

**MINUTES OF THE SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG).
HELD AT SIZEWELL SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB, KING GEORGE'S AVENUE,
LEISTON, IP16 4JX ON THURSDAY 14TH FEBRUARY AT 9.30AM.**

IN ATTENDANCE

Ms Marianne Fellowes	-	Co-Opted Member, SSG Chair
Mr Pete Wilkinson	-	Co-Opted Member, SSG Deputy Chair
Dr Carolyn Barnes	-	Economic Development and Regeneration Officer, Suffolk Coastal District Council
Mr Paul Berenguier	-	French Nuclear Safety Authority
Mr Trevor Branton	-	Co-Opted Member
Miss Kerry Byrne	-	Minute Taker
Ms Lisa Chandler	-	Energy Projects Manager, Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Council
Mrs Tracey Finn	-	SSG Secretariat, Magnox
Mr Bill Hamilton	-	Stakeholder Relations Manager, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)
Cllr Terry Hodgson	-	Suffolk Association of Local Councils
Ms Pat Hogan	-	Sizewell Residents Association
Cllr Geoff Holdcroft	-	Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr Maureen Jones	-	Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Councils
Mr Paul Morton	-	Sizewell B Station Director, EDF
Mr Allen Neiling	-	Sizewell A (and Bradwell) Closure Director, Magnox
Cllr Peter Palmer	-	Aldeburgh Town Council
Mr Steve Payne	-	Regional Communications Lead, Magnox
Mrs Niki Rousseau	-	Community Liaison Officer, EDF
Mr Colin Tait	-	Sizewell B Inspector, ONR
Mr Mike Taylor	-	Suffolk Friends of the Earth
Mr John White	-	Bradwell Local Community Liaison Council (LCLC)

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Pat Dorcey
Steven Dorcey

CHAIRS OPENING COMMENTS

3910 The Chair welcomed all attendees and provided domestic arrangements.

3911 The Chair gave congratulations to Niki Rousseau and Bill Hamilton; Niki Rousseau has been named as one of the most inspirational women in Suffolk, for her work in the community. Bill Hamilton has secured a new post as Director of Communications for Magnox. A special welcome was given to John White, Deputy Chair of Bradwell LCLC (Bradwell's SSG equivalent).

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3912 Apologies for absence were received from:

- Chris Betson – East Suffolk Business Association Network
- Dr Thérèse Coffey – MP for Suffolk Coastal
- Janet Fendley – Suffolk Friends of the Earth, Mike Taylor present as representative
- Cllr William Howard – Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council
- Cllr Russ Rainger – Suffolk County Council
- Colin Tucker – Sizewell B Staff Representative
- Chris Wheeler – Co-Opted Member
- Rowland Cook – Sizewell A ONR Inspector, Colin Tait present as ONR representative
- Phil Fahey – Sizewell A EA Inspector
- Andy Osman – Head of Emergency Planning, Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit
- Victoria Thomas – Sizewell B EA Inspector

3913 There were no new declarations of interest.

2. SIZEWELL A REPORTS

2a. Allen Neiling – Closure Director, Magnox

3914 Safety and Compliance

Sizewell A had two recordable injuries since the last SSG meeting:

- False widow spider bite. This was reportable since GP advice and antibiotic were given. The public were advised to watch out.
- Slip in wet conditions. A contractor slipped on the metal surface of the site weighbridge and injured the back of his head. There is a rule that people are not to exit their vehicle, however, he did and subsequently slipped. This rule to not exit any vehicle while it is on the weighbridge has been reinforced by putting up extra signage, amending a form for vehicles entering site to state that occupants are not to exit the vehicle whilst on the weighbridge (which the driver must sign and agree to), and providing further briefings to escorts of contractors on this matter.

No environmental events.

3915 Management of Bradwell

Bradwell Site is now in Care and Maintenance. Sizewell A now manages Bradwell and Allen Neiling is the Closure Director for both sites. At Bradwell, there is still an Administration Building and Waste Building to demolish. Other buildings (Reactor Building Safe Stores, Ponds/Vaults, and ISF) are now in their passively safe Care and Maintenance state and Sizewell A staff will continue to manage them until the Final Site Clearance phase.

Allen commented that delivering Bradwell into Care and Maintenance is a major achievement and a UK first. Extensive work has gone into this both from Magnox and the Regulators, Allen thanked everyone involved for their hard work.

Bradwell Intermediate Storage Facility (ISF) is still periodically receiving Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) packages from Dungeness A (approximately 6 weekly) which is being managed by Sizewell A staff. Periodic inspections and maintenance routines at BRD will still be required during Care and Maintenance which will be managed by Sizewell A staff. These inspections and maintenance routines will generate a small amount of waste which will be packaged and transported to Sizewell A to be disposed of via approved waste routes. The waste volume is expected to be up to approximately 5m³ per annum. There is a 30-day notification requirement to inform Suffolk County Council of the proposed transport of waste. Waste items are expected to comprise of coveralls, wipes, cloths and other disposable items. There is also a possibility that some liquids will be generated through decontamination processes.

New emergency and security arrangements are in place at Bradwell. Discussions had been held throughout the transition into Care and Maintenance with the Bradwell LCLC and NDA.

3916 Plant and Structures Programme

Work continues to progress with the National Grid Substation demolition. The contractors are in the middle of asbestos removal and clean which has approximately two months left before full demolition commences. Scaffold with asbestos enclosures are visible up each side of the building, these are in place to aid removal of asbestos boards as well as the building's roof drainage system. Work is progressing well and physical building demolition is scheduled to start in April 2019.

3917 Ponds Programme

The programme is now into a phase of waste retrievals. A Temporary Shielded Storage Container has been used to store a filter medium and sludge residue from a corroded fuel element that was removed from the pond. The container has now been removed from the Ponds and is being stored at Sizewell A. ILW Skips have been removed from the Pond. There were 34 skips which were characterised as ILW, the skips were cut up into flat plates by the divers and then packed into baskets. The baskets have been removed, packaged and placed into storage awaiting transfer to Hinkley Point A where they will be put into their final waste containment and grouted. This is a significant achievement since these were some of the higher activity wastes that were present in Sizewell A Ponds.

Some ILW remains in the Ponds such as nimonic springs, Fuel Element Debris (FED), and other miscellaneous contaminated items. These items have been collected by the divers and are now being sorted and segregated into the relevant waste streams. They will then be put into their containers which are known as Shielded Transfer Pots before removal from the Pond. The Shielded Transfer Pots will then be stored alongside the other ILW streams at Sizewell A before being transferred to DCICs for storage at Bradwell ISF.

Within the next month, waste items will have been reduced to a point where the level of the Pond water can be dropped. This will allow the wash down and decontamination process of the Ponds walls to begin.

3918 Asset Care Projects

Asbestos work, cladding and roof repairs are ongoing and will continue into the next financial year. Allen Neiling stated the importance of maintaining Sizewell A assets in a good condition.

3919 Socio-economics

Several contributions have been made to the local community this financial year which are detailed below. There is still funding available through Sizewell A Closure Director and more information can be found at www.magnoxsocioeconomic.com or by contacting Steve Payne, Regional Communications Lead, Magnox. Encouragement was given for people to apply for funding of local projects as there is still money available.

Organisation	Funding Awarded	Description/Outcome
1 st Saxmundham Rainbows	£250	Purchase of craft materials and new badges.
Ransomes Sports U11's Youth Football Team	£600	Provision of new goals as per FA requirements for age group.
Leiston Football Club U14's	£850	Purchase of new kit.
Needham Market Phoenix Youth FC U14's	£558	Purchase of new kit.
Martlesham Youth Football	£560	Purchase of training tops.
Total Awarded	£2818	

3920 Sizewell A Summary

Allen Neiling concluded that Sizewell A is relatively quiet at present, largely due to the Site being in a good condition. This means that funding levels are low for the next few years reflecting the relatively low risk.

Questions to Sizewell A

- 3921 Pete Wilkinson reiterated that ILW from Sizewell A is planned to be transported to Bradwell. He reflected that storage of ILW at Bradwell is intended to be temporary. However, this interim storage is currently for an indefinite period until a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) is available, which Pete said may never happen. Allen Neiling responded that it is Magnox's responsibility to get the waste into safe interim storage and that the future strategy is the NDA's/government's responsibility. Bill Hamilton added that he will speak further on this topic later in the meeting. The Chair added that she has been invited to a Radioactive Waste Management (RWM) meeting in April and will feedback any information from this as well as asking any questions raised prior.
- 3922 Mike Taylor stated that Bradwell is in a high flood risk area and he is concerned with how robust the storage arrangements are if there are issues with increased flooding. He questioned how confident Magnox are with having to move the waste if needed. As this question relates to long term waste strategy, Allen Neiling referred the question to Bill Hamilton.
- 3923 Cllr Maureen Jones asked for further information on the 5m³ of waste from Bradwell which will be transferred to Sizewell A for disposal. She asked about the decontamination of this waste. Allen Neiling clarified that this waste does not require decontamination and will be packaged and follow the Site's approved waste streams (e.g. to Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR), or combustible soft waste which is compacted and sent for incineration at licenced commercial facilities, metal recycling etc.). Sizewell A already has these waste routes in place, which will no longer exist at Bradwell. Allen confirmed that this will be a continual process, though it hasn't yet begun.

The Chair clarified that this waste is going to be generated from maintenance activities conducted at Bradwell and is not relating to Bradwell operational waste. The Chair stated that the process of bringing Bradwell waste to Sizewell A is currently not a permitted activity and questioned whether it would need to be subject to an application. Allen Neiling reiterated that a minimum of 30 days' notice is required for any council permissioning. Allen stated that the amount was minimal in comparison to the volumes of waste Sizewell A currently manages and will have a negligible impact. The Chair considers that this is an oversight in the management of Bradwell since this is the first time it has been raised in this forum. Allen Neiling said that this is in the development of Magnox's plans. Maintenance will be required over the Care and Maintenance period and during this time items such as valves or sensors will need replacement, leading to the creation of waste. He stated that this volume is manageable and acknowledged that the requirements of the transport and waste disposal regulations will have to be met.

- 3924 The Chair asked how Magnox will continue to communicate with the Bradwell LCLC and wider community. Bill Hamilton advised that he will speak on this topic later in the meeting. Allen Neiling attended the last Bradwell LCLC with Bob Nichols (the previous Bradwell Closure Director) to help with the transition and it is his intention to continue to communicate in this forum.
- 3925 John White asked about the FED dissolution process which has been used at Bradwell and Dungeness A, and whether this process would be employed at Sizewell A. Allen Neiling stated that Sizewell A has approximately 1500 drums of FED which is currently stored in vaults. This FED has been sampled and will be characterised as Low Level Waste (LLW). As Sizewell A FED is not as active as the Bradwell FED, Sizewell A will be able to dispose of it as LLW to LLWR rather than having to process it into DCICs. Allen noted that some Bradwell FED was reclassified as LLW and

was also able to be disposed of to LLWR. The Sizewell A FED therefore doesn't need to follow the dissolution process to reduce its volume.

- 3926 Pat Hogan gave her thanks for Allen Neiling's attendance at the Sizewell Residents Association meeting. Residents are in favour of a 40mph speed limit on the 'Sizewell Gap' Road to the 'dump'. An application has been made to the Highways Agency which Cllr Betson has assisted with. Pat Hogan expects that the Closure Directors for both Sizewell Site's will be consulted and she expressed her hope that they would support the application. Allen Neiling confirmed his support.
- 3927 Pat Hogan questioned if the Nuclear Licensed Site Boundary could be rearranged as the Site decommissions and the land becomes available. She expressed concern over impingement on the 'Pillbox Field' and access onto that road. She felt it strange that land which could be better used for Sizewell B or Sizewell C facilities hasn't been released. She did not think it likely that Sizewell A land will be made available for public use and would like for Magnox to apply pressure to realign the Nuclear Licensed Site Boundary as soon as possible, allowing use of what she feels is redundant Sizewell A land. She understands that this is a complicated process but asked that it is started as soon as possible. Allen Neiling noted that Magnox is a client of the NDA and that Sizewell A land belongs to the NDA, not Magnox. Magnox and EDF are in ongoing discussions over the reuse of land.

The Chair stated that she understands this is a difficult situation. She noted that it is easiest for a new build to ask for Sizewell B facilities to be relocated, and that Sizewell B's easiest option is to relocate to unused land. This is because there would be unlimited access to the land, no conflicts in scheduled timelines for decommissioning/construction, it would be cheaper, and there would be less legal ramifications than negotiating use of someone else's land. However, she believes this could be a trigger to get Sizewell A decommissioned sooner. She noted that Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Safety (BEIS) are investigating Continuous Reactor Decommissioning (CRD) if there is sufficient justification (which is usually based on the condition of the Site). She continued that Sizewell A has well maintained buildings so the Site is considered low risk. She felt that if there is public demand for CRD at Sizewell A, this could happen to facilitate other energy infrastructure projects. The Chair feels that more and more green spaces are being given up around the existing stations and asked if a summary of Magnox opinion regarding realignment of Sizewell A Nuclear Licensed Site Boundary could be given. Allen Neiling advised that Magnox had contributed to the NDA's response, which expresses interest to continue interface and discussions and that further clarification is needed regarding boundaries.

- 3928 Trevor Branton believed that Sizewell A Turbine Hall would be the next large building to be demolished after the National Grid Substation building. He asked when in the decommissioning programme clearance and demolition of this building is scheduled to begin. Allen Neiling advised that the current plan is to begin in 2024. He explained that the planned date is due to the Turbine Hall being a large structure which still contains all of its equipment. Therefore it will be a very expensive project. Sizewell A Turbine Hall is also considered low hazard compared to other structures across the Magnox fleet. Sizewell A Turbine Hall is in good condition and the main issues in maintaining it is ensuring cladding integrity and dealing with pigeon ingress. The Chair believes Sizewell C construction is due to begin in 2022 if approved, she noted her disappointment over having construction activities begin whilst the legacy of Sizewell A remains. She acknowledged that this is based on funding and risk.

3929 Pete Wilkinson asked for an explanation for the change in Sizewell A FED characterisation from ILW to LLW. Allen Neiling explained that Sizewell A FED characterisation has always been borderline (activity level on the threshold of LLW/ILW classification). A substantial sample (4 drums worth) was taken from the FED vaults and sent for analysis. Results have characterised the FED as LLW. Pete asked if samples had been sent from all 1500 drums. Allen clarified that a representative sample was taken from out of the vaults themselves. Pete Wilkinson questioned whether this change in characterisation was the result of natural decay or differing burn-up times and why Sizewell A FED was different to other Magnox sites. Allen Neiling confirmed the change in characterisation was due to natural decay. The reason for Sizewell A FED differing is because they stopped de-splitting their fuel very early on in generation, allowing a longer period of natural decay. This is also the reason that Sizewell A has a very small quantity, with only three of six vaults containing FED. Allen added that a small quantity one Ductile Cast Iron Container (DCIC) of ILW is expected to be found in the FED vaults. The ILW is expected to comprise of materials such as Nimonic spring, nose cones etc. which will not have decayed sufficiently to be LLW. These items will be sorted and packaged appropriately as ILW. He confirmed that this will be in addition to the approximately 1500 210 litre drums of LLW FED.

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

3930 Rowland Cook had sent his apologies. The Sizewell A ONR quarterly report for 1st October 2018 – 31st December 2018 had been issued. Questions were welcomed for Colin Tait, Sizewell B ONR Inspector but none were forthcoming.

2c. Phil Fahey – Environment Agency (EA)

3931 Phil Fahey had sent his apologies and no EA representatives were present. EA Report to SSG covering October 2018 – January 2019 had been issued.

Questions to the EA

- 3932 The Chair will ask for the EA to comment on the impacts on screening and the buffer zone at Sizewell A caused by the proposed Sizewell B relocation of facilities. She will also ask for comment on the movement of waste from Bradwell to Sizewell A.
- 3933 Mike Taylor asked if there is a known footprint on cumulative environmental and radiological impacts of Sizewell A and Sizewell B, if so can this be shared and reviewed to consider if any factors have been overlooked in relation to Sizewell C. He referenced the example of Hinkley Point C 'mud-dumping' at Cardiff Bay.
- 3934 The Chair noted that on page 6 of the EA report there is a section regarding strontium-90. Strontium-90 was detected on Aldeburgh beach a year or two ago, causing concerns and press coverage. She stated that there have now been findings at Southwold which were reported in the Radioactivity In Food and the Environment (RIFE) 23 report. The EA report is the first instance that the Chair had heard of these findings and was not aware of community or press awareness on this matter. The Chair will ask the EA to give more information regarding strontium-90 at Southwold, for circulation to stakeholders. Pete Wilkinson endorsed the Chair's point and said the EA report stated "*the levels of strontium-90 reported in RIFE are very low and are of negligible risk to the public and environment*", he feels that this is incorrect. He believes the report should say 'to the best of our

(EA) knowledge' as the impacts of strontium-90 are unknown.

3935 Pete Wilkinson referred to page 2 of the EA report 'Joint Inspection on Higher Activity Waste with ONR' which refers to an inspection of the EDF High Active Waste (HAW) arrangements and a site inspection of Sizewell B in conjunction with the ONR in January 2019. He assumed HAW arrangements meant spent fuel as he wasn't aware of what other HAW would be on site at Sizewell B. This was the first time he'd seen spent fuel referred to as waste. Colin Tait explained that this was an ONR led inspection, held jointly with the EA. The inspection covered HAW arrangements at Sizewell B. HAW at Sizewell B refers to spent ion exchange resin (which is borderline between LLW and ILW), not spent fuel and not high-level waste. The Chair noted that waste categories are used in reports with the assumption that the public will understand them, however this is often not the case.
Action: EA/ONR to clarify where Higher Activity Wastes may arise from.

2d. Bill Hamilton - NDA

3936 Use of NDA Land

Bill Hamilton discussed the reuse of NDA owned land at Sizewell A. He explained that the first duty of the NDA in considering reuse of land (in or around the site) is that proposals won't impinge on the ability to decommission safely and compliantly. He continued that the next duty is managing competing aspirations for the land, whether for community use or to help the development of Sizewell C. He explained that the NDA acts as a facilitator between Sizewell A and Sizewell B. The NDA listen to the needs of the Sizewell A and refer this to the NDA property experts who discuss with EDF which parts of land, if any, are suitable for reuse. There is no agreement in place with regards to reuse of land but they remain in discussion over this complex issue. Once information is available on any agreements between the NDA/Magnox/EDF it will be shared with the SSG. He reminded the SSG that CRD is not the current NDA strategy. He reinforced that final decisions on reuse of land sit with those responsible for regulating land use such as the local planning authority, or for national infrastructure projects like nuclear new build, the UK Government.

3937 Milestones

The regulators have declared Bradwell fit for entry into C&M. A variety of stakeholders celebrated this event. This is the first of the Magnox Sites to enter the period of quiescence known as Care and Maintenance. Bill mentioned the 'hot topic' of CRD and stated it should be made absolutely clear that the current NDA strategy is for Care and Maintenance (deferred decommissioning). Each community hosting a Magnox Site in the UK is arguing the case for CRD, and he would advise that this community, if it felt that CRD is wanted, should make their case to the Local Authority. He gave Cumbria as an example, where time and resources have been allocated by their Local Authority to prepare a business case to present to the NDA for Calder Hall CRD.

Bill explained that at the end of 2018 THORP at Sellafield completed its final shearing of the last fuel rods. In the coming months Post Operation Clear Out (POCO) will take place for the repurposing of THORP. After POCO, the Ponds will be repurposed to store fuel from existing EDF Power Stations (not Sizewell B). Apart from Calder Hall which is located at Sellafield, the last remaining Magnox Site with fuel is Wylfa. Wylfa is three quarters defuelled and is expected to finish defuelling by the end of 2019. By the end of 2020 that fuel will have all been reprocessed in the Magnox Reprocessing Plant and that plant can then shut down. Therefore by the end of 2020 all the Magnox Sites will be defuelled and either in Care and Maintenance Preparations, or in Care and Maintenance. There will no

longer be a requirement to reprocess UK nuclear fuel and Sellafield Site will then be decommissioned.

3938 Magnox Transition

Bill explained that there is a team dedicated to the Magnox transition comprising of NDA, Magnox and other contractors and consultants. The Cavendish Fluor Partnership will exit the business and will no longer be in control of Magnox Ltd. from midnight on the 31st August 2019. The NDA will take over on the 1st of September 2019 and Lawrie Haynes has been appointed Chair Designate of the NDA subsidiary Magnox Ltd. He is in favour of stakeholder engagement and is already meeting Magnox's stakeholders. It is expected that he will at some point attend the SSG. Other Magnox Ltd Executive Directors are also to be appointed, the NDA are very advanced with regards to the interview process and offering positions. Bill is fortunate to have been offered the position of Director of Communications which he has accepted.

3939 Holliday Inquiry

The Holliday Inquiry, is an independent inquiry into the award of the Magnox decommissioning contract by the NDA and its subsequent termination. An interim report has been produced and meetings have taken place, however, the full report is yet to be published. Bill's impression is that the NDA feels very different as a result of the inquiry and that it is still changing.

3940 Bradwell LCLC

Bill said in response to an earlier question, that Bradwell LCLC will continue and will only change as and when requested by the LCLC. The NDA won't impose any change in community engagement and there will continue to be one meeting a year. Bill speculated that future engagement could be channelled through the local parish council who could communicate questions and concerns directly with the NDA. He noted that nothing has been decided upon and any changes would be in agreement with the LCLC and the community.

3941 GDF

The Secretary of State issued a paper in December 2018 confirming their response to a consultation paper written by BEIS on the way in which BEIS and RWM will consult and engage with communities on the GDF. RWM are holding a series of engagement meetings around the country starting off the consultation process. Alongside the meetings there has been a geological survey map published on the government website (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/about-national-geological-screening-ngs>) to summarise the geology of the UK (excluding Scotland) that is relevant to the safe disposal of HAW. Publishing this survey has led to some confusion as many believe that identifying suitable rock formations means there is an intention to locate a GDF in these locations. Bill made it clear there will be no investigations anywhere in the country unless the community volunteers. Volunteering does not commit the community to host a GDF, it opens a dialogue for future consideration to host a GDF.

The NDA have arranged a seminar in April for SSG Chairs and Deputy Chairs in London. One of the main parts of this seminar will be a presentation by RWM. If the SSG want RWM to give this presentation to them later in the year the SSG will need to request it. RWM are not engaging with communities at this stage, they are raising the issue so that communities can have time to consider

and reflect whether they would like to engage in discussion about hosting a GDF, once this stage begins.

3942 Bill expressed his thanks to the SSG for their engagement over the years, as this was his last SSG in his current role.

Questions to the NDA

3943 Trevor Branton referenced the Thermal Oxide Reprocessing Plant (THORP) final shearing and stated that seven Advance Gas-Cooled Reactor (AGR)s creating oxide fuel remain. He asked Bill Hamilton to provide information on the justification for repurposing THORP to a storage facility rather than a reprocessing plant. Bill responded that THORP was built in the 1980's and in order to continue to reprocess fuel at high quality the plant requires significant investment for refurbishment. He also believes that the global market for reprocessing fuel doesn't support the investment. It was identified that the Ponds Buildings remain in a good condition and can therefore be easily repurposed for long term storage, continuing to make some use of the plant.

3944 Peter Palmer mentioned the GDF and the community engagement taking place as part of this. He referenced the Sizewell B DFS and that fuel would be stored for 120 years, he doesn't recall the same level of engagement as for the GDF. Bill responded that whilst 120 years is a long time, this remains interim storage, not permanent. The GDF is planned to be the final store for the spent fuel.

3945 Pete Wilkinson stated that THORP didn't perform well and often failed to meet the annual targets for reprocessing. He recalled previous government enthusiasm for THORP 2 which didn't materialise. He agreed that there was no longer viable market appetite for reprocessing fuel internationally. He believes that the UK government regulators should recognise that the reprocessing of fuel was always a bad idea. He added that huge amounts of radioactive waste from reprocessing fuel have contaminated the Irish Sea and speculated that this may be causing cancers along the Cumbrian coast. He noted that there is 100 tonnes of plutonium which doesn't have an agreed strategy for long term storage. Pete Wilkinson noted that he is a member of the Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates (NWAA) who has put together an issues register comprised from review of IAEA and EA reports. They have identified over 100 technical and scientific hurdles to dispose of radioactive waste through analysis of these and other reports. NWAA engaged with RWM regarding these findings and understand that RWM have an issues register containing approximately 300 issues. He stated that he understood many of them are relatively small, but there are some 'show stoppers'. Pete complained that GDF is being promoted as providing a safe and secure long term disposal solution for HAW. However, he continued that the NDA couldn't say whether this was safe or not. He urged the NDA to tell people the truth, that disposal of HAW is not a 'secure science' and that uncertainties need to be addressed during the consultation before they reveal themselves at a later date. He felt that this clarity is needed to give people confidence in the NDA resolution processes.

Bill Hamilton responded that this is not his area for debate, but as he stated earlier in the meeting he can try to facilitate discussion between RWM and the SSG.

Pete Wilkinson continued that the NWAA have engaged with RWM many times. Pete said that RWM are a subsidiary of the NDA and that the NDA Monthly Update (January 2019), page 2 ('Search begins to find site for Geological Disposal Facility') contains the words he referenced about safe and secure storage, hence he was raising it in this forum.

The Chair clarified the question as being “how can the NDA state that GDF will provide a long term solution when there are still uncertainties”. The Chair feels part of the issue is the language which is used and the disparity between that used by the public and the industry. The Government have tasked RWM with delivering a GDF, therefore RWM are saying they *will* deliver a GDF. The Chair believes the language the public want to hear is they *may* deliver, if all the requirements are met, including technical specification, safety case and community will. The Chair’s advice to the NDA and RWM is to consider their language and that terminology used can appear to pre-empt the outcome of consultation. She noted that BEIS are not represented at the SSG and therefore these questions are directed at the NDA as a government representative.

Bill Hamilton confirmed that he understood why the NDA are asked the questions and it is not within BEIS remit to attend the SSG. He understands the issue with language use and stated that he hasn’t used this language himself. His responsibility is to make sure the NDA/RWM are open and transparent and that people can engage in discussion. Bill states that in his new role at Magnox he will continue to put pressure on the NDA and RWM to engage in the debate. Bill assured the SSG that he would feedback the comments on the language used.

3946 Terry Hodgson stated that as a society we have a duty to provide a safe and secure disposal facility. He continued that safety is always a relative term and provided some real-life examples.

3947 Mike Taylor referenced predictions of sea level rise and raised his concerns over the effect of sea level rise on Sizewell B DFS. He is concerned whether the materials within the DFS can be safely transported to a GDF, if/when it becomes available. If sea levels rise to the extent that the material needs to be moved from Sizewell B, he asked whether an ‘above surface store’ should be considered now. He also asked if the same consideration had been given to the ILW stored at Bradwell. Mike raised another point on the ‘Suffolk Minerals and Wastes Local Plan’. He said this report mentioned the whole of Sizewell A Site as a proposed waste site but the report did not mention NDA involvement.

The Chair noted that Cllr Russ Rainger had previously confirmed to her that the ‘Suffolk Minerals and Wastes Local Plan’ referred to non-nuclear waste. Mike Taylor added that the report also stated Sizewell A would have shared waste facilities with Bradwell. The Chair agreed to ask Suffolk County Council about this issue and asked Bill Hamilton to focus his response on Mike’s question regarding sea level rise. Bill Hamilton stated that this question should be addressed to RWM and that he is not able to give a response.

Mike Taylor said that he was aware of a meeting which took place 13th February 2019, with the ONR reviewing the potential effects of overall climate change predictions. He took this to mean that the ONR have concerns on this matter.

Colin Tait stated that it is the ONR’s job to consider the implications of climate change but they are not concerned. Radioactive waste storage must be underpinned by a robust safety case which examines the risk to the store from potential external hazards, including flooding. It is important that the safety case is robust for current conditions and for the future. He confirmed that climate change/sea level rise is something that the ONR monitor, but reiterated they’re not concerned.

Trevor Branton gave his understanding that both Sizewell A and Sizewell B are at least 30ft above current sea level. He had not seen any predictions that would challenge this, and the greatest increase he has seen projected is 1-2m maximum.

- 3948 The Chair expressed her disappointed that new energy infrastructure projects cannot be used as an opportunity to accelerate Sizewell A decommissioning, however she understands that the primary remit of the NDA is decommissioning the Site. The Chair feels there is a disconnection between NDA and BEIS, as NDA doesn't have the remit to look at all energy infrastructure. The Chair believes that BEIS does have the remit but won't dictate that Sizewell A decommissioning should be accelerated. The Chair thanked Bill Hamilton for his advice on producing a business case with the Local Authority for Continuous Reactor Decommissioning at Sizewell A. The Chair feels the public don't understand that differentiation of responsibilities with government organisations. Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) consultation opens 16th February 2019, their proposal requests use of green field space for another energy project. The Chair referred again to the timing of Sizewell A National Grid Substation demolition in conjunction with a proposal for a new energy infrastructure project. The Chair requested more support for the community in navigating the system as she feels they need someone within government to offer their help. She directly asked Bill Hamilton if he felt he could create a dialogue with BEIS.

Bill Hamilton sympathised with the Chair's view but explained that government is not structured to function in that way. He added that over the last 30 years decisions have been made to privatise the country's energy infrastructure, creating private companies who work to their own agendas. This has made things less joined up. He was happy to feedback the points raised at this meeting to his contacts within BEIS. He was wary to not promise anything more than this and noted that the argument is with the structure of government itself. Bill believes the best way forward is the business case for Sizewell A CRD, which the NDA are in support of.

- 3949 Peter Palmer expressed his concern over the inability to establish a confluence of local projects since none have planning permission.

Cllr Geoff Holdcroft noted that he attends Suffolk Energy Coast Delivery Board. This quarterly meeting is chaired by Dr Thérèse Coffey and is attended by BEIS. He will attend the next meeting on 15th February 2019. It is within their role to review co-ordination of all energy projects proposed. BEIS are being urged to review all energy proposals cumulatively. Cllr Holdcroft visited Claire Perry, Minister of State for Energy and Clean Growth at the end of summer to press the case.

The Chair asked what response was received. Cllr Holdcroft reported that the initial response from BEIS was that it is a matter of how planning inspectorates review applications. Planning applications are initially reviewed individually but then collectively. He reiterated that BEIS will continue to be pushed to apply pressure to planning inspectorates to review planning applications collectively. He recognised that civil servants are bound by protocol and constraints. The Chair noted that Dr Thérèse Coffey and George Freeman (MP for Mid-Norfolk) are pushing to have this matter debated in the House of Commons. Cllr Holdcroft confirmed this was scheduled for 6th February 2019 but extenuating circumstances mean this has to be rescheduled.

- 3950 Mike Taylor referenced an Energy White Paper which he believed was due in June 2019. Due to other political influences he doesn't feel answers are being given in relation to energy projects.
- 3951 The Chair noted that the SSG hasn't asked the NDA (Bill Hamilton) to comment on the impacts of Brexit and the associated issues (e.g. Euratom).

Bill responded that Dave Peattie, NDA Chief Executive recently reported to the NDA on this topic. Bill commented that the NDA has a Manager which has been dedicated to Brexit over the last two years. Bill reflected on the transfer of obligations and safeguards from Euratom to British safeguards, which has been successful in policy framework terms. The new policy framework is equal to what exists now under Euratom. The Chair acknowledged that ONR have worked hard to train and recruit staff in preparedness to take control following exit from Euratom.

3. SIZEWELL B REPORTS

3a. Paul Morton – Station Director, EDF

3952 Safety performance and staffing

During the period of the report there were:

- No lost time injuries;
- No nuclear reportable incidents (now over 3000 days since the last);
- No environmental incidents.

Staffing levels remain stable at 541 EDF Energy staff including 16 Apprentices, 5 Technical Trainees, 1 Graduate and 2 Industrial Placements. Sizewell B also has 250 year-round contracting partners on Site.

3953 Company News

The SSG had previously been interested in initiatives EDF were exploring to enhance their support of the environment and new technologies. During the last period EDF have signed a formal agreement with Nissan for the reuse of electric car batteries (batteries which have come to the end of their normal use within cars). The batteries are transferred to a domestic or light commercial environment and used to back up local generators (e.g. for wind and solar power generation). This initiative will help support decentralisation of electricity generation and supply strategy. One of the challenges of renewable electricity generation is how to store the power to account for fluctuations in demand and production. This new agreement is in the early stages, but EDF are happy to report that development is progressing.

3954 EDF Energy women named in Suffolk List of the most inspirational women in the county

The East Anglian Daily Times newspaper ran a campaign in 2018 to find the most inspirational women in Suffolk. EDF had three women nominated for these awards including Katie Bannister, Reactor Operator Sizewell B; Julia Pyke, SZC Nuclear Development Officer; and Niki Rousseau, Community Liaison for Sizewell B who won one of the awards. EDF are very proud of their personnel and work very hard on diversity and inclusion.

3955 SZB Relocated Facilities (RF)

An environmental scoping report was submitted to Suffolk Coastal District Council in October 2016 which included proposals to relocate some Sizewell B non-nuclear facilities. Public consultation on this topic took place (4th January 2019 to 1st February 2019). Consultation included:

- Exhibition boards at two events (Friday 4th January 2019 – Sizewell B Visitors Centre and Saturday 5th January 2019 – Leiston United Reformed Church);
- A4 Newsletter distributed to residents within Leiston-cum-Sizewell Parish outlining proposals and informing people how to respond;
- Consultation information was included in Sizewell Bs December Community Newsletter; and
- Proposals outlined at a local residents meeting.

Maps were presented to the SSG indicating which existing buildings require relocation and the proposed new locations.

3956 Relocated Facilities -what happens next?

106 responses were received with a range of comments for consideration which are now being worked through. These comments will be incorporated into a Statement of Community Consultation which will accompany the planning application. There will be opportunities for further consultation as the planning process progresses. Encouragement was given to raise any concerns and it was noted that this can be done outside of formal meetings. Permission will be sought for Relocated Facilities through both the Town and Country Planning Act application and as part of the Sizewell C Development Consent Order.

Next steps:

- April 2019 planning submission;
- August/September 2019 planning application determination; and
- Proposal for works starting in early 2020.

3957 Sizewell B Outage

The next refuelling outage for Sizewell B is planned to commence on 31st May 2019 and is expected to last for 54 days. The next SSG meeting is 23rd May 2019 and further information on this outage will be provided at this time.

Questions to Sizewell B

3958 Cllr Maureen Jones asked about Sizewell B relocation of facilities and whether Sizewell C would have its own visitor centre, or if the Sizewell B visitor centre would be combined with Sizewell C. Paul Morton confirmed that a combined visitor centre is anticipated to minimise the impact. He continued that a combined training facility had also been considered but Sizewell C will have to build their own training centre if Sizewell C goes ahead. This is due to the need for a larger building footprint for a combined facility. Niki Rousseau added that each training facility would need to hold a full-scale simulator and that Sizewell B and Sizewell C are of a different design and would therefore need two simulators to be housed within a combined facility (which there is not space for on Sizewell B land).

3959 Terry Hodgson reference the two maps presented regarding the relocation of Sizewell B facilities. He questioned that the maps showing existing and proposed facilities indicated that there is already a car park on 'Pillbox Field' which is incorrect. Niki Rousseau clarified that the key indicates this area is to be used as a consequence of relocating other facilities and is not currently in use. The Chair agreed with Mr Hodgson and highlighted that the key was misleading due to the grouping of areas which include existing buildings and landscaped areas, with areas to be used as a

consequence of relocating facilities. The Chair felt that the key should give a differentiation between existing buildings and landscaped areas, and areas to be used as a consequence of the relocation of facilities. Terry Hodgson continued that the diagram on the EDF website was too small to be able to view the key with any clarity. Paul Morton apologised for this and stated that it was not their intention to be misleading.

- 3960 Pat Hogan gave her opinion that development on 'Pillbox Field' was not supported locally. She considers that use of Sandy Lane as a point of entry and exit from the proposed car park would present a hazard. Pat Hogan voiced the local resident's preference for entry via a single access road due to road safety concerns. She referenced SPR's plans for two additional access points for development of their facilities. Pat Hogan asked for support in preserving the character of the village and the coast.

Paul Morton acknowledged that a number of the responses received in the planning consultation process reflected the sentiments that Pat Hogan presented. Impacts such as road access and screening will be considered in planning consultation. Paul committed to continued discussions and noted that plans will aim to minimise the impact on people and the local environment.

- 3961 Pat Dorcey confirmed that SPR propose construction of two access roads on the 'Sizewell Gap' road. She continued that they also plan for a construction compound to be located on 'Home Farm Field' which will likely be accessed from 'Sizewell Hall' access road (three access points created). Pat Dorcey said that Sandy Lane is a bridleway which is regularly used by horse riders, pedestrians and cyclists. If Sandy Lane is widened for use as car park access and the first 60m is tarmacked, she would like to know how the different users will be incorporated into the plans to ensure they are kept safe.

Paul Morton and Niki Rousseau questioned whether Pat Dorcey believed this was a Sizewell B proposal or SPR since Sizewell B did not have any plans to tarmac Sandy Lane. Pat Dorcey stated that it was an EDF proposal.

Action: Sizewell B to investigate and clarify what changes are proposed in relation to 'Pillbox Field' including access routes.

- 3962 Mike Taylor gave the position of Friends of the Earth that they do not believe any further development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) should be permitted. Mike questioned why consideration had not been given to reuse of buildings at the Masterlord Industrial Estate. The Chair gave examples of the visitor centre and training facility which could be located in this area, and also suggested another potential location could be Sizewell B Emergency Response Centre. Mike Taylor believes that visitor centres to nuclear sites present a security issue. He raised a further point that run-off from the proposed car park could impact the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and anticipates that this issue would be raised during the planning application.

Paul Morton commented on the location of visitor and training facilities. The options for the location have previously been reviewed and this has already been discussed with the SSG. He explained that there is an operational requirement to have the training facility close to the site. The practicalities of transportation negate facilities being off site as a possible option. He continued that the visitor centre is popular and effective, and it's felt this service is

important. There is an important link between the information given in the centre and the power station tour that follows. This becomes prohibitive if the visitor centre is located off site, and again there is a problem with transportation. Paul also commented that locating these facilities off site would lead to increased traffic on local roads.

Paul Morton responded to Mike Taylor's second point regarding security issues posed by visitors. Paul explained that there is a graded approach to security of the site and that checks are undertaken before allowing access. He said that there is a balance between opening the business to the public and maintaining a high level of safety.

The Chair agreed that allowing access is a balance and that there are a number of factors, one of which is cost. She highlighted that benefits of having an off-site visitor centre include not having as rigorous security requirements and that it could be used as a community space out of working hours. The Chair discussed the traffic levels associated with the visitor centre and mentioned that not all people visiting the centre participate in the site tour. She therefore felt that only a proportion of people would travel from the visitor centre to site, and communal transport could be used. This would provide a greater reduction in local traffic compared with all visitors having to visit an on-site facility for both the visitor centre and tour.

Paul commented that the transportation of staff to the visitor centre also needs to be considered. The Chair asked why staff could not go direct to the training centre instead of reporting to Sizewell B first. Paul confirmed this is already the arrangement for the training centre and added that it is a debate and a balance; sometimes there would be more traffic and sometimes there would be less. Paul highlighted that this was an example of a consideration and that there are many other attributes which are taken into account in the decision-making process.

The Chair stated that if permission is not granted to relocate Sizewell B buildings there is not room for Sizewell C to be built in its proposed location. Paul stated that the current plans for Sizewell C show that some of the land is currently occupied by Sizewell B. He was unsure whether this could be adjusted but agreed that it seemed unlikely. The Chair clarified that the position as far as it is known is that Sizewell B building relocation is crucial for Sizewell C construction to which Paul agreed. The Chair stated the easy option is to relocate Sizewell B buildings to an unused location. She believes that the public don't want any more greenfield sites used, the alternative is use of brownfield sites. However, if brownfield sites can't be used for the relocation of facilities it will prevent construction of Sizewell C. Paul said that discussions are continuing, and he is putting energy into pushing the use of brownfield over green, but timelines need to be considered.

3963 Lisa Chandler informed that the fall-back position for new nuclear builds is that they are including relocation of facilities in their Development Consent Order (DCO). Should an application be refused through the Town and Country Planning Act application EDF can include it in Sizewell C DCO. This is not ideal due to the construction timescales of Sizewell C, with Sizewell B requiring the relocated facilities sooner.

The Chair recapitulated that if the Sizewell B planning application is declined, the same proposals (i.e. the same land) for relocation of facilities will be put forward in the Sizewell C planning application.

- 3964 The Chair expressed her disappointment that the photos used on Sizewell C promotional material do not show the four proposed pylons and their impact. Niki Rousseau agreed to feed this back.
- 3965 Mike Taylor asked whether Sizewell B is involved in the closure of Bridleway 19 for work on the electricity network. Niki Rousseau responded that EDF are not involved. The work is being undertaken by UK Power Network (on behalf of Galloper). Niki stated that further information can be obtained from Leiston Town Council. Notices of temporary closure were sent locally (Appendix A).
- 3966 The Chair noted that she had not prepared a response to the EDF informal consultation on behalf of the SSG due to the group not having met since the consultation opened. However, following this meeting she would summarise, prepare and submit a response on behalf of the SSG.

3b. Colin Tait – Sizewell B Site Inspector, ONR

- 3967 Colin Tait began by introducing Paul Berenguier, a regulatory inspector from the French Nuclear Safety Authority who is on a three-year secondment to ONR and will be supporting work with Sizewell B. Paul will also be assessing how approaches to inspection in the UK compare to those internationally. Colin Tait then proceeded to talk through the highlights of the ONR Site Report for Sizewell B (Report Period 1st October 2018 to 31st December 2018) covering the following.

3968 Organisational Capability

This was part of a series of inspections completed across all EDF sites in the UK to evaluate their arrangements for organisational capability. Organisational capability is about confirming whether there are appropriate levels of Suitably Qualified and Experienced People to manage the site safely. Three inspectors worked over two days interviewing staff and reviewing data and documentation to form a view as to the adequacy of resourcing. Findings were that Sizewell B does have effective arrangements to manage and monitor human resources and organisational change. As a result, Sizewell B achieved a green rating against licence condition 36. Minor findings were identified relating to further development of the nuclear baseline documentation being required. This document justifies the level of staffing on each site. This was a common finding throughout the EDF sites. ONR have therefore written to EDF to rectify this.

3969 Safety Case Management

The principle focus of this inspection was to evaluate arrangements under licence condition 14, to review how Sizewell B deals with safety case anomalies. The process is part of EDF arrangements and is a structured process regarding how queries can be raised and evaluated to determine the adequacy of the safety case. This inspection took place over one day and was performed by the Site Inspector. No significant findings were identified resulting in a green inspection rating against licence condition 14.

3970 System Based Inspection – Essential Power Systems

This inspection took place in October 2018 and involved a Specialist Inspector and Site Inspector assessing Sizewell B's Essential Power Systems. The site-based inspection took place over two days, however the inspection took 14 person days overall to evaluate. These are very important systems and the time spent indicates the level of scrutiny given. No significant shortfalls were identified resulting in a green inspection rating against licence conditions 10, 23, 24, 27, and 28.

3971 Pete Wilkinson queried anomalies in the wording on Page 3 of the ONR Site Report for Sizewell B which states “*In general, ONR judged the arrangements made and implemented by the Site in response to safety requirements to be adequate in the areas inspected*”. Pete asked which areas were not inspected, and why ‘in general’ because he believes that this language infers that something was wrong. Colin Tait responded that the wording quoted is standard wording across all ONR site reports. Pete wondered if this means that no site is satisfactory. Colin went on to explain that a green rating is not given lightly, it means that EDF have been evaluated and judged to be meeting their legal duties (e.g. Health and Safety at Work Act, Energy Act). Colin agreed to feedback the issue regarding the standardised wording to the ONR Communications Department.

3972 Mike Taylor asked whether the ONR had an update regarding changes in the emergency planning regulations. The Chair responded that Andy Osman, Head of Emergency Planning, Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit would be attending the next SSG meeting to address emergency planning and Radiation Emergency Preparedness and Public Information Regulations (REPPIR). The Chair suggested this question be deferred until Andy attends to provide an update.

Colin Tait commented that BEIS are the lead government department for the progression of this issue, though it is his understanding that changes to REPPIR are progressing. The draft regulations are planned to be presented to parliament this Spring. Colin noted that an explanation of the process is provided on the BEIS (Gov) website. Once the regulations have been presented to parliament, the ONR will be responsible for providing advice including development of a Code of Practice to support compliance with the regulations.

The Chair added that Andy Osman is good at keeping the SSG informed of any changes.

3973 The Chair asked for details on the minimum number of staff required to fulfil Sizewell B emergency requirements, both for on-site response and for responding from within a certain radius of the site within a specified time.

Paul Morton responded that the nuclear baseline number for general operation is 350 people (which is under review at present and is expected to increase). He then advised the emergency scheme staffing is broken down into specific roles (e.g. monitoring specialists, engineers, etc.) and there is a requirement against each role. Personnel on the emergency scheme must be available on a 24/7 basis (when they are ‘on call’). Staff levels are managed through a rota system and notification of events would be received by pager. Sizewell B is required to monitor the level of cover and self-report if any failure is identified. On-site staff are trained to deal with any initial emergency. Niki Rousseau advised that there are 250 people on the emergency scheme. She added that to be on the scheme it is a contractual obligation to live within 45 minutes travel time from the Site. In the event of an emergency, on call personnel would be notified by pager including the location they must report to (e.g. Sizewell B, Emergency Response Centre). Pete Wilkinson challenged the 45 minute travel time stating that travel times can be variable. Niki Rousseau advised that personnel on-site are trained to manage any potential incident and would do so until emergency scheme personnel arrived to take over. Paul Morton added that the pager system is routinely tested and Sizewell B also conducts emergency exercises. Colin Tait confirmed these arrangements are also tested externally by the ONR, the last instance was September 2018.

- 3974 Colin Tait mentioned in response to REPIIR preparations that the ONR are happy to invite their representative to the SSG who is involved with developing the ONR Code of Practice. The Chair responded that this would be welcomed at the next SSG meeting.
- 3975 Peter Palmer asked Colin Tait about flood planning for Sizewell B and what distribution of floods is used within calculations. Colin Tait responded that the ONR expects safety cases to be based on a 1 in 10,000 year extreme weather event. In addition, they expect a margin to be applied to add pessimism to calculations. Following evaluation of the safety case for Sizewell B, the ONR are satisfied it is well underpinned.

3c. Victoria Thomas – Environment Agency

- 3976 Victoria Thomas had sent her apologies and no EA representatives were present. The EA Report to SSG covering October 2018 – January 2019 had been issued. Victoria Thomas will no longer be Sizewell B's Site Inspector, the newly appointed inspector will be invited to the next SSG meeting.

Questions to EA

- 3977 Pete Wilkinson referred to 'Inspection of Sizewell B Environmental Monitoring Programme' section on page 1 of the EA report in which it states:
We undertook an inspection of the Sizewell Environmental Monitoring Programme, which involves a wide range of environmental samples to assess and provide reassurance of the impact of radiological discharges from the stations to the surrounding environment.
Pete Wilkinson stated that the EA do not have the ability to make assurances on the impact as they're unknown. He feels that whenever referring to radiological impacts the EA should be transparent on the divergence of views in this matter.
- 3978 Mike Taylor has concerns regarding sewage treatment capabilities. He asked whether the EA would conduct monitoring of the sewage works outfall during Sizewell B outage. He continued to question whether it is the intention for Sizewell C to make use of the existing Sizewell A and Sizewell B sewage plant.

Paul Morton noted that structural work has recently been completed on the sewage plant which is owned and operated by Sizewell A. Sizewell B will take over operation at a later date, yet to be determined. The sewage plant is monitored regularly and meets EA standards. Paul welcomed the request to the EA for conducting further monitoring during Sizewell B outage.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND ACTION TRACKER:

4a. Minutes of the last meeting held on 4th October 2018

- 3979 No corrections or questions were noted.

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

- 3980 The Chair noted that four actions were recorded as a result of the last meeting. She will meet with Steve Payne to review the actions register once the minutes of this meeting were available.
- 3981 Action item 3846 - Niki Rousseau responded that no placements in government have currently been given.
- 3982 Action item 3857-3859 - SPR consultation time was felt to be disproportionate. The request to extend the consultation period was successful, resulting in closure of this action.
- 3983 Action item 3864 - Cllr Howard had asked the ONR to give an update on Brexit, an update has been provided but this matter is considered ongoing as Brexit develops.
- 3984 Action item 3889 – Cllr Howard had suggested that BNFL decommissioning talks would be a good base to launch the CRD strategy. As Jonathan Jenkin was not familiar with the details of the talks an action was taken for him to consult with his colleagues on the benefits of CRD. It is believed that Jonathan is reviewing this request.
- 3985 Action item 3901 - Mike Taylor had asked whether medical professionals were aware of compensations schemes for workers affected by radiation. The Chair noted that there is no standard on clinical governance and so methods vary between practices. This action remains open.
- 3986 The SSG had expected information to be shared before Christmas 2018 on the next round of GDF consultation. SSG Chairs and Vice Chairs will be briefed at the NDA Seminar in April 2019, feedback will be provided at the next SSG meeting in May. The Chair will ask for RWM to attend the next SSG. The Chair noted that this is an evening meeting and the focus will be REPPiR and emergency planning, therefore there may not be sufficient time until the following SSG meeting.

5. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

- 3987 The Chair has shared the closure dates for both the SPR and Sizewell C consultations, the latter being 29th March 2019. The Chair requested that people get in touch if they would like support.
- 3988 The Chair had received no further communication or information pertinent to the SSG to report at this meeting.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 3989 Colin Tait shared that this was his last SSG meeting. He has secured a new position within the ONR providing internal assurance. Daniel Gregory will take Colin's place as ONR's Sizewell B Site Inspector from 1st April 2019. Daniel was previously Sizewell A ONR Site Inspector.

The Chair gave her thanks to Colin for his contributions to the SSG during his tenure as Sizewell B Site Inspector and asked him to take the SSG comments with him in his new role.

- 3990 Terry Hodgson identified that few representatives were in attendance at the meeting from both the public and regulators. He asked whether this was due to not having regular pre-set dates. The Chair explained that the meeting planned for January was moved to try to reduce the length of time between this SSG and the next meeting in May. The Chair also noted that a number of apologies

had already been received for the January SSG date. The Chair speculated that recent low attendance at SSG meetings could be a result of busy schedules caused by a lot of local project meetings taking place diverting resources. The Chair also made reference to a number of people who attend the SSG meeting changing posts and that there will be a number of new people invited to attend the May SSG.

Terry Hodgson added that purdah should not prevent regular activity, for example attendance at SSG meetings. The Chair said that the SSG had been asked not to hold meetings by the NDA during purdah. Bill Hamilton commented that the SSG is a public forum where media could be present and that the whole point of purdah is not to hold meetings where the public vote could potentially be influenced. He continued that advice from BEIS is that meetings should not be held during purdah.

3991 The Chair thanked all for their attendance.

NEXT MEETING: 23rd May 2019, Sizewell Sports and Social Club, King George's Avenue, Leiston, IP16 4JX. Arrival from 6.30pm for meeting 7pm-10pm.

Glossary:

AGR	Advanced Gas-cooled Reactor
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Safety
BRD	Bradwell Site
CRD	Continuous Reactor Decommissioning
DCIC	Ductile Cast Iron Container
DNA	Dungeness A Site
EA	Environment Agency
FED	Fuel Element Debris
GDF	Geological Disposal Facility
HAW	Higher Activity Waste
HPA	Hinkley Point A Site
HPC	Hinkley Point C Site
ILW	Intermediate Level Waste
ISF	Interim Storage Facility
LCLC	Local Community Liaison Council
LLW	Low Level Waste
LLWR	Low Level Waste Repository (Cumbria)
NDA	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation
REPPiR	Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations
RIFE	Radioactivity In Food and the Environment
RWM	Radioactive Waste Management
SPR	Scottish Power Renewables
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SIZEWELL	Sizewell A Site
SZB	Sizewell B Nuclear Power Station
THORP	Thermal Oxide Reprocessing Plant (at Sellafield)

Appendix A.

ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984: SECTION 14

TEMPORARY CLOSURE OF PART OF BRIDLEWAY 19, LEISTON

Suffolk County Council intends to make an order closing Bridleway 19, Leiston from Sizewell Road for 1300 metres north westbound to facilitate the installation of underground high voltage cables. Other coordinated works may also take place during this period.

It is intended that the closure will operate from 21/01/2019 - 08/03/2019 but if necessary the order may remain in force for 6 months (or longer if extended by the Minister).

Enquiries should be made to Glen Matthews of Compass Infrastructure. Tel: (01449) 727600 or 07876 406109. Email: glen.matthews@ci-uk.com

Date: 10/01/2019



NIGEL INNISS, Head of Legal Services, Suffolk County Council, Constantine House,
5 Constantine Road, Ipswich, IP1 2DH