stable iodine.

3002 Mr Taylor stated that this did not conform to what ONR have said and that their determination of the DEPZ was based upon the risk posed by the sites. Mr Osman explained that previously the DEPZ areas were determined only by the area of risk. When determining the DEPZ for Sizewell in 2014, the ONR discussed with SCC whether in addition to the area of risk, there were any factors that should be considered that would influence the size of the DEPZ. If the emergency planning zone had been set purely on the basis of risk, it would extend to a radius of 1km and would not have led to any meaningful emergency arrangements. Hence Leiston was brought into the DEPZ, meaning that Suffolk are better prepared in the event of an emergency. The DEPZ was determined not just from the risk but from considering local elements as well. Mr Moorcroft concurred explaining that local boundaries and logical considerations were included in the determination.

3003 Cllr Whitby questioned whether IAEA guidance was being followed. He sought clarification of whether the DEPZ was simply a radius or had defining boundaries. Mr Osman explained that both the DEPZ and the extended zone were based upon postcode boundaries. Mr Osman explained that if the IAEA guidance is interpreted as a two tier approach (an area in which there could be a very fast response and a further area where a more severe incident could be managed) then the guidance is being followed. If a more technical interpretation is taken then there was not a direct like for like comparison in terms of exact descriptions of what the zones should be. Chair advised that the statutory requirements in the UK are different. Mr Moorcroft advised that DECC and the HSE are reviewing the REPPIR regulations and that there will be a public consultation next year.

3004 Cllr Howard led a vote of thanks to Mr Osman. He asked whether Mr Osman was concerned about the lack of constabulary and questioned whether he was keeping an eye

on what was happening in Europe. Mr Osman advised that what the public see on a day to day basis is not what would be available in the event of an emergency. He asserted that there has been no change to the Police resources that are prepared to respond to a nuclear emergency. If a large event occurs then there is an agreement to 'back fill' from neighbouring areas to enable the local resources to be deployed to deal with the event. Mr Osman stated that he does not have a concern because he has seen and understands how this works in practice. Mr Osman asked whether Cllr Howard was referring to HERCA/WENRA and upon confirmation advised that he was being kept informed of the ongoing dialogue.

3005 Ms Girling quoted from a letter dated 23.07.86. that states "the time has come and the public will feel more assured, if they knew evacuation plans were being taken seriously".

#### **4 SIZEWELL A REPORTS**

##### **4a. Closure Manager's Report**

3006 Chair welcomed Mr Peter Montague, the current Sizewell A Closure Manager. She congratulated Mr Tim Watkins, the previous incumbent, upon his retirement and led a vote of thanks to him for his diligent attendance and input at SSG meetings.

3007 Mr Montague introduced himself, advising that he was previously based at Hinkley A site and had lived within a mile of the three Hinkley power stations, hence he had a good understanding of community concerns. He added that Mr Watkins had reinforced the importance of community liaison. Mr Montague was noted to have a background in radiological protection and health and safety roles and had previously worked at the Bradwell site. Mr Pete Knollmeyer, Deputy Managing Director on the Magnox Executive Team, was introduced.

3008 Mr Montague provided a presentation regarding the following matters:

- Safety & Compliance: good during last period with no accidents or injuries. Radiation doses for the year are below 1mSv.
- Organisational restructuring: consultation has taken place with all staff about the site restructure and initial best fit has taken place for site lead team with no changes other than the change of Closure Manager. Individual consultations with each staff member to ascertain individual aspirations are ongoing.
- Projects Update:
  - District Survey Lab building has been handed over to EDF Energy.
  - Empty flask containers have arrived to transport redundant IONSIV cartridges to Oldbury site for packaging and disposal. This enables progress with ponds decommissioning.
  - Work continues to remove systems and processes from site.
  - Early discussions have taken place with EDF Energy regarding the use of Sizewell A car park for workers associated with Sizewell C development.
  - Redundant machinery and equipment continues to be removed from the pile cap [picture].
- Lifetime Plan: providing no constraints, site should enter Care & Maintenance (C&M) in 2026/7. Funding level will be a determining factor. Significant projects underway that will help the site to deliver this plan are as follows:
  - IONSIV packaging at Oldbury
  - skip decontamination at Hinkley. This involves milling off the top 2mm [picture] but this is labour intensive and limited to the flat surfaces of the skip. Process is currently being optioneered
  - Some FED has been shipped from Bradwell for disposal at the LLW repository

- A trial to use divers [picture] to retrieve and decontaminate pond debris will begin at Dungeness this month.
- Draft Socio-economic Plan: draft delayed from Sept to early 2016 to fit in with the revised NDA strategy (which contains the NDA socio-economic strategy). Noted that Sizewell area community is not as proactive at seeking funding as other areas.

- 3009 Mr Taylor referred to the use of divers in the ponds and a question raised at the subgroup meeting 24.11.15. about the allowable dose rates for nuclear workers in the USA compared to the UK. He asked if the industry were working towards international standardisation. Mr Montague explained that the USA allow average dose limits of 50mSv whereas the UK limit is 20mSv per annum. In each country the dose must be justified and optimised. He clarified that the dose record of all divers will be rigorously checked before each individual is deployed in the ponds.
- 3010 Cllr Hodgson asked whether Hinkley would become the centre for processing all redundant skips. Mr Montague confirmed this. He explained that skips would be cut up in the ponds, packaged and sent to Hinkley where flat pieces would be milled to enable disposal as either LLW or free release. As the process is labour and time intensive, the economic viability of milling has yet to be established. Cllr Hodgson questioned why paint remover wasn't used instead of milling and heard this had been trialled and that the resulting contaminated paint emulsion was particularly difficult to then process.
- 3011 Cllr Hodgson asked whether the pond chemistry had changed and heard that it remained similar but that the tolerances for each parameter had been widened since the ponds no longer contained spent fuel.
- 3012 Mr Branton sought clarification of the IONSIV processing. Mr Montague explained that the IONSIV cartridges will be loaded into fuel flasks and shipped to Oldbury using existing approved transport routes. Once at Oldbury the flasks will be unloaded for storage in the ponds using the existing fuel route until they are repackaged into 6m<sup>3</sup> containers and sent to an ILW store, probably that at Berkley.
- 3013 Dr Barnes asked for an update on likely staffing numbers and heard that reductions to 183 total staff would be made. Mr Montague advised that there were very few agency staff remaining on site currently and that the process of understanding individual aspirations was underway. He estimated that up to 20 staff may be asked to leave.
- 3014 Cllr Whitby questioned what the site would look like during C&M and asked what other site it would most resemble. Chair advised that the plan for every site was different and that, for example, part of the land may be reused to support Sizewell C. Mr Montague explained that it was likely to be a one box model but that the final vision was unclear and learning from Bradwell would help inform this.
- 3015 Ms Girling questioned whether the District Survey Lab would be demolished, reused or offered for community use. Chair questioned who owned the land. Mr Cubitt advised that EDF Energy own the land and the building and are still considering its use, adding that currently some facilities within the building are still in use. Ms Girling stressed that the location of the building made it ideal for community use.
- 3016 Mr Montague commented that Sizewell A was well supported by the blue light services. He commented that at a recent low-key shift exercise there was support from two fire officers. Mr Montague advised that he had been a firefighter for 12 years. Mr Montague added that an ambulance en route to support another exercise was diverted to a real emergency. Ms Girling asserted that the SSG want this level of support to be continued. Chair advised that she was attending a meeting on Monday evening at which the Police Crime Commissioner would be speaking.

3017 Chair welcomed the job opportunities that the parent body were offering to current Magnox employees. Mr Montague commented that currently 8 individuals had transferred to CFP. Mr Knollmeyer added that a further 50 individual expressions of interest were currently being processed.

#### **4b. Office for Nuclear Regulation**

3018 Mr Jakeways, ONR Sizewell A Inspector, drew attention to his quarterly report dated 01.07.15. – 30.09.15. and provided a presentation that outlined the following:

- Three on-site inspections, of which one was considering security, plus two meetings.
- Compliance inspections against four licence conditions and a systems inspection of the containment systems, including inspection of six license conditions; no significant findings, some areas of good practice.
- After reporting period an unannounced inspection during silent hours was undertaken to assess timings in safety case for response to an incident; adequate response.
- Licensee's Hazard Identification and Risk Evaluation (HIRE) Report of Assessment has been submitted under REPPiR and is being assessed for adequacy. This submission claims that a radiation emergency is no longer feasible and if validated will mean that the requirement for an off-site plan will be withdrawn. Decision expected by mid-Jan 2016.
- Dr Andy Hall, Chief Nuclear Inspector, has recently retired and Dr Richard Savage is now serving as the Acting Chief Nuclear Inspector. Adrienne Kelbie has been appointed Chief Executive of the ONR to commence January 2016.
- Intervention records and reports available on the ONR website ([www.onr.org.uk](http://www.onr.org.uk))

3019 Questions were invited but none were forthcoming.

#### **4b. Environment Agency Report (EA)**

3020 Mr Fahey reminded attendees that he had succeeded Andy Pynn as Environment Agency Sizewell A Inspector on 01.10.15. He drew attention to the combined EA report dated December 2015 and in particular the following:

- Asset management inspection undertaken 08.09.15.; site found to be compliant, some recommendations made.
- Meeting held 09.09.15. to discuss way forward for ponds decommissioning.
- Inspection earlier this week to close out some of the themed audits to ensure recommendations have been covered.
- No non-compliances or breaches of discharge permit / quarterly notice limits.

3021 Chair questioned what the recommendations were from the asset management inspection and Mr Fahey explained that these included the linking of nuclear assets and environmental assets on different registers. He added that an audit was undertaken on site a year ago. Some actions resulting were noted as incomplete and these actions should be closed out. Mr Fahey described how walkdowns were undertaken to check for issues and it was recommended that the timings of these could be more evenly spaced, that historical findings from previous walkdowns should be referenced to ensure appropriate remediation and prevent recurrence and that the head of systems should undertake a walkdown periodically to monitor progress. Finally, it was recommended that clearer records of when small radiation monitors were taken out of service should be recorded. He added that reports were available on the public register

- 3022 Chair sought clarification of the permit situation for the District Service Lab (DSL) and Mr Fahey explained that Sizewell A had applied to surrender their permit. Sizewell B does not require a permit as all radioactive substances have been removed from the DSL.
- 3023 Mr Fahey clarified the position with several actions resulting from previous SSG meetings as follows:
- Ref 2686 sewage outlets: written information submitted 30.11.15. detailing twice/year inspections of sewage discharges. Sizewell A treatment works has always achieved a pass result.
  - Ref 2786 biological monitoring of seawater and blue flag status: no requirement for biological monitoring of seawater around Sizewell as not a designated bathing area. Full brief of environmental monitoring undertaken around Sizewell dated Sept 2014 resubmitted 30.11.15. Anyone can apply for an area to become designated bathing water, although this is usually the Local Authority. A hard copy was provided to the Clerk and can be downloaded at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/designation-and-de-designation-of-bathing-waters> Once designated then the EA will undertake biological monitoring.
- 3024 Chair sought and received clarification that the Sizewell area had to be designated a bathing area for the EA to undertake biological monitoring. Ms Girling thanked Mr Fahey for explaining the situation clearly and commented that many tourists and residents do bathe without realising that appropriate monitoring was not undertaken. Ms Girling suggested that **this matter was taken up with the District Council to ensure appropriate designation and Chair concurred.**

#### 4c. Nuclear Decommissioning Authority Report

- 3025 Mr Jenkin, NDA Stakeholder Manager, advised that the recent Government spending review meant that, in high levels terms, the NDA will receive £11bn grant over the next four years. In addition, income expected is £5bn meaning a total of £16bn. This is positive recognition of the importance of decommissioning. The NDA have yet to agree funding allocations to each site licence company. Draft business plan will be published on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2016 alongside the draft strategy.
- 3026 Mr Jenkin drew attention to the NDA monthly update for November 2015 and in particular to the following items:
- Supply Chain Event held in Manchester attracted more than 1500 visitors and had 270 exhibition stands, including an Innovation Zone with technology demonstrations
  - Sellafield has installed a 50tonne transfer tunnel to assist with the movement of highly radioactive waste into modern storage facilities prior to consignment to the GDF.
  - Sellafield have now removed 50% of the radioactivity from the Pile Fuel Storage Pond. Ongoing work will remove a further 20% of pond radioactivity by April 2016.
  - EA have granted a permit for the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) enabling planning permission to be sought for the phased construction of three new vaults.
  - Oldbury site has now completed defueling with the last fuel planned to leave site in January with ONR verification expected in Spring. This is well ahead of schedule.
  - NDA draft strategy will be published 05.01.16. in time for the formal 6 week public consultation. Final strategy will be submitted to Government Ministers for approval at end of March 2016.
  - NDA website content has moved to [www.gov.uk/nda](http://www.gov.uk/nda) and the old website will be switched off shortly. Any issues with navigating this new site should be addressed to Sophie Palmer ([sophie.palmer@nda.gov.uk](mailto:sophie.palmer@nda.gov.uk)).

- NDA subsidiary RWM is currently (closes 04.12.15.) consulting on the draft National Geological Screening Guidance. Individual and stakeholder views are welcome

3027 Ms Girling commented that decommissioning Sellafield was likely to cost a substantial part of the £16bn spend over the next 4 years. She questioned whether additional funding specifically for Sellafield could be sought from Government. Mr Jenkin advised that the £16bn figure assumes that there will be substantial efficiencies and driving spending down at all sites will continue. Some flexibility may be to draw funding early to support new technology development to enable cost savings later. After further discussion Mr Jenkin asserted that the NDA were pleased with this settlement figure as it does enable projects across the estate to proceed. Mr Montague advised that part of the Magnox mission was to innovate and gave recent examples of regional ILW storage and some FED characterised as LLW as areas that will save money. He commented that the ubiquitous use of asbestos at all sites was costly to safely remove. Mr Jenkin concluded with the reassurance that Magnox funding would not be raided to support Sellafield decommissioning.

3028 Ms Girling expressed her disappointment that the National archive is located in John O'Groats. Chair advised that this had already been raised with Magnox. Mr Montague commented that the National archive was for documents and that memorabilia would be kept locally. Mr Jenkin advised that it was primarily socio-economic factors that prompted the decision about the location, adding that much of the material would be made available on line. **Mr Jenkin offered to provide clarity about what material would be sent to the National archive and what would be retained locally.**

## **7. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND ACTION TRACKER**

### **7a. Minutes from the SSG Meeting held 09.09.15.**

3029 The minutes of the SSG Meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2015 were agreed as an accurate record subject to the written request for para 2950 to be amended "... Sizewell B replaced the RPV head *in 2006* ~~six-years-ago~~ the current testing regime at that time was deployed.

3030 The Executive Summary was amended to state "Confirmation that refuelling of SzB next spring *can proceed but that the subsequent refuel Autumn 2016* will require the DFS to have been actively commissioned."

3031 Chair reported that the ONR had requested amendments of the 4<sup>th</sup> June 2014 SSG minutes and that these would be corrected retrospectively

### **7b. Minutes from the SSG Sub-group Meeting held 24.11.15.**

3032 The Minutes of the SSG Sub-group meeting held 24.11.15. were agreed as an accurate record subject to the addition of apologies received from Mr Trevor Branton. Chair suggested that recording apologies for sub-group meetings was not required as attendance was optional.

### **7c. Matters Arising, the Action Tracker and Correspondence.**

3033 Chair drew attention to the SSG sub-group minutes of 24.11.15. advising that the matter of the RWM National Geological Screening consultation had been discussed and that the views of those members present would be submitted in response. She encouraged individuals to respond to the consultation (<http://www.nda.gov.uk/rwm/national-geological-screening/consultation>) on an individual basis, reminding all that the deadline was 04.12.15.

3034 Chair advised that the SSG sub-group had discussed the recent scientific evidence that low level radiation exposure led to both Leukaemia and solid cancers (<http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanhae/article/PIIS2352-3026%2815%2900094-0/fulltext> <http://www.bmj.com/content/351/bmj.h5359.long>) and reminded attendees that more

information about dose would be provided by the EA and that a separate meeting to consider this had been suggested earlier at today's meeting (see para 2992).

- 3035 Mr Taylor advised that he had formulated a summary of the findings of the Emergency Planning meeting held 12.11.15. (please see appendix 1 below). Chair commented that the minutes of that meeting had yet to be published.
- 3036 After the meeting had closed Mr Taylor requested that the response from Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service to enquiries about their duties under REPPiR were included as appendix 2.
- 3037 Chair advised that an updated Action Tracker, previously circulated to all members and available in hard copy today, had been considered at the SSG sub-group meeting of 24.11.15. and recommended changes were detailed in the minutes. She added that subsequent emails had been received in response to outstanding actions and hard copies of these had been made available at this meeting. A discussion about how to ensure electronic circulation of responses to members ensued and Chair explained that the SSG secretariat resource was being reduced to a single person for all Magnox sites, that this would be monitored by Magnox and that this reduction may mean delays in dealing with correspondence.
- 3038 Chair thanked members for supporting the smooth running of meetings, particularly Mr Foy for his assistance with running the meeting today. Chair agreed to ensure circulation of an updated Action Tracker to include recommended changes, responses received this week and actions resulting from this meeting.
- 3039 Mr Taylor referred to the responses received in answer to questions about the DFS (see appendix 3) requesting that in future the respondent include a contact name to enable subsequent questions or clarification.

## **8. CHAIR'S REPORT**

- 3040 Chair advised that she had attended site meetings at both Sizewell A and B sites, had attended the briefing in Ipswich regarding the GDF and had attended the Magnox SSG Chairs meeting. Chair advised that the latter had enabled discussion with counterparts from other sites about resourcing implications from the restructuring programme, socio-economic policy and the update from Magnox and NDA about the draft strategy. Questions were invited and none were forthcoming.

## **5. FSA- RIFE REPORT 2014**

- 3041 Chair reminded attendees that the 2014 Radioactivity in Food and the Environment (RIFE) Report had been circulated and was available in hard copy at this meeting. She invited questions either now or in writing after the meeting by email.
- 3042 Cllr Whitby expressed concern that Sizewell B had reached 70% of its discharge limit for Tritium last year. He questioned what would happen if it reached 100%. Mr Parr suggested that this topic could be expanded upon at the meeting about steam venting and summarised that if Sizewell B reached any discharge limit then a formal investigation would be instigated resulting in enforcement action and possibly prosecution.
- 3043 Mr Branton sought clarification of the terms limit and authorisation level. Mr Parr explained that limits were hard boundaries and that levels were indicators of performance set way below the limit itself. Levels were used to indicate that something unusual was happening during day to day operation.

Meeting closed at 13.35

## Appendix 1: Mr Taylor's summary of the Emergency Planning meeting held 12.11.15.

Emergency Planning meeting 12<sup>th</sup> November 2015.

SZA may not need to be covered under REPPiR if HIRE report is received in time.

Fire service cuts may affect duties under REPPiR.

RADSAFE to be taken over by SZB from SZA.

EDF confirmed that the vehicles in the Emergency Response Centre are for severe weather response.

The ERC is still not officially the operation centre.

Galloper construction staff added to emergency cover.

SCC and Police looking at new strategic centre may need EDF help.

National review of K lodate may become over the counter. National stockpile to be distributed across country.

### SZC presentation.

Workforce numbers and source known.

Hostel reduced in size and to be local.

Tourism accommodation to be used.

Working on Socio economics, public service impact, traffic incident plans and messaging signs.  
Health Impact assessments.

A couple of years off an application.

Asked by EDF to brief SCC highways on need for condition survey of Lovers Lane conduit (sewage outfall) pipe and highway. Leiston town council Highways sub committee 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2015 refers.

**Minutes awaited.**

Mike Taylor 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015.

## Email

 Print

From:	
To:	
CC:	
Date:	Nov 16 2015, 12:40 PM
Subject:	Re: Duties under REPPiR
	<a href="#">Show full header</a>

Hi Mike,

Regarding your query about SFRS duties under REPPiR and the impacts of proposed reduction in resources arising from service risk management plans, I would make the following observations.

I can confirm that there are no proposed changes to the weight of attendance for response to any emergency incident at Sizewell sites. Notwithstanding this, proposed risk management plans are likely to make it more difficult for SFRS to attend all level 1 exercises with the levels of resource we have historically deployed.

If we assume that current service design proposals are confirmed after public consultation, in practice this means that SFRS will work closely with Site operators (as we always have) to maximise the benefit of all occasions when SFRS resources are deployed for level 1 exercising. The noticeable difference may be the number of occasions when a fire appliance and crew are able to attend level 1 exercises.

Level 2 and 3 exercises will continue to be fully resourced. The reason for me raising this at EPCC is to ensure that key stakeholders are dialled into future training design so we start to explore and plan for it now to ensure we are making the best of available resources.

I hope this reassures you and I am confident SFRS will continue to fully satisfy the requirements of REPPiR with particular regard for sections 9, 11 and 14 of REPPiR.

If you have any specific questions please get in touch.

Regards

Ali Moseley  
Risk and Resilience Manager  
Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service  
[Ali.moseley@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:Ali.moseley@suffolk.gov.uk)  
07880 785021

Emails sent to and from this organisation will be monitored in accordance with the law to ensure compliance with policies and to minimise any security risks.

The information contained in this email or any of its attachments may be privileged or confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake, please advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your email software.

## Appendix 3: EDF Energy Response to questions about the monitoring of the DFS.

How is ONR licencing and monitoring the process of placing into the cask, the cask transportation and storage within the Dry Fuel storage building, sufficient to ensure that there is no risk to the environment or people?

### **Response**

NGL proposal for the introduction of long-term interim dry fuel storage on the Sizewell B Site is jointly regulated by ONR and EA. ONR's approach is based on the provision of an adequate safety case justification, whereby NGL is required to demonstrate that hazards and risks from this activity have been reduced to As Low As Reasonable Practicable (ALARP).

ONR's assessment of the safety case has focused on a number of issues and factors including: integrity of the fuel for the duration of the life time of the store; integrity of dry fuel store containers; shielding to ensure public and work force are protected; dry fuel store monitoring arrangements; capability to return fuel in dry storage to a water storage facility in the event of detecting degradation; final disposability and decommissioning.

We have established regulatory hold-points that NGL is unable to proceed beyond without ONR approval, including a hold on commencing dry fuel store operations and commencement of active commissioning. Activities inspected by ONR have included fuel selection, MPC processing, movement of MPC on the licenced site, and MPC monitoring and commissioning. This regulatory oversight is to confirm operations are adequately controlled and operational personnel are suitably qualified and experienced to carry out identified tasks. To date ONR has not identified any safety issues from its assessment of NGL's dry fuel store safety case or its activities in implementing this safety case.

How will ONR ensure that these facts are communicated to any team researching Geological Disposal facilities? Who will carry out the essential research into long term safe storage of this material?

### **Response**

Government Policy is to dispose of high activity waste in a geological disposal facility. Construction is expected to start in the next 15 to 20 years, following identification of a host community and suitable location. Until final disposal, responsibility for the safety and security of radioactive waste and spent fuel remains the responsibility of the dutyholder, including any research that is required. The developer for the GDF is Radioactive Waste Management (RWM), they are fully aware of the dry fuel store pending ultimate disposal in a GDF and have routine dialogue with EDF.