

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE  
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)  
HELD AT SAXMUNDHAM MARKET HALL, 29 HIGH STREET, SAXMUNDHAM, IP17 1AF  
ON THURSDAY 6<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2017 at 19:00**

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Cllr M Fellowes	- Co-opted Member	<i>SSG Chairman</i>
Mr P Wilkinson	- Co-opted Member	<i>SSG Vice Chairman</i>
Cllr D Bailey	- Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Sgt M Brown	- Suffolk Police	
Miss K Byrne	- Minute Taker, Sizewell A	
Mr K Caton	- Technical and Safety Support Manager, EDF	
Ms L Chandler	- Planning Department, Suffolk Coastal District Council	
Mr P Fahey	- Environment Agency Sizewell A Inspector	
Mr S Fox	- SSG Secretariat	
Mr T Griffith-Jones	- Co-opted Member	
Mr B Hamilton	- Head of Stakeholder Relations, NDA	
Cllr T Hodgson	- Suffolk Association of Local Councils	
Ms P Hogan	- Sizewell Residents Association	
Cllr B Howard	- Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Mr R Maitland	- Site Inspector, ONR	
Mr A Osman	- Head of Emergency Planning, Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit	
Cllr P Palmer	- Aldeburgh Town Council	
Cllr C Poulter	- Suffolk Coastal District Council	
Mr M Taylor	- Friends of the Earth Representative	
Ms V Thomas	- Environment Agency	
Mr C Tucker	- Sizewell B Staff Representative	
Cllr M Turner	- Saxmundham Town Council	
Mr P Wilkinson	- South Eastern Region Lead, Magnox	
Cllr M Whitby	- Dunwich Parish Meeting	

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

9 members of the public, including:

Ms J Girling  
Ms J Kirtley  
Mr B Hoggar

## **CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS**

3470 Chair welcomed all attendees and directed their attention to the 'welcome' opening PowerPoint slide displaying the SSG principles.

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

3471 Chair welcomed all, including the following:

- First time attendees
- Those substituting or representing others
- Returning attendees

3472 Apologies for absence were received from:

- Trevor Branton, Co-opted Member
- Rachel Carrington, National Farmers Union
- Dr Thérèse Coffey, MP
- Cllr Russ Rainger, Suffolk County Council / Snape Parish Council
- Cllr Geoff Holdcroft (substitute Cllr Carol Poulter)
- Janet Fendley, Friends of the Earth (substitute Mike Taylor)
- Rowland Cook, ONR Inspector for Sizewell A
- Pete Knollmeyer, Chief Nuclear Officer, Magnox
- Niki Rousseau, Sizewell B
- Dr Carolyn Barnes, Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils (substitute Lisa Chandler)
- Jonathan Jenkin, NDA (substitute Bill Hamilton)
- Allen Neiling, Closure Director, Sizewell A (substitute Paul Wilkinson)
- Paul Morton, Station Director, Sizewell B (substitute Kevin Caton)

3473 Additional declarations of interest were sought but none were forthcoming.

### **2. SIZEWELL B REPORTS**

#### **2a. Mr Kevin Caton (Technical & Safety Support Manager, acting for Station Director, EDF)**

3474 Mr Caton, acting for Station Director for Sizewell B updated the group and covered the following points:

- Safety performance and staffing:
  - Safety and compliance has continued to be good
  - No injuries to staff for over 2 years
  - No nuclear reportable events for over 6 and a half years
  - No environmental incidents for over 2 and a half years
  - 531 EDF Energy staff, including 18 apprentices
  - 4 further local apprentices (2 male and 2 female) to join in September 2017
  - 250 year round contracting partners

- Company News:

- Vincent De Rivaz, Chief Executive Officer for EDF Energy will retire from his position on 31/10/17 after 40 years of service.
- With effect from 01/11/17 Simone Rossi, Group Executive Vice President, responsible for the International Division will be appointed CEO of EDF Energy

- Dry Fuel Store becomes operational:

- Active commissioning is now complete, 7 dry casks have been transferred into the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) located on the south of site. This was done without event or incident
- The DFS will safely house spent fuel from Sizewell B until Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) is available for the longer term storage of spent fuel.
- The store has sufficient capacity to cover the anticipated operating lifetime of Sizewell B

- Sizewell B Refuelling Outage 2017:

- The next refuelling outage is scheduled for early November this year, to last for approximately 5 weeks.
- During outage the following will be delivered in addition to refuelling:
  - > Routine maintenance and upgrade on turbine 1
  - > Overhaul of 1 of 4 Main Cooling Water pumps
  - > Replacement of a reactor building cooler
- Around 1000 specialist contract workers will arrive in the area from early October to join the Sizewell B workforce, which will also provide a boost to the area's hotels and businesses.

- Education and Skills:

- Schools from Bungay, Leiston & Beccles took part in a project focused on reduction in energy consumption at local schools, with the support of a Sizewell B apprentice
- An assessment day was held at Sizewell B visitor centre in April
- After a competitive and educational project Alde Valley Academy in Leiston were overall project winners.

- Visitors to Sizewell B:

- Sizewell B has welcomed over 20,000 visitors to the power station since the new visitor centre opened in 2012.

- Community Programs:

- The joint Sizewell B and Galloper Wind Farm Ltd community fund has awarded £6,000 in 2017 as follows:
  - > £2000 Kelsale village hall
  - > £1500 Middleton Primary school playground redevelopment
  - > £1050 Cancer Awareness campaign for local primary schools
  - > £1000 Leiston Angling Society Provision for disabled anglers

- > £250 Leiston day out for the elderly
- > £200 Aldeburgh Business Association Christmas lights fund

- 3475 Mr Bob Hoggar, member of the public questioned the use of the word temporary for the DFS, noting that it may be 100-150 years until a GDF is available. Mr Hoggar clarified with Mr Caton that the high stores which are kept within DFS are imported from America and that 7 are currently filled, with a capacity of 143. Mr Hoggar asked if Sizewell B will have ceased operation prior to reaching capacity or if further storage options would be sought. Mr Caton explained that the DFS is designed for 100 years of operation, far beyond Sizewell B's expected operation period. Mr Hoggar expressed his concern that stores and materials will remain on both Sizewell A & B sites beyond operation, as rising tides come further in land. Mr Caton confirmed that the safety case accepted by the regulators covers 100 years of operation, factoring in many issues, including rising tides. Mr Hoggar noticed that the timescales given for outage were 5 weeks approximately and asked if the upcoming outage is a straight forward one and if spent fuel rods would be removed from ponds and placed into the DFS. Mr Caton explained that all refuelling outages involve taking fuel out of a reactor, replacing a portion and that which doesn't return to the reactor is stored wet in the fuel pond, until it's decided to move in a future dry store campaign. He clarified that there is no dry fuel campaign associated with the upcoming outage.
- 3476 Cllr Bill Howard, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council noticed that the DFS picture in the presentation shows cables coming from the stores and queried what the cables monitor. Mr Caton responded that the DFS cask's cooling is entirely passive but in order to monitor cooling there are sensors which feed into the control room and will indicate if there is any blockage (e.g. through debris) in the cask, he defined that this monitoring is not a requirement for cooling the fuel.
- 3477 Mr Mike Taylor, Friends of the Earth Representative asked for an explanation on the replacement of the Reactor Building (RB) cooler (i.e. what it is and why it's being replaced). Mr Caton detailed that in order to dissipate the heat generated inside the RB there are 4 independently connected coolers. Sizewell B is now 22 years into its operational life and so some components are reaching a state of life which requires their replacement. The first replacement is scheduled for the upcoming outage and the remaining 3 will follow in subsequent outages, as part of the normal exchange programs.
- 3478 Mr B Hoggar noted that the presentation stated there are 531 employees, he assumes there are 3 shifts which would mean around 150 workers on each shift in addition to 1000 contractors. He asked how many of these are armed guards and if they under Sizewell B's employment. Mr Caton confirmed there are 6 shift teams, with only a proportion of the workforce being part of the shift operation teams. During the upcoming outage a larger number of the workforce will join the shift pattern as well as all the contractors. Staffing numbers will peak at around 900 during the day shift and 500 at night. The civil constabulary numbers are not included in the figures and are employed by the Police. Chair added that the Civil Nuclear Police (CNP) have recently been replaced by other personnel to assist nationally so the public may see different uniforms; More specific information can be sought and provided if requested. Mr Hoggar highlighted that the last outage cost around £60m and enquired if the next outage is likely to be similar. Mr Caton reassured it will not be a similar figure and contextualised by likening outages to car services being major or minor and confirmed this would be a straightforward refuel (minor) with scheduled maintenance on the Turbine Hall. The last outage was their largest ever in terms of scopes, including some inspections which take place every 10 years.
- 3479 Mr Pete Wilkinson, co-opted member & vice chair questioned in the assumption that Sizewell C construction went ahead, (meaning around 3000 construction workers, an additional 1000 contractors for Sizewell B outage as well as regular staff, residents and a further 600 houses being built in Leiston) what impact this would have on the emergency

plan. Mr Wilkinson also commented that he expects that the spent fuel will remain on site for at least a further 160 years, though he doesn't foresee a GDF will be implemented which effectively would mean the spent fuel remaining on site indefinitely. He theorised that in that time institutional control may be lost and hopefully EDF would no longer exist but there would still be nuclear fuel, he questioned who EDF presumes would become responsible for the fuel in such events. Mr Caton confirmed that emergency planning arrangements during construction of an adjacent facility is part of any new build's plan. In order for a nuclear site licence to be issued an emergency plan including the extra workers must be supplied. He explained it is not within his remit to comment on the building of 600 new houses in Leiston. Regarding long term storage of spent fuel he established that it would become the responsibility of the NDA, plans are made on the expectation that there would always be a government in place to look after all nuclear facilities, as they would with other government facilities. EDF maintains responsibility during operation. Mr Wilkinson articulated that the current generation has an ethical responsibility to consider future generations which he doesn't feel is happening, he asks if Mr Caton will be taking the matter to his management for discussion and consideration on what would happen to the fuel. Mr Caton countered that EDF take all their responsibilities very seriously, including long term management of fuel. Mr Wilkinson disagreed, referencing that there is no plan in place in the event that no GDF is made. Chair mediated for all to remember the different roles and responsibilities of different agencies. There are many parties, EDF, NDA, government etc. involved in the long term management of spent fuel, she pleaded that this is considered when directing questions, she reiterated that enquirers should not make accusations, but should be challenging and asking for information.

3480 Mr Andy Osman introduced himself as being responsible for emergency planning arrangements in the regions outside of the 2 current Sizewell sites and this would change to include Sizewell C if constructed. He clarified that on any development around Sizewell he is required to confirm to the ONR that the development and increased population can be incorporated into the emergency planning arrangements; this happens now and will continue to be so. Any constructors of Sizewell C would be treated as members of the public when not on the construction site. As members of the public they would have to fit within emergency planning arrangements that the County Council put in place and again confirm to the ONR that they can be incorporated. If the increased population could not be incorporated it would be reported to the ONR. At present there have been no issues accommodating developments (such as housing estates in the Leiston area). Each new development will have to provide clarity to ONR who ultimately have the authority to continue licensing of the activity. Chair iterated the concern the public and organisations have due to the public sector's reduced resources and felt it right to acknowledge their concern over the accuracy of the model, whether it would be possible to evacuate a larger populous when it cannot be tested, and request for further detail. Mr Osman expressed his understanding of their concern. Reminding attendees that they do have experience of other risks and live evacuations, having experienced a number of serious incidents relating to flooding, this has given practice for evacuating large numbers of people at various places over the coast. Recapping that there is not a lack of experience, they have a grasp on the pitfalls of evacuation and for managing effective evacuations across a large spread of county. Evacuation is not an automatic public protection measure; it is an option which may be selected once there is an understanding of the event. Traffic modelling helps to give them an insight on the viability. Other countries have legislation which enables the co-operation of citizens in evacuation practice. At present there is no UK legislation which can compel or require the public to participate in an evacuation exercise; therefore emergency plans cannot lawfully be practiced in this country.

3481 Mr Tom Griffith-Jones Co-opted member noted that in Mr Caton's response to Mr Wilkinson regarding spent fuel (which Mr Griffith-Jones refers to as nuclear waste) he said it would 'eventually' become the responsibility of the NDA. Mr Griffith-Jones sought clarity on when and how it ceases to be the responsibility of EDF and become that of the NDA. Mr Caton

said that the NDA may be better able to answer than him but went ahead to explain that the arrangements in place are that EDF retain responsibility until after generation stops at the site, then at that point or some point after the decommissioning process responsibility would transfer to the NDA, which is why they pay money into the decommissioning fund. Mr Caton asked that if he has said this incorrectly that the information is challenged and corrected, to which there was no reply. Chair asked for confirmation from Mr Caton on the period of time after generation ending, to which he said that Sizewell B has a 40 year operational life which EDF are looking to extend for a further 20 years so he cannot give a definitive point in time which generation would end but that it would not be prior to 2025. Chair clarified that she was asking what the time period is between ceasing generation and starting decommissioning, and if there is a phase in between this. Mr Caton confirmed that the phase in between is defueling, which EDF is responsible for, once completed the responsibility would be handed to the NDA.

**2b. Mr Ryan Maitland (Site Inspector, Office of Nuclear Regulation)**

3482 Mr R Maitland introduced himself and gave an overview of his experience and professional history, explaining that he is replacing Graham Moorcroft as the Site Inspector at Sizewell B. He described the reporting period as read, explaining that it was a relatively quiet period due to the transition between Graham Moorcroft and himself. He reported that the ONR had undertaken routine inspections and the findings were reported as adequate. They reported on the active commissioning of the DFS and since then have been monitoring the situation with the 7 dry casks installed in the DFS and will continue to monitor them. As the station moves into the next campaign of movement they will be assessing the ongoing safety case for future campaigns. Not mentioned in the ONR quarterly Sizewell B report was that they had recently laid their corporate plan out in parliament, which would be available at [www.onr.gov.uk](http://www.onr.gov.uk) in the following days for reading. Mr Maitland declared that he would be happy to discuss this further at the next meeting.

3483 Mr P Wilkinson offered a statement rather than a question, explaining that it was not targeted at Mr Maitland. He declared that the ONR advertise themselves as an independent regulator and he feels people should know that the ONR operates under direction from the government to ensure that their regulatory duties do not impede the commercial activities of the plants which they regulate. He highlighted that since the new ONR regime was implemented they have dropped their previous support for the Non-Government Organisation (NGO) requirement for examination of low level waste (LLW) and associated uncertainties. He reconfirmed that his statement wasn't intended to be directed at Mr Maitland but he feels that the statement 'independent regulator' should be taken with a pinch of salt and that the ONR does the government's bidding to ensure the government's programme goes ahead to their timescale. Mr Maitland thanked Mr Wilkinson for his comments and respectfully disagreed. He confirmed that they do have a sponsoring department which is the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) but that all public bodies must have a sponsoring department. In member states of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which have a nuclear industry there is often a sponsoring department. Though they may not be considered truly independent there has to be a level of accountability to respective parliaments. There are firewalls in place that are subject to international convention through the international convention every 3 years, which the ONR and government are assessed for. In terms of independence they are one of the strongest of the IAEA member states. Chair asked Mr Maitland to declare what consultation work the ONR does with the public. Mr Maitland explained that he personally is not involved so can only notify of what he hears centrally which is that they liaise with NGO forums, he stipulated that they are not compelled to consult but are as open and as transparent as they can be through those forums. He advised through the forums they are challenged and held to account, though could not comment on the effectiveness of this. When the ONR derive plans they take into account a number of factors including government policy, as required through legislation, forum feedback and regulatory bodies in regards to statutory

consultation on some topics.

Chair expressed the importance of making people aware that there is a vehicle available for them to provide input and feedback, hopefully reassuring people of the ONR's independence when they show action on what the public has brought to them. **Provision of the ONR notes from the NGO forums were requested for review, Mr Maitland agreed to come back on this matter.** Mr Wilkinson said it's a theory that there will be a repository to put the 'waste' into; his understanding is that the ONR state their point of view and when NGO's disagree they have to agree to disagree. He explained that the NGO counter with a number of recommendations to settle the disagreements, such as arbitration or independent expert review, which the ONR refuse. He feels that though the ONR have the semblance of transparency and openness, when a certain point in discussion is reached they state their opinion as final.

- 3484 Mr T Griffith-Jones addressed Mr Wilkinson's point on the government requiring the NGO to not interfere with commercial operations. He wanted to know what instructions the government have given to the ONR. Mr Maitland believed that the matter being referred to was the content of the Regulator's Code. The need for all regulators to take due account of economic growth has been a topic of concern for NGO's and others. He explained that they have always been duty bound by the regulatory decisions they make. Prior to it being outlined in the Regulator's Code it was still enshrined in legislation for approximately 30-40 years in the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974). Regarding reasonable practicability it is for the court to judge if the ONR have been disproportionate in their decision making and cost is a legitimate measure of this. They are legally bound by government policy to have in place and adhere to clear policies. They've had an independent review undertaken on the economic impact of regulation in the nuclear industry, which all public departments are subject to it. Mr Griffith-Jones asked where to find the Regulator's Code, and to review the independent report including results. Mr Maitland explained that the Regulator's Code is governmental, not specific to the ONR. To find the code you can search on [www.gov.co.uk](http://www.gov.co.uk) for the Regulator's code. The economic impact assessment is still in draft and has only been received from the independent agency by the ONR in the last few months; Mr Maitland was not in a position to disclose the contents because he didn't yet know himself. **Mr Maitland agreed to obtain from the ONR and provide the expected timing in which the report will be released. The ONR are in the process of responding with their position on the findings, which will also be published. Once released, the links can be provided. It was agreed that a link for the Regulator's code would also be circulated – please see <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regulators-code>** Chair offered an example of why people don't understand the ONR's independence. Referencing that recently the ONR was sufficiently concerned by records regarding faulty components and replacement that they sent a team to France to review the records, yet prior to going they had already given the go ahead for Sizewell B to start back up. Justifying that this type of disconnect is why members of the public find it too difficult to balance that the ONR was alarmed enough to send a team to review records but not to instruct Sizewell B to wait for the records to be reviewed before starting back up.

- 3485 Cllr Peter Palmer Aldeburgh Town Council, wanted to know if the ONR regulated the DFS and who passed or passes it as fit for purpose. Mr Maitland explained that the process began with EDF applying to the ONR for construction, under the licensing conditions, beyond this there were a series of regulatory hold points; applications were required which the ONR assessed and then if deemed acceptable to regulatory standards permission was given. The most recent permission granted was for active commissioning, he consulted with Mr Caton and timescales were confirmed to be approximately 3-4 months prior. Through project conception, construction and on to the movement of spent fuel into the DFS the ONR were involved. Mr Palmer questioned how it was known that containment will stand up to 100+ years' worth of high level radiation. Mr Maitland explained that as part of the

assessment process the ONR looked at all aspects of the safety case, including using a benchmark; they looked at Holtec's equivalent design in the US for comparison. From a very early stage they strived for EDF not to take Holtec's design as it was, because though it meets American code it does not mean it meets theirs. The design of EDF's DFS has many layers of additional improvements on the American design, based on our regulatory framework. Mr Palmer wanted to know if anybody had put 'nuclear waste' in one of the container's and left it for 100 years to test what happens. Mr Maitland reminded that it is not legally classified as nuclear waste; it is a zero value asset. Mr Palmer challenged if it was going to be recycled, which Mr Maitland was unable to comment on as it is government policy. Chair noted that there was no current plan for the fuel to be recycled. Mr Maitland advised that provision of any GDF is a government decision, if agreement for a GDF was made then the ONR would regulate accordingly. Mr Palmer was concerned that until the government made a decision about a GDF the spent fuel would be left waiting, and believes it may take the government in addition of 150 years to decide. Mr Maitland commented that based on the next 10 years of operation, through the periodic safety review process they will look at the condition of viability, though the parameters used on their assessment are predicated on 100 year lifespan. **Chair proposed that as the SSG has a number of new members that a visit to the DFS with a suitable expert would be beneficial as part of the introduction tour, though other members would be welcomed if they wish to join.** Chair invited Colin Tucker, Staff Representative and Nuclear Safety Group Head at Sizewell B to add any additional comments. He added that the safety case for the DFS was predicated on 10 year intervals, so every 10 years they will assess where America are with their similar but less rigorous casks, if there is hint of any potential problems. The ONR have insisted that the casks are able to be inspected if there are problems elsewhere in the world. This means that the storing process is reversible; there is the ability to return the casks to the fuel building to unload and inspect them to identify any problems or actions needed.

- 3486 Mr B Hoggar asked in the event that a GDF was made available and the spent fuel was in storage within when it started to decay due to geological conditions, what would happen and would the stores inside the GDF be recoverable. Chair responded that it hasn't yet been decided by government if the GDF will be a recoverable one. Mr Maitland also confirmed that there would be a decision on the design of the containers to go into the GDF, as the design has not yet been decided by government the specification is not known, so EDF stores may not be compatible and the spent fuel could require re-containment before being stored within the GDF.
- 3487 Cllr P Palmer asked who will pick up the costs of the spent fuel storage after EDF are no longer responsible. Mr Maitland queried whether this was a regulatory question, highlighting that it was a matter for the government and the NDA. Chair answered that funding would be from the nuclear legacy fund. Mr Maitland added that the requirement for the fund is not enshrined in the ONR legislative framework, it's part of the wider framework that the NDA has under the energy act. He sought correction from Mr B Hamilton at this point but no comments were added. He summarised by saying that this topic was not for him to comment on. Chair asked for the topic to be delayed until it was Mr Hamilton's turn to speak.
- 3488 Ms J Girling, member of the public brought up a question she had asked previously, she referenced that the casks have a 25 year life span and will be inspected at 10 year intervals. She questioned whether any similar build casks have lasted their lifetime yet. Mr Maitland believed the nearest equivalent is Holtec, he was unable to comment. **Mr Caton agreed that EDF will provide a response as the operator whether a Holtec container 25+ years old exists around the world.**
- 3489 Mr T Griffith-Jones wanted to know why if the material was not nuclear waste, its next storage location is due to be within the GDF and if it is for disposal and not reuse how it could be anything but nuclear waste. He queried if the spent fuel is not called nuclear waste

now, then when or in what hypothetical situation would it be classified as such. Chair intervened to state that this question is for Mr B Hamilton because it is national government policy to not call it waste. Mr Maitland gave caution as the government have classified it as a zero value asset; it is spent fuel and must be managed accordingly. The DFS has been accepted as an appropriate interim storage facility pending a decision on whether a GDF will happen or not. Chair asked hypothetically if it was waste in the same container, in the same stores, with the same regulatory framework what would be different. Mr Maitland explained that it would depend on a number of different factors, explaining that it would be dependent on what the waste storage strategy was for that particular type of material, then ultimately, the answer would be the same - it depends what the government policy was for that type of material. He summarised by confirming that the fundamental answer is the same, so long as the storage of the material meets their requirement for the standards of that material and the associated risks and hazards it poses, then they would be satisfied. Chair agreed from a regulatory perspective but highlighted that that if it was classified as waste there would be a very different socio-economic package available for the surrounding community.

3490 Ms Jenny Kirtley, member of the public asked if Sizewell C opens how much 'non waste' would the coast have (inclusive of Sizewell B's). Mr Maitland explained that it depends how long EDF generates for and if Sizewell C happens. Currently no site application has been made for Sizewell C but there would be a requirement for appropriate interim storage, not just for Sizewell C but for whatever period of time Sizewell B operates. Sizewell B's case has been made for 100 years of storage, based on their current generation forecast. If there was insufficient storage it would hinder EDF's commercial ambitions. Ms Kirtley noted that they (the local community) had been told that there would be no DFS on the coast. Mr Maitland believed she could refer to NDA for assurance regarding the decision. He accepted her question as understandable but redirected her to the NDA and the duty holder (EDF) as it was and is their decision. He finished by giving assurance for the safety of the DFS for the next 100 years. Ms Kirtley asked what will happen with Euratom when the UK leaves the EU. Mr Maitland confirmed that the membership of Euratom will cease and the ONR will assume responsibility, providing a similar service to Euratom in regards to inspection and audit. Over the next 2 years the ONR will be building their capabilities in order to provide the same safeguard activities. Ms Kirtley asked if the ONR can guarantee this (pending government approval). **Chair asked for the ONR to provide more information on the impact of Brexit on regulations and what the ONR will be doing in the interim.**

3491 Chair asked if more storage was needed would it require a further planning application, as when the planning application went to the district councillors there was an opportunity for local organisations, parish councils and the public to comment on the planning and building of the structure, however when active commissioning started and the store began to fulfil its purpose there wasn't any opportunity to comment. She explained that they were only able to comment on planning, not operation, waste or decommissioning, giving frustration that they put the case before the public to build something, without saying how waste will be dealt with and then later say that waste needs to be stored and the local community are not consulted and don't have a say. Mr Maitland queried what the question was for him, **Chair agreed that she would think of a question and raise with The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) as to how it fits with government policy.**

**Mr Andy Osman, Head of Emergency Planning, Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit.**

3492 Mr A Osman explained that last year Mr P Wilkinson (Vice Chair) asked for a copy of the Sizewell evacuation technical report (2013) which was attached to the agenda for this

meeting. He has been asked to provide a background on why the document was produced. 2013 was within the post Fukushima timeframe; there was heavy discussion and debate both locally and nationally on what it meant for a range of topics, including emergency preparations. UK legislation requires emergency planners to prepare for a reasonably foreseeable accident. More severe but far less likely scenarios aren't covered by the current legislative requirements. Locally In 2013 Suffolk County Council, other emergency services and health authorities comprising the local emergency planners were looking at the national debate; to see if there may be any change in policy which could potentially lead to a change in legislation. After a period it became clear to them that not much was happening, this left those planners in Suffolk with a choice to continue by the legislation as it stood, or to do something different. They chose to do something different, putting onus on them to look beyond the UK legislation and address a more severe accident scenario. A reasonably foreseeable accident has a small focus area of 3-4km around Sizewell. The public protection counter measure is to shelter and issue stable iodine within a 1km radius from site. Planners compared the UK legal requirement to the Fukushima event and saw a huge difference in scale, so chose to provide a second tier of assessment beyond legislation, which meant assessing things such as evacuation. Looking at information available at the time they had to stretch back to the original Sizewell B planning enquiry, in that time the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII) produced a paper on what might happen to a pressurised water reactor if you lifted the lid off, allowed it to vent for 7 hours and then returned the lid. That is the challenge they used as a planning assumption for second tier emergency arrangements. This meant the challenge would be for evacuating to 4km and sheltering at 15km, the background is important to the context of the report. Locally they lacked the technical expertise to do an evaluation on whether it was feasible, so they acted beyond the legislative requirement and commissioned Vectos, a national traffic management company who have regular experience in such matters. They tasked Vectos to take the 4km around Sizewell, the people living within the area, the road network, traffic conditions and to forecast on a number of scenarios; daytime, night time and different wind directions in case of contaminated a plume meaning part of the road network couldn't be used. They requested Vectos inform on worst case scenarios in terms of evacuation. The outcome for the worst case scenario was a daytime evacuation with wind passing across Leiston, taking 2.5-3 hours to evacuate the 4km perimeter. For a more severe accident the design and operation of Sizewell B is taken into context. Sizewell B expects that in the event of a more severe accident a warning of about 10-12 hours would be given. The reason Vectos had been asked to provide timing is because they want to ensure that the model would assess whether the evacuation period would fit within the likely warning time. Mr Osman then opened for questions. Chair added that if more time to read the report was needed then questions can be emailed for Mr Osman.

- 3493 Mr T Griffith-Jones thanked Mr Osman for taking the report further than required. He questioned whether Vectos or anyone else had looked at what would occur when the local people discover that something serious had happened at Sizewell, meaning those at 4.1 km would not stay put, the whole of Aldeburgh would decamp as would people further up the coast. He asked whether this impact on the road network has been addressed. Mr Griffith-Jones was also concerned about the impact if the accident occurred on a bank holiday when the area would be filled with tourists who don't know the area. Mr Osman confirmed these assumptions weren't included within the report. This is an initial report to find out what the answer is, the intention is to repeat the report once there is greater clarity on what is or will happen with Sizewell C. There are a number of things on the horizon which will affect the emergency planning arrangement, an example is the European Basic Safety Standard Directive which has to come into place under UK legislation by February next year. This will fundamentally effect how they prepare for emergencies, the detail is unknown at this stage but it will require reassessment of the emergency arrangements around Sizewell. Mr Osman's reading is that it suggests all accident scenarios will need to be taken into account. Which would bring the UK closer to where Suffolk has planned, it's still uncertain on the scale of the planning task. By the point more is known on this hopefully more will be known regarding Sizewell C. The intent is to then revisit the report to make

sure population is updated and also to look at any change on planning assumptions about where will need to be evacuated. If a wide evacuation zone is needed and if other feedback is given such as Mr Griffith-Jones' they can look to change the planning assumptions. Mr Griffith-Jones hadn't had a chance to properly review the report and again it was reassured that he would be able to come back with further questions at a later date if required.

- 3494 Cllr Terry Hodgson, Suffolk Association of Local Councils noted that the 'pinch point' was if the plume was over Leiston, in this scenario it would be the people of Leiston that would want to evacuate yet the roads would not be available due to the hazard. Mr Osman reminded that Vectos were asked to provide a worst case scenario. If they have the time to understand the nature of the hazard which presents a risk to Leiston and it's better for people to be told early to evacuate that is the decision they'd make, before any contamination came, therefore there would be a greater road network at that time.
- 3495 Cllr B Howard wanted to know how often the report would be reviewed because Leiston and its road network are expanding already. Mr Osman confirmed the report from 2013 had some future proofing included; it factored in planning applications at the time as well as Suffolk Coastal's strategic site allocation, some of which has now been taken up as part of Leiston planning. He expects the report to be revised within the next 12-18 months.
- 3496 Mr Colin Tucker, Sizewell B Staff Representative said that a warning period of 10-12 hours seemed short and he expects it would be 30-60 hours warning due to the nature of the containment building, he asked that they (EDF) be involved in future review discussions. Mr Osman advised Mr Tucker to raise this within EDF as he had been very clear that he wanted to know what timing EDF expect to give. They confirmed that the timescale came from EDF so Mr Tucker agreed to raise this question internally.
- 3497 Chair advised that the SSG send a representative to the emergency consultation planning committee as an observer, though their role is not to ask questions. **Chair asked that as part of Mr Osman's review he would investigate if there was a role for public consultation.** Mr Osman added that he couldn't find another nuclear site around the country that had done as much as Suffolk, it is an evolutionary process which he is for improving.
- 3498 Mr M Taylor noted that the project brief says 75% of people within the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) will have self-evacuated; he wanted to know where this came from. Mr Osman notified that it came from national work completed by the cabinet office on evacuation for a range of risks, assessing human nature when faced with a hazard where there is an incomplete understanding of what the hazard means for public safety. They looked at UK and worldwide experience. It was identified that you can tell people not to worry, and that they will not be harmed, but people read the media and make their own decisions. You can tell people to remain in their houses but people will make their own decisions about what they want to do. The outcome figures were that for hazards with a sense of dread there was a self-evacuation figure of around 75%, which the emergency planners have accepted. Mr Taylor added that he understands that the European Basic Safety Standard Directive is due for enactment into current law by February 2018 which he believes is being negotiated through BEIS and the ONR. He asked if Mr Osman knows whether anybody either through the SSG or the County council is likely to be involved in consultation. Mr Osman informed that the lead government for civil nuclear are BEIS, the lead for defensive nuclear are the Ministry of Defence and the Health and Safety Executive are leading from a regulatory perspective in legislation changes. The policy direction is unknown. His personal take is that when it changed to the hazard industry legislation 3 years ago, the same driver came from the EU. The change of directive meant that there was a change in legislation. Before the legislation was made there was a public consultation on what would go into it. He assumes a similar process will take place in this

instance, though there is now a short window. **Once EDF and Suffolk County Council know more as the duty holders they can notify what the plans are regarding public consultation and the steps to changing the legislation. The consultation will give all of the options that government are looking to implement. A meeting is to be scheduled around that time.**

- 3499 Mr B Hoggar had read that a lot of the emergency equipment was stored in Martlesham and so the specialist services that may be required to transport to Leiston would have to use the same roads as those evacuating. He also highlighted (time dependent) to expect a number of parents travelling back into Leiston to collect their children from school. He wondered how it would be managed with the number of people trying to evacuate as well as enter Leiston on top of the emergency service requirements. Mr Osman explained that the specialist equipment which may need to be deployed in a nuclear emergency is held around the county. It is not held within 3-4km of site to give the flexibility to move it where desired and to help prevent contamination from the event. This process is the same across the emergency services, the NHS and local authorities. There is a range of equipment holding at various sites. He highlighted that the issue regarding the number of people in Leiston was addressed within the report, including where there may be vulnerable people (e.g. children and those with mobility issues which may require assistance to evacuate). He confirmed that planning arrangements have to accept that even when you advise people to not enter the area, people will act of their own free will. From an emergency services perspective you cannot enforce people to evacuate (as discovered from other incidents), the same as you cannot stop people from returning. Mr Osman informed that the term self-evacuation is used to acknowledge that people will do what they want.
- 3500 Cllr P Palmer asked how long it takes to shut down the nuclear reactor. Mr C Tucker replied 3.5 seconds. Chair offered that it's debatable what is meant in the term 'shut it down', whether this means to stop generating or to cool completely, she asked that the question was asked again as part of the induction tour.
- 3501 Mr P Wilkinson noted that looking at figures, in accident scenarios you don't get 60 hours' notice or any warning they're going to happen. Mr C Tucker informed that the timescale is the containment period. He reassured that it's one of the largest and strongest containments in the world, even in a severe accident, (industry defines as a severely degraded melted core) potentially with a pressure vessel failure it would take that long until the conditions within the containment degraded to the point where containment was at risk, this is even if they were to take no cooling action, he noted that this is by virtue of the design of a large empty container. Mr Wilkinson said that his point was that people are assuming the containment will hold, he believes that giving a timescale of warning is ludicrous and that the plan is incapable of being put into practice. He wanted to clarify the yardstick in the report is that 75% of people within the DEPZ could reach the A12 within 93 minutes. Mr Osman clarified that the worst case was forecast as higher, recalling approximately 163 minutes. Mr Wilkinson added that presumably to go south they would have to go through the bottleneck by Waitrose and Tesco which he had sat for this amount of time in traffic on a Saturday afternoon. Mr Osman reminded that the plan is to evacuate to 4km and the A12 is 9-10 km away. He has to plan based on assumptions, e.g. warning periods, the report is to give a technical basis for the answer. No other information around evacuating in a nuclear incident was found which is why the report was commissioned. Mr Wilkinson cited that there had been evacuations for nuclear accidents around the world (Fukushima, Chernobyl etc.) to draw experience from. Mr Osman confirmed that it was, but there was no such information for the UK, though they have practical experience in Suffolk for evacuating people. The last flooding event was 2013 and they evacuated 1800 households in 6 hours.
- 3502 Ms J Girling recalled Mr Osman being a consultee when planning applications are made for Leiston to Suffolk Coastal District Council. She referred to the figures on page 26 of the

report which had assumed figures of consensus up to 2027 and which she feels are fatally out of date. She asked that if planning application was made for a further 300 houses in Leiston would Mr Osman have the power to say it is unwise. Mr Osman clarified that his role is to comment on any planning application that is within 15km of Sizewell; his position is to comment to the ONR on the ability to incorporate the proposed development into the off site plan. It is then the ONR's responsibility to respond to Suffolk Coastal District Council regarding the safety aspect. Referencing the report he reminded that his task is only to take the current legal requirement for a reasonably foreseeable accident and see if shelter can be provided for people within a 1km distance from Sizewell. Outside of the 1km zone there are no public protection measures in place for a reasonably foreseeable accident, which is why he'd continued to give contact throughout the evening's discussions, to demonstrate that they had gone far and beyond our legislation. Therefore the contents of the report have no bearing on planning applications as it wasn't and isn't a document or measure required by law.

3503 As the discussion had run on into Mr Osman's engagement time, Chair stopped the discussion here. She reminded that all questions asked that evening, along with any outstanding questions or any that are born from further reading of the document can be brought together and if required arrange a separate meeting for this.

## **2c. Ms Victoria Thomas (Environment Agency)**

3504 Ms V Thomas, Environment Agency (EA) Inspector for Sizewell B introduced herself and touched on the EA's report to the SSG which she outlined covers both Sizewell A & B sites. It has been a quiet period, and the EA have undertaken 2 inspections on radioactive waste discharges and liquid radioactive waste discharges. They found that the sites were compliant with their permits, the EA have not needed to undertake any enforcement action. She highlighted to say that East Anglian region's rating had been changed by the EA from normal to prolonged dry weather, this doesn't mean a drought will occur, only that the EA is monitoring the situation. Further information is in the report for avenues to report findings (e.g. low rivers) to their helpline to assist. Ms Thomas welcomed any questions.

3505 Chair asked if there were any further questions but none were forthcoming, she thanked Ms Thomas for her patience in waiting and welcomed Mr Paul Wilkinson.

## **3. SIZEWELL A REPORTS**

### **3a. Mr Paul Wilkinson (Closure Director, Magnox)**

3506 Mr P Wilkinson, Site Closure Director at Dungeness and South Eastern Region Lead. He had 25 years of working at Sizewell before relocating 7 years ago. He updated the group with a presentation and covered the following points:

- Safety and compliance:

Mr Wilkinson advised that safety and compliance has remained at the top of the agenda at Sizewell and they have a very healthy safety and compliance record

- No injuries or first aid events on site for 2 years
- No personal contamination events
- No environmental events

- Lifetime Plan:

- Care and maintenance date for Sizewell A remains April 2027

- The cooling ponds will be drained and stabilised in August 2019 as previously reported. Operation technicians will then be taken off 24/7 shift and moved to a daytime operation
  - Sizewell A will take on management of Bradwell when it enters care and maintenance which is planned for November 2018
  - Staff at Magnox realise they are in a downsizing program, meaning a reduction in the workforce. Part of Mr Wilkinson's role is to ensure that expertise and resources are moved to the right places at the right time. This will see some resources move between Sizewell Bradwell and Dungeness
- Projects update:
    - The Ponds Programme continues to prepare for decommissioning. Divers have finished at Dungeness and will arrive at Sizewell in September, 40 LLW skips have been retrieved in preparation and 15te of diving equipment has been transferred from Dungeness
    - The Waste Programme is established and preparing for waste retrievals. A containment is required to be designed and built to safely access the Fuel Element Debris (FED) vaults
- Asset Care Projects:
    - Asbestos management has received increased funding and resources, to maintain inventory control and monitoring requirements
    - Cladding is subject to aging and is 40/50years old; repairs are being carried out on the Turbine Hall and Reactor Building cladding. Though the best option for the Turbine Hall would be to take it down and use the space left it would take significant funds to do this. The portfolio across the country is such that it's not a priority activity so repairs will continue to ensure safety
    - Town's main water system was upgraded for Legionella prevention
    - Asbestos encapsulation was carried out on the boiler blow down tanks
- Socio-economics:
    - £916,214 Socio-economic funding spent across the 12 Magnox sites
    - £6,000 allocated to each of the sites for Good Neighbour Applications up to £1,000
    - To date, Kelsale Kestrel's u8's football team have received £613 and Halesworth Town FC £527
    - Read the guidelines before you apply – If you're still unsure contact Sam Fox (applications up to £1,000) or Haf Morris for applications over £1,000
    - Magnox Socio-economic Plan 2016-19 review was carried out and the revised plan will be issued in the next few weeks
    - There is still money available for bidding. Magnox are keen to receive more applications. More details are available at [www.magnoxsocioeconomic.com](http://www.magnoxsocioeconomic.com)

3507 Ms J Kirtley enquired where the water from the ponds goes to and how it is transported. Mr Wilkinson confirmed that it will be treated and pumped out to the North Sea. As Ms Kirtley was alarmed by this response he clarified that the radioactivity and contamination will be removed before it is put in the North Sea, Ms Kirtley asked 'where will you put the radioactivity that you somehow extract from the water'. Mr Wilkinson stated that they extract radioactivity from water frequently, the water treatment plant is running all the time, they are

taking radioactivity out and pumping water out on a frequent basis which they have done since day 1. Ms Kirtley went on to ask where the asbestos funding is coming from which Mr Wilkinson stated the NDA which he explained all decommissioning programs are funded by the NDA via the taxpayer. Ms Kirtley described cladding as an alarming word at present and questioned whether he could guarantee that the cladding at Sizewell A was fireproof. Mr Wilkinson pointed out that it hadn't burnt in the 60 years since installation, he noted that they're looking to decommission as soon as possible and any new cladding will be appropriately proofed.

- 3508 Ms Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association wished to raise issue with the rigs and placement of the buoys. She described that they were told buoys would be placed as navigational lights, to replace existing lights on the rigs; as such she expected the buoys to be within 50m of the rigs and to the seaward side as is standard navigational light practice. She stated that instead they were placed from each rig to the South around 350m away which she believes means they are not acting as proper navigational lights. She raised the issue as being that the location of the buoys was impinging on local fisherman space. She had spoken to Peter Montague who had agreed to a discussion but in the meantime he has moved to Hinkley. Ms Hogan pleaded for Mr Wilkinson to reopen the discussion and assure that the issue will be attended to. Mr Wilkinson advised that he has had a brief from the Senior Executive within Magnox and if its compensation she seeks Magnox do not intend to compensate. However, they are prepared to discuss the relevant issues, although they feel it is Trinity House's (company responsible for placing the buoys) decision on where they placed the buoys. Ms Hogan disagreed as it is Sizewell A work and Magnox would have told Trinity House what they wanted, she hoped that Magnox/Sizewell A has the expertise and care of the community that they could move the buoys nearer or arrange a different method of hazard light. Chair intervened to note that this was a very detailed and specific question to what constitutes it being a navigational light and whether it is distance. Ms Hogan stated that she had sought advice from the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) who was contacting Peter Montague regarding this. Mr Wilkinson agreed that a further discussion will be arranged, he had just wished to be very up front in regards to the stance on compensation. Ms Hogan illuminated that if the lights were moved back so that they're not impinging on fishing there won't be a problem. Chair summarised that if something had changed and there was a reason why the placement was moved this needs to be given clarity as to what happened and why, which is why a meeting is to be set up.
- 3509 Ms J Girling reminded that in the minutes of the last meeting on page 5 she asked a question about the mass of the graphite core which she was meant to get the figures for at this meeting, she noticed it was not in any reports. Chair explained that this is due to changes in personnel and that this matter had not been lost from the action tracker.  
**ADD: The graphite mass in the two cores at Sizewell A is approximately 8160te.**
- 3510 Cllr P Palmer referenced Mr Wilkinson mentioning in his report removing Sizewell A as soon as possible, he asked how quickly this is possible and what is preventing this. Mr Wilkinson answered that funding is the issue from the first stage of decommissioning into care and maintenance. There is funding for the Magnox portfolio and Sizewell A will take its turn as decommissioning progresses. Bradwell will enter care and maintenance next year some time, Dungeness will be 2025 and Sizewell A 2027. Mr Wilkinson explained that the care and maintenance stage is put in place as there is nowhere to put the graphite, they will have to take the reactors apart then build a bigger facility to house the actual reactors. While there is nowhere to house the graphite it's safer to house the cores in the reactors themselves. The government *could* choose to accelerate and decommission in a shorter timescale, this is only *could*. Chair questioned if the turbine hall building would be removed prior to care and maintenance which Mr Wilkinson confirmed it would. Chair confirmed that there is a local interest to see the skyline change and for use of the land rather than building on fresh green sites if there is a possibility to do so but that would depend on spending. She added that government have demonstrated recently they have the ability to

find extra funding for unexpected items, referencing the need to compensate the Parent Body Organisation (PBO) competition.

- 3511 Mr M Taylor noticed that it was mentioned there would be work to gain access to the FED, he asked what the intention is for the FED, would it be sent off site to Bradwell and if so would Sizewell A inherit a treatment problem when Bradwell goes into care and Maintenance? Mr Wilkinson confirmed there are a number of potential solutions, at Dungeness they dissolved by carbolic acid, at Bradwell they dissolve by nitric acid, both are expensive approaches, the latest approach for Low Level Waste (LLW) is to encapsulate and send to the LLW repository at Drigg, LLW will be packed into yellow boxes and sent to Bradwell (not sent to be treated).
- 3512 Mr B Hoggar wanted to understand more about the eventual reactor core site, he queried if there was a clear picture of how the site would look once the debris is cleared, specifically if it would be returned to an environmental state for the public to enjoy. He also wanted to know who owns that part of the site, EDF or the NDA. Magnox confirmed that the NDA own Sizewell A's part of the site and from Mr Wilkinson's recollection he believed the area would be returned to green field.
- 3513 Chair ensured there were no further questions before thanking Mr Wilkinson for his assistance whilst awaiting a Site Closure Director to be appointed.

**3b. Mr Rowland Cook (Site Inspector, Office of Nuclear Regulation)**

- 3514 Chair had received apologies from Mr R Cook and a quarterly update for 1<sup>st</sup> January to 1<sup>st</sup> March was provided prior to and at the meeting.

**3c. Mr Phil Fahey (Environment Agency)**

- 3515 Ms V Thomas had confirmed during her talk that she was also speaking for Mr P Fahey but he still wished to make an address. In addition to the points covered by Ms Thomas he noted that as Sizewell A will be taking on management of Bradwell when it enters care and maintenance, the EA is in discussion with both sites to ensure that Sizewell A is adequately resourced to cover both sites. He noted that the EA have an annual review of safety, security, and environment sees them meeting with Magnox and the ONR to discuss any issues across the 3 sites (Bradwell, Dungeness and Sizewell A). They recently spent the day with representatives from the ONR and Magnox and note that there was no non-compliance since the last meeting. He welcomed questions but none were forthcoming.

**3d. Mr Bill Hamilton (NDA Representative)**

- 3516 Mr B Hamilton, Head of Stakeholder Relations at the NDA noted that there had been a number of interesting points of discussion, some which he'd like to address as he believed they had the potential to become substantial agenda items at future meetings. He would welcome wider debate but hoped that people would not feel he was skating over items, he was merely conscious of the time constraints. The topics he addressed being:

> Effluent - As somebody that has worked and lived near Sellafield for a long time he wished to address the comments on Sellafield and sending effluent to sea. He assured the historic effluent emissions to the Irish Sea were subject to global regulations which was the case for many years.

> Cladding - As an austerity measure the NDA asked its sites to look at all the cladding across their sites, there are thousands of buildings across their estate but the early feedback

for the nature of the cladding is very positive. Overall the safety regime for nuclear power sites is very different than that for domestic buildings.

> Asbestos - The major hazards at Magnox sites are not radioactive material but asbestos. They're spending hundreds of millions of taxpayer's money in dealing with the asbestos at every Magnox site.

> Delay in funding – The NDA are working with the Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP) who are the marrying body managing the Magnox sites. There is an overall decommissioning plan covering all 12 sites, requested funding from the Parent Body Organisation (PBO) is not cut, it remains at a positive level of funding. Good Site Directors will tend to want to do everything now but it's a UK wide decommissioning program. There is dedicated funding for the next 2 years.

> Next 2 years – The decision has been made to terminate the contract that CFP has to run the Magnox sites; the decision was unanimous and was not because of either party's performance. The scope of work that had to be done was far greater than that which was bid for in competition a few years ago. As there is so much more work, the other bidders can cry foul to say that CFP are getting a greater scope of work than they bid for, and if they'd have known the full scope at the time of bidding they could've undercut etc. There was a great risk of legal action so the CFP and NDA agreed to terminate the contract. One of the losing bidders (Energy Solutions) took the NDA to court, Mr Hamilton attended the High Court last summer and Energy Solutions won their case against the NDA. This was due to the way that the competitions had been run. It is a very complicated competition process, one that is imposed by the European Union. The NDA and Energy Solutions settled out of court for around £100m. With the scope of work expanding dramatically Mr Hamilton explained they felt it would be crazy on behalf of the taxpayer to risk further legal action, which is why the contract with CFP was terminated. CFP will remain until end of August 2019. It was advised that 38 CFP staff will depart; all other staff are Magnox Ltd employees so will not leave as part of this separation. There are serious discussions in the NDA and government about what happens next and there will be an announcement in the next few months over the future of Magnox. Mr Hamilton explained that there's a spectrum of options; one end being to have another competition for a replacement PBO, a private body or consortium to run the Magnox business on the NDA's behalf, the other end is what the NDA did with Sellafield which was to not have a PBO and instead have the site as a limited company, reporting directly to the NDA as a subsidiary of the NDA. He expected the pendulum would swing closer to latter.

> Waste – Mr Hamilton explained as someone in the communication business he is hugely sympathetic to the confusion between spent fuel and nuclear waste. He has battled with this topic in his 12 years in the NDA and understood that to ordinary people (non-nuclear experts) it's all the same. His opinion is that things which could be used again are not waste, until it got to a point where they couldn't be used again. E.g. it is spent fuel until put in a GDF as it could potentially be reused. There is strong lobbying within the NDA to continue reprocessing though at present this will not be happening. There are no plans for long term reprocessing of spent fuel. *If* once the Thermal Oxide Reprocessing Plant (Thorp) at Sellafield and Magnox shut down the government were to decide to restart reprocessing then a new plant would have to be built.

> GDF – Radioactive Waste Management (RWM) are a subsidiary of the NDA, he described them as technical experts who advise government. BEIS were due to launch a consultation about how they should approach asking people to take part in a new conversation about potentially becoming a host community. Not volunteering to be a host community but how to enter into conversation, with potentially several years down the road becoming a host community. Consultation got delayed as the general election was called, he didn't know when the consultation will be, but assumed it will be later this year. Once the consultation is complete BEIS will announce how RWM will come forward to start talking to potential communities that may be interested in discussions on becoming host community.

> DFS – This is not currently the NDA’s property or responsibility, it’s expected that it will become theirs when Sizewell B reaches the decommissioning phase, the material within the DFS would also become NDA responsibility. Though it is not currently the NDA’s they are not ignoring it and it is part of the waste inventory and their long term plans.

> Brexit - 1 person from the NDA is acting as advisor to BEIS regarding EURATOM, experts are looking at the consequences of UK government exiting the EURATOM treaty, which falls under extensive government work on Brexit. Eventually there will be a separate arrangement between UK government and other nuclear countries around the world. We are still members of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which we aren’t going to exit, meaning there is still a global nuclear organisation looking at the future of nuclear. There are specific arrangements with EURATOM that need to be addressed, and will be as part of the lengthy process of work that will go through parliament in the coming years.

3517 Mr T Griffith-Jones declared that it is his understanding that the NDA has put money into the structure or other aspect of the DFS; he asked if this was indeed the case. Mr Hamilton didn’t know, which he confirmed does not mean it to be untrue. Chair added that it was the Nuclear Liability Fund (NLF) which paid in part. Mr Hamilton explained that the NLF is an independent fund which EDF has to pay into. There is a team of people at the NDA who liaise with EDF to ensure that the cycle of payments are fit to keep the fund updated. He assured that the fund is building to take care of the eventual decommissioning of the DFS and its movement into the DFS. Chair clarified that it is not NDA money so it is not taxpayer’s money. Mr Griffith-Jones sought clarity on if the NDA are part of discussions on how the fund is used. Mr Hamilton explained that they would be but it is decades away from the fund being used to pay for anything for Sizewell B. Mr Griffith-Jones and Chair understood that some money had come from the fund to pay for the DFS.

3518 Mr M Taylor noticed it was mentioned that CFP indicated the scope of work was more, he asked by implication does that mean the budget for decommissioning for all Magnox sites may be underestimated. Mr Hamilton confirmed that it was hugely under estimated. Chair was concerned by the impact of this on staff morale, explaining that only a few people would be leaving it would be from senior management roles and so their experience will be lost.

3519 Mr P Wilkinson stated that the reprocessing plants at Sellafield are due to close down and the government have looked at a range of options for the use of MOX (mixed oxide fuel), direct disposal or reuse. Mr Hamilton expressed that the government’s preferred option in using 140 tonnes of separated plutonium is to turn it into MOX fuel to fuel the ‘nuclear renaissance’.

Mr Wilkinson wondered where the government gets its advice from and whether the NDA and ONR etc. as regulatory and advisory bodies give them advice regarding use of the 140 tonnes of plutonium, or other nuclear matters. He believes the worst thing to do with it is to turn into MOX fuel and move into a plutonium economy, seeing movement of plutonium around the country and adversely creating a greater terror risk. Mr Wilkinson referenced the comments made on disposal of waste and the issue of setting up volunteer discussions. He noted that it was running parallel to RWM grappling with hundreds of questions about the technical feasibility and scientific issues raised by the disposal of radioactive waste; it seems to him that if the NDA continue under the assumption that a volunteer host community will be found its pre-determining the outcome of the uncertainties. He feels they should first be solved in an open and transparent way with the involvement of NGO’s and other independent experts in order to demonstrate that it’s safe prior to opening discussion. If not there is great risk that a volunteer community would stand down once the facts are known. Mr Hamilton heard the points made about plutonium but was unable to comment as he had already shared his knowledge on the subject. He explained it is RWM’s area and they are a different organisation. He understood the need for discussion and noted that RWM also attend some of the meetings. Chair confirmed that the RWM gave a large

presentation at the last meeting and if there were any outstanding issues or new questions then she would be happy to take them. Regarding giving technical advice to the government Mr Hamilton confirmed the NDA gave unbiased advice, providing the array of technical options available to treat plutonium, including various disposal options. The NDA have given such advice for the last 5 years and continue to do so. Disposal has not been ignored and the NDA continue to give advice to the government. He confirmed government's preferred option as stated but clarified it has not been decided how to move it forward technically, commercially or organisationally as it has been a very busy time in government the last few years. Mr Wilkinson asked if the NDA realise that a course of action which the government has as a preferred option is going to lead long term to a greater sum of nuclear waste being generated, do they have the ability to advise direct disposal. Mr Hamilton confirmed they have the ability to make proposals, which they do and their advice enters the public domain, however ultimately it is government's decision.

- 3520 Cllr P Palmer posed a question on the decommissioning of nuclear plants. He noted that there are many different plant designs, seeming that the method for taking each apart has to be figured out as it's done. He asked when the new build(s) are being planned if the method for decommissioning and taking them down is also. Mr Hamilton confirmed that they are and the NDA has played a large role in this, in terms of reviewing the expertise gained from taking down other plants. Input is being given to ensure that if a new fleet is built that faster, cheaper, safer, more secure methods are being built into the design assessments.
- 3521 Mr T Griffith-Jones made an enquiry surrounding the cause of CFP termination (effective 2019). He noticed it was mentioned that the competition was run on an inadequate scope, he asked who was responsible for this and how much more hidden money is there to know about. He wanted to know how any of the sums can be relied on when enormous sums of money are underestimated and if the NDA now know what works are needed and how much money is required for this. Mr Hamilton explained that there are still unknown unknowns and there will always be surprises (e.g. pockets of asbestos in places that there were no signs of, with no records to indicate and which wouldn't be expected or foreseen). Asbestos must be dealt with delicately and it is hugely expensive, one element of the underestimation was the scope of asbestos work across Magnox. The assessments of costs for the known works were provided to the NDA by the then PBO Energy Solutions, the NDA accepts that it was still their responsibility to check the figures, though there was still unknown scope. In hindsight he feels the scope should've been less specific. **Chair confirmed there will be an announcement later this year on what the next phase (post CFP) will look like; once the information is available it will be shared.**
- 3522 Ms J Girling noticed on the NDA's monthly update there was a piece about cleaning up Sellafield's most hazardous building. She asked where the Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) from this will go. Mr Hamilton explained that unlike the graphite in the Magnox reactors where it is safer to leave it in situ, the old storage buildings were in grave need of action. The degradation of the building left no option to leave the ILW in the old buildings. It is being taken out of the old buildings and put into new purpose built waste stores on site at Sellafield. He shared that Sellafield is one of the biggest construction sites in Europe, though decommissioning it is building more than demolishing. They are building safe ILW stores with a 100 year life to take the material until a GDF is ready, where it will be disposed. Ms Girling reconfirmed with Mr Hamilton that none of the ILW has left site and that it will remain on site as is the case at Sizewell (though larger). Ms Girling noted that they had asked for an update on Sellafield, chair confirmed this matter is still on the agenda and a national meeting of chairs will include a visit to Sellafield, she hopes to bring information back including presentation materials, videos, updates etc. Ms Girling said that responsibility was felt for Sellafield as they are storing some of Sizewell's waste and so looks forward to the update.

3523 Ms J Kirtley asked where asbestos is disposed and is it LLW and contaminated? Mr Hamilton confirmed the asbestos legally goes into licensed landfill sites. Ms Kirtley was sceptical as to how such high levels can be accommodated to which Mr Hamilton confirmed there is availability. Chair clarified that there are many other industries also creating asbestos waste, not just nuclear. Mr Hamilton added that if the asbestos items are contaminated then they would likely be LLW and treated as such (probably in the LLW repository at Drigg).

3524 Chair wished to emphasise the value of having a stakeholder group and to hold these meetings, where questions can be asked directly. She confirmed there is an action tracker for all outstanding questions and actions, which they pursue answers and outcome for. She highlighted the importance for local elected representatives to attend the meetings, on this occasion there was representation from Suffolk County Council, Suffolk Coastal and District Council but unfortunately the local MP had sent their apologies.

#### **4. Review and agree the following previously circulated**

##### **4a. Minutes of the last Main meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and Working Group 15<sup>th</sup> June 2017**

3525 Due to the time impediment chair did not verbalise the feedback provided she welcomed future contact for further feedback and agreed to circulate the information electronically (see below)

**3526** Mr Phil Fahey, EA Inspector Sizewell A – *In 3398, it says the EA have generated and will generate waste that needs to be kept for a long time etc. The EA doesn't generate waste. Also somewhere during the meeting I think we said any queries on the leaflets that we made available should be directed to the email address at the end of the information presented.*

3527 Mr Mike Taylor, Suffolk Friends of the Earth – *There was some confusion where Jack Broom declared he was representing Janet Fendley as FOE rep. Jack attended as a member of the public and I attended as nominated substitute for FOE for Janet. Please can you correct the attendance list? Can you correct the date on the minutes which I think is wrong?*

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

3528 Chair thanked all those that attended the working group and reviewed all the outstanding actions, she gave special thanks to Mr Wilkinson for his work as deputy chair in facilitating the meeting, going through the items and providing clarity. A hard copy of the condensed action tracker was provided at the meeting and was also sent electronically prior. A full list of the items which they felt could be closed was included in the minutes of the Sub-Group meeting for Sizewell A and B Stakeholder Group held on 16<sup>th</sup> June, along with the assessment of each action. Chair requested that these minutes were read to ensure they match with your expectation of the actions. Mr Wilkinson had volunteered to progress some of the actions as well as assist the chair and secretariat in getting answers. The actions from this meeting will be added to the action tracker which will then be re-circulated.

3529 **Mr B Hamilton added that he has reviewed the action tracker and there were a number of items for the NDA which he has responses for; to save time he will email Chair the notes rather than speak on the items at that time.** Chair encouraged other organisations to do the same and added that the actions had also been grouped (e.g. emergency planning, steam venting), they can also be grouped by who is responsible for

answering.

3530 Mr M Taylor asked the chair if there were actions moving forward from the minutes of meeting held 15<sup>th</sup> March 2016, specifically the action for Mr Paul Morton, Sizewell B Station Director to encourage the County Council to support the 40mph limit on the approach road from Lovers Lane to the site. Chair confirmed that all the questions for Mr Morton would be checked for answers, Niki Rousseau, Sizewell B Community Liaison Officer had sent her apologies for this meeting. Mr Wilkinson confirmed he would go through the minutes, and these, to match with the action tracker.

## **5. Review of constitution**

3531 Ms Girling noticed that they were low on elected representatives at the meeting, she didn't believe there was a County Council representative present, she noticed that Suffolk Coastal and District Council had sent an Officer from and an elected representative from the District Council but there were others missing. She wondered if the constitution should be reviewed for alternative wording as some of the important issues arising at the meeting need to be reported back to the Councils for action, or at the least to the Chairman of the committees that they sit with. She added that there are parishes without representation as their members don't attend. Chair confirmed that attendance is tracked and she has a report percentage which she will send in hope to encourage attendance. Chair will also correspond with those that have not attended for a few consecutive meetings. There had been apologies from the County Council, Cllr Russ Rainger is a new representative and before he was elected had already booked leave on the date of the meeting which is not his fault. Cllr Geoff Holdcroft and Cllr Carol Poulter were attending the Local Government Association conference. Cllr Poulter had kindly left early and rushed from another engagement to attend this meeting which Chair gave her gratitude for. Chair's main concern was the lack of an MP as it has been several meetings that Dr Thérèse Coffey had not been able to attend, as a result of this chair has written strongly to Dr Coffey's office to acknowledge her commitments but request that if she is not able to attend to please send a representative. Neighbouring MPs are also made aware of the meetings and sent the minutes. Chair agrees that it is important to keep trying to increase attendance. Chair has also been attempting to broaden attendance, most recently by liaising with the Local WI's to see if they will send a representative.

3532 Mr T Griffith-Jones declared that the general election showed the other candidates had a limited understanding of nuclear issues, he feels it shouldn't be assumed that a conservative candidate would be re-elected and to invite the other candidates to the meetings, there is no reason for them not to attend and if they were to be elected they would already be at an advantage of understanding the issues further in order to be more helpful. Chair confirmed that as members of the public they are free to attend, as all members of the public are. Mr Griffith-Jones asked if they could be invited individually which Chair explained not unless the constitution was changed as they would need to be representing an organisation or become a co-opted member. Mr Griffith-Jones wanted to understand why they weren't able to be invited as members of the public. Chair detailed that it is down to individuals to invite persons they feel could contribute to the SSG's role, which is to act as a conduit between the public and the industry, if there are barriers she is willing to provide support to help.

3533 Mr Terry Hodgson, Suffolk Associated Councils but speaking as a member of the labour party shared that the candidates at the last general election ceased to be candidates following the election, until new candidates are nominated there is nobody elected to invite. He proposed that perhaps they could invite members of other political parties. Chair mentioned that when there were hustings held nuclear matters came up on the agenda and not much was known by many people.

- 3534 Mr David Bailey, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council continued on the topic of MP's attendance and reconfirmed that the meetings are well advertised so does not see a reason that they would need to be specifically invited as they are free to do so if they wish.
- 3535 Chair reminded that the SSG is a non-political independent group and should not be seen, or risk being seen otherwise.
- 3536 Mr B Hamilton sympathised that the group was in a very difficult situation in inviting parliamentary candidates or members of specific political parties, though there is no issue with attendees being part of a political party. He supported Chair's comments that it'd be a benefit as part of an educative process for potential local candidates to know more about nuclear. He mirrored other comments that it is down to individuals to encourage such attendance. An official invite from the SSG who is independent but backed by the NDA would be hazardous unless the MP was already elected. Chair clarified on the comment of 'being backed by us' that the NDA encourage Magnox and EDF to contribute to the cost of a secretariat provided. Mr Hamilton added that they pay for more than that, e.g. the hall and that the money that's given by Magnox comes from the NDA which Chair added was public money.
- 3537 Ms J Girling referenced the non-attendance of elected members and offered that she doesn't feel there is enough publicity, including media publicity, she feels the website is not easily accessed and it's not clear where people can get paperwork from. She summarised by saying that she feels it is a case of educating the public to educate themselves, which they will only do if they use all media tools to show them where to learn. Then if they don't want to educate themselves it is their choice. She feels it makes a statement when people are elected and still choose to not attend the meetings when there are important issues for local residents being discussed.

## **6. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

- 3538 In the last year as well as attending and chairing the 4 Stakeholder Group meetings Chair has attended:
- > Sub-group meeting
  - > 3 national meetings
  - > Magnox Chairs meeting
  - > NDA briefing
  - > Radioactive Waste Management consultation in Manchester
  - > Emergency consultative planning meetings (attended with Vice Chairman Mr P Wilkinson)

This is still considered a quiet year. She thanked Mr Wilkinson and everyone else for their support in the last year in terms of delivering the work with the group.

## **7. Membership**

### **7a. Welcome new individual members representing Town/Parish, District & County Councils**

- 3539 Chair welcomed the new members representing Town, Parish, District and County Councils and confirmed them as representatives. Names were not itemised but are as follows:

#### Members

- > Cllr Carol Poulter – Suffolk Coastal District Council for Cllr Geoff Holdcroft
- > Mike Taylor – Suffolk Friends of the Earth for Janet Fendley
- > Cllr James Sandbach – Saxmundham Town Council

### Officers

- > Lisa Chandler – Suffolk Coastal District Council for Dr Carolyn Barnes
- > Bill Hamilton – NDA for Jonathan Jenkin
- > Ryan Maitland – ONR Sizewell B for Graham Moorcroft

## **7b. Confirmation of co-opted members**

### 3540 Co-Opted Members:

- > Trevor Branton
- > Marianne Fellowes (Chair)
- > Tom Griffith-Jones
- > Pete Wilkinson (Vice Chair)

Chair asked for any further pledges to become co-opted members but no response was forthcoming. She added that if anybody else wished to be co-opted then they can get in touch as the constitution allows 10 co-opted members.

## **7c. Review of organisational membership**

- 3541 Chair repeated that if anybody feels there are any groups or individuals locally who could be of benefit then to please encourage them to get in touch, she clarified that there is no election process or vote, instead interest would need to be shown in order for them to be brought on board.

## **8. Confirmation of Chairman and Deputy Chairman**

- 3542 Chair explained that as part of the constitution there are not annual elections but members may object to any continuation. Marianne Fellowes was confirmed as Chair and Pete Wilkinson as Vice Chair.

## **9. Any other business**

- 3543 Mr T Griffith-Jones declared that he has been a member for 3 years and has not yet been invited for his induction tour, or round Sizewell A & B. He hoped to take part in an induction that the new members would be invited also. Chair agreed and noted the DFS of particular interest, she assured that this will be progressed and enquiries will be made with A & B site for arrangements (together or if too much to achieve in one day then separately). Chair emphasised the importance of working together and responding to the invite, to do your best to attend the dates offered as there will not be a succession of them as it has to be cost effective and with the correct members of staff present.

- 3544 Chair thanked all for their attendance, wishing safe journeys home and declaring that minutes and notes would follow.

## **NEXT MEETINGS:**

Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2017 at 10:00, Sizewell Sports and Social Club

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017 at 10:00, Aldeburgh Community & Sports Centre