

Sizewell A and B Stakeholder Group (SSG)

Minutes of the Sub-Group meeting held at 18.30 on Monday 15th February 2016

at Leiston Community Centre

Item 1. WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE

- 1.1 Chair welcomed attendees, advising that the main objective for this sub group meeting was to consider and gather views about the draft Magnox Socio-economic Strategy Plan 2016-18 and the NDA Draft Strategy. The members would also consider updates regarding the Sizewell off-site emergency plan in readiness for the next full SSG meeting to be held on 17.03.16.
- 1.2 Members Present: Cllr Marianne Fellowes (MF) Chair; Cllr David Bailey (DB); Cllr Terry Hodgson (TH); Ms Pat Hogan (PH); Cllr Bill Howard (BH); Cllr Russ Rainger (RR); Mr Mike Taylor (MT), Mr Pete Wilkinson (HW).
- 1.3 In Attendance: Louise Franks (LF), Minutes

Item 2. DRAFT MAGNOX SOCIO-ECONOMIC PLAN 2016-18 CONSULTATION

- 2.01 Chair introduced this item explaining that historically the Sizewell community has not received substantial funding and that at a recent meeting with the Sizewell A Closure Director she had questioned why this was the situation. Chair clarified that funding was available on three levels:
 1. Up to £1,000 for small projects neighbouring Magnox sites (good neighbour funding)
 2. Over £1000 up to £10,000 capital expenditure towards a sustainable project
 3. Over £10,000 to support large projects that make a significant contribution towards mitigating the impact of decommissioning Magnox sites.
- 2.02 Chair explained that the decision to award funding to bids for up to £1000 were taken by the Closure Director, the Socio-economic Regional Coordinator and herself and that these same individuals could make recommendations to the NDA regarding bids over £1000.
- 2.03 Chair invited comments about the draft socio-economic plan and RR questioned what involvement she had with the bid process. Chair advised that currently it was assessing approved bids but that she had asked to be involved at an earlier stage to understand why bids were considered unsuitable and to assess promising bids. Chair advised that local knowledge would enable unsuccessful applicants to be advised of alternative local funding and MT supported this, reminding attendees that the District Council no longer had a Business Development officer. Chair added that aligning this funding to other locally available schemes, like those available from EDF Energy, was important.
- 2.04 PW referred to the section about stakeholder engagement (p5) commenting that this did not include the public or Non-Government Organisations (NGO's). He suggested that a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan should be inclusive and extensive. He drew attention to figure 1 (p6) which describes the timeline for stakeholder engagement and consultation commenting that 3 months was the standard period for consultation not the 6 weeks allocated. Chair advised that the consultation period had been truncated to enable the autumn Government spending review outcomes to inform the NDA Strategy which in turn informs the socio-economic plan and to have both plans in place for the next fiscal year.
- 2.05 PW drew attention to section 4.1 (p6) expressing disappointment that the strategy did not consider mitigation of factors like noise, traffic and other amenity values. Chair commented that loss of employment was also a consideration. DB sought clarification of redundancy levels in

the current Sizewell A downsizing and heard that two individuals had been invited to leave the organisation, others had volunteered. It was agreed to ask for an update at the next full SSG meeting. BH questioned how skills were being retained within Magnox and Chair explained the principle of programmisation deployed within Magnox.

- 2.06 Chair questioned whether the SSG should be working with local councils to establish a socio-economic development plan for the area and noted that both Bradwell and Dungeness site stakeholder groups had large projects funded from the Magnox socio-economic scheme to support economic regeneration for their local areas in conjunction with their respective local councils. Chair took an action to consider this matter further and to liaise with local councils to encourage a similar plan to be established for this area. Chair questioned whether Magnox offered any skills support to assist this process and RR advised that this had been a part of the previous Magnox socio-economic plan. Later Chair said that the timeframe for any regeneration scheme was determined by the entry date to Care and Maintenance (C&M) when there would be zero employment at Sizewell A, commenting that this was only 11 years away.
- 2.07 MT observed that a local socio-economic development plan could support training and development of locally needed skills. He suggested that funding could be sourced from all the local power generating firms, not just Magnox, adding that the North Suffolk Skills Academy would be an ideal beneficiary of a local scheme to support skills training in the area. MT advised that there was support for this idea at Town Council level. Chair suggested that there was a misconception at District Council level that funding for training and skills development would be associated with new build and not decommissioning.
- 2.08 Members discussed economic regeneration and debated up-skilling local people to work in tourism and hospitality. MT commented that there was a tradition of engineering in this area and using local knowledge to train young people in this area was an important consideration.
- 2.09 Chair questioned why Sizewell was deemed a low priority area and drew attention to the table in appendix 1 (p34/5) which describes the prioritisation matrix. It was noted that new build was a factor despite the understanding that was still a proposal and not a definite for Sizewell. Members noted that new build may still happen at Bradwell, yet this was not considered within the matrix. Members agreed to question whether the new build generating date should be considered when prioritising funding allocation.
- 2.10 Chair drew attention to section 4.2 (p7) regarding prioritisation of interventions and questioned whether there was anything else that should be added to this. Chair suggested that whilst there were not wards of deprivation locally there were pockets of deprivation that were masked by areas of affluence. Chair commented that disturbance to the community caused by decommissioning, the lack of local infrastructure to support the increased traffic and the extension of the date to return the site to a final end state were all factors that should influence prioritisation. MT added that the proximity of Sizewell A to the AONB and the impact of decommissioning on associated tourism was another factor. TH questioned why the entry date into C&M was included, where an early date positively influences prioritisation. Members debated how this influenced the duration before the site was returned to a green field site and PW commented that late entry to C&M would mean a later date for final site clearance.
- 2.11 Members debated how the site would be kept secure during C&M and how the skills and understanding of how to demolish the site would be re-established.
- 2.12 PW drew attention to the bullet point regarding lifecycle transition dates (Section 4,2) suggesting that this should read "Lifecycle transition dates from generation to defueling *and* from decommissioning to care and maintenance *and from care and maintenance to final site clearance.*" Chair questioned who the long term owner of the Magnox sites would be after the fleet were in C&M. The issue of the geological repository was considered.

- 2.13 The other bullet points in the list were carefully considered and PW questioned what the 'NDA priority area' referred to. It was agreed to ask for an explanation in the feedback. Under the 'external factors' bullet point the fact that new build was not certain was agreed. Other terms were debated and it was agreed to ask for a definition of 'surrounding area' and what statistics were considered under 'prevailing socio-economic conditions'. RR advised that at Bradwell the District Council had commissioned a socio-economic study, paid for by the Magnox socio-economic scheme, that had investigated socio-economic conditions and had identified key risk factors for the local area, like insufficient local care for the elderly.
- 2.14 Chair drew attention to section 4.3 and suggested that there needed to be more transparency about the evaluation of bids.
- 2.15 BH questioned how tied in the Cavendish Fluor Partnership is to support the Magnox socio-economic scheme. RR advised that CFP were contractually obliged under their parent body arrangements to support this Magnox scheme. Chair questioned the total annual value of the scheme and what happens to unspent monies. RR advised circa £7million across the entire fleet with unspent monies returning to the total pot.
- 2.16 Chair drew attention to section 4.4 where socio-economic objectives were detailed in table 1. Chair read through the key objectives and hi-lighted the objective to support opportunities to divest land for socio-economic benefit (p12) commenting that the local community are unlikely to benefit from this as any available land has been bought by Sizewell B. Members discussed the District Survey Lab and expressed the hope that this would be returned to community use once EDF Energy have finished with this facility.
- 2.17 Chair drew attention to the CFP objective to work with local education establishments to support the curriculum and raise aspirations commenting that the Magnox objective details only STEM related work. Chair questioned why this was not broader. RR advised that STEM was now STEAM as it now included Arts. Chair commented that the targets were too global for the local community to benefit.
- 2.18 MT observed that the removal of the cooling water rigs require guidance from an environmental perspective. TH advised that the cooling water rigs were protected because of the Kittiwake population and that they were not part of the operation of the site. MT explained that this was an example of where proper planning was required to ensure that decommissioning of the site was undertaken sensitively to minimise the impact on the environment. Chair stated that similarly transport issues needed to be addressed. Chair explained these were examples of where training beyond STEM related matters would be useful to the decommissioning process.
- 2.19 Chair referred to the objectives detailed on p13 and questioned the definition of the 'travel to work area'. She added that the SMART targets detailed are not applicable to the low priority sites. PW questioned who determines the value of the performance measures and who oversees and monitors these.
- 2.20 Chair drew attention to the individual site socio-economic objectives and in particular to p32 detailing Sizewell A. PW questioned why no stakeholders were listed and it was thought that this was because no projects over £10,000 have been bid for. Chair questioned how the £30,042 spend during 2012-15 was allocated. Members discussed this and were reminded that the Closure Manager's quarterly report detailed the projects supported by the socio-economic scheme. Chair questioned what the phrase 'discussions are on-going around larger projects that support young people in making the transition from school to work' referred to and agreed to enquire.
- 2.21 Chair commented that communities surrounding other low priority sites had been successful in bidding for £10,000+ value projects. She suggested that what was missing from this strategy was help from Magnox to assist successful applications to be submitted. RR commented that the funding website did detail this. Members discussed this and agreed that a socio-economic review of the area would help identify local needs.

- 2.22 Chair drew attention to section 4.6 regarding C&M and expressed the view that funding should go beyond C&M and until a green field state is re-established. Chair commented that the proposed engagement with stakeholders (third bullet point) should be more than the '12 months prior to the date of C&M' specified.
- 2.23 BH drew attention to section 4.7 regarding monitoring and reporting and suggested that stakeholders should be involved in evaluating the progress against targets and objectives to ensure independent oversight.
- 2.24 Chair drew attention to Appendix 2 (p36 onwards) which details the contract and after consideration agreed that the SSG were not able to influence the wording contained therein.
- 2.24 Chair concluded that the SSG need to serve the community better and help more socio-economic funding to be accessed locally.

Actions & Recommendations:

- i Chair to ask Closure Manager for an update on job losses on site to be reported at the March SSG meeting.**
- ii Chair to liaise with local councils to encourage an economic regeneration plan for the local areato be established.**
- iii Chair to ascertain what the phrase 'discussions are on-going around larger projects that support young people in making the transition from school to work' referred to.**
- iv Chair to collate and submit comments about the Magnox draft Socio-economic Plan 2016-18.**

Item 3. NDA DRAFT STRATEGY

- 3.01 Chair explained the content of the draft strategy (published January 2016) and invited comment. MT drew attention to section 7.9 Public and Stakeholder Engagement (p88), commenting that the SSG's are not sufficiently representative of their local communities. Chair commented that the Sizewell SSG had previously had an independent review of their efficacy and questioned whether other SSG's had been similarly evaluated. Chair drew attention to the 'Delivery' section and in particular the proposed evolution of the site stakeholder group once the Magnox site has entered C&M. Members debated how this may look locally and considered the future of the NDA. Chair questioned what the equivalent body will be for the EDF Energy sites and the decommissioning of the AGR's.
- 3.02 PW drew attention to the Nuclear Free Local Authorities (NFLA) response to the NDA draft strategy and read out the seven key points made:
 - 1. Nuclear Waste Management should be conducted according to such a clear set of environmental principles. In particular radioactive and toxic substances should be concentrated and contained rather than diluted and dispersed, and should be managed in accordance with the proximity principle.
 - 2. The way in which the NDA is applying the waste hierarchy to radioactive waste is not compatible with environmental principles and results in the dilution and dispersal of waste into the sea; around landfill sites; and into the atmosphere via incineration and metal recycling.
 - 3. Whilst the NFLA has no objection to re-visiting the timing of Magnox reactor dismantling in the light of recent advances in robotics, this should be demonstrated through the prism of an agreed set of environmental principles, not because new opportunities for spreading waste across the country have arisen.

4. Although both reprocessing plants at Sellafield are due to close in the next five years every opportunity to end the method of diluting and dispersing waste in the Irish Sea should be taken as soon as possible.
5. All methods of re-using plutonium, thus keeping weapons-useable material in circulation, should be dropped in favour of immobilising this material.
6. NFLA calls on the NDA to review the necessity and utility of transports of radioactive materials by road, rail and sea and to avoid them wherever it is practical to do so.
7. The NDA needs to improve its stakeholder engagement with NGOs and the NFLA, and review the membership and remit of site stakeholder groups.

PW added that the NFLA also calls on the NDA to outline in much greater detail how it will undertake £1 billion in 'efficiency savings'.

- 3.03 Chair commented that point 7 above echoes the comments that MT made (para 3.01) and that she agreed with point 5 regarding plutonium. Chair drew attention to p48 of the NDA strategy concerning Plutonium and quoted the sentence 'Whilst re-use of plutonium is the preferred policy position there is currently an insufficient understanding of the options to confidently move into implementation.' She questioned why the views of the public about this matter had not been sought and suggested that the implications of re-use should be known before any re-use is undertaken. She expressed concern that if plutonium was re-used as fuel for civil reactors how the subsequent waste would be treated. Chair agreed to circulate the phrase "All methods of re-using plutonium, thus keeping weapons-useable material in circulation, should be dropped in favour of immobilising this material" to the SSG members for approval prior to submitting this as part of the SSG response to the consultation.
- 3.04 RR drew attention to p128, Appendix C, regarding plutonium. PW advised that CoRWM had undertaken considerable work to consider Plutonium disposition and that the NDA should take this into consideration.
- 3.05 PW asserted that in the absence of a geological disposal facility it was outrageous for the NDA to support the continued reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel being undertaken at Sellafield. He suggested that the SSG should ask the NDA to oppose this until a repository was built. Chair expressed concern that without the geological repository the Sizewell B dry fuel store would contain spent fuel indefinitely.
- 3.06 PW asserted that the NDA should adhere to the principles of the waste hierarchy to concentrate and contain and not dilute and disperse (NFLA key point 2 above). Chair questioned whether NuLEAF and the Local and District councils are responding to the NDA strategy. Chair agreed to write to the District Council and Local Council representatives on the SSG to ask them to find out whether their organisations were intending to respond to the NDA Draft Strategy consultation.
- 3.07 MT questioned why renewable energy, like solar panels, had not been developed on the nuclear stations given the infrastructure in place. Chair suggested that perhaps renewable energy could be generated on the Sizewell A site during the quiescent phase. PH commented that she would not want to see ingress of new industries and would much prefer a return to a green field site. BH suggested that the SSG should comment that they welcome the opportunity for divested land to be made available for community use.
- 3.08 Chair drew attention to p30 "To define credible objectives for the restoration of each site (or part of a site)." expressing concern that this may not be what the community would prefer. Chair suggested that further site clearance to enable land to be re-used for Sizewell B so that any new build could be part built on Sizewell B land rather than extend into the AONB seemed an appropriate objective.

- 3.09 Chair drew attention to p112 about Sizewell A site. Members considered the timeline and noted that the final site clearance was around 2090. Chair read out the third bullet point under 'site end state' that describes the physical state objectives, commenting that this did not reflect the community preference for a green field site. MT commented that the artist impression of Sizewell A was misleading and it was noted that it does not include any Sizewell B structures.
- 3.10 RR drew attention to the timeline and questioned what the 'intensity' scale referred to. It was thought perhaps number of people, resources or cost. RR pointed out that most site timelines reflected an intensity of work around the 2090 period and questioned how resources would be deployed across the fleet of sites during the same period. Chair questioned whether this was realistic. It was agreed to ask how 'intensity' was evaluated. Members also agreed that more detail of the site plans between now and 2030 would be useful. RR drew attention to p10 fig1 the estate wide timeline which defined intensity as the 'relative intensity of work (manpower and resources)'. Members agreed that the intensity scale should be magnified to enable a better understanding of the work proposed.
- 3.11 BH drew attention to Fig 2 p11, a bar chart showing the combination of grant and income 2005 - 2015, commenting that income will have significantly fallen now that no stations in the fleet are producing energy. Members discussed Government funding for the nuclear industry and Chair suggested that the decommissioning work should be determined by what the public want and not simply the budget provided by the Government. PW suggested that considerable funds were wasted and Chair questioned the need for the new office block at Sizewell A. She added that the old office block had not yet been demolished despite the evident need for increased availability of parking spaces. PW suggested that local input into how the site could be rationalised should be sought to enable land to be put to better use. Members agreed that this was an example of how land could be re-used.
- 3.12 DB advised that when he had previously enquired why Magnox employees were not undertaking demolition work he had been advised that it was because this work was self-funding, in that valuable recyclable scrap materials would pay for the work to demolish buildings and recover them. Chair suggested that she should feedback that the strategy does not include any stakeholder views regarding preferred end state, decommissioning or allocation of funding. PW added that there were obvious areas to make quick gains like demolishing a building, recovering valuable scrap and enabling the land it sits upon to be re-used.
- 3.13 Further comments about the NDA Strategy were requested via email to the Chair over the next few days.

Actions & Recommendations:

- i Chair to circulate the phrase "All methods of re-using plutonium, thus keeping weapons-useable material in circulation, should be dropped in favour of immobilising this material" to the SSG members for approval prior to submitting this as part of the SSG response to the consultation.**
- ii Chair agreed to write to the SSG representatives from the District and Local Councils to ask them to ascertain whether their organisation was intending to respond to the NDA Draft Strategy consultation.**
- iii Chair to collate and submit comments about the NDA Draft Strategy**

Item 4. UPDATE ON OFF-SITE EMERGENCY PLAN

- 4.01 Chair advised that the ONR announced on 28.01.16. that Sizewell A site is no longer required to have an off-site emergency plan. She added that there have been new buildings constructed in Leiston. Chair invited members input.
- 4.02 MT reported that PW has been in the local papers requesting a demonstration of the off-site emergency plan.
- 4.03 MT referred to the Suffolk Resilience Sizewell Off Site Emergency Plan issued January 2016 (<http://www.suffolkresilience.com/emergency-plans/sizewell-offsite-plan/>) and drew attention to p8 describing the 'reasonable worst case' countermeasures. MT quoted from the text: *"EDF Energy advise that a warning period of 10-12 hours is likely to be available for emergencies that are beyond reasonably foreseeable."* Chair commented that this was because the first response would be to shelter.
- 4.04 Members attention was drawn to appendix K of the same document which details evacuation arrangements. MT described the emergency plans as based on computer modelling but commented that this has not been made available for public scrutiny. He expressed concern that major building developments in Saxmundham (a key evacuation traffic route) and within Leiston itself had not been taken into consideration in the current plans. Chair suggested that evacuating a restricted area, for example just two roads, would be a way of testing evacuation methods. MT concurred and questioned whether either a restricted evacuation could be tested or the computer modelling demonstrated to the SSG.
- 4.05 MT drew attention to the timelines detailed in the evacuation assumptions in appendix K (extract repeated in Appendix 1, p8 below). He suggested that these timings were based on 75% of people self-evacuating. RR commented that the modelling was based upon other events and associated crowd behaviour and that there was a window after the event of 10-12 hours to plan the evacuation.
- 4.06 MT commented that after 'reasonable worst case' comes 'unforeseen' and questioned what incidents may be unforeseen. He commented that the Sizewell B Emergency Response Centre was for 'unforeseen' incidents.
- 4.07 PW referred to a document called 'Accidents Will Happen' by Françoise Necto commenting that this describes the foreseeable accidents and predicts the area affected for Sizewell B. PW suggested that the computer modelling will not be made available for public scrutiny because it will be considered security sensitive and that a live evacuation will not be undertaken because it will cause chaos. He asserted that the emergency plans will not work, that the plans are in contravention to REPIR and the Human Rights Act and that the only viable action is to take out a court action. He added that he was prepared to do this.
- 4.08 Chair commented that without a demonstration the public were being failed. RR suggested that a controlled demonstration of evacuation would not be undertaken because of possible accidents involving those not involved or unaware. RR reiterated that modelling was taken from live events all over the UK that did require evacuation and that demonstrating the modelling was feasible. PW stated that the modelling needs to be specific to this area. RR advised that the modelling would take into account the demographics of this area. MT suggested that the SSG should ask for the computer modelling to be demonstrated and this was agreed.
- 4.09 Chair asked why volunteers were not sought to practice evacuation and members noted that this would not be representative of the community that would require evacuation. Members debated the chaos that might ensue during evacuation and speculated that traffic flow would be compromised by people flooding into the area to rescue relatives, pets, friends etc. Chair commented that the wrong street had been evacuated during the flood at Aldeburgh.

- 4.10 RR suggested that the SSG should ascertain when the last level 3 extendability exercise was undertaken by Sizewell A. MT commented that this would only include the immediate response area. It was questioned why this was relevant given that Sizewell A no longer required an off-site plan. Members agreed to find out when the last level 3 extendability exercise was undertaken by either Sizewell A or B.
- 4.11 DB questioned how austerity measures may have affected the ability of the blue light services to respond to an off-site emergency and it was agreed to recommend that the SSG investigate.

Actions & Recommendations:

- i Recommend that the SSG ask for the computer modelling for evacuation to be demonstrated.**
- ii Recommend that the SSG ask when the last level 3 extendability exercise was undertaken.**
- iii Recommend that the SSG ask how austerity measures may have affected the ability of the blue light services to respond to an off-site emergency.**

The meeting closed at 9.50pm

Next SSG meeting: 9.30 for 10am on Thursday 17th March 2016 at the Riverside Centre, Stratford St Andrew.

Appendix 1: Extract showing timeline evacuation assumptions from Appendix K of Suffolk Resilience Off site Emergency Plan (Issue 3.3 Jan 16)

Evacuation times for existing population plus consented development in Leiston are as follows:

There are 7,244 permanent residents in 3187 properties within the DEPZ, including a range of vulnerable groups (schools, care homes and child care providers) and transient groups (camp sites, hotels and B&Bs) within Leiston. There can be up to 650 people visiting the Minsmere Reserve to the North of the DEPZ and up to 150 people at times at Sizewell Hall, some of whom are classed as disabled.

An evacuation of the DEPZ only will not cause traffic issues and can be conducted quickly, assuming people leave promptly when advised. Support to evacuate the DEPZ will be provided by Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk County Council with east of England Ambulance Service providing support for any people with medical conditions.

Indicative timings to complete an evacuation of the DEPZ for day or night for a range of wind directions are as follows:

Time of Day	Wind Direction	Evacuation Planning Time
Day	Northerly	1hr 33 mins
	Easterly	1hr 33mins
	Southerly	2hrs 17mins
	Westerly	2hrs 34mins
Night	Northerly	1hr 2mins
	Easterly	1hr 2mins
	Southerly	1hr 32 mins
	Westerly	1hr 41mins