

**MINUTES OF THE QUARTERLY MEETING OF THE
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)
HELD AT
RIVERSIDE CENTRE, 6 GREAT GLEHAM ROAD, STRATFORD ST ANDREW,
SAXMUNDHAM IP17 1LL
ON THURSDAY 26 SEPTEMBER 2019 AT 09.30**

MEMBERS

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Ms M Fellowes | - Co-opted Member, <i>SSG Chair</i> |
| Mr P Wilkinson | - Co-opted Member, <i>SSG Deputy Chair</i> |
| Cllr S Betson | - Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council |
| Ms J Fendley | - Suffolk Friends of the Earth |
| Mr M Freeman | - Sizewell Residents Association |
| Ms J Girling | - Co-opted Member |
| Mr W Howard | - Co-opted Member |
| Cllr M Jones | - Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Councils |
| Cllr C Lewis | - Aldeburgh Town Council |
| Mr C Wheeler | - Co-opted Member |

IN ATTENDANCE

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Mrs M Barnes | - EDF Energy Generation |
| Mr M Baron | - EDF Energy Generation |
| Mr M Castle | - Environment Agency |
| Mr N Cofield | - Planning & Development Manager, EDF Energy Generation |
| Mr I Cuthbert | - Closure Director, Magnox |
| Mr R De'Ath | - Emergency Planning, Suffolk County Council |
| Mr P Fahey | - Inspector (Sizewell A), Environment Agency |
| Mrs T Finn | - SSG Secretariat |
| Mr D Gregory | - Inspector (Sizewell B), ONR Operating Nuclear Reactors Inspection Team |
| Mr B Hamilton | - Communications & Stakeholder Relations Director, Magnox |
| Ms G Kennedy-Brown | - Site Restoration Programme, Magnox |
| Mr R Lee | - Inspector (Sizewell B), Environment Agency |
| Ms M McInnes | - Economic Development and Regeneration, East Suffolk Council |
| Mr J McNamara | - Head of Stakeholder Relations, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority |
| Mr P Morton | - Station Director, EDF Energy Generation |
| Mr A Osman | - Head of Emergency Planning, Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit |
| Mr J Rogers | - Inspector (Sizewell A), ONR Operating Nuclear Reactors Inspection Team |
| Mrs A Vincent | - Magnox Communications |
| Mr I Warner | - Site Restoration Programme, Magnox |
| Mr E Anckorn | - Minute taker, Ubiquis |

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- Ms J Kirtley
Mr M Taylor
Mrs J Wheeler

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

4065 Apologies had been received from Cllr David Bailey, Colin Tucker, Cllr Peter Palmer (represented by Cllr Christopher Lewis), Pat Hogan (represented by Martin Freeman), Peter Reynolds (represented by Phil Fahey), Niki Rousseau, Carolyn Barnes and Lisa Chandler (represented by Morag McInnes).

4066 Ian Cuthbert had replaced Allen Neiling, whom the SSG thanked for his service. Cllr Craig Revitt was the new representative for East Suffolk Council and John Rogers was the new Inspector for Sizewell A.

4067 There were no new declarations of interest.

2. PRESENTATION: Prior Information Discussion and REPIR 19 Update

REPIR Update

4068 Andy Osman outlined that REPIR had changed in May 2019 and for the next year there would be a series of implementation activities. The County Council would be responsible for four activities: a review of the DEPZ, on which a decision would be taken at a Cabinet meeting on 5 November; a change in public information by the end of the year; reviewing and reissuing the existing Sizewell emergency plan in February or March 2020; and a test of the arrangements in July 2020. A new product called the consequence report was replacing the previous hazard identification and risk evaluation. The consequence report would be made public in approximately a week's time, and would confirm the hazards that the nuclear sites had and what their consequences were for public protection activity.

Q&A

4069 Pete Wilkinson asked when the papers for the DEPZ would be available online. Andy Osman confirmed that they would be available on the Council website a week prior to the Cabinet meeting on 5 November.

4070 Janet Fendley asked when the minutes would be available from the Cabinet meeting. Ryan De'Ath replied that it was likely to be in December, but members of the public were able to attend Cabinet meetings.

4071 Martin Freeman asked whether the lack of a relief road during the construction of Sizewell C would cause problems with emergency planning. Andy Osman responded that any construction around the existing sites would have to fit in with the existing emergency arrangements and if they could not he would notify ONR, who would provide a view to the planning authority. The relief road was not material in relation to Sizewell C, because the focus was on the Sizewell B aspects. An evacuation assessment would be repeated with the construction assumptions.

4072 Martin Freeman asked whether Andy Osman would be willing to speak to Sizewell local residents to explain the findings on the emergency plan and evacuation assessment. Andy Osman confirmed that he would be.

4073 Joan Girling asked whether the matter would go to Full Council rather than just the Cabinet. Joan Girling asked whether there would be a presentation to Cabinet on the size of the roads and the difficulty of people in remote locations receiving information. Andy Osman responded that the existing DEPZ was the starting point for the narrative that would be presented to Cabinet. The consequence report had confirmed that there was no change to the Sizewell B hazard, so the work was all potentially unchanged. It was a Cabinet decision because that was what the County Council had determined, but if the decision was called in by Scrutiny it might become a Full Council decision.

- 4074 Janet Fendley stated that not everyone in the DEPZ had internet access and consequently might be ignorant of what they were expected to do. Andy Osman stated that anyone in the DEPZ should have information from EDF about what emergency arrangements were in place.
- 4075 The Chair commented that there needed to be some clarification for the public regarding the inner 1km and outer 3-4km areas. There might not be a high level of information among the Cabinet and it appeared that there was no public consultation. Andy Osman confirmed that there was no publication consultation. The Chair asked whether the public was allowed to speak at Cabinet. Ryan De'Ath replied that members of the public could submit questions in advance. The Chair stated that the SSG would like to offer to assist on informing the report to Cabinet. Andy Osman noted that the report would be available seven days before Cabinet, which was the County Council's decision. The Chair noted that there was an opportunity to include aspects the public had requested before.
- 4076 Mike Taylor observed that the reasons why the DEPZ was being reviewed related to Fukushima and the European Directives. The inner DEPZ should be 3-5km, so he did not know where the 1km area came from. Andy Osman noted that the European Directives were inactive in the UK through UK legislation. In the event of an incident, people within 1km could take shelter, take stable iodine or be evacuated. In the case of a more severe accident, evacuation would take place in a 4km area and shelter and stable iodine would be provided in a 15km area within 10 to 12 hours. The new regulations said that the evacuation shelter or stable iodine provision needed to be able to be extended to 30km. Therefore, there were three tiers of public response actions, one of which was automatic and the other two would be determined on the day depending on what the radiation monitoring indicated.
- 4077 The Chair observed that the DEPZ determined whether people received pre-information, but if a certain number of people needed to know, the DEPZ needed to be wider in terms of information provision. Andy Osman noted that the prior information was in two formats, one of which was more detailed for the DEPZ and one of which was more general. The information was public, so people outside the DEPZ could view it. The Chair noted that any further information could be forwarded to Andy Osman and there could be a sub-meeting to consider what questions to submit to Suffolk County Council Cabinet.
- 4078 Janet Fendley asked at what point in time the emergency services became involved with the paper going to Cabinet. Andy Osman replied that the emergency services were aware of everything being done.

Public Information

- 4079 Ryan De'Ath highlighted that the documents that had been distributed were to replace the existing EDF DEPZ calendar and the plan was to expand the number of properties receiving the information to approximately 3,500, including schools and businesses. His team's email was communications.team@suffolk.gov.uk for the submission of any feedback.
- 4080 The Chair asked whether the documents were drafts. Ryan De'Ath confirmed that they were. The Chair noted that the last SSG had recommended that miles were used instead of kilometres or put in brackets.

3. SIZEWELL B REPORTS

3a. Q&A on Sizewell B Infrastructure Relocation

Presentation

4081 Paul Morton outlined that the work would primarily take place within the boundary zone and he did not want work to happen that he would not be able to govern, hence the decision to facilitate the work through Sizewell B. The planning decision had been referred and section 106 consent would not be granted until it was resolved.

4082 Nick Cofield highlighted that the planning application for the relocated facilities in Coronation Wood had gone through an LVIA and had been found to have a negligible visual impact.

Q&A

4083 Pete Wilkinson asked what was being built. Nick Cofield replied that there would be a training and visitor centre. The building was lower than the dry store and the application had been approved by the Planning Committee subject to section 106 agreements. The Chair noted that the Planning Committee had chosen to ignore over 100 letters against the development and 10 bodies that had opposed the application.

4084 Martin Freeman commented that there had been very good resident communication for the dry fuel store and local residents had agreed to it at the time. Part of the planning application had been that Coronation Wood would provide shielding, but suddenly Coronation Wood was not required to shield the dry fuel store and there was now an application to construct another building. Local residents had suffered from construction noise from Sizewell B and the noise would only become worse from the development at Coronation Wood.

4085 The best location for the visitors' centre was in Leiston, which would give the town a desperately needed boost, and the training facilities did not need to be in Coronation Wood either. Local residents wanted to be good neighbours, but confidence and communication between local residents and Sizewell B was at an all-time low. The Chair of the Planning Committee had given permission because she wanted her grandchildren to have jobs, which was not a legal reason for granting planning permission.

4086 The Chair stated that if EDF waited until the DCO was finished there would be time for creative solutions to avoid the use of greenfield sites. The Hinkley Point visitors' centre was in Bridgewater and Leiston would benefit from having the visitors' centre. There was a view from Fukushima that training centres and simulators should be offsite. The Council Officer and Planning Committee had tried to argue that Sizewell B would stop generating if the development did not go ahead, which Paul Morton had confirmed was untrue.

4087 Paul Morton stated that it was a judgment call about where to build the facilities. The simulator was an essential part of the protection in terms of emergency scenarios and had to be onsite. The Chair queried why Sizewell A's simulator had been in Ipswich. The emergency response centre would be the perfect place for the simulator. Martin Freeman noted that for training purposes the simulator could be 100 miles away, provided there was communication between the control room and the simulator.

4088 Joan Girling stated that she was gravely concerned that the construction was for Sizewell C rather than Sizewell B. The development had damaged Sizewell B's relationship with the area. She had asked that the application was withheld until the DCO had been decided by the planning inspector at the District Council meeting. A large number of people in Leiston felt that the historic elements of their area were being eroded. Martin Freeman observed that the development would allow Sizewell to expand their footprint even further, because the barrier of Coronation Wood would no longer be there.

- 4089 Mike Taylor noted that the site licence plan shown on the relocation map was not Sizewell B's actual site licence boundary, according to advice from Niki Rousseau. Coronation Wood appeared on the map for every document and every time landscaping was mentioned, which was part of the planning conditions for Sizewell B and the dry fuel store. The District Council's decision had also looked at alternative access and the drawing had been thrown in at the last minute suggesting that employees would have to walk from Pill Box Field to the site. Nick Cofield noted that the plan had been submitted to East Suffolk Council three or four weeks before the Committee as a result of objections to using the bridleway for access.
- 4090 Cllr Sammy Betson asked whether the unions had been spoken to about the outage workers coming off a 12-hour night shift and being expected to walk over a kilometre and drive as far as Lowestoft. People took the line of least resistance when walking and Sizewell B would not have sufficient minibuses to cope with a shift change every 12 hours, which would have a significant impact on Lover's Lane. EDF was trying to expand Sizewell C's footprint by another route, which was unacceptable. Paul Morton responded that the plans had been communicated in detail to the workforce, including the union. Sizewell B would stop people cutting through land, but the consequences of the original proposal being removed would have to be worked through. Nick Cofield noted that the Pill Box Field car park was purely for Sizewell B outages and was not for Sizewell C.
- 4091 Martin Freeman observed that in one planning application from the Secretary of State it had been stated that Coronation Wood would be preserved to maintain screening, so he suggested that the planning authority required Sizewell B to preserve Coronation Wood.
- 4092 Paul Morton explained that 200 trees in Coronation Wood would be affected by the proposal and 2,500 trees would be planted as a replacement, some of which would be semi-mature. The Chair asked where the trees would be planted. Nick Cofield replied that it would be on Sizewell B land. Martin Freeman stated that it was fantastic that 2,500 trees would be planted, but there would not be any benefit in terms of screening in local residents' lifetime. The Chair noted that the report had acknowledged that the new trees would not replace Coronation Wood. Janet Fendley commented that the duty of regard to the AONB was not being undertaken by EDF.
- 4093 The Chair asked whether there had been a conscious decision not to maintain Coronation Wood, given that the report stated that the wood was in a 'poor state'. PM replied that the wood had been managed, but the issue was the lifecycle of the trees and the report did not say that Coronation Wood had been badly maintained.
- 4094 Mark Baron highlighted that Sizewell B would look to start the preparations for the construction in early 2020 and there was a timeline of 36 months for the works. Sizewell B would wait until final permission was given to start the works.
- 4095 Cllr William Howard asked whether the 36 months took the demolition of the old buildings into account. Mark Baron responded that the demolition of the existing structures would be handled by Sizewell C after the new buildings were finished. Phase one was the construction of the outage store and the training building and there would not be any construction on the visitors' centre, admin building or welfare building until Sizewell C had received permission. The Chair asked whether the boundaries would have changed by the time the existing structures were demolished. Mark Baron replied that he was not sure about the boundaries, as EDF would have to talk to the regulator about licensing.

- 4096 Jenny Kirtley asked about the bats in the old buildings. Mark Baron replied that he did not know whether there were bats in the buildings. Nick Cofield noted that the bat surveys had been submitted to East Suffolk Council a day before planning permission had been granted, meaning the decision had been subject to the surveys being acceptable.
- 4097 Martin Freeman asked whether there would be an acoustic survey to determine how cutting down Coronation Wood and developing the car park would increase the noise effect from Sizewell B. Mark Baron responded that there would be monitoring points and the concrete breaking during the dry fuel store construction would be monitored. Martin Freeman noted that the noise he was concerned about was the everyday running of Sizewell B. Replacing a wood with a hard car park surface would change the acoustic dynamics of the area. The Chair suggested that Clive Pink should be involved as the relevant officer from the District Council.
- 4098 Joan Girling asked whether HGVs driving through Leiston would be monitored and whether Sizewell B could provide an indication of the construction traffic that could be expected. Mark Baron responded that traffic would be similar to the dry fuel store, which had been approximately 140 HGVs per day. Joan Girling asked whether there was going to be a peak in traffic over the 36 months. Mark Baron replied that Sizewell had an idea of what the ramp up would look like and there would be peak times, which had been looked at in the plans. A haul road with operating hours would be used and there would be penalties for people who behaved improperly.
- 4099 Joan Girling queried whether a group of people who had concerns could be brought together in a forum, because it felt like the process was being done to them. Paul Morton responded that it was something he could consider. Joan Girling suggested having a telephone line to report traffic issues. Nick Cofield noted that the planning conditions had not yet been issued, but they would contain hours of work and delivery hours.
- 4100 Morag McInnes explained that she was attending to take notes and she would pass on the feedback on planning. The Chair noted that she had raised that it was indicative that East Suffolk Council felt the most relevant officer was economic development and regeneration. SSG had asked for an environmental officer and Lisa Chandler to attend and she hoped they would in future. Morag McInnes stated that she would pass the suggestion on and see if there could be broader representation.
- 3b. Paul Morton, Station Director, EDF**
- 4101 Paul Morton outlined that there had been no lost time to injuries or nuclear reportable incidents during the period. There had been a minor environmental event during the outage, which had been an ammonia tank leak. A full investigation had been conducted into the leak and no ammonia had leaked into the environment. The beach had been closed for a period of time as a precaution.
- 4102 Sizewell B had returned two weeks late from the recent outage, as there had been problems with the generator rotor and polar crane work. The plant was now at full load and working well.
- 4103 Janet Fendley asked what '250 year-round contracting partners' meant. Paul Morton replied that certain tasks onsite were conducted with contract partners, who were onsite year-round.
- 4104 Martin Freeman noted that residents would have liked more information of a comforting nature on the ammonia leak. Paul Morton noted that there was a contract in place for a texting service for local residents, which would allow Sizewell

B to communicate general information to the local community. If the event had been deemed to be more significant more information would have been provided, but he recognised the need for better information.

4105 Mike Taylor asked what the situation was with the French components. Paul Morton responded that Framatome had identified that stress relieving of wells had not happened correctly in some of their steam generators, but Sizewell B's steam generators were not Framatome. Independent QA analysis had been conducted and there had been good readings, so there was nothing to worry about regarding components.

4106 Mike Taylor asked whether EDF was looking at planning for decommissioning the AGRs. Paul Morton replied that EDF had been for some time. A waste and decommissioning organisation was being built and EDF had benchmarked internationally on best practice.

4107 Joan Girling asked whether it would be helpful to communicate via Radio Suffolk. Paul Morton replied that a direct communication process was preferable, because going through a third party would not necessarily mean that the message would reach the audience it needed to. The Chair suggested that people who lived further away but worked or had family in the area could elect to receive the text messages.

4108 Joan Girling noted that she had asked for an update on the computer systems at Sizewell B. The Chair noted that the answer had been that there was a rotating programme of replacing computers. Paul Morton observed that there were different strategies for different equipment, depending on whether there was a marketplace for them.

3c. Daniel Gregory, Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation

4109 Daniel Gregory outlined that he had picked up an action to provide a map of the site licence boundary, so he would provide the actual map. During outages the ONR made sure that the outage was being conducted safely and all the maintenance was as expected. Permission to restart had been issued and the project assessment report was available on the ONR website. The ammonia leak had been investigated and the ONR had been satisfied that the leak had been contained and not by chance. EDF had stepped up its programme to examine the decommissioning of reactors.

4110 Martin Freeman asked how comfortable the ONR was that there would only be one access road for Sizewell B for emergency purposes, given that Sizewell C construction would start two years before a relief road would be available. Daniel Gregory replied that he would assess whether the plans in place could be delivered. Martin Freeman noted that residents would like to see the relief road built before construction on Sizewell C took place from a safety perspective. Daniel Gregory stated that the same process as for the relocated facilities would be conducted when the application was submitted.

4111 Pete Wilkinson asked what the ONR was contributing to the review of the DEPZ, whether the ONR's paper was publicly available and whether the hazard from Sizewell B was the same as in 2014, given that there was an additional five years of spent nuclear fuel onsite. Daniel Gregory responded that the bounding hazard had not increased for Sizewell B. Pete Wilkinson stated that there was more radioactivity onsite, which increased the risk. Daniel Gregory observed that there was a small increase in risk, but there was not an increase in the worst-case risk, which was the planning assumption for the DEPZ made by EDF.

4112 Pete Wilkinson stated that the worst-case scenario did not include terrorism. Daniel Gregory noted that the documents he had looked at before had included terrorism.

Central Emergency Planning Response colleagues were involved in the response to the Suffolk County Council DEPZ review. The Chair asked whether Daniel Gregory would introduce himself to Emergency Planning Response colleagues and make any information they needed available. Daniel Gregory replied that Emergency Planning Response had asked for information where needed and the ONR was in contact with Andy Osman. Pete Wilkinson asked whether the DEPZ papers would include an ONR paper. Daniel Gregory replied that he did not know what the process was.

4113 Chris Wheeler requested further information on the station experiencing multiple instrumentation failures in the plant control system. Paul Morton noted that there had been a partial failure of the control system, which had not led to a loss of control of the plant. The piece of equipment that had failed was part of what had been replaced in WISCO 2. The performance of the equipment was monitored and there was redundancy in the design, so it was a resilient system. Chris Wheeler asked whether the component failure had prompted the WISCO 2 upgrade. Paul Morton replied that it had not. Components failing indicated that the equipment was approaching end of life, but the manufacturer's recommendation was also used.

4114 Chris Wheeler asked about the problems with the gas containment valves and fuel storage pond. Paul Morton replied that he did not have much detail on the gas containment valves, because it had been a very minor failure. Regarding the fuel storage pond, it appeared that pressure had worked on the weld at the discharge point, causing the weld to crack. Fuel had been removed from the area and an open space had been created in response. Sizewell B would need to review the construction methodology of the welded section.

4115 Pete Wilkinson queried what was classified as a severe accident or more severe accident and how the radiation dose was calculated.

ACTION: Daniel Gregory to provide the information on the definition of severe or more severe accidents and how radiation dosages were measured.

4116 Joan Girling asked whether inspections would become more frequent as the station reached end of life. Daniel Gregory replied that the requirement for a review of the whole site holistically would not change unless there was a specific reason, but the review of specific components did factor in components becoming older.

3d. Richard Lee, Environment Agency

4117 Richard Lee outlined that an incident in February had led to a warning letter regarding non-compliance with a permit, but he was very satisfied that all the actions the Environment Agency had raised with EDF had been completed. The bund had performed very satisfactorily in containing the ammonia leak and he agreed that Sizewell's response in cordoning off the beach had been proportionate. He was satisfied that the ammonia leak had been investigated in considerable detail to identify the root causes.

4118 The Chair asked whether the ammonia leak had been due to human error. Paul Morton confirmed that it had been. The actions were around enforcing the process and preventing reoccurrence.

4119 Chris Wheeler asked whether discharge from Sizewell was related to tritium being found in domestic water. Richard Lee replied that there was not a mechanism by which the tritium discharged to sea would end up in drinking water.

ACTION: Richard Lee to liaise with Public Health England regarding tritium being found in domestic water.

4120 Pete Wilkinson noted that tritium was released in significant quantity during the outage. Richard Lee noted that regular assessment was carried out by the operator and the Environment Agency to assess the impact of emissions from the power station. Pete Wilkinson stated that there was a huge amount of disagreement about the impacts of radiation, so the Environment Agency did not know what the impacts were. Phil Fahey noted that both A and B stations had permits to emit radioactive material, based on the available science.

4. SIZEWELL A REPORTS

4a. Ian Cuthbert, Closure Director, Magnox

4121 The Chair noted that there would be a greater focus on Sizewell A at the next meeting.

4122 Ian Cuthbert outlined that there had been two incidents onsite resulting in minor injuries. Sizewell A had moved out of Bradwell at the end of August and a maintenance period had started at Bradwell, which would continue for approximately six weeks. Both safe stores had been entered and the asbestos checks had been cleared.

4123 The asbestos strip of the National Grid building had been completed. The demolition date had been delayed because there had been a leaky water pipe at the back of the building, but demolition had now commenced and would be finished by the middle of October.

4124 The ponds were 81% drained and had been segregated. The target was to have the ponds drain completed by 25 November. The asbestos removal programme was continuing and there was funding to remove more legacy scaffold from the boiler rooms.

4125 Chris Wheeler asked where the water from the ponds went to. Ian Cuthbert replied that it was tested in a tank and discharged to sea.

4126 Martin Freeman asked whether the substation demolition would be left as a flat site. Ian Cuthbert replied that the concrete base would remain. Martin Freeman asked what the plan was for the land. Ian Cuthbert replied that there were open discussions with the NDA as to what to do with the land moving forward. There were certain parts of the land that Sizewell B would like and a meeting was taking place the following week in that regard.

4127 Pete Wilkinson asked what miscellaneous components had been found on the floors of the spent fuel ponds. Ian Cuthbert responded that there had been small quantities of spent fuel in the ponds and the components had been springs and caps from fuel elements. The waste had been put into a container, which would be sent for storage. The Chair asked where the waste was stored onsite. Ian Cuthbert replied that it was in the ponds area at present, but the long-term plan was to transport the components to the storage facility at Bradwell and the fuel to Sellafield. Pete Wilkinson asked how much waste had been found. Ian Cuthbert replied that it had been less than one container.

4128 Cllr Sammy Betson noted that there would be brownfield sites at Sizewell A for the relocation of Sizewell B facilities, but the response had been that trying to re-fence the site was impossible in the timescale required. However, Ian Cuthbert had said that there was going to be a meeting the following week regarding Sizewell B use of Sizewell A land.

4129 The Chair observed that East Suffolk Council was aware that conversations had happened with Alan Neilling and NDA was aware of the request. The basis for assessing whether to fund accelerated decommissioning was the condition of the

buildings and the buildings at Sizewell were in very good condition, but a business case could be put forward for decommissioning Sizewell A buildings sooner to free up land.

4b. John Rogers, Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation

4130 John Rogers outlined that he did not take over from Rowland Cook until 1 October, which meant he had not written the previous ONR report. He had attended the Arrows[?] meeting with Rowland Cook three months ago and his takeaway had been that ONR thought that Sizewell was in a good place. Asset management needed to be looked at. The buildings at Sizewell were in good condition, which was not the case at all the Magnox sites. He was spending two days with Rowland Cook the following week to ascertain exactly what was going on and what was planned for the next 24 months, along with an inspection of Sizewell's management of Bradwell.

4131 The incident involving a hose containing pond water dousing an operator had not led to injury or radiation dose. The ONR was happy with Magnox's response and the root causes had been identified. The main root cause had been a conflict between safety and decommissioning project delivery, which he would pick up when he was onsite.

4132 The Chair asked whether a change in culture happened when sites stopped generating. John Rogers replied that it was more complex than that. There was an element of truth in terms of Magnox staff who had been employed throughout the generation period and had been reskilled; the funding for Sizewell A had come and gone since it had shut down.

4133 Pete Wilkinson asked on what basis someone being doused in pond water was not a radioactivity problem. John Rogers replied that it had been down to time, distance and shielding. Ian Cuthbert noted that the employee had been in full protective clothing and had been treated immediately. External people had come in to walk the team through behaviours and understanding and since then the pond draining had progressed well.

4c. Phil Fahey, Environment Agency

4134 The Chair asked whether the ongoing measurement of strontium-90 was still being monitored. Phil Fahey replied that the operator and the Environment Agency were conducting monitoring, which would carry on until the pond drain was finished.

4d. John McNamara, NDA

4135 John McNamara highlighted that the Bradwell station had gone into care and maintenance and a review had been conducted for the best part of two years questioning whether the care and maintenance was right for all the Magnox stations. Continuous reactor dismantling was under discussion and the decision would have to be ratified by government with public consultation. The costs of keeping a site in care and maintenance were quite high and the dose rates in some of the areas that could be dismantled quicker had been found to be lower than originally thought.

4136 He had fed back the strength of feeling in the community around relocating properties to the NDA Land and Legal teams. It was a complex issue and the primary aim was to safely and efficiently decommission the power station, which required sufficient land. Part of the remit was to return land to societal use, which could be what a community wanted it to be. It would have to be determined whether EDF would defuel the site and hand it over to NDA, but the government had started the dialogue.

- 4137 Mike Taylor stated that he was pleased to hear there had been some dialogue between NDA and EDF, as there was shortfall in the funding EDF was liable for and it sounded like there could be a national decommissioning organisation that had oversight of decommissioning for the entire nuclear fleet. John McNamara observed that that was part of the current dialogue and an EDF team was looking solely at the Nuclear Liabilities Fund. Mike Taylor noted that one of the concerns was jobs and it would be good to hear the plans into the future. John McNamara stated that he would be happy to report back regularly to SSG on jobs.
- 4138 Pete Wilkinson noted that the risk in fall strategy from the NDA change of focus meeting was largely driven by a fear of a loss of skills and supply chains. The plan was being changed again and there was urgency behind it, which could compromise the safety aspects. John McNamara stated that safety was at the centre of all discussions on continuous reactor decommissioning. The waste hierarchy was under review and he could ask for a more in-depth answer.
- 4139 The Chair commented that if ILW could be stored in less robust packaging people would want to know the rationale and the regulator's view, because people would want reassurance that it was not cost driven. John McNamara noted that there was agreement with the NDA, but there would have to be public consultation. Pete Wilkinson suggested recruiting a couple of people from the NGO community.
- 4140 Mike Taylor asked how NDA or Magnox would approach any risks to the Sizewell A site from the Sizewell C development. John McNamara replied that a response had been submitted to the stage 4 consultation on that point.

5. PRESENTATION: Magnox Site End States

- 4141 Ian Warner outlined that a great deal of learning was being taken from other Magnox sites and one option for the Magnox sites was the potential to leave some of the structure onsite as permitted disposals under the environment permits. Magnox would investigate whether it was technically feasible and identify whether it was the right option for the particular site. The Chair asked whether there would be public consultation. Ian Warner confirmed that there would be.
- 4142 The Chair asked what impact there would be on how the site could be used if there were permitted disposals. Ian Warner responded that it was one of the factors that would need to be considered in defining what the end use of the site would be. The work that had been done thus far in the fleet indicated that a technical case could be made to leave behind materials onsite without affecting the end use.
- 4143 Pete Wilkinson observed that there would be a problem with public acceptability of leaving materials onsite. Ian Warner noted that the social side of it would need to be taken into account. Phil Fahey noted that the whole process would be controlled by environmental permits, a waste management plan and a site-wide environmental safety case.
- 4144 The Chair observed that Sizewell had been promised accelerated decommissioning to a greenfield site, which would not happen, so there was a history of expectations being raised and it was important to make sure that what was being said to the community was deliverable and acceptable for the public. Ian Warner could come back to the next meeting, which would start with his presentation.
- 4145 Joan Girling asked whether more information could be published on the website before the next meeting. Ian Warner replied that he would produce a briefing note. Phil Fahey noted that GRR applied to Sizewell B and any decisions would affect the decommissioning plan.

ACTION: Ian Warner to produce a briefing note on Magnox site end states.

4146 Joan Girling asked whether the Sizewell A rigs were covered by Ian Warner's presentation. Ian Warner replied that the rigs were in the permitted site and a standard of decommissioning had to be reached that would be acceptable to the Environment Agency.

6. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES AND ACTION TRACKER

6a. Minutes of the last main meeting held on 23 May 2019

4147 The item was deferred.

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

4148 The item was deferred.

7. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

4149 The item was deferred.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

4150 The Chair noted that Steve Payne had moved on to another role. There being no other business, the meeting was closed.

Next Meeting date: Thursday 12 December 2019