

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)  
HELD AT ALDEBURGH COMMUNITY AND SPORTS CENTRE,  
VICTORIA ROAD, ALDEBURGH IP15 5HY  
ON THURSDAY 8<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2016 AT 10:00**

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Cllr M Fellowes	- Aldeburgh Town Council	<i>SSG Chairman</i>
Mr P Wilkinson	- Co-opted Member	<i>SSG Vice Chairman</i>
Dr C Barnes	- Suffolk Coastal District Council	
Ms M Barnes	- Public Relations Officer Sizewell B	
Mr C Betson	- East Suffolk Business Association Network	
Mrs S Betson	- Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Mr T Branton	- Co-opted Member	
Mr K Caton	- Sizewell B Technical and Safety Manager	
Mr R Cook	- Office for Nuclear Regulation Sizewell A Inspector	
Mr P Fahey	- Environment Agency Sizewell A Inspector	
Ms J Fendley	- Suffolk Friends of the Earth	
Mr S Fox	- SSG Secretariat	
Mr B Hamilton	- NDA	
Ms P Hogan	- Sizewell Residents Association	
Mr A Holt	- Office for Nuclear Regulation	
Cllr B Howard	- Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Mr P Montague	- Sizewell A Closure Director	
Mr G Moorcroft	- Office for Nuclear Regulation Sizewell B Inspector	
Mr S Parr	- Environment Agency Sizewell B Inspector	
Cllr R Rainger	- Snape Parish Council	
Ms N Rousseau	- Public Relations Officer Sizewell B	
Ms V Thomas	- Environment Agency	
<b>Mr C Tucker</b>	<b>- Sizewell B Staff Representative</b>	

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Ms J Girling  
Mr R M<sup>ac</sup>Gibbon  
Dr J Tait  
Mr M Taylor

## CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS

3291 Chair welcomed all attendees, provided domestic arrangements and asked all speakers to use the microphones and to introduce themselves.

### I PUBLIC FORUM

3292 Ms Girling wanted to raise several questions to ask as and when they come up in the agenda. If they link to particular reports, Chair was happy to take questions throughout the agenda. Chair reminded members and members of the public that questions can be raised at the end of each report.

3293 Ms Janet Fendley, Friends of the Earth (FoE) representative wanted to know what ILW was. Mr Montague confirmed that this was Intermediate Level Waste.

3294 Mr R M<sup>ac</sup>Gibbon from the Westleton Parish Liaison Group and an active member on the Community Speed Watch Group raised the issue of commuter traffic through all the villages in the area. Mr M<sup>ac</sup>Gibbon believes it is particularly relevant on the B1125 which passes through the villages of Blythburgh, Westleton and Middleton. These areas have serious pinch points and really serious corners and sharp bends. With the looming of SZC, Mr M<sup>ac</sup>Gibbon believes it will become an even bigger problem. He went on to give some statistics obtained within the last year with around 56,000 cars recorded going over 35 mph and approximately 700 vehicles travelling over 50mph. Mr M<sup>ac</sup>Gibbon accepts that some vehicles are not destined for Sizewell but there are recorded peaks at times when Sizewell staff are expected to be travelling to and from their workplace with the biggest times starting at around 5am and again between 4pm and 5pm. Mr M<sup>ac</sup>Gibbon understands that Sizewell C plan to bring in a vehicle validation system of some kind and wondered whether this can be introduced now.

3295 Chair summarised the concerns about the volume of traffic at peak times mainly between 4pm and 5pm and speeding in general on the village roads. Chair advised that it would be difficult to say if all the traffic is going to one place or another as consideration should be given to the Greater Gabbard company and other industries in the area where workforce may be travelling to, but the concern is a valid one. Chair noted that Cllr Helen Williams (Westleton Parish Council representative) and Cllr Nigel Smith (Theberton representative) were not present at the meeting but wondered whether it would be acceptable to write to the Parish Council from this meeting to see if there is something they could do. Chair suggested that perhaps a working party could be set up to look at and put submissions through to the Highways department at the County Council and EdF and other main users of the road to see if the problem can be tracked and whether any solutions can be sought in the interim and to the potential traffic increase in the longer term.

3296 Chair looked to EdF to confirm the main shift times at Sizewell B and find out roughly the volume of staff coming to and going from site is. Mr K Caton, Sizewell B advised that the shift start times vary according to their duties, for example, Security Staff are given different times to Operations and the day based staff. There are approximately 60% of day based staff and their start times are 08:30am with finishing times at 4.30pm.

3297 Mr M<sup>ac</sup>Gibbon said that there was already a Parish Liaison group and wondered why another group should be set up. Chair advised that the group was set up with a remit to engage in activities to mitigate any issues regarding potential new build. The SSG was set up to act as a conduit of information between the stations, the regulators and the public regarding problems or issues from the generating sites. This has been raised as a problem from a generating site. Chair suggests that three or four people from different organisations should meet and talk about this issue to see what the problem might be. The SSG can write in the first instance to the Parish and Town Councils and copy in Suffolk County Council Highways to advise that this issue has been raised.

3298 Mr Trevor Branton, co-opted member, wanted to know what the traffic arrangements will be once the Sizewell C construction starts. Based on his experience of working on Sizewell A during the construction of Sizewell B, Mr Branton advised that there were times of serious traffic congestion that occurred on the approach road with traffic often backing up into

Leiston and also beyond the Lover's Lane entrance on the Theberton Road. Of particular concern was the delay in emergency services should they have been required at site during times of slow movement of traffic. Mr Branton wanted to know what EdF are proposing to ensure there would not be a repeat of the kind of congestion seen during those years. Chair clarified that the group was set up to discuss issues from the operating stations sites, Sizewell A and Sizewell B. However, Chair believes Mr Branton's question is valid because any additional build coming to the area will impact on staff coming to sites. In the past EdF has not been willing to tackle questions relating to Sizewell C or send a Sizewell C representative to this forum.

- 3299 Chair suggested members attend the Sizewell C exhibitions and engage in the Stage 2 consultation which is currently open. The traffic management question could be asked as part of a personal submission or as an organisation. Chair wanted to know how EdF would look after their own workforce during that time. Ms N Rousseau advised that the question was pointed towards Sizewell C and agreed to the suggestion of engaging with the Sizewell C consultation and the exhibitions currently going on at the moment.
- 3300 Chair wondered whether Sizewell B is going to actively engage in the consultation process to ensure their workforce were not delayed. Chair went on to say that although Sizewell B is the same company, it will still be a separate entity in terms of making representations as part of the consultation process. Chair would also like Mr A Osman as Head of Emergency Planning at Suffolk County Council to comment on traffic management and emergency planning.
- 3301 Dr Carolyn Barnes advised that on Tuesday they had the town parish Sizewell C consultation event. The problem with emergency planning was commented on by lots of people talking to the emergency services at the event and the group will be responding to the consultation as well, adding 'the more voices, the better'. Notes from the consultation and the responses from the County Council and the District Council will be on the Sizewell C website.
- 3302 Chair wanted to know if all responses would be shared in the Stage 2 consultation. Dr Barnes advised that the County Council has asked the Parish Council to share their responses.
- 3303 As a point of information that may help villages and problems with speeding motorists, Ms Girling mentioned that when Sizewell B was being built, the various parish councillors organised a county highways debate. During this period, a lot of roads were restricted to 30mph and the area had a lot of traffic assessments planned through the county council. Ms Girling went on to say that traffic management and speeding is a county council problem and not entirely an EdF issue. All villages are suffering from speeding traffic and Ms Girling believes that a strong worded letter from this group to the county council asking them to look at the wider area on how traffic is managed in the east Suffolk area from Peasenhall to Leiston. Yoxford is inundated with traffic from the A1120 and the county council should be carrying out traffic surveys. Ms Girling advised that it was not all EdF workers, there are a lot of delivery vehicles and it is not Sizewell C that is the issue, it is the traffic at this moment. **Chair noted that members were broadly in agreement that a letter is sent to the county councils highways department and the parish councils of the areas mentioned will be copied in.**
- 3304 Mr M Taylor informed the group that at the last Leiston Town Council meeting it was resolved to ask EdF if they would support some extra work on speeding particularly in the Lover's Lane area. The county councillor advised at the meeting that there was no money that could be spent on speed limit signs. It is clearly a matter that members are concerned about and the town clerk will be writing to EdF to see if they would support that.
- 3305 Mr P Wilkinson believes that if Sizewell C is built, a lot of people will be inconvenienced and not just the ones on the access roads to site. As far as the emergency planning is concerned, it is important to recognise the plans that exist are un-implementable and the fact that there will be three to four thousand extra workers on site in any emergency situation just makes it unconscionable and would not be able to be put into practice. The

extra people on site are going to make an already difficult plan even more difficult and it makes an un-implementable plan more impossible.

- 3306 Dr J Tait, retired general practitioner, wanted to know who holds the stock of iodide tablets in sufficient numbers to cover the whole of the population. Chair advised that the issue of the potassium iodide tablets changed with the last review to the emergency planning zone and the number of people that were included in the area that was felt necessary to keep a stock of tablets was reduced down. Chair noted that Mr A Osman was not present today but did ask if there were other officers present to confirm the situation currently. Chair went on to say that Public Health England (PHE) confirm that they do not feel it necessary for the public to routinely be given these as they would not be asked to evacuate and be exposed – rather they would be asked to shelter and remain. Dr Tait continued to say that she lives very close to the plant and used to be issued with the tablets but was recently advised in a letter to return them back to the chemist.
- 3307 Mr Graham Moorcroft, Sizewell B Inspector for the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) confirmed the Chair's understanding that there was a termination of the old emergency planning for Sizewell B and a new Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) was issued and revised. Part of that plan was to revise the area in which the potassium iodide tablets were distributed to the members of the public. Chair asked Mr Moorcroft to explain to Dr Tait what would happen in the event of a nuclear emergency. Mr Moorcroft advised that there is a notification system that would be activated which leads to a cascade call-out to the emergency services and various communication means. There was a distribution of leaflets to describe the effects of potassium iodide tablets and the means for taking them and is in the local authority's emergency plan.
- 3308 Chair confirmed that every year a calendar is sent out to a certain area and radius to those who are within the distance of the inner emergency planning zone and that provides information on what to do in the event of an emergency. That will be issued again this year. Last year the SSG contributed to the process and made suggestions on information included in the leaflet. There is another emergency planning committee meeting and Chair is hopeful that a representative from the group will be able to attend and the issue can be raised again. Chair advised that Dr Tait's comment and answer will be noted. Dr Tait was concerned that in an emergency there will be a general panic and everyone would want to get their iodide tablets. **Dr Tait suggests that stocks should be held in every town, preferably in a pharmacy, so the public can get them easily and quickly. Chair will take the question to Mr Osman and PHE to clarify the current rationale behind that.**
- 3309 Ms P Hogan, Sizewell resident, confirmed that she is still in receipt of the tablets. The zone was very much reduced and Ms Hogan recalls that there were two reasons for this: one being that the emergency planning services didn't think there would ever be an emergency and the other reason being that the public do not think the tablets would be effective. There are still houses in the area that receive in date tablets.
- 3310 Mr Wilkinson explained that the potassium iodide tablets would only stop radioactive iodine which is important to do, but there are another 199 radionuclides that will be released for which there is no protection for, particularly if they are inhaled. Mr Wilkinson is confident that the emergency planning will not work; citing Dr Tait's theory of complete panic. If the tablets are available at chemists, Mr Wilkinson believes there will be queues back to Sizewell and the whole situation is untenable.
- 3311 Mr Wilkinson went on to say that, sometime ago, the SSG did discuss the possibility of driving their own emergency plan information pamphlet which would go out to the community to bring some reality to the situation rather than the 'dream-world' that is publicised by the industry. To this end, Mr Wilkinson would like to revive that idea and would like authority from the SSG to write that document and bring it back to the SSG for discussion and debate – this would probably be a Sub-Group meeting. Chair put it to the members to see if they wanted to contribute to an SSG leaflet. Chair believes it may be too late to contribute to the document going out in January and added that the group has looked in the past at sending out a newsletter to local residents promoting the work of the SSG and talking about various issues, and wondered if a piece on emergency planning can

be added to that. Mr Wilkinson reiterated that he would like a document and a separate mail-out that tells people what to do. Chair advised that the role of the SSG is to provide information but obviously that had to be proportionate to the work that the SSG does and asked Mr Hamilton from the NDA to comment.

- 3312 Mr B Hamilton, NDA, thinks the Chair's suggestion of a newsletter and information on emergency planning within that newsletter is absolutely fine, but just wanted to add that whilst he welcomes this debate, there will be absolutely no funds coming from the NDA to pay for any independent safety information. Mr Hamilton went on to say that the SSG can do this independently, but the NDA will not pay for it because they are part of the government agencies that are involved in Nuclear and support government advice and specialist agencies that provide that advice. Mr Hamilton was very happy for a debate to take place and that debate to be reflected in a newsletter which they would be happy to fund as long as the costs were proportionate, but it is not the role of the SSG to have its own safety plan to be circulated to thousands of individuals and families around the community.
- 3313 Chair clarified that the SSG were not going to set up their own plan, but were going to explain some of the language used in the emergency plan leaflet which they felt was difficult and confusing to the public. The SSG suggested some changes but not all were incorporated and it was felt that if some of the SSG's changes were not included, then perhaps what the group had to say was valid. Chair noted that their draft did point the public to the relevant agencies and their websites so they were able to obtain further information and felt the group was still working in the same direction as the statutory agencies. Chair went on to say that the SSG were trying to be what they were set up for, which is a conduit of information to make it more helpful and realistic to the public. Chair accepted Mr Hamilton's point but was disappointed that the NDA support the government agencies. Members want the NDA to be independent in terms of assisting the group if there are concerns that may need addressing. Chair wondered where the SSG seeks advice if they want to challenge government policy?
- 3314 Chair went on to question the point Mr Hamilton made about not spending NDA money to fund additional information and advised that it is actually public money and the NDA are a servant of the public as every organisation attending the SSG is. If the public overwhelmingly wanted the SSG to put out a leaflet and the Chair represented that view to a government body that the public want this information – then she would hope there would be a compromise where relevant information could be included along with the minutes or a newsletter to help the public. Chair asked the group to think about it and discuss it a bit more and not react to the request at this time.
- 3315 Mr Wilkinson said that the group should not be afraid of being controversial. He went on to say that the industry has a plan which will not work and threatens the lives of thousands of people around the community and it is not called 'controversial'. The group is trying to put forward something about the way people live in the shadow of a nuclear power station and the possibility of a third one coming along and how they look after themselves and their families in the event of an accident. Mr Wilkinson echoed Chair and clarified that it is not a different emergency plan, but it is giving the public information which he feels the industry does not want them to know about. Mr Wilkinson advised that most of the work he has carried out over the years for the NDA and the industry has been carried out for free and he does not expect to get paid. He urged the NDA to let him write the document, get it through the Chair and see if it is acceptable. If the NDA do not feel that it is acceptable, then Mr Wilkinson suggested that the group publish it themselves without the financial support of the NDA.
- 3316 Chair interjected and advised that any draft of a document the group produce would be run by Mr Andy Osman, the joint emergency planning unit, the ONR, the EA and other regulators and site licence holders to ensure anything the group said was not confusing the public or giving them the wrong information as that would be dangerous too. Chair clarified that the group would not issue anything that was not approved or checked by other relevant agencies and regulators.

3317 Mr R Cook, the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) Sizewell A Inspector, taken over from Mr A Jakeways, was a little concerned about the issue of iodide tablets as they are designed to limit the dose internally. Mr Cook went on to say that if there is a significant event where there is a release offsite, the products should be taken and distributed around. At that point the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001 (REPPiR) plan comes into force and an offsite emergency response is coordinated involving the police, ambulance and emergency services. The public in the area who are affected by a release would probably be advised to take shelter. There are plans in place to give plenty of radio broadcasts and information on what to do. Mr Cook explained that there had been a great deal of thought put into an emergency response plan and that response plan will kick into effect if it needs to and the public will be provided with advice which they will need to follow. Mr Cook advised the group that inventing a plan is probably not such a good idea. Chair interrupted that it was not a SSG plan but thanked Mr Cook for clarifying and briefly summarised: there will be a REPPiR plan that would take effect and the public would be told what to do, advice would be given, tablets would be issued and if they need to be taken, the tablets would be brought to the public who would be advised to shelter.

3318 Ms Girling understands that the emergency strategy is a rolling plan and there are going to be several meetings next year to discuss it. Ms Girling suggests that the group talk about it at the next meeting as she feels that it is something that needs to be looked at very carefully. Ms Girling went on to say that she fully understands the concern about potassium iodide tablets and the public may be confused in what they should do. Ms Girling informed the group that she lives on the basis that there is no emergency plan and she will look after her own family and has her own plan of action. She suggests that most people should do the same as it is not just nuclear emergencies that might affect the community. Ms Girling understands that all parish councils should have an emergency planning officer which is usually the clerk or the chairperson and asked the various representatives from the parish and town councils to take part in the emergency planning debate at their local meetings. Chair used this opportunity to remind town and parish councils to look at their emergency plans to see if they align with the REPPiR guidance or they make reference to where the public can get information from a joint emergency planning unit for example. From experience, Chair advised that when there was a flood emergency at Aldeburgh, it was difficult for the town clerk to get in touch with somebody at the joint emergency planning unit to get advice. So this should act as a timely reminder for town or parish council representatives to take the opportunity to look at their own emergency plans and see how that feeds in to the current strategies and what information is provided to people. **Chair took on board Ms Girling suggestion to take part in any emergency planning meetings coming up in the New Year and take the opportunity to feed information back to Mr A Osman and request he attends the next meeting to address the issues that have been raised today.**

## **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3319 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr D Bailey, Ms L Baker, Mr M Cubitt, Cllr G Holdcroft, Mr T Griffith-Jones, Mr P Morton, Mr A Osman, Cllr M Whitby

3320 Additional declarations of interest were sought but none were forthcoming.

## **3 SIZEWELL B REPORTS**

### **3a. Mr Kevin Caton, Technical, Safety and Support Manager for Sizewell B**

3321 Mr Caton, technical safety and support manager from Sizewell B updated the group that covered the following points in the last three months:

- Safety performance and staffing:
  - 2207 days since the last Nuclear Reportable Event (over 6 years);
  - 639 days since the last EdF Energy Lost Time Incident (LTI) (over 1.5 years);
  - 751 days since the last contract LTI (over 2 years);

- 745 days since the last Environmental Reportable Event (over 2 years);
- 528 EdF Energy staff including 18 Apprentices;
- 250 year round contracting partners.
- Dry Fuel Store (DFS) Update:
  - Work has been progressing well with the completion of the Dry Fuel Store project;
  - Safety case was submitted to the ONR in October, once accepted, a Licence Instrument (LI) will be issued permitting the movement of nuclear fuel into Dry Storage;
  - Safety case includes substantiation for operation, new buildings and associated services, implementation of supporting modifications, inactive and active commissioning;
  - Other work: Upgrading of the Pond Fuel Handling Machine was completed and successfully tested in November;
  - Focus: final preparations and mobilisation of plant and personnel for the first campaign, movement of nuclear fuel, in 2017.
- Relocated Facilities at Sizewell B:
  - Environmental scoping report submitted to Suffolk Coastal District Council – proposals to relocate some non-nuclear buildings at Sizewell B;
  - After consulting with key bodies, the local authority will provide an opinion to Sizewell B on what information should be included in developing the proposals and assessments;
  - Facilities include a new Visitor Centre, replacement offices, storage, workshops, welfare, training and parking facilities; the new facilities would be established before the existing buildings are removed;
  - Sizewell B will consult with the local community on the proposals and carry out further technical and environmental assessment before submitting a planning application to the local authority next year.
  - **Chair requested a plan for the group in more detail**
- New Charity Partnership Launched:
  - Breast Cancer Now and EdF Energy has launched a three year partnership;
  - The charity was chosen in an employee vote, with thousands of employees across the company taking part;
  - Sizewell B launched the charity on the station in October raising £1,300 (companywide EdF has raised approximately £20,000).
- Education and skills:
  - In the local area, EdF has been supporting two significant events:
  - The Pretty Curious event which is a national initiative to encourage young females into employment in science and technology – this event took place in Trinity Park in Ipswich;
  - The LabLive event took place in the Woodbridge area encouraging young people to move into careers in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM).
- Sizewell B and Galloper Wind Farm Limited community fund:

Projects Awarded to date totalling £49,650. This is an ongoing project for the foreseeable future

The Leiston and Sizewell Community Fund has awarded the following grants **since the last report**:

- Sizewell Sports and Social Club – Children’s play area - £5,000
- Wardens Hall Access Road Repairs - £5,000
- Leiston and District Community Partnership – Late Night Shopping event - £750
- Saxmundham Music Festival - £2,500
- Benhall Pre-school Playgroup – toys/outside canopy - £700
- Elizabeth Garrett Anderson – promenade show - £2,000
- Supporting Activities for Everyone (SAFE) – drop in café - £5,000

- 3322 Mr T Branton, co-opted member, wanted to know if the 250 contractors employed were full time equivalents. Mr Caton confirmed that there are 250 fulltime contractors with year round jobs.
- 3323 Mr Branton wanted to know if the brown area on the relocation map was the Coronation Wood and asked if it is going to be taken down, has the appropriate environmental assessments of the land been carried out? Mr Caton confirmed that this was the case and the document to the council was an environmental impact assessment and is the first stage of consultation. Mr Caton went on to say that it will go to formal public consultation in 2017.
- 3324 On questioning from the Chair, Ms Rousseau confirmed that the town council has been engaged at this stage.
- 3325 Ms S Betson, Leiston Town Council, advised that they have this application for the changes to the Sizewell B buildings. Ms Betson confirmed that they cannot object to the environmental impact assessment but has grave concerns over the proposals over Coronation Wood and the impact on that area. Ms Betson suspects that when the application is submitted as a formal planning request, the council will not be going ahead with that and they will be requiring more information and consultation before then and possibly considerable changes.
- 3326 Ms P Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association, has had a brief look at the environmental scoping and is worried about quite a few areas – not only Coronation Wood but particularly the Pillbox Field development. Ms Hogan was very pleased however, that the Sizewell Residents have been offered an opportunity for a presentation before the application goes in.
- 3327 Cllr B Howard, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council, had only learnt about the scope of the work about a week ago but it was put out for consultation on 17<sup>th</sup> October. Cllr Howard was concerned as the Suffolk Coastal District website advises that the consultation has closed. Cllr Howard requested a hard copy of the application. Chair advised that Councillors can put an appeal through their town clerk to send a request to the District Council if they feel there has been any delay and additional time was needed. It was noted that hard copies were available at the meeting for town council representatives to take.
- 3328 Ms Girling had a hard copy of the document which she had printed from the Suffolk Coastal website a couple of weeks ago. She is very disturbed that Sizewell B is perhaps being drawn into a Sizewell C application. Ms Girling is convinced that Sizewell B would not be asking to have these buildings relocated, apart from the Visitors Centre, if it wasn't leaving the land for Sizewell C. When she read through the document she was also very concerned about the amount of traffic movements and waste that it will create. The planning application will come in next year and Ms Girling hopes that everyone will take the time to read through these documents because it will have an enormous impact on the roads and everywhere else round the area. Ms Girling was especially worried at the proposal of a carpark for 576 vehicles and believes that the traffic implications of that are quite horrendous. The document also states that it is a 4½ year project and although not a planning application, the public need to make themselves aware of it. Ms Girling went on to say that she was surprised at Sizewell B because they have been very good in the past at

notifying the public about such documentation and working in cooperation with them. Ms Girling thanked Suffolk Coastal for making sure environmental bodies such as English Nature appeared on their website. Ms Girling's main concern is that local people know what is going on in what she sees as EdF taking over an enormous part of East Suffolk that will impact vastly on tourism. This scoping report document is equally as important as the Sizewell C consultation document, and yet local people have not known about it and so Ms Girling requested that EdF make sure they set up an exhibition area in Leiston so that the public can see what is planned for the area. Ms Girling is bothered that EdF are not listening as Leiston Town Council would prefer a Visitors Centre in the town rather than destroy Coronation Wood and other land. Ms Girling stated that Leiston-cum-Sizewell is a parish in its own right that stretches as far as Eastbridge and is not a subsidiary of EdF.

- 3329 Chair noted that these are concerns and questions about the operation of the B site and the changes that the B site are proposing to make to their site. The reason they are proposing to relocate buildings is outside the SSG's remit but the fact that they will have a planning application in next year to carry out this work will impact on the group and therefore Chair agrees that more information needs to be raised at this stage.
- 3330 Ms Rousseau advised that Sizewell B will be consulting with the public next year that includes visits to Sizewell and Leiston residents. There will be exhibition boards and visuals displayed of what the area would look like. There will be talks on traffic movement, working hours, light and noise pollution which will be covered at the public consultation. Chair wanted to know why this is being carried out in two stages and not including the public now. Ms Rousseau advised that it is an environmental impact assessment which is part of the planning process that includes statutory consulting and governing bodies first and then it will go to public consultation. Chair believes that those government bodies' opinions should be informed by public questions and the public has not been aware of it to give a view. If the environmental assessment is approved at this stage by the statutory agencies, it weakens the ability for the public to influence the next stage.
- 3331 Dr Tait wondered whether the environment impact assessment had been published. Ms Rousseau advised that it is in the public register on the Suffolk Coastal website. Mr S Parr advised that this is a scoping document that informs an environmental assessment which will develop an environmental statement which will go in support of the planning application, so the environmental assessment has not yet been done – the scoping document is a precursor to the planning application in the development of the environmental statement which will be based on the environmental impact assessment. **Chair would like an email outlining the timeline and the differences between the two documents and the two stages and what the result is (either by the District Council or EdF) so the public can understand where this feeds into and the difference between a scoping document and the actual environmental assessment.**
- 3332 Cllr B Howard asked why this document is not part of the Sizewell C consultation. Mr Caton advised that it is about the feasibility of the land to the north for development. Chair informed Mr Caton that the document states the work will enable potential new build and wanted to know the rationale behind it and why money was being spent on relocating now when there may be no need to do it if a new build does not happen. Mr Caton felt that this was beyond the remit of the group. Chair went on to say that as Sizewell B is the operator in this area, why were they planning to destroy a woodland and footpath that is very much part of the local area, that locals would be very upset to see potentially demolished. Chair pointed out that the woodland could not be reclaimed once it is gone. Mr Caton did not want to comment on the woodland but the amenity of site, north of Sizewell B for new build, will be improved by relocating the facilities that are currently there. Chair summarised that it would be easier for Sizewell B if they moved things now.
- 3333 Mr Wilkinson was concerned that the woodland would be sacrificed on a whim that it may be needed. Chair wanted to know that as part of the request to relocate buildings on the Sizewell B site that necessitates the destruction of a wooded area that is used and valued by the public, does the plan include creating an area of woodland equally valued that the public would contribute to ideas as to where that might be located and what facilities might

be included? Mr Caton advised that this was part of the consultation process and if it is a recommendation to do that then that would be considered.

- 3334 Mr M Taylor wanted to know about Sizewell A's plans to go into Care & Maintenance because that would clearly have an impact on traffic issues, coastal process and environmental issues and if this is combined with the work on Sizewell B, it needs to be part of the environmental scoping opinion. Mr Montague advised that they meet regularly with Sizewell B and C sites and were aware of the development. It has a small effect on some redundant reservoirs on a piece of land that Sizewell A lease and they are currently in discussions about how that affects the Sizewell A site, but currently none of the potential activities would affect Sizewell A and the Sizewell A site plan would not affect Sizewell B site plans. Mr Montague went on to example the Hinkley C development when the planning was permissioned and there were restrictions made on the total number of vehicles accessing the roads leading to each site and it might be expected to happen here. Mr Montague reiterated that the decommissioning of Sizewell A site would not be affected by potential Sizewell B works.
- 3335 Dr Tait wanted to know what will happen with the footpaths that access the beach to the north and south that are used frequently and wondered where the footpaths are going. Mr Caton believes that there will be diversions on the footpaths. Dr Tait described the area and could not understand where the footpaths would go. Chair advised Dr Tait, that as part of the consultation response she could let her town council know that should be raised as a legitimate question about where footpaths are going to be diverted to. Ms Rousseau said that when Sizewell B go into consultation next year she will ask that the footpaths form part of the communications and exhibition materials so it can be looked at and explained.
- 3336 Mr M Taylor wanted to know if Sizewell B is able to confirm absolutely that there is no issue with the French and Japanese components in any of its plant. Mr Caton advised that this will be covered in the ONR presentation and report but EdF and ONR has visited the forging works in France and ONR has been in contact with EdF requesting additional information.
- 3337 Ms Girling would like a full report at the next meeting about the possible planning application and would like an ongoing item on the SSG agenda as the next meeting will not be until March 2017. Mr Caton advised that it will be provided and there will be information on the website as it is clearly a topic of great interest to everybody.

**3b. Mr Graham Moorcroft, Site Inspector, Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR)**

- 3338 Mr Moorcroft delivered the report for Quarter 3 (1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> September) and updated the group on the following:

It has been a period of safe operation and no incidents of any significance that have been reported that required ONR follow-up.

Mr Moorcroft has carried out a number of compliance inspections during this period which are conditions attached to the nuclear site licence and are checked and reviewed periodically to ensure the arrangements are adequate and are being implemented. One of these inspections was to do with the Level One emergency arrangements and one to support the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) active commissioning.

Mr Moorcroft also undertakes system based inspections and over a five year period the ONR intend to review all the important systems structures and components that support the safe operation of the plant. The ONR use specialist resources to support these inspections and during this period they inspected the secondary containment enclosure building that was reviewed by their own civil engineering specialist. All inspections were found to be satisfactory and did not raise any issues or significant safety concerns.

Further details of the report can be found on the website. The ONR publish the assessment reports and intervention records on: <http://www.onr.org.uk/intervention-records>. Mr Moorcroft sought questions from the group.

3339 Mr Wilkinson referred to the bottom paragraph on page one that begins: 'In general, ONR judged the arrangements made and implemented by the site in response to safety requirements to be adequate in the areas inspected'. Mr Wilkinson wondered about the areas that were not inspected. The report goes on to say: '[...], where improvements were considered necessary, [...] satisfactory commitments to address [them were made]' – Mr Wilkinson wanted to know more details about what the areas of concern were and what is going to be done about them? Mr Moorcroft advised that there are 36 conditions that are attached to the nuclear site licence and a lot of these require arrangements to be made by the licensee to implement the right processes and resources to enable the safe operation of the plant. The ONR has guidance to support the inspections of these well-established arrangements. The ONR inspect the arrangements to see how they are implemented and the ONR judge the adequacy of those through the 'red', 'amber', 'green' rating system and if minor shortfalls have been identified or issues in the arrangements, the ONR might require the licensee to address them and improve them via their own processes and the ONR might give that a rating of 'green'. If there are any more significant shortfalls, the ONR will rate them 'amber' and the licensee may be required to make improvements. The issues are tracked through the ONR processes and that goes through a full governance structure. Mr Moorcroft advised Mr Wilkinson that all the reports are published on the website. Chair wanted to know if there were any 'red' or 'amber' ratings currently. Mr Moorcroft confirmed that there were none.

3340 Mr Moorcroft introduced his colleague, Mr Andrew Holt who presented the following update on the Creusot Forge Anomalies:

Mr Holt explained the developments since June 2016 and updated the position with regards to the main forge which is used for the Reactor Pressure Vessels (RPV) on site.

- Creusot Forge France:

- Long established manufacturer of heavy steel forgings
- Plant located in the town of Le Creusot central-eastern France
- Currently owned by the AREVA group but previously part of Creusot-Loire Industries
- Identified concerns pre 2016 Sizewell B reactor outage 14:
  - o Flamanville 3 Reactor Pressure Vessel domes (early 2015)
  - o Historical production monitoring anomalies (April 2016)
- Post 2016 Sizewell B outage developments

- Forgings supplied by Creusot Forge for the Sizewell B project:

- Reactor Pressure Vessel (6 main forgings plus 8 smaller forgings)
  - o Lower Dome
  - o Transition Ring
  - o Nozzle Shell Course (plus 8 inlet/outlet nozzles)
  - o Vessel Main Flange
  - o Closure Head Flange
  - o Head Dome
- Steam Generators (2 forgings per vessel – 8 forgings in total)
  - o Upper Shell 1
  - o Upper Shell 2
- 22 Forgings

Mr Holt displayed and explained the Reactor Pressure Vessel and Steam Generator Forgings diagram to the group.

## **Ms Girling requested a copy of the presentation**

- Flamanville 3 Domes – Sizewell Response:
  - Early 2015 – Flamanville 3 reactor pressure vessel top and bottom domes manufactured at the Creusot Forge works
    - Carbon segregation, high carbon levels – reduced mechanical properties
    - Conventionally cast ingots insufficiently large
  - March 2015 – ONR seeks assurance from EdF Energy NGL regarding implications for Sizewell B
    - Different manufacturing process for Sizewell B – directional solidification cast ingots (LSD) – carbon segregation well controlled
    - Reports received and accepted
  - Technical problem with the manufacturing process for the ingots which does not apply to Sizewell B
- Historical Production Monitoring Anomalies Sizewell Response – May 2016:
  - April 2016 – Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN) and AREVA issue press releases on historical production monitoring anomalies at the Creusot Forge works
  - Quality Control/Quality Assurance problem
  - Sizewell B response – RO14 outage May 2016
    - 22 forgings supplied by the Creusot Forge works for the Sizewell B project
    - ONR seek assurance on whether Sizewell B supplied components are affected
    - ONR sample lifetime records held by EdF Energy on these forgings
    - Unrelated but extensive in-service inspection work undertaken as part of 10 year outage shows no problems
  - ONR has confidence in the quality of the forgings and allows Sizewell B to return to service
- Post Outage response – June/July 2016:
  - EdF Energy (EdFE) send team to Creusot Forge Works to review manufacturing records held there – none were identified as having an anomaly, but EdFE wanted to review records in any case
  - Two one week visits with a team of four specialists
  - ONR attended on second week to observe the EdFE audit process and sample files itself
  - EdFE audit process thorough and comprehensive – files for all Sizewell B forgings reviewed by EdFE
  - No systematic failings found in the files and they support ongoing integrity of forgings
- Creusot Forge Findings:
  - Five findings brought back for further review and consideration
  - One of the findings of interest – carbon content value test value exceeded manufacturing specification but was recorded in lifetime record as having met the specification – an ‘anomaly’ in a non-marked file
  - Carbon value does still meet ASME III (American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and pressure Vessel Section III) design code specification

- Mechanical properties not affected – strength/toughness/ductility
- Weldability not affected
- Not considered to pose a threat to the integrity of the forging
- Safety cast to be updated to reflect these findings
- Creusot Forge – ONR Conclusions:
  - EdFE Audit process thorough and comprehensive – all Sizewell B forging files reviewed by EdFE
  - No systematic failings in files and they support ongoing integrity of forgings
  - On the carbon content anomaly:
    - ONR cannot exclude the possibility that this was a false recording
    - Carbon value is still within design code specification
    - ONR does not believe that the higher carbon value poses a threat to the integrity of the forging based on good mechanical test results and weld inspection
  - ONR considers it prudent to ask for further investigation by EdF Energy also
  - EdF Energy asked to review the position on the other main forgings supplied for Sizewell B project in terms of reviewing manufacturing processes and manufacturing records
- Further experience in France:

Developments post Sizewell B 2016 outage:

  - Steam Generator Channel Heads (June 2016)
    - High carbon levels
    - Manufactured at Creusot Forge and at Japan Forging and Casting Corporation
    - Technical problem with the manufacturing process used to cast the ingots

**Sizewell B Channel Heads were manufactured at the Japan Steel Works using proven techniques**

- Further experience continued:
  - Fessenheim 2 Steam Generator Shell (July 2016)
    - High carbon levels
    - ‘Discard ratio’ too low
    - Quality Control/Quality assurance problem

Sizewell B shell forging properties checked at the top and bottom of each forging

  - ASN indicate that a review of all production monitoring files at Creusot Forge will now be required (October 2016)

All production monitoring files for forgings supplied for Sizewell B has now been reviewed

- In Conclusion:
  - ONR has taken steps to identify whether the problems identified in France affect the forgings supplied by Creusot Forge for the Sizewell B project
  - Different production methods used in some circumstances

- All Creusot Forge production files now checked for anomalies
  - o No systematic failings found
  - o One carbon value found to be higher than anticipated, but still within the design code and mechanical properties not affected
- ONR remain satisfied with the quality of the forgings supplied for Sizewell B
- ONR judge that the anomalies identified do not affect the continued safe operation of Sizewell B
- ONR will continue to monitor developments and cooperate with other international regulators including ASN
- ONR has placed documentation related to this on its website in June 2016 in support of the return to service of Sizewell B
- <http://news.onr.org.uk/2016/06/onr-permission-for-sizewell-b-return-to-service/>
- ONR will place further documentation in relation to the further developments on its website early in 2017.

3341 Chair advised that it was a very comprehensive report and the slides will be circulated to members

3342 Mr Wilkinson said that the ONR are basically relying on information from the French and French agencies to give themselves the confidence about the robustness of the parts in Sizewell B. Mr Holt did not accept that the ONR were reliant on information coming from France. Mr Wilkinson went on to say that the ONR were reviewing and monitoring the production files from France. Mr Holt advised that the ONR has been to France to look at those production files, they understand them and they have taken full account of them. Mr Wilkinson interjected that they were French files generated by the French authorities. Mr Holt said that they were not generated by the French authorities but the French company that manufactured the Sizewell B parts. Mr Wilkinson wanted to know if the ONR had total confidence that the files were absolutely accurate and had not just carried out a 'best-face' survey. Mr Holt had done the many physical checks over and above that were carried out at the time of manufacture. Mr Wilkinson went on to say that it was just a paperwork exercise. Mr Holt believed it was disingenuous to say it was a paperwork exercise and reiterated that the ONR has been out to the site and looked at the papers and reviewed them and at the moment the ONR can see no requirement to do any physical testing of the components at Sizewell B.

3343 Mr Wilkinson was worried that according to his information, ASN made a statement to the French government hearing on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2016 to say that it needs a further year to examine the records and it expects to find more anomalies and irregularities in those records and yet the ONR were happy to see Sizewell B continue and gave it authority to start up again in June/July 2016 and yet the ONR assessment is still ongoing. Mr Holt explained that there are around 10,000 files at AREVA and they identified 450 of those that could contain potential anomalies. Sizewell B files were not in the 450 and were in the 9,550 that had not been looked at. Both the ONR and EdF Energy were uncomfortable with that position and that was why the ONR and EdF Energy went out to France to look at the 22 files that were related to the forging and supply of the Sizewell B Reactor Pressure Vessels. Therefore, although the French authorities quite rightly say that it was going to take a long time to get through the remaining files relating to the French fleet, the ONR and EdF Energy has been through all the other files with respect to Sizewell B. Mr Wilkinson stated that the ONR are still allowing the plant to run despite the fact that the ONR assessment is still ongoing. Mr Holt clarified that the assessment of the position is based upon the knowledge and understanding the ONR has of both the supply of the forges, the quality assurance and quality control that was put in at that time. The ONR has asked EdF to understand further why there is a slightly elevated carbon level which Mr Holt emphasised was within the design code for that component and to think about the components supplied by other forging manufacturers to see whether or not there could be

similar problems, which is over and above the position that the ONR would otherwise have been in. Mr Wilkinson would not expect anything less of the ONR but reiterated that the assessment is still ongoing and the plant is still running. Mr Holt has sufficient confidence in the forging not to be concerned about allowing the plant to continue operating. Mr Wilkinson again said that the assessment is still ongoing and the plant is still running before the ONR has finished the assessment. Mr Holt advised that the ONR are monitoring developments.

3344 Chair pointed out that because of the ONR's level of concern and Mr Holt used the words 'uncomfortable', the decision was made to go out to France and inspect the 22 files that related to Sizewell B because they were not in the ones of potential concern. Chair wanted to document and raise the fact that the inspection of the 22 files were done after the ONR had given permission to Sizewell B to start their reactor on completion of the outage. Chair went on to mention the timeline which was: May 2016 – Sizewell B coming back on line after the outage and June/July 2016 – ONR going to France to review the files. That is the concern that although the ONR were 'uncomfortable' and concerned it was not to the extent that the site could not reopen. Members of the public might say that a more cautious approach was needed if the ONR had concerns to the level that they had to go out to look at the files themselves. Chair wondered whether it was prudent with hindsight to allow the reactor to start because something had been found in those files it would have put the plant at risk. Mr Holt explained that the reason why the ONR were content with Sizewell B to reopen was because the ONR had a very good understanding of the material properties the components had. What is not apparent here is the amount of testing that Sizewell B has undertaken on those components which exceeded the industry norm in terms of understanding the toughness of the materials. The ONR knows all those toughness values that were recorded were very good and in excess of those required by the design specification. The ONR also understands the level of inspection undertaken at Sizewell B was above the industry norm whereby they carried out redundant (more than one inspection of the same type) and diverse (using different inspection techniques) inspections. The ONR also had significant confidence in the quality assurance and quality control that was in place at the time of manufacture and the inspections undertaken on the plant through its life has not indicated any problems. Taken together it was a reasonable position for ONR to decide that Sizewell B could start up again after the outage but clearly the ONR want to be as sure as they can about absolutely everything so they took a cautious approach of wanting to see the files and understand what was in them. ONR believe they were not acting imprudently but they did clearly want to monitor the situation and understand as much as they could.

### **3c. Mr Stuart Parr and Ms Victoria Thomas, Environment Agency (EA)**

3345 Mr S Parr, Environment Agency Inspector for Sizewell B, introduced Ms Victoria Thomas as the new Environment Agency Inspector. The process for the next few months as the EdF proposals for Sizewell C mature, the EA has a big role with the planning and permitting process and Mr Parr will be part of the EA statutory response team to go through the permitting should the application be forthcoming in the future. Ms Thomas will take over more of the day to day work that Mr Parr carries out for Sizewell B and this is her first opportunity to present to the SSG.

3346 Ms Thomas introduced herself as having been with the EA for about a year now, prior to that she was an environmental advisor at the Harwell Nuclear Site. Ms Thomas was involved with radiological discharges and also conventional environmental elements like energy reduction and biodiversity. Ms Thomas has been shadowing Mr Parr and has produced the EA report covering both Sizewell A and B sites.

3347 Since the last SSG the EA has undertaken one inspection on waste characterisation which is how a site look at their waste and how they decide how it would be disposed of. The EA found no non-compliances and they did find some examples of good practice.

3348 Ms Thomas advised that the annual Radioactivity in Food and the Environment 2015 has been published and can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/radioactivity-in-food-and-the-environment-2015-rife-21>

The report explains the EA and Food Standard Agency (FSA) monitoring programme taken around various nuclear sites not just Sizewell.

3349 Ms Thomas presented the monitoring results for Quarter 2 (March-May 2016):

**Chair advised that the presentation will be circulated out to members:**

- What do we require?:
  - Define, document and carry out an environmental monitoring programme
    - Reported quarterly to EA (publically available)
    - Three months retrospectively
  - Sizewell B manages programme for both sites
  - Separate to monitoring done by the EA and Food Standards Agency
- Why do we ask?:
  - Monitor environmental effects of permitted discharges
    - What, when & how
  - Objectives & Principles
  - Source-Pathway-Receptor model
- Sizewell Programme (Operator):
  - The current programme has a wide range of monitoring and sampling locations:
    - 13 radiation monitoring locations in the local area
    - 10 passive shade monitoring locations (changed monthly)
    - 3 different milk samples
    - Sampling of up to 10 species of fish, molluscs and crustacean during the year
    - 13 coastal locations for radiation monitoring
    - Biannual radiation monitoring of the strandline close to the power stations
    - Radiation monitoring of local fishing equipment
    - 5 locations where grass and soil samples are taken
    - 5 locations where sand/sediment samples are taken
- Q2 Results (April-June 2016):
  - Sizewell A perimeter fence dose rates
    - 13 fixed dosimeters
    - No unusual results
    - Annual average results  $\leq 0.25$  mSv
  - Off-site dose rates
    - 13 fixed dosimeters
    - 2 arcs around site at 1km and 6km
    - No unusual results
    - Annual average results  $\leq 0.25$  mSv
  - Beach/estuary dose rate monitoring

- 11 locations monitored quarterly
- 2 locations monitored annually
- No unusual results
- Access to one sample site was not possible due to construction works
- Net dose rates all < 10 nGy per hour
- Passive shade monitoring
  - 10 shades deployed in an arc around Sizewell
  - Replaced monthly
  - 11 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
  - No positive results during the quarter
  - All results less than the limit of detection (0.1-0.3 Bq per shade)
- Milk sampling
  - 2 samples collected quarterly
  - One sample site not sampled as ceased milk production in Q1 2016
  - Another site will cease milk production at end of Q2
  - 12 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
  - No positive results during the quarter
  - All results less than the limit of detection (0.1-0.6 Bq per litre of milk)
- Grass/herbage sampling
  - 5 locations sampled quarterly
  - 11 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
  - Analysed for concentration (Bq per kg) and loading (Bq per m<sup>2</sup>)
  - No positive results during the quarter
  - All results less than the limit of detection (<0.1 to <1.1 Bq per kg or <0.1 to 0.8 Bq per m<sup>2</sup>)
- Marine sand/sediment samples
  - Samples taken quarterly from 5 locations
  - 11 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
  - Positive Cs-137 result recorded at Southwold
    - 7.7 Bq per kg
    - Not unusual, similar to last quarter
- Annual contamination monitoring of fishing equipment
  - Equipment used by local fishermen at Sizewell
  - Not carried out in Q2
- Fish, crustacean and mollusc sampling
  - Oyster, mussels, cod, bass, sole and turbot
  - Collected from local fishermen quarterly (species depends on season)

- 11 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
- No positive results
- All results within the limit of detection (0.1-1.5 Bq per kg)

3350 Dr Tait wanted to know why there was a positive Cs-137 result recorded at Southwold. Ms Thomas explained that these were still within background levels and only just slightly elevated and probably due to the natural radiation in the environment. Mr Parr interjected that the EA has always recorded a positive result of Cs-137 at Southwold. Cs-137 exists in the environment from weapons testing and reprocessing activities and the EA concepts show that Cs-137 is the feature of discharges from Sellafield which get pushed around from the top of the UK down from the North Sea and is collecting at Southwold harbour and is just a feature of the natural distribution in the environment and contamination from elsewhere. The EA do not think it is a feature of discharges from Sizewell A and B because caesium is not recorded anywhere else around the area. Mr Parr advised that it is important to remember that the levels recorded at Southwold are incredibly low that the environmental threshold is 3,000 Becquerel per kilo and at Southwold only 7.7 Bq per kg was recorded. Mr Parr clarified that caesium is only recorded at Southwold harbour and is a feature of the distribution.

3351 Chair wanted to know if Strontium-90 (Sr-90) is still being monitored at Aldeburgh. Mr P Fahey reported last time that Sizewell A were doing an investigation on Sr-90 and has got all the data together now and a full report will be available soon. Mr Fahey confirmed that the levels found were very low and the EA has no concern but they have requested extra monitoring in the area. Mr Fahey believes that the different results recorded could be the different laboratories carrying out the analysis and the equipment being more sensitive to environmental Strontium which is already in the environment.

3352 Mr Wilkinson wanted Ms Thomas to confirm that the EA recognises that even the usual results recorded could be harmful. Ms Thomas advised that the EA takes advice from Public Health England (PHE) which recognises the low dose threshold. Mr Wilkinson went on to say that when the EA advises that the recorded levels are very low or are undetectable it does not mean it is safe.

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

##### 4a. **Mr Peter Montague, Closure Director, Magnox**

3353 Mr Montague delivered the following report and presentation:

- Safety and compliance:
  - Safety and compliance has continued to be good
  - No injuries on site for 20 months
  - No personal contamination events
  - No environmental events, but did not meet our schedule for returning some equipment to service
- Sizewell radioactive discharges summary:
  - Both aqueous and gaseous discharges from Sizewell A represent a small percentage of the weekly, quarterly and annual limits set within the site's permit.
  - Gaseous discharge totals are all less than 1% of the permitted limits for both Tritium and Carbon-14. Only two aqueous discharges have been completed over the past quarter with a total volume discharged of 296.1m<sup>3</sup>. The activity of these discharges was low compared with the quarterly notification level and annual limit of Tritium, Caesium-137 and other radionuclides respectively.
- Lifetime Plan:

- The Care & Maintenance (C&M) closure date for Sizewell remains April 2027
- Magnox are currently reviewing the NDA funding profile against the LTP, this may require some changes, no decisions have been made
- Sizewell A and the South East region (including Bradwell and Dungeness) are all progressing further savings
- The Sizewell A Magnox workforce is now 180, there will be continual reduction in numbers as the site progresses the C&M preparations
- Projects Programme:
  - The Ponds Programme continues to prepare for decommissioning. Divers will be used at Dungeness first and then arrive at Sizewell A in August 2017
  - The Waste Programme is now established and is preparing for waste retrieval. A containment is required to be designed and built to safely access the Fuel Element Debris (FED) vaults
  - Mr Montague presented a diagram of the FED vaults and used a dummy fuel element to describe FED items and the FED retrieval programme
- Asset Care Projects:
  - Abseiling teams on the reactor building repaired the cladding
  - A new access point for the reactor building with state of the art personal contamination monitors is now in use
  - Several roofs have been repaired to prevent water ingress and protect internal equipment and structures and prevent asbestos lagging degrading
  - Redundant diesel stacks found to be badly corroded and have been tied into building pending ultimate removal
  - Pedestrian bridge has been reinforced following severe corrosion being identified, expect to be removed in March 2017
- Off shore structure:
  - Mr Montague presented a photograph of the off shore structure and described the plan and work to make the structure and platform safe commencing February 2017. The structure will be removed in 2024.
- Socio-economics:
  - Magnox Socio-economic scheme, managed on behalf of the NDA has an annual funding portfolio of up to £1 million across the 12 Magnox sites
  - Three levels of funding available:
    - Up to £1,000 for small projects neighbouring Magnox sites
    - Up to £10,000 capital expenditure towards a sustainable project
    - Over £10,000 to support large projects that help towards mitigating the impact of decommissioning
- Sizewell successful applications 2016-2017 (up to 1<sup>st</sup> December 2016):
  - £3,261 under Good Neighbour scheme:
    - PhotoEast £1,000 (Historical Photographic exhibition)
    - Ransomes Sports Football Club £446 (football kit)
    - Kyson School, Woodbridge £315 (wheeled outside play-kitchen and raised bed)
    - Shining Stars Nursery £1,000 (equipment)
    - Sizewell & Knodishall Youth Football Club £500 (under 11's football kit)

- £6,000 allocated to each site - £2,739 available for Sizewell area before the end of February 2017 under the Good Neighbour scheme

3354 Ms Hogan wanted to know if Sizewell A has liaised with the fishermen on the removal of the navigational aids and the off shore structure. Mr Montague is happy to talk to the fisherman but has not had any formal contact with them. Mr Montague does not think that it will affect the fisherman's access and Ms Hogan advised that they are fishing with nets around the structure and it is important that they know what is going to happen to them. Ms Hogan wanted a Sizewell A representative to attend and liaise with the Sizewell Residents Association as it is very important part of their lives. Ms Hogan said that the residents and the sites have always had good relationships built up by individuals and local companies within the community and now that has been lost. Ms Hogan would like Mr Montague to reinstate the good communication, the information on the off shore structure work, a timeline and if they are going to be offering any mitigation for fisherman. Ms Hogan feels that they are losing touch with the Sizewell A site and asked that liaison with the local residents is put back on the job list. Mr Montague said that he would be happy to liaise but he never receives an invite and does not know when the meetings are and advised Ms Hogan to get in contact with him via the secretariat or his PA with some dates for his diary.

3355 Chair advised that Cavendish Fluor Partnership were consulting on how effective their communication has been since they have taken over and the deadline for the consultation is today and members can contribute online. That is another way in which the group can alert the company that communication has changed since they took over.

3356 Mr Taylor was worried about decommissioning work increasing radiological emissions and wanted to know if the site was happy with the monitoring programme with regard to the FED waste programme. Mr Montague advised that the site's emissions were at an all-time low but some of the processes that the site undertakes will increase the emissions particularly with aqueous discharges from the Ponds which will go up for a period and then disappear altogether. The FED programme emissions will be very low as sorting will be carried out through a filtered ventilation plant and would not expect to see any increase and certainly no particulate. Gaseous monitoring is all below detectable limits and as the site does not have any chemical processes going on, there would not be any increases in that area. Liquid discharges will start at the end of next year and emissions will rise and go on for a maximum of eighteen months. During that period, Mr Montague does not think that there will be any reason to challenge any permit levels and does not feel that there would be a need for any variation in the permit limits.

**4b. Mr Rowland Cook, Site Inspector, Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR)**

3357 Mr R Cook introduced himself and has taken over from Mr A Jakeways. Mr Cook drew attention to the current status within the ONR programme. Sizewell A comes under the Sellafield Decommissioning Fuel and Waste (SDFW) programme and incorporates Sellafield, Magnox sites and Harwell and Winfrith (ex-UKAEA) sites. Mr Cook takes responsibility for the South East sites including Bradwell and Dungeness.

3358 Sizewell A is well into its decommissioning process and all the high level inventory is off the site. The site is looking at cleaning and tidying all lower level activity for preparations to go into C&M and that is reflected in the report that there were no accidents notified and one system based inspection of the Ponds during the period with no issues raised.

**4c. Mr Phil Fahey, Environment Agency (EA)**

3359 Mr P Fahey reported a quiet quarter with one inspection on waste characterisation in a similar vein to Sizewell B and there were no non-compliances but some recommendations were made.

3360 Mr Fahey informed the group that there was a slight change in the Compilation of Environment Agency Requirements Approvals and Specifications (CEARAS). The main purpose of the change was to include a schedule for records retention. At the moment, the operators are required to keep all records and the EA has been working with the operators to put in a retention schedule for certain records based on 2 years; 5 years or permanent

but all records have a caveat that they cannot be thrown away if they are still required. The operator has to make an assessment and if the purpose for which they were made is still valid, they cannot throw it away. Hopefully this will help reduce the amount of records.

#### **4d. Mr Bill Hamilton, NDA**

- 3361 Mr B Hamilton advised that the NDA along with the SLCs are undergoing a review of local engagement and how the NDA engage with the communities. Mr Hamilton had concerns about the resources that the NDA is putting into the local meetings and he will be reviewing how the NDA engage with the communities around the site. This morning's meeting had given Mr Hamilton ample evidence of the importance and the urgency of such a review. He went on to say that today the group had seen a wide range of experience in terms of engagement; some very positive and some not so and part of the NDA review would be to decide what material is presented to communities and the SSGs and how that material is presented (is it presented in an accessible format that representatives can take away and share with their organisations? Can the material be represented beyond the meeting?). Mr Hamilton said that it is also important to decide when the material is presented and look at the material left behind so that representatives of organisations within the community can use the information and feedback to the community. Mr Hamilton will be working with the groups and organisations that present at the meetings to improve it.
- 3362 Another important part is who is represented at the meetings. Mr Hamilton would like to make sure that the NDA try and get a wider community view as possible at the meetings and the Sizewell SSG does have a very wide and diverse representation and the NDA wants to make sure that continues. One aspect Mr Hamilton is concerned about is the dwindling numbers as a lot of people had already left the meeting and the group were not even at the end of the scheduled timetable. Mr Hamilton believes that lengthening the period of time to have the meeting is not the right way. What is far more important is the SSG focuses on the important elements and the SSG understands what its remit is and it concentrates and discusses things that are in its remit and not the items that are outside the remit. The NDA review will be focusing on those elements and will put forward practical proposals so that SSGs can move forward and focus on the work and the remit that they have.
- 3363 Mr Hamilton, from the NDA perspective, believes that the Site Stakeholder Groups are 'scrutiny bodies', they are there to scrutinise the activities that are going on at the sites. However, it is important to say that the SSG is not a policy making body, it does not make a policy and neither is it a campaign group. This is a scrutiny organisation and that is what it is for and it is also a representative body, representing the community and that is why it is disappointing to see a dwindling audience. The NDA review is being carried out now and will come up with some draft proposals and suggestions on how SSGs should carry on their work in the future and some of those would be around responsibilities of attendees carrying out the presentations to get them sharper and providing information in a more timely and useable fashion. The NDA will also be reviewing the agendas on what is discussed, what is not discussed, the remit of the SSG and who is represented on the SSG to ensure that there is a wider community view as possible at all the SSGs. Mr Hamilton concluded that for the future of this SSG, it has got to be a little more focused.
- 3364 Chair commented that the meeting is a challenge due to the amount of issues to be discussed for Sizewell. Unlike some other Magnox sites, Sizewell B is the only Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR) in the UK that brings additional questions and concerns and it is a challenge to cover everything within the timeframe. Chair advised that the group has looked at different ways to conduct the meetings and will continue to provide the principle of having a public forum at the beginning of the session. Chair apologised for the late start and admitted that the group can always improve and has looked at other options including starting earlier, having five meetings a year instead of four, but the group will work with Mr Hamilton and others to make the focus a bit sharper.
- 3365 Chair implemented a bullet pointed Executive Summary that goes to representatives so they can distil it to their parish and town councils. Mr Hamilton has taken that up with other SLCs who are now doing the same thing.

- 3366 Cllr Howard was concerned over the years about the openness of funding. The group does not know where the money is coming from and how it is spent. Chair knows that Sizewell B site contributes a sum of money to Magnox which they use to administer these meetings and between meetings but it is not known how much is used and what is left over. There is no transparency and Chair is unaware of any annual budget, the cost of the hall hire or the cost of time for staff so Chair cannot identify what she can spend on information booklets for example. Mr Hamilton offered his own view that the group does not have a budget and will not have a budget but is happy to discuss it and give the reasons for that.
- 3367 Cllr R Rainger was frustrated that he had to listen to an hour and forty minutes of public observations before they left and did not get the benefit of the full meeting. The group has cut short the presentations from the specialists who were here for members to listen to and to interrogate essentially through questioning and the representatives are not getting the benefits. Cllr Rainger will take back to his parish public concerns but has not had a full meeting and the public section at the beginning is a big frustration. Chair advised that she does try very hard to make sure the questions go through the Chair and everyone remains respectful. Chair believes that the Public Forum questions should be submitted in advance to shorten the section but the reports need to come out sooner.
- 3368 Mr Montague believes the Sizewell C topic will dominate the meeting and although it affects the site a little bit, that is dealt with through inter-site forums. Mr Montague respectfully requested that Sizewell A appear first on the agenda and recommends that the 'C' site issues are halted. The group should recognise that Sizewell C will start to dominate and it is not what the group is about.
- 3369 Chair believed that today's issues to Sizewell B's relocation planning application and transport was relevant and the principle of new build was not spoken about. Mr Hamilton said that this was a difficult area. Chair advised that if questions are asked about the 'C' site, the group should direct them to the consultation currently going on or to the office in Leiston or through EdF. Mr Montague requested that issues about Sizewell C should go into the SSGs terms of referencing so it is upfront and the public and members know that this is not the forum for the new build.
- 3370 Ms Betson wondered where such issues can be raised if the issue of the relocation of the buildings at Sizewell B cannot be raised during the Sizewell C consultation or at the SSG. Mr Hamilton advised that this is for EdF to answer and if they want it raised at the SSG, then it will need to be discussed with the NDA and whether there is any time available on the agenda for that. It is a thoroughly legitimate issue which has to be raised somewhere and it needs to be determined where it is and discussions need to take place. Mr Hamilton's personal view would be at the Sizewell C consultation but it is EdF's decision. If it was to be discussed at the SSG, time needs to be set aside properly and the relevant people are in attendance at the meeting to provide answers so the meeting can move forward.

## **5. Other matters from members**

- 3371 Chair advised that this additional agenda item is in place so members can raise any reports or matters of interest with the group

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

### **6a. Minutes of the last main meeting held on 9 June 2016:**

- 3372 Matters arising as follows:

- Ms Girling wanted clarification on minute refs: 3207 and 3208. Mr Montague confirmed that Sizewell FED will not be dissolved at Bradwell – our FED will be retrieved, sorted and the majority will go to a LLW repository and the High activity items that are ILW will be recovered, separated put into a storage container and then stored in the Bradwell Interim Storage Facility – it will not be dissolved. Mr Montague confirmed that dissolution is not the plan. **Mr Montague to send an email with exact wording for the response.**

- Mr Wilkinson wanted clarification that dissolution would not be happening at Sizewell or anywhere else. Mr Montague confirmed that currently dissolution is happening at Bradwell for Bradwell FED, it happened at Dungeness for Dungeness FED. It was agreed that some of the Bradwell FED was dissolved at Dungeness. The study looked at an extension of this process, but nothing has been agreed at the moment. Chair confirmed that is in line with the briefing she received when she attended the Magnox Chair's meeting in London last week where that was discussed.
- Ms Girling advised that she has received a map detailing EdF land ownership and specifically wanted to know why the old Gate/Railway House on the Leiston/Sizewell crossing is not in use. Ms Girling noted that it is owned by EdF and would like it minuted that she would like to see the building used for some specific purpose, if not for property. **Kevin Caton, Technical and Safety Support Manager at Sizewell B, has offered to take the query away and will provide a response. Ms Girling advised that this issue was raised at the last meeting but would like it followed up again.**

3373 The minutes for the SSG Meeting held on 8 September 2016 were agreed as an accurate record subject to the following amendments:

- Mr Mike Taylor wanted it noted that he attended the last meeting as a substitute for the Friends of the Earth Representative and it should read '*Minutes of the Meeting*' not '*The Annual General Meeting*'.
- Mr Phil Fahey advised that item 3218 should read: '*a remnant of a failed fuel element*' rather than '*a failed remnant element*'. Discussions took place on whether the remnant related to a 'piece' or dust of the failed fuel element. **Mr Montague will confirm the words for the minutes.**
- Mr Fahey wanted to clarify item 3221 in that the EA were going to talk to the operator to make sure levels of Sr-90 do not increase and said that they are going to keep an eye on the levels. **Mr Fahey will clarify the words for the minutes in an email.**

#### **6b. Other matters arising from minutes and action tracker or correspondence received**

3374 Chair advised that a summary of the outstanding issues to members and has asked for comments by email within two weeks

#### **7. CHAIR'S REPORT**

3375 Chair attended the Magnox Chair's meeting and also attended the Radioactive Waste Management (RWM) meeting. There will be a RWM consultation in the New Year regarding the next stages towards consulting communities around a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) and she continues to work between meetings on issues people raise including socio-economic meetings on the A site and such briefings.

#### **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

3376 Chair sought any other business issues but none were forthcoming. Chair wished everyone a good Christmas.

#### **NEXT MEETING:**

Thursday 16 March 2017, Venue TBA

Meeting closed at 13:45??