

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)  
HELD AT SIZEWELL SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB,  
KING GEORGE'S AVENUE, LEISTON, IP16 4JX  
ON THURSDAY 28<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2017 09:30**

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Cllr M Fellowes	-	Co-opted Member, SSG Chairman
Cllr D Bailey	-	Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council
Dr C Barnes	-	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Mr C Betson	-	East Suffolk Business Association Network
Mr T Branton	-	Co-opted Member
Miss K Byrne	-	Minute Taker, Sizewell A
Mr J Carey	-	Sizewell A Staff Representative
Ms L Chandler	-	Suffolk Coastal & Waveney District Council Planning
Mr R Cook	-	Sizewell A Site Inspector, ONR
Ms J Fendley	-	Suffolk Friends of the Earth
Mr S Fox	-	Communications Regional Lead, Magnox
Mr T Griffith-Jones	-	Co-opted Member
Cllr T Hodgson	-	Suffolk Association of Local Councils
Cllr G Holdcroft	-	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr B Howard	-	Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council
Insp M Jackson	-	Suffolk Police
Mr J Jenkin	-	Stakeholder Relations Manager, NDA
Cllr M Jones	-	Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Councils
Mr P Morton	-	Sizewell B Station Director, EDF
Mr A Neiling	-	Sizewell A Closure Director, Magnox
Mr P Palmer	-	Aldeburgh Town Council
Mr J Pitchford	-	Suffolk County Council Planning
Mrs N Rousseau	-	Community Liaison Officer, EDF
Mr C Tucker	-	Sizewell B Staff Representative

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

J Girling  
D Green  
B Hoggar  
C Moss  
M Taylor  
C Wheeler  
C Wilson  
J Wilson

## CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS

3545 Chair welcomed all attendees and directed their attention to the 'welcome' opening PowerPoint slide displaying the SSG principles. Chair then went on to provide domestic arrangements and asked all speakers to use the microphones and to introduce themselves.

### 1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3546 Apologies for absence were received from:

- Cllr Russ Rainger – Suffolk County Council / Snape Parish Council
- Daniel Poulter – MP for Central Suffolk
- Pat Hogan – Sizewell Residents Association
- Phil Fahey – EA Inspector, Sizewell A
- Pete Knollmeyer – Chief Nuclear Officer, Magnox
- Ryan Maitland – ONR Inspector, Sizewell B
- Andy Osman – Emergency Planning, Suffolk County Council
- Victoria Thomas – EA Inspector, Sizewell B
- Pete Wilkinson – Deputy Chair

### 2. SIZEWELL A REPORTS

#### 2a. Mr Allen Neiling (Closure Director, Magnox)

3547 Mr Neiling, Closure Director for Sizewell A updated the group and covered the following points:

- Safety and Compliance:
  - There was 1 minor first aid event in August when a worker was carrying out grinding work in a valve pit. Despite wearing goggles and a respiratory mask some flakes of grinding steel got into his eye. The flakes were flushed out and he was back at work the same day with no long-term damage. Magnox undertook an investigation to ascertain how the injury occurred despite the worker wearing safety equipment. The outcome was that the respiratory mask didn't sit properly with the goggles, causing a pathway between the two items for the flakes to enter his eye. The outcome of the investigation was circulated throughout Magnox.
  - No personal contamination events.
  - No environmental events.
- Lifetime Plan:
  - Sizewell A Care & Maintenance closure date remains April 2027.
  - The cooling ponds will be drained 2019.
  - Sizewell A will take on management of Bradwell when it enters Care & Maintenance state, preparations are taking place.
  - The Sizewell A Magnox workforce recognises there will be continual overall reduction in numbers as they progress Care & Maintenance Preparations.

- Plant & Structures Programme Update:

- The Plant & Structures Programme is mobilising to support Sizewell A with a number of early demolition packages of work during this financial year.
- Works range from safety improvements on offshore structures through to removal of most of the conventional buildings along the south side of Site, including the Admin Building and Engineering Block.
- Arrangements are being put in place to engage with local stakeholders and to maximize the onsite recycling of materials to avoid lorries taking large volumes of waste away for disposal.
- It's anticipated that any physical works will commence from late October 2017 and should be complete by the end of March 2018.

- Projects Update:

- The Ponds Programme continues to prepare for decommissioning. 48 Low Level Waste (LLW) skips have been retrieved in preparation for divers arriving in October.
- De-planting inside the Ponds Building is taking place in preparation for the set-up of the dive platform and supervisor station.
- The Waste Programme is now established and is preparing for waste retrievals. A containment facility is required to be designed and built to safely access the Fuel Element Debris (FED) vaults (known internally as the FED Overbuilding).

- Asset Care Projects:

- Asbestos management continues to be a high priority for the site, to ensure compliance with inventory control / monitoring requirements and completion of remediation work packages. Remediation is the current approach, until money is available for bulk stripping.
- Cladding repairs continue on the Reactor Building.
- Towns Main Water System upgrades continue. This will allow isolation of un-used parts of the system which will keep water safe & useable.
- Future work packages are being prepared for:
  - > Sewage Farm bank subsidence;
  - > Security Fence upgrade.

- Socio-economics:

- £916,214 of socio-economic funding is available across the 12 Magnox sites.
- £6,000 allocated to each of the sites for Good Neighbour Applications (up to £1,000 each).
- To date to the following funding has been given: Kesgrave Kestrels U8's football team have received £613; Halesworth Town FC £527; and Ransome's U8's football team £475.
- Read the guidelines before you apply – If still unsure contact Sam Fox for applications up to £1,000 or Haf Morris for applications over £1,000.
- The Magnox Socio-economic Plan 2016-19 (2017 version) was issued 30/08/17 and is available at [www.magnoxsites.com/Publications](http://www.magnoxsites.com/Publications).

- They are keen to receive more applications. More details are available at [www.magnoxsocioeconomic.com](http://www.magnoxsocioeconomic.com).

- 3548 Janet Fendley, Suffolk Friends of the Earth asked post-April 2027, what is the security plan? The facility will be fenced and locked, the remaining structure will be securely closed, with doors welded shut or removed and blocked where best suited. The exact security measures are not yet determined; this will be part of the final Care & Maintenance arrangements which are yet to be agreed. The first test case will be Bradwell Site. Chair added that this will be different as Bradwell doesn't have a twin site and so Sizewell will always be a unique case. Rowland Cook, Sizewell A Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) explained that the security arrangements won't be discussed in detail as broadcasting security arrangements would negate them. The intention is for site to be remotely monitored and so difficult to break into that if anybody were to try there would be adequate time to respond.
- 3549 Janet Fendley requested an explanation for what LLWR means. This refers to the Low Level Waste Repository near Drigg in Cumbria.
- 3550 Janet Fendley queried whether the upgrade of Sizewell A security fence includes increased lighting. It does not.
- 3551 Janet Fendley noted that in relation to the towns mains water works it was stated that water was 'probably not up to standard'. Allen Neiling explained that as services have been disconnected from buildings this has left 'dead legs' in the pipework. The 'dead legs' are not used and do not have a flow of water, meaning it can stagnate with the potential to affect water quality. The works are to disconnect these 'dead legs' from the main water system.
- 3552 Janet Fendley questioned what was meant by 'bringing in sufficient funds' in relation to bulk stripping of asbestos from the Reactor Building. The NDA give Magnox and annual funding profile and there is a plan of works based on this. Currently it is not in the plan to remove the asbestos from the Reactor Building for a few more years. Should the NDA grant more funds then it may be possible to accelerate removal of the asbestos. Until then the asbestos conditions will be maintained. Chair added in relation to asbestos removal they are limited by the industry; the number of specialists, availability of disposal routes, other power station's use of resource.
- 3553 Bob Hoggar, member of the public, asked whether the £916,214 socio-economic fund was from the NDA, and therefore the government. It is.
- 3554 Trevor Branton, Co-opted member, sought clarification on the answer of question 3509 from the last meeting, which states the mass of graphite in Sizewell A reactors is approximately 8160te, making it in excess of the commissioned volume. **Allen Neiling agreed to get clarity on this issue.**
- 3555 Joan Girling, member of the public, asked if it's still intended to store the graphite within the core until a repository becomes available and if so, how long will this be. Regardless of mass it is still intended to store the graphite within the core until there is a disposal path. Chair added that this is Magnox's current plan and agreed process, however, later on another speaker will discuss the exploration of changing this plan.

- 3556 Mike Taylor, member of the public, asked how and by whom will ponds decommissioning be managed, e.g. emissions and noise. Whether decommissioning or not emissions are monitored as per Sizewell A's permit. They are engaging with Local Authorities and stakeholders. Monitoring is done by the site, who will also be monitoring the sub-contractor's work. Generation of waste will have a management plan.
- 3557 Joan Girling asked 2 questions; what and where are FED vaults, and whether sewage works were due to increased use from Sizewell C. She also congratulated Magnox on the works planned on the offshore structures. FED vaults are concrete storage vaults to store Fuel Element Debris; FED was generated from stripping fins off fuel elements prior to dispatching them to Sellafield for reprocessing. The sewage farm is jointly used by Sizewell A and Sizewell B, the work is not due to additional workforce from Sizewell C.
- 3558 Chair noted that the annual Magnox report states the amount of FED at Bradwell requiring reprocessing has been reduced by declassifying it as LLW, she asked whether there has been any deregulation to allow this change. The regulations have not changed; they were able to separate the lower level materials rather than including them in the bulk to be reprocessed. The FED at Sizewell A is primarily Intermediate Level Waste (ILW), additional re-characterisation is taking place to confirm this and allow segregation on removal. Chair asked if there had been any consultation e.g. with RSPB, local fishermen, MMO, in terms of work on the offshore structures. There has been interface, including detailed notice of works with local fishermen.

**2b. Mr Rowland Cook (Sizewell A Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation)**

- 3559 Rowland Cook introduced himself as the ONR Site Inspector for the South East region, covering Sizewell A, Bradwell and Dungeness A, he assesses whether work is being done safely across all sites. Extensive work is being done to prepare for handover of Bradwell's management which will be remotely handled by Sizewell A once Bradwell enters Care & Maintenance. Knowledge is being collated from Bradwell and being shared with nominated Sizewell A workers during frequent visits. The sites are making good plans and doing everything he feels is necessary.

FED retrieval and ponds projects - Work at Sizewell A is a continuation and evolution of similar projects done elsewhere. Divers have now completed work in the ponds at Dungeness A and will be moving to Sizewell A once the necessary preparations have been made. This approach means that they are retaining the experience gained from previous works as well as the equipment. Good quality arrangements have been made and even though there has been a lot of change to Sizewell A pond area in preparation for the divers it looks as though it had been built this way. Magnox are doing what he feels to be a very good job in ensuring the appropriate experience and arrangements are in place.

Issues raised from the last quarter - Rowland Cook raised two issues from the last quarter. The first was regarding training and the maintenance of authorisations held by persons on site. A change of arrangements led to a 'hiccup' in the training records which is being addressed. The second was that Sizewell A occupies a small footprint spatially. Much of this is currently taken up by unused facilities. Waste retrieval projects require room to complete the work so he raised a regulatory issue to demolish some of the unused buildings. They cost money to maintain and demolition will free up space to undertake projects more safely.

There were no non-routine or regulatory activities to report this period.

ONR News - Nick Baldwin, the Chair of the ONR was appointed Commander of the Order of the British Empire for services to nuclear safety and security in Britain and charitable sector. The current Chief Executive Dr Richard Savage has tendered his resignation on personal grounds, Mark Foy has been appointed Deputy Chief, pending formal appointment. Mark Foy has worked his way up through the organisation, Mr Cook would've made the same choice if it were in his hands and agrees that Mr Foy is the right choice for the position.

- 3560 Bob Hoggart stated "it's common knowledge that the ONR is required by government to ensure that its regulatory work doesn't impinge on the commercial viability on the industry that it's regulating, how do you feel about that?"  
Mr Cook stated that this is a misconception. There is a wider picture, the ONR are independent of financial concern and are responsible for what they do. He has a warrant which allows him to do things which would otherwise be illegal; go onto a nuclear site at any reasonable time, take things into his position which would otherwise be theft, tell people to stop what they're doing if he feels it necessary. With this power comes great responsibility, if he were to do something which created significant damage he could be held personally responsibly and possibly imprisoned. If he sees something on a nuclear site which he feels is dangerous he is expected to take action, irrespective of cost. He summarised by confirming the ONR is not in the pocket of the people they regulate or the government, they must balance their responsibility and power with the need for safety. Chair noted the reassurance of Mr Cook's powerful and personal response. She asked if there is a route for him (and other ONR Inspectors) to whistle blow if the government is doing something they feel is not right. Mr Cook explained that even if the government is motivated by political direction they do not want to cause incidents and rely on the ONR for quality of advice. Mr Cook does not know of any politician that has not taken the ONR's advice.
- 3561 Terry Hodgson, Suffolk Association of Local Councils, asked when Bradwell will be entering Care & Maintenance. The current plan is that Bradwell will apply for this June-October 2018 depending on the state of preparations. The ONR are currently in the process of assessing the safety case for Bradwell's Care & Maintenance. A team of eight specialist assessors are making sure appropriate arrangements in place in order to give consent or agree improvements. Chair added the level of stakeholder engagement has yet to be determined, or if a stakeholder group will remain at Bradwell. When the site is shut and safe she feels there's still a need for information and a pathway for discussion which may be via Local Authorities.
- 3562 Terry Hodgson asked if the ILW store at Bradwell will be full prior to Care & Maintenance, or will Sizewell A still be transporting waste there. There are still around 15 packages of waste to be moved from Sizewell A and more from Dungeness A. There will be a programme of work in which the bulk of the packages will be processed before Care & Maintenance; further packages will follow after this. There will still be a requirement to check the facilities for damage, to perform legally required inspections and tests to check the degradation and safety of buildings and carry out required repairs. There is still a requirement to manage the site but as there is such a low level of activity it's not viable to have a team of people on site, instead management will be done remotely (in this case by Sizewell A) ensuring that qualified and experienced personnel remain available to complete the tasks.
- 3563 Joan Girling asked if the graphite will be left in situ at Bradwell, which it will be. She went on to question how long this will remain the case at Bradwell and Sizewell A and whether Mr

Cook feels this option is more safe and secure than removing the graphite. Mr Cook explained that a safety perspective, the reactors have been defuelled which reduces the risks by two orders of magnitude. The graphite is irradiated and is a solid component, which is retained in the containment structure of the Reactor Building. There is no issue with graphite remaining within the core during the Care & Maintenance period, which is expected to last 70 years. Removal of the graphite would require an engineered means to get in and also to remove waste. In either case the ONR would ensure that there was a safe system of work in place. In summary, the graphite remains safe as long as the containment building is maintained. Ms Girling asked if the time period of 70 years is the same for Sizewell A, which was confirmed. Ms Girling was concerned that there would be a higher dose to workers if removal was accelerated, she also noted that transportation of the waste is a public concern. The acceptable dose of radiation to workers is fixed in legislation and is not negotiable; a safe system of work would be planned around this. An example was given to demonstrate that suitable techniques and equipment exist and have been implemented. It was noted that the ONR would not allow people to be put at excessive risk. Chair added that without a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) available the question would arise as to where the graphite would be stored and whether it would be on site. Mr Rowland reiterated that this would be the NDA's decision and hasn't been defined as removal is not currently planned. Chair stated that "the contract with the public is that decommissioning means that things are removed and opportunities are freed up for re-use either industrial or green field. The question about end state is still to be had, and with the local authority in terms of planning. It does impact on things like future house building, if you you've still got ILW stores on site and the ONR is still involved it is ongoing resource when we were told the direction of travel is Care & Maintenance and things being moved into the Environment Agency's remit". Mr Cook reminded the group that it has yet to be decided. There would be an optioneering process for the store's structure and location(s) which would involve a consultation process as well as ONR involvement.

3564 Joan Girling voiced concern regarding 'moving things that are probably better left where they are. Simply because it means more traffic on the roads', she knows it is not stakeholder decision but would like to be part of the decision-making process. Mr Cook responded in relation to the graphite containment explaining that at some point it will have to be moved, the question is when. If left too long the containment structure would eventually degrade. The graphite needs to be recovered whilst the structure is still strong and safe. If the decision were made to move the graphite it would be done safely. There is a long history of safe operations for this type of work where large concrete structures had to have engineered means to enter and recover the contents. Magnox Swarf Storage Silo was given as an example. Chair noted that staff retention would be preferred rather than a period with no activity. Safety and consultation with stakeholders and Local Authority would remain of interest.

## **2c. Mr Phil Fahey, Sizewell A Inspector (Environment Agency)**

3565 No Environment Agency (EA) representative was present but their report was circulated previously. Chair invited questions which will be forwarded to the EA.

3566 Mike Taylor recalled from the last SSG meeting that he had asked Victoria Thomas whether the EA monitors extra reservoirs being built locally by the farming community and how this is permitted. Ms Thomas had explained it would be the local EA office that has the information but an abstraction licence would usually be required for reservoirs. Mr Taylor has been awaiting further information on this and noted that the vast amount of water being removed at Sellafield is affecting the quality of the local water company's supply. **Chair requested the article / report detailing this so that it could be forwarded to Victoria Thomas for review and comment.**

**2d. Jonathan Jenkin, Stakeholder Relations Manager (Nuclear Decommissioning Authority)**

3567 Update on Magnox contract – The NDA is cooperating with the Holliday Inquiry set up by the Secretary of State. This is to understand why the 2014 Magnox contract procurement was flawed. It's expected in the near future that the Secretary of State will make an announcement approving the terms of settlement over the next two years and also what the arrangements will be from September 2019 (the end of the termination period with the Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP)), which the NDA have made their recommendations to government on.

Magnox reactor dismantling – The NDA strategy was last published in 2016; it was publicly consulted and approved by government. The current high-level approach to decommissioning is to do so as speedily and safely as possible. The current approved plan for dismantling Magnox reactors is a deferred approach, meaning the bulk of hazard reduction is done and sites are left in a passively safe state with the reactor waste stores remaining. The site would then be left in a Care & Maintenance state for 60-70 years before final dismantling. The reasoning behind this is threefold. The first being it allows time for natural radioactive decay which allows a safer and simpler approach. The second is cost; the value of money changes over time and so deferring appears cheaper. Thirdly a waste solution is needed, especially for large quantities of graphite. Last year the NDA asked Magnox to look into the feasibility of accelerating the dismantling of their reactors. A team within Magnox investigated and fed back their conclusions which are that technically it is feasible to accelerate the works. The potential benefits would be continuity of employment and not leaving the matter to future generations. The overall cost terms are seen as neutral, more upfront money would be required but would reduce the sum invested during Care & Maintenance (which accumulate over a 60-70+ year period). Previously a 60-70+ year timescale was expected to allow for natural decay, it's now understood that the bulk of radioactive decay would take place over the first 15-20 years. The treasury sets discount rates for projection on long term projects; inflation changes have led to a different discount rate, meaning it may now be less attractive to defer work. A NDA Stakeholder Summit was held in Cumbria the week prior to this meeting. In the past they have held one or two stakeholder events a year, where representatives from a range of stakeholder organisations are invited. This year they aimed for a more interactive event with a larger turnout and more interesting topics. A presentation was hosted on the timing and sequence of the Magnox reactor dismantling.

Some of the NDA's thoughts on the Magnox study were shared at the event. Mr Jenkin acknowledged there are lessons to be learnt on how they did this. They understand it came as a surprise to some people and perhaps have the view that the NDA are going full steam ahead and fundamentally changing the approach to decommissioning the Magnox sites. He hopes to reset that expectation with the NDA doing further work over the coming months, based on the Magnox study, to assess whether a case could be made to government for accelerated reactor dismantling. There are many factors to consider including safety, waste disposal routes and cost aspects. The NDA will also be engaging with stakeholders, regulators and others. They are aspiring to put a business case to government in March, but this is not a deadline which is set in stone and appropriate time will be taken to follow the right steps. A more detailed presentation will be held at the next SSG meeting, with an opportunity for open questioning and discussion with the NDA subject matter experts. **Mr Jenkin has also offered a meeting with all SSG Chairs in November.**

3568 Chair commented that the NDA's presence at every SSG meeting is valued, as is the opportunity for early consultation. She feels the shock factor from the event was that the announcement was at 1 of 4 drop in workshops. As this is an important topic for any Magnox site it's expected to have been appropriately billed. She stated that "early

consultation is not saying 'this is what we're taking to the government in March' (considering we're now in September). Early consultation is last year when the NDA approached Magnox to request a study into the feasibility of early reactor dismantling. Chair welcomed that the NDA continue to look for safe ways to decommission sites which would free up the Sizewell A site. She noted that it should be recognised that re-use of site in any part is a planning and environmental issue which requires a lot of consultation with the Local Authorities. She doesn't agree that December to March is a long enough period to feel that stakeholders have been involved. She acknowledged that Mr Jenkin's address has helped and now understands the NDA is going to government to request a consideration for a principle change in strategy. Chair expressed that a crucial point is who ends up with the waste as it's not felt that rehousing at Sizewell A fits with expectations for decommissioning.

Mr Jenkin explained that whenever the business case is put to government it will request approval in principal. If the high-level approval is granted a lot of work and engagement will follow. In assuming accelerated reactor dismantling was pursued, the NDA will have to consider the sequence, priority, and timescales of roll out across Magnox sites. There is not the capacity or financing to pursue dismantling across all Magnox sites at the same time and so it will still take a long time to roll out the accelerated decommissioning. Though this would still be a different approach than the current Magnox plan. Examples for considerations into how to prioritise sites included where in the decommissioning process the site is, does the site have waste stores, are there socio-economic considerations and are there drivers for restoring and re-using the land. Mr Jenkin accepted criticisms and highlighted there is some benefit in the discussion at last week's event. The NDA are now aware of the strength of feeling and further points for them to consider.

3569 Geoff Holdcroft, Suffolk Coastal District Council, was in the audience in Cumbria with the Chair. He came away with the perception that the value proposition had been done and that the NDA was going to government with a business case in March. He's happy that this has been wound back and asked for the courtesy of a clarification to be extended to Local Authorities, Chairs and Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF). He noted that during a NuLeAF event in March the impression was given that the Care & Maintenance plan was set in stone, he found this astonishing given that in March the NDA were already considering the new proposition. Chair agreed that it would be helpful if the presentation to the SSG in December had the offer extended to other interested partners. She also recommended that instead of a national Chairs meeting in London a regional meeting was held including Chairs, Local Authorities and Regulators. Mr Jenkin confirmed the NDA are in the process of planning engagement with NuLeAF. Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) is hoping to organise a meeting with the SSG Chairs in London to discuss the GDF consultations coming up. Chair noted that the discussion of accelerated decommissioning was raised in 2006 but didn't happen. A lot of time was spent locally discussing end states and what the communities wanted. She wondered when consultation and the energy invested would need 'ramping up'. In her experience when the national government agrees something in principal they rarely change their mind, even after consultation. She explained that in respect to phased decommissioning it could be the case that Sizewell A decommissioning is delayed and aligned with Sizewell B decommissioning, or Sizewell A decommissioning is accelerated and the resultant waste put into the potential Sizewell C site, or somewhere between these options. If Chair is invited to a meeting she will share the agenda so members can provide questions to ask.

3570 Peter Palmer, Aldeburgh Town Council, raised concern with leaving the reactor cores to slowly decay over 80 years. He believes in doing this the expertise to dismantle the cores may be lost. Mr Jenkin explained that Magnox has to make a safety case to the regulator to cover the period of Care & Maintenance. There's no intention to allow decay to the point of becoming unsafe. There are pros and cons to each approach and the skills issue is an important consideration in whichever approach is decided.

- 3571 Joan Girling, supported Mr Palmer's concerns regarding management of the current workforce and appropriate reskilling / retraining. She wondered if decommissioning was accelerated would Sellafield be able to cope, would there be a list and dated order of each site's decommissioning, or would it be done at once. She noted that if the graphite were to be moved by rail it would still have to be transported to the railway line and highlighted that there are plans for more passenger and freight lines which would need to be factored in. Ms Girling described the timescales as confusing and as there are so many points to consider requested consultation.
- 3572 Chris Moss, member of the public, noted that nuclear power is advertised as having low CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, he asked whether the CO<sub>2</sub> cost for decommissioning and the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) is taken into account. Chair commented that this was a good question as the industry has always said how low nuclear CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are but she feels that if every element of the lifecycle was considered, then this point could be challenged. She added that the CO<sub>2</sub> footprint was provided when the DFS was being built at Sizewell B. Allen Neiling is required to do environmental impact statements with any new constructions, they are not added up over time as this isn't required but the information is available and could be collated.
- 3573 Colin Tucker, Sizewell B Staff Representative, stated that the environmental impact statements for Sizewell include both construction and decommissioning emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. He believed the lifetime emission (including maintenance following decommissioning) result is 2.5-3 grams of CO<sub>2</sub> per kWh. Chair added that the figure cannot be known as it's unknown when a GDF will become available. She summarised that there may not be a mid-way point and that it can't be agreed what emissions look in real time and so it may be best to agree that there is a difference of opinion. Colin apologised if his recollection of the figures were wrong and welcomed people to visit EDF's website for links to their environmental impact statements. The link has been circulated a number of times in the past ([https://www.edfenergy.com/sites/default/files/sizewell\\_epd\\_full.pdf](https://www.edfenergy.com/sites/default/files/sizewell_epd_full.pdf)).
- 3574 Bill Howard, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council, is involved in another organisation which is looking to persuade Network Rail to provide an hourly service on the Suffolk line. The only obstruction to this request at present is the current flask path and he questioned when this can be given up. Chair replied that she took an opportunity at the national meeting the week prior to engage with representatives from Network Rail. The next step must be for a formal challenge from a rail provider (Greater Anglia in this instance) who wishes to take the matter forward.

### 3. SIZEWELL B REPORTS

#### 3a. Mr Paul Morton (Station Director, EDF)

3575 Mr P Morton, Sizewell B Station Director, noted that Sizewell B has been generating 'flat out' and their performance has been recognised in international measures. He updated the group with a presentation and covered the following points:

- Safety performance and staffing:
  - There has been 1 minor injury to an employee. An individual was crouched at a metal rack in the workshop when he lost his balance and put his arm back, causing a bone in his wrist to break. He now has a Velcro support and has returned to work.
  - No nuclear reportable incidents.
  - No environmental incidents.
  - 539 EDF Energy staff including 16 apprentices and 4 trainees. EDF are proud to have a 50/50 gender balance on apprenticeship recruits in the last 2 years and believe this is partly accredited to work they do with local schools.
  - 250 year-round contracting partners. EDF are facing a recruitment challenge due to a new power plant opening in the United Arab Emirates who are looking for English speaking operators and are offering greater financial benefits.
  
- Sizewell B refuelling outage 2017:
  - Sizewell B power station will be taken offline on 03/11/17 to begin its 15<sup>th</sup> refuelling and maintenance outage.
  - An extra 1,000 specialist workers will join the Sizewell B workforce and provide a boost to the area's hotels and businesses.
  - During the approximately five week period they will carry out over 10,000 separate pieces of work (compared to last year's 16,000) which have been carefully planned during the last two years.
  - As well as refuelling the reactor they will also deliver major investment and routine maintenance work during the outage:-
    - > Turbine 1 routine maintenance and upgrade of Turbine 1 monitoring systems;
    - > Overhaul of 1 of 4 main cooling water pumps;
    - > Replacement of a Reactor Building cooler fan motor.
  
- Education and skills – Science in Summer Holidays:
  - A fun packed agenda for young visitors to Sizewell B has been on offer. The centre welcomed around 910 visitors during August in a bid to bring science to life over the summer holidays.
  - Each week a new science-based workshop was rolled out for visitors. The workshops were themed around science and the sea, science and sound, and science and nature – with children learning about density and atoms using coloured sandy water. Children made musical instruments using recycled material and then measured the decibels they made in a sound booth. They were also able to make telephones using cups and string and formed a bottle orchestra to study sound and vibrations.

- Suffolk community projects get a cash boost thanks to EDF:
  - Sizewell B offer funding for community projects within a 10-mile radius of the station and development site. Up to £10,000 is made available each year (January-December) to projects that meet the criteria.

3576 Joan Girling recalled that last year Sizewell B was looking at moving facilities which were on Sizewell C land to Coronation Wood by conducting an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to submit to Suffolk Coastal District Council. She requested an update on this matter. Mr Morton explained that there is no update, they are still working on feedback from the EIA. The timescales are driven by Sizewell C schedule and no planning application has yet been made. Ms Girling added that early notice would be appreciated. Chair felt that instead of waiting for Sizewell C it should be considered whether de-licencing and re-using part of Sizewell A Site would be a feasible alternative.

3577 Maureen Jones, Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Councils, asked if Sizewell C is not built will the clearing of Coronation Wood go ahead. Mr Morton confirmed the need to relocate facilities is directly linked to the construction of Sizewell C.

3578 Terry Hodgson recalled during initial consultation the local community requested for certain areas not to be used for Sizewell C and they were given assurances that this was the case for Coronation Wood. He stated that this proposal now feels disingenuous to the local community. Mr Morton responded that options have been considered for using space on the existing sites and there is not suitable availability with the current timescales. If this were to change they would be able to re-assess the options as the decision is not set in stone.

3579 Tom Griffith-Jones stated that the Operational Safety Review Team (OSART) report was produced 18 months ago yet there hasn't yet been a follow up report or a meeting to discuss this. He asked that a sub-group meeting be held to discuss the report. **Mr Morton confirmed that Sizewell B has had a follow up initial visit from OSART and the results were satisfactory. The public update from this follows a governmental route. He agreed to chase when the information is likely to enter the public domain.** Mr Griffith-Jones asked "Have you complied with all their suggestions because one of their suggestions is that you should extend the emergency zone to cover a serious accident, however unlikely." Mr Morton explained that the recommendation around UK and international approaches is a consultation which filters through government for them to then comply with the outcomes. He acknowledged that there is an action to provide an update and clarified that they were not non-compliant. The issue was that the UK and international approaches differ and the gap needs closing. Mr Griffith-Jones said "They suggested you create it, not wait for the government. They pointed out that you were complying with what the British government requires but they said that in terms of safety issues you should be doing more than that. You should be complying with what other nuclear stations around Europe are doing which is complying with the more serious issues, and you weren't doing that. So that was what they recommended that you did regardless of the government". Mr Morton disagreed with this, the report challenged the government's position, which EDF cannot act unilaterally on and require a fleet approach across the UK. EDF are involved in the discussion and need to respond to the outcome which has a deadline of February. This is the approach which the UK government want EDF to follow and OSART were comfortable during follow up that this is appropriate. The point was raised regarding Euratom and the different approaches adopted across Europe and the UK. **Chair suggested the best approach would be that she is notified when the new OSART report is published so that a sub-meeting can be arranged on this topic.**

3580 Bob Hoggar noted that the first DFS in the country is at Leiston, which he believes is “far too close to too many people”. He feels that the ‘waste’ (spent fuel) has no place on a nuclear site storage facility. He explained that there is no solution to waste and no communities want to store it. He believes that EDF enjoy the profits of nuclear energy and then hand the waste to the UK and future generations. He noted that the GDF plans don’t seem to be advancing and questioned whether EDF believe it is fair “to leave all of this for our grandchildren to sort out”, describing the issue of storage as unsolvable. He stated that when Sizewell A and Sizewell B are ‘closed’ the local people will be left with possibly up to 140 six metre high storage containers filled with spent fuel and questioned whether they are likely to fulfil their 150 year lifespan. Mr Morton explained that the stores are designed for a 100 year life but this is a living safety case and would be reviewed periodically throughout this time, including review of stores around the world so that they can respond accordingly. He went on to remind the group that the Sizewell design is an enhancement on others, both in regards to mechanical integrity and screening as well as the monitoring instruments which make it unique. He described the storage as reversible and explained that if a challenge was detected they have tested the process of removing the fuel and returning it to water before returning it to another high store. Mr Hoggar asked what would happen if the store was underground in a GDF. Mr Morton described the storage system created is able to be monitored, is adaptable and reversible and will not be kept underground. He went on to say that the fuel would have to be repackaged into a store suited to the GDF requirements once a GDF plan has been produced and the containment specifications are known. Chair advised that at the national meeting she had attended the week prior it was expressed that there are communities in the UK who may be interested in hosting a GDF though she understands this would depend on a number of factors including technology, geology, community response and socio-economics. She confirmed that the GDF process is continuing and progressing and consultations will begin early next year. Chair noted that it was also stated categorically that spent fuel will not be stored in a GDF. Currently it is considered a zero-value asset with the potential to be reprocessed. She explained that the NDA are looking to future international business opportunities regarding plutonium. There is a level of waste that has been reprocessed at Sellafield for Japan and Germany who have now changed their strategy and will not accept it back. She believes there is potential that the government may reconsider reprocessing in the future. If not she expects that the spent fuel will remain at Site. **She noted that confirmation and further detail is needed as this stance conflicts with what had previously been advised.**

3581 Mike Taylor referenced Section 9 of ONR’s Sizewell B report which states ‘On 17th May 2017, ONR observed the annual Level 1 Demonstration, Exercise Eagle 17. ONR judged this to have been overall an adequate demonstration of the station’s arrangements made under Licence Condition 11. Notwithstanding this, the station did not fully demonstrate its capability to deploy and connect deployable back-up equipment. ONR has since written to the station requesting a re-demonstration of this element of the exercise objective within an appropriate context before 31st March 2018’. Mike Taylor assumed this referenced equipment which is held in the Emergency Response Centre. He had attended the opening of this facility in 2013 where he feels it was plain that EDF were preparing for all incidents including those unforeseen. He questioned whether EDF have the drivers required for the vehicles in the facility as his understanding was that they were meant to be available 24/7, seven days a week at 4 hours notice. He noted that the facility is unique amongst the EDF fleet and asked Mr Morton to explain the role of the centre. Mr Morton confirmed that EDF conduct these exercises regularly (both peer reviewed by EDF and observed) to practice use of the equipment. The anomaly referenced was a minor one in relation to the position of a pump. The pump is expected to be ready for connection but the position of the pump during the exercise meant that the length of hose designed for it wouldn’t reach. This was resolved in minutes by picking up the pump and moving it. He explained that EDF will practice and demonstrate this performance during the next exercise. Mr Morton confirmed that he has no concerns about their ability to deploy the equipment. In regards to the ERC’s function Mr Morton confirmed it forms part of EDF’s response to ‘beyond design basis’ events. There are 3 fully trained people on shift 24/7 at the ERC. The training scheme is

approved, accredited and independently assessed. He reiterated that he has no concerns in their ability to mobilise and believed that if a Sizewell B ONR representative was present they would resolve this.

- 3582 Colin Tucker asked Jonathan Jenkin of the NDA whether is it government policy for EDF Sizewell B fuel to enter a GDF once available. Jonathan didn't know himself, he was interested who Chair had spoken to at the presentation. Chair confirmed it was a presentation by Dr James McKinney, Head of Integrated Waste Management at the NDA and Dr Juliet Long, Radioactive Waste Management BEIS. **Mr Jenkin agreed to get a response as to whether it is still government policy for oxide fuel to enter a GDF once available.** Chair recalled that Rowland Cook had previously stated that what makes Sizewell A so safe is that it doesn't house spent fuel, she feels it's important to note that there is spent fuel kept at Sizewell B.
- 3583 Janet Fendley presumes the National Environmental Research Council (NERC) are funding research into a GDF. She hadn't researched this and so asked Mr Morton if he was able to provide a response. Mr Morton explained it is not his organisation so was unable to comment though he was aware that a GDF representative had attended a previous SSG meeting. Chair confirmed it is Radioactive Waste Management's (RWM's) field. She explained that RWM is part of the NDA and have been tasked to deliver a GDF solution for the UK. Chair confirmed that RWM have previously presented to the SSG and that the slides and commentaries from these meetings can be forwarded / recirculated. She believed that from the launch of the next consultations on GDFs there will be an opportunity for the SSG to comment. She encouraged people to do research and offered to share her papers on this topic to those interested. Chair believes the challenge is for the public and organisations to be educated on the GDF in order for informed decisions to be made on GDF consultation.
- 3584 Chris Wheeler, member of the public, expressed concern regarding DFS due to a "clear increase in global terrorism and recent reports about the drone attacks on a number of nuclear sites". He noted that it has been published that Sizewell has a DFS above ground. He referenced that a nuclear site in Callaway, Missouri has their Holtec containers stored in concrete silos underground. The decision to do this was due to terrorism concerns following 9/11 as they deemed it inappropriate to have nuclear spent fuel stored above ground. Colin Tucker stated that Holtec provide two design solutions for DFS and one is a bunkered solution. He noted that the vast majority of the American power stations which have a DFS store their containers outdoors in the open. He explained that it is the resilience of the cask which is relied upon as the spent fuel's protection. Paul Morton added that concerns like those Mr Wheeler had expressed are part of what is considered in design of a DFS. Their DFS design was assessed by ONR, including their security section and it has passed every requirement specified by them. Specific security designs couldn't and cannot be discussed for safety reasons.
- 3585 Joan Girling referred to item 3488 of last meetings minutes, specifically the action for EDF. Mr Caton had agreed that EDF would provide a response whether a Holtec container 25+ years old exists anywhere in the world. She asked whether a response was available. Mr Morton confirmed the oldest Holtec containers are 20-30 years old. He highlighted that there is an ability and need to reassess the integrity of the containers and that there is the ability to reverse containment (as was underwritten in the long-term case for the containers). Ms Girling asked at what stage in their 100 year lifespan the stores would deteriorate. Mr Morton explained that the safety case for Holtec containers varies across different countries, depending on the regulators and the design of the stores. He reiterated that the design for Sizewell B DFS is an upgrade with a unique monitoring ability as previously discussed. Ms Girling noted that the Holtec design is refined each time and wondered whether the spent fuel would be stored in an upgraded design if it were re-

contained at the 25 year period, if not would the original container be as secure. Mr Morton explained that though it is not expected to require removal at this time safety case requirements would have to be met for re-containment. If it was decided to use a newly designed store then EDF would have to build a new safety case following the same rigor as previously.

- 3586 Chair asked, if it was known that the DFS would remain in situ for longer, would a different location have been chosen, explaining that the DFS is located on the boundary with Sizewell A rather than in the direction of a potential Sizewell C. Colin Tucker explained that the location was optioneered and the decision was made because it is the best location on site to deal with sea level rises.
- 3587 Mike Taylor said “At the last meeting it was stated that EDF would be defuelling Sizewell B and after that responsibility would be handed to the NDA”, which was the first he’d heard of this. In addition to Ms Girling’s last question he wanted to know if the NDA would also take responsibility for repackaging the spent fuel. Mr Morton explained that there is no change in the NDA’s responsibility and it remains the same as other sites. With regards to the spent fuel he confirmed that the licence holder at the time would have to put forward a safety case for repackaging spent fuel. He also confirmed that EDF pay into the Nuclear Liability Fund (NLF) during the lifecycle of the plant, this pot is used to cover costs after responsibility is handed to the NDA. Mr Taylor suspected there may not be enough money in the NLF.
- 3588 Bob Hoggar noted that Sizewell B’s upcoming outage has 10,000 work tasks compared to the last outage’s 16,000. He questioned whether the change in figures meant that spent fuel is not being put into high stores. He also wondered why nobody has turned on a European Pressurised Reactor (EPR) yet. Mr Morton explained that this will be EDF’s normal refuelling activities as done in each outage. SZB has an outage cycle and every 10 years they do a large inspection. The large inspection was undertaken at the last outage which is why the volume of tasks was so much greater. He explained that loading of high stores is an independent activity which they do in campaigns. In relation to EPRs Mr Morton explained that the first to be brought ‘on load’ is at Taishan, China, followed by Flamanville, France late 2018-19. He commented that before Hinkley is mid-way in the process there will be 4 EPRs on load. Mr Hoggar commented that this was all on the assumption that switch on would be successful. Mr Morton noted that there is always learning to be done from commissioning a site.
- 3589 Chris Wheeler noted that the government regards spent fuel as being a zero-value asset, which he feels is fundamentally wrong. He believes that if there is no definable route for the fuel it must have a negative asset value, due to the associated costs of storage and maintenance. He feels there is an accountancy issue in this which should be challenged. Chair confirmed that it is described as a zero-value asset rather than a liability. She explained that an asset meant “It’s got some value but no value because an agreed route to reprocessing isn’t agreed”. She recently had a tour of Sellafield and was showed their Plutonium Plant, which could reprocess plutonium technically and safely, though there isn’t currently a government strategy for this. **Chair agreed that an action would be taken to seek clarification on the justification for labelling the spent fuel a zero-value asset. She noted this is a local issue because spent fuel is stored at Sizewell B.**
- 3590 Tom Griffith-Jones echoed Mr Wheeler’s thoughts and highlighted the need for an additional meeting with more information to discuss the issue. He understands Thorp is closing and so wouldn’t be able to reprocess spent fuel. He stated that “waste is one of the major issues of nuclear power production, it is not a sustainable system of power production because it has this immense production of nuclear waste that has no use, no purpose, and is exceedingly dangerous”.

3591 Trevor Branton stated that if there is an ability to reprocess spent fuel then there's an option for it to be used to make mixed oxide fuel (MOX) or other fuels. This has a significant cost benefit and he believes is why it is not regarded as a liability. Chair noted that there is currently no government strategy to use the spent fuel for MOX. Tom Griffith-Jones added that the option for this closed with Thorp.

3592 Peter Palmer stated "You can build a nuclear reactor because it's a national infrastructure project, how do you get permission afterward for a DFS?". Mr Morton wasn't able to give the precise process but confirmed it could be mapped. Chair explained that it was a local planning application. Her concern was that that it was just regarded as building of a structure, there wasn't consultation of building a waste store. She noted that the economic benefit awarded to the community is based on a Section 106 agreement. Had it been categorised as a storage for waste a different economic package would've been provided. Chair has raised this with Suffolk Coastal District Council Officers but a wider socio-economic package was not agreed. She expressed concern that storage in ponds is temporary, but feels the 100 years lifespan of the DFS makes it permanent. Mr Morton noted their strategy is not for it to be left permanently but understands it is seen as long term.

3593 Bob Hoggar said that the task of dealing with spent fuel will fall on future generations, who won't have enjoyed the benefits of nuclear energy and will be dealing with the results for centuries. He doesn't agree that a Sizewell C or a Sizewell D should be approved.

**3b. Mr Ryan Maitland (Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation)**

3594 Apologies had been received from Mr Maitland, no questions were posed in his absence.

**3c. Ms Victoria Thomas (Environment Agency)**

3595 No Environment Agency (EA) representative was present but their report was circulated previously and Chair had already invited questions for forwarding to the EA.

**4. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND ACTION TRACKER**

**4a. Minutes of the last Main Meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July**

3596 John Carey, Sizewell A Staff Representative, had received communication from the Head of Engineering at Sizewell A and confirmed that there is 2237te of graphite per reactor at Sizewell A.

3597 Joan Girling clarified that Jenny Kirtley's name was spelt incorrectly as Curtley in the minutes from the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July.

3598 Feedback from Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association on minutes.  
3508 2<sup>nd</sup> line – 'Were told buoys would be placed as (not in) navigational lights, to replace existing lights on the rigs (not with hazard).'

**4b. Other matters arising from minutes and action tracker or correspondence received**

- 3599 Tom Griffith-Jones recalled from the last meeting it was advised that one group of the inspectors is only going to attend one SSG meeting a year, he asked which site and group this related to. Chair explained that this related to the apologies received from Rowland Cook, Sizewell A ONR inspector, the reasoning was that as Magnox sites were moving into Care & Maintenance and there wouldn't be activity for a number of years that the regulatory duties would be passing to the EA and so the Sizewell A ONR inspectors would only attend one SSG meeting a year. She stated "They (the ONR) were withdrawing because there wasn't as much going on. If accelerated decommissioning starts up or if there is activity at site then obviously ONR will need to provide resources. Part of the question about the government business case as well as 'is the money there to decommission, is the waste route there to decommission, can it be done technically safely', is 'will ONR have the capacity to support all the extra work that they're going to have to do and the officers trained up etc., and at what point do they start all of that work". She had stated at the national meeting that it's felt the ONR should continue to attend meetings.
- 3600 Tom Griffith-Jones had struggled to understand the minutes from the previous meeting. He will provide a list which he asked to share with Chair outside of the meeting. Chair stated "If there's an expression used that might cause confusion in the future, because what we have to remember is that although we know what we mean now, these become a matter of record in the future and so certainly we welcome your suggestions if you think there's anything we can do to clarify".
- 3601 Pat Hogan had asked to forward her thanks on behalf of Sizewell residents for the help received from Magnox and EDF Energy towards the sign for Sizewell and the time capsule.
- 3602 Chair advised that the new actions from the last minutes have been added to the action tracker but need prioritising. Stuart Parr has been asked for dates before Christmas for him to present on 'steam venting'. He may want to do so after the upcoming outage. A sub-group will be planned once the new OSART report is released. Chair noted there are a few actions which need progressing. Chair had met with the new BEIS nominated person and is hopeful for a better relationship moving forward with more involvement from them and the government in response to requests for information. BEIS issues / actions have been collated and put to them. Chair hopes to have a presentation on accelerated decommissioning and more information regarding GDF for the next meeting on December 14<sup>th</sup> 2017.
- 3603 Tom Griffith-Jones had issues with the Vectos report (as presented by Andy Osman in the last SSG meeting) and requested a sub-group be held to discuss them. Mr Griffith-Jones also raised that he has still yet to be invited on an induction tour of the sites. Nikki Rousseau, Community Liaison Officer Sizewell B, confirmed that Sizewell B had been liaising with Sizewell A to arrange this and the tour will either be January 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> 2018. Plans to arrange this will continue and be available for all SSG members. She reminded the group that Sizewell B visitor centre is open to members of the public 5 days a week and on weekends by prior arrangement.
- 3604 Bob Hoggar was concerned with the length of time it took to get information back from the last meeting as he had agenda items to discuss at the Council but no precis to assist. Chair explained that the new arrangements with CFP means there is less SSG support, Tracey Finn is the SSG secretariat but she covers several sites. Chair noted that if they had a project which needed an extra push she felt she could request further support. She explained that the minute taker before was contracted for the job and posed that it may be more beneficial to hire a contractor to provide the minutes within a timescale dictated by the SSG.

- 3605 Terry Hodgson raised that there had been a breakdown in notification for the date of this SSG meeting, several people were not aware the meeting date had changed, Chair apologised.
- 3606 Tom Griffith-Jones noted that the poster for this meeting titled it as the AGM but that was the last meeting. Chair agreed to feedback to Tracey.
- 3607 Chair noted that Louise (a previous minute taker) used to provide a 2 sided A4 precis that could be circulated quicker, she considered doing this moving forward to assist with Council meetings.
- 3608 Trevor Branton asked for clarity on the time of the next SSG meeting, a 9.30am start was agreed with arrival from 9am.
- 3609 EDF response on Le Creusot components  
'Thank you for asking us to comment on the latest developments from the French regulator about the Creusot Forge issue which we know is of interest to the SSG. The main point is that we have already carried out a full review and confirmed that there are no outstanding concerns for Sizewell B.  
Last year while the refuelling outage was underway, we were able to carry out an extensive review. We have now reviewed 100% of the records for Sizewell B and confirmed that there were no anomalies and no significant issues. We have been in contact with the ONR throughout and shared the details of our checks with them – including sending teams to carry out the checks in person'.
- 3610 Ryan Maitland, ONR response on Le Creusot components  
'Thank you for your enquiry of the 23 August 2017 referring to work being undertaken in France relating to the manufacture of Category N1 components originating from Le Creusot Forge, and asking:  
*What, therefore, is ONR doing in respect of Sizewell to carry out further paperwork examinations to ascertain the presence or otherwise of 'irregularities'? Should we not expect ONR to order EdF to undertake the same actions here as ASN has deemed necessary in France? This would be additional work to that required post-outage in 2016.*  
As you are aware (ONR presentation to Sizewell SSG meeting in November 2016) the Licensee for Sizewell B, EDF Energy Nuclear Generation Ltd, sent a team to review the manufacturing records held at the Areva Creusot Forge plant in June and July 2016. The review looked at the manufacturing records held for all of the nuclear safety significant forgings supplied for the Sizewell B nuclear power station.  
ONR inspected this work and sampled the manufacturing records, and is satisfied that the review was both thorough and complete. All the manufacturing records associated with each of the nuclear safety significant forgings were checked.  
No systematic failings were found in the manufacturing records for the forgings supplied for Sizewell B and they support the ongoing integrity of the forgings. There was one finding from the review where ONR considered it prudent to ask the Licensee to investigate further, and this has now been resolved to ONR's satisfaction (as reported to the SSG in July 2017).

ONR will continue to monitor the situation in France but, as the review already undertaken by the Licensee in 2016 was complete and thorough, ONR does not currently envisage asking for a further review of the records at the Areva Creusot Forge plant.

You may also recall from the November 2016 ONR presentation to the SSG that ONR had asked the Licensee to review the position on the other main forgings supplied for the Sizewell B project in terms of manufacturing processes and manufacturing records. Just to emphasise that ONR had no evidence of any specific concerns regarding the manufacture of these components, but ONR considered that it would be prudent to look at the problem more widely. This work is now complete and ONR is satisfied that it supports the ongoing integrity of the forgings supplied for Sizewell B.'

3611 Feedback from Andy Osman on the action tracker

'I have reviewed the SSG action tracker for the forthcoming meeting and offer the following comments:

2998 – The process for determining the DEPZ is clear and can be found at: [onr.org.uk/depz-onr-principles.htm](http://onr.org.uk/depz-onr-principles.htm). I suggest that the SSG monitor UK government plans to transpose the EU Basic Safety Standards Directive into UK law to see whether this changes the position with regards to HERCA/WENRA; as previously indicated, if I hear anything about this, I will let you know.

2992 – The law is quite clear about what information the public need to be given both before and during any emergency; REPPiR Regs 16 and 17 plus Schedules 9 and 10 refer. Again, BSSD transposition may change this legal requirement as the directive does cover both of these areas.

2368a – Just to check that you are aware that DECC are now BEIS and I can provide a contact if you need?

2368b – I am aware that UK government is considering the transposition of BSSD into UK law and this may change REPPiR 2001. I don't have any further detail but I can provide you with a contact if you wish to ask this question directly?

2998 – This action has been answered by Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service in my attached response. This action should be closed or a supplementary question asked.

3097 – The Vectos evacuation report has been provided to the SSG already. This is the only traffic flow report that I am aware of. The CNC have no responsibility in this area and I don't understand what more this question is trying to achieve?

3111 – This question has already been answered, see attached, and should be closed. A further Sizewell severe accident tabletop exercise, Ex EPIMETHEUS, was undertaken in Sep and Oct 2016 and the learning from this will be used to update severe accident planning in the Sizewell Off Site Emergency plan once the implications of BSSD transposition is known.'

## 5. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

3612 A copy of Chair's report was available on entry and requests have been made for copies of all presentations which can be shared to SSG members as soon as possible. Since the last SSG meeting she had attended two major events of interest. Presentation slides and official reports will follow.

Below are excerpts from the report:

6<sup>th</sup> September 2017 – Magnox SSG Chairs & Magnox Executive meeting at the Novotel in Paddington, London.

- Magnox's current safety focus is on industrial and electrical safety as well as mental health awareness.
- The NDA advised that they hoped to be in a position to announce what would come next, in the next few weeks.
- In regards to the termination of contract and impact on staff and the local community/tax payer - We were told that overall a value of savings had been delivered, and it is very much 'business as usual' and that projects would continue, but some senior staff will change.
- The Holliday Inquiry will report next Spring.
- Magnox has diverted over 90% of FED from Bradwell to LLWR. We questioned how this was achieved when previously FED had to be subject to dissolution or encapsulation.
- Asbestos has been removed from 6 sites (Sizewell A and Oldbury are delayed due to piling by supply chain).
- 'In situ' disposal (not 'storage') was introduced as a new pathway for decommissioning (less lorries, less worker dose) – those attending questioned how this will match end states. It was confirmed that where ILW remained, a site would still come under ONR.
- Magnox Internal Site Closure Committee has reported on managing/maintaining aging assets with rationalisation to drive down costs – concern was expressed that local supply chain may be disenfranchised if tasks were across sites. It was confirmed that cost was not the only driver.
- Socio-economics – survey findings were that more PR is needed to promote awareness of Good Neighbour and Transformation schemes.

17<sup>th</sup> September 2017 – Annual NDA Stakeholder Summit at Energus, Cumbria (with attendants from Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council).

In addition to exhibition trade stands, a separate Chairs meeting and optional half day tour of Sellafield, speeches with Q&A were held by:

Tom Smith NDA Chairman, Craig Lester BEIS, David Peattie CEO NDA, Andrew Van der Lem Head of Government Relations NDA, Prof Andy Blowers Co-Chair of BEIS NFO Forum, Jamie Reed Head of Development & Community Relations Sellafield Ltd, Dr Ir Philippe Van Marcke Nuclear Engineer IAEA, Trudy Harrison local MP, Trudy Morris CEO Caithness Chamber of Commerce, Jean Llewellyn CE National Skills Academy for Nuclear, Nathan Goode Dir. The Social Value Portal, Chair of Dounreay SSG and Tom Pottinger Chairman of the Scrabster Harbour Project.

Day 1 – Waste strategy presentation from Dr James McKinney Head of Integrated Waste Management NDA, Dr Juliet Long Head of Radioactive Waste Infrastructure BEIS & Ann McCall GDF Siting & Stakeholder Engagement Director. It was said that Spent Fuel will not go to the GDF that plutonium could be reprocessed with additional business being sought internationally, and the return of reprocessed waste to Germany and Japan is currently stalled despite contracts.

Day 2 – Choice of four breakout sessions on Socio-economics, STEM education, Technical Innovation & Reactor decommissioning. Chair chose the latter where it was announced that Magnox/NDA would be going to government in March with a proposal to approve in principle an accelerated decommissioning. It was recognised that this would capitalise on

knowledge and skills of existing staff and provide work now rather than a period of no activity/cliff face into Care & Maintenance during which time assets would still require funding to be maintained. Concerns were raised regarding:

- Potential increased worker doses.
- Timeframes (with the CFP contract ending in 2019) and that it was announced in this way without stakeholder consultation realistically possible prior to submission to government, although it was promised this would follow for the site-specific detail.
- That there is no solution for the waste that would be created (earlier than any GDF availability).
- The impact on end states and the need for Local Authorities and SSGs to now shift focus away from the model of Care & Maintenance and to work up end states ideas/plans without detailed information at this stage as to whether this was likely/realistic (remembering the expectations raised in 2008).

## **6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

3613 Joan Girling said it was nice to see so many members / officers of the local authorities present. Chair added that the County Council are in communication and had sent their apologies as Russ Rainger is on holiday and they were unable to provide a substitution.

3614 Chair thanked all for their attendance, declaring that minutes and notes would follow.

### **NEXT MEETING:**

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017 at 9:30, Aldeburgh Community & Sports Centre, arrival from 09:00.

### **Glossary:**

CFP	Cavendish Fluor Partnership
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation
NDA	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
RWM	Radioactive Waste Management
DFS	Dry Fuel Store
EPR	European Pressure Vessel
ILW	Intermediate Level Waste
LLW	Low Level Waste
MOX	Mixed Oxide Fuel
FED	Fuel Element Debris