

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)
HELD AT
ALDEBURGH COMMUNITY AND SPORTS CENTRE,
VICTORIA ROAD, ALDEBURGH IP15 5HY
ON THURSDAY 14TH DECEMBER AT 09:30**

IN ATTENDANCE

Ms M Fellowes	– Co-opted Member, <i>SSG Chair</i>
Mr P Wilkinson	– Co-opted Member, <i>SSG Deputy Chair</i>
Cllr D Bailey	– Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council
Dr C Barnes	– Suffolk Coastal District Council
Mrs S Betson	– East Suffolk Business Association Network
Mr T Branton	– Co-opted Member
Mr K Caton	– Technical and Safety Support Manager, EDF
Mr R Cook	– Office for Nuclear Regulation Inspector, Sizewell A
Mr P Fahey	– Environment Agency Inspector, Sizewell A
Ms J Fendley	– Suffolk Friends of the Earth
Mrs T Finn	– Secretariat, Magnox
Mrs J Hepton	– Minute Taker
Cllr T Hodgson	– Suffolk Association of Local Councils
Mrs P Hogan	– Sizewell Residents Association
Cllr G Holdcroft	– Suffolk Coastal District Council
Cllr B Howard	– Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council
Mr J Jenkin	– Stakeholder Relations Manager, NDA
Mr T Griffith-Jones	– Co-opted Member
Mr R Maitland	– Office for Nuclear Regulation Inspector, Sizewell B
Mr A Neiling	– Sizewell A Closure Director, Magnox
Cllr P Palmer	– Aldeburgh Town Council
Cllr R Rainger	– Snape Parish Council / Suffolk County Council
Mrs N Rousseau	– Community Liaison Officer, EDF
Mrs A Vincent	– Communications Manager, Magnox

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

J Brown
B Hoggar
J Kirtley
M Taylor
C Wheeler

CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS

3615 Chair welcomed attendees and made the facilities available known to all there and fire notifications. Chair thanked everyone who supported the SSG this year (Tracey, Angela and Julie were specifically mentioned). Chair gave a brief history on the building where the meeting was taking place.

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3616 Apologies for absence were received from:

- Dr T r se Coffey – MP of Suffolk Coastal
- Mr Chris Betson – East Suffolk Business Association Network
- Victoria Thomas – EA Inspector, Sizewell B
- Paul Morton – Station Director EDF

2. SIZEWELL B REPORTS

2a. **Mr Kevin Caton, Technical and Safety Support for Sizewell B (who was stepping in for Mr Paul Morton, Sizewell B Station Director, EDF) updated and covered the following points:**

3617 Safety and Compliance

- Nothing to report on the safety performance since the last meeting.
- No change to permanent staff numbers since the last meeting. 538 permanent staff including 16 apprentices and three trainees and around 250 year round contracting partners. An apprentice information day was held on the 9th December 2017 for next year's intake.

Power Stations Performance

- Sizewell B is currently shutdown for its 15th refuelling outage which started on the 3rd November after a 500 day run. There are 1,000 additional workers on site. Main work apart from refuelling is work on Turbine Generator One. All the usual inspections have been done and they have found a minor defect on the bottom of one of their steam generators (a picture was shown and details of the picture was made familiar). The indication was a prior warning that there was a small pin hole leak in the bottom of the generator, it is something that is not tolerated so the decision was made to shut down and carry out repair on that hole and since they have got four of them, although the other three showed no signs of defects, they took the opportunity to replace all four whilst they were shut down. It had been reported on the international INES scale as an anomaly, level one. A picture presentation was shown and an explanation of the defect given. Mr Caton answered questions explaining the pin hole was picked up by a visual inspection. The steam generator is a one piece device and it is not taken apart, it is the reactor in the centre that is taken apart. All fuel comes out during the refuelling outage and replaced by 40% of it. The worst case scenario if the pin hole had gone unnoticed is that the defect could have got larger but there is no evidence anywhere that there would have been a complete failure of the drain line and in that event they would have ultimately seen a build-up of water inside the building and that would have

been the point where it would have been detectable. The components are quite radioactive so there is a small but measurable dose to the workers at the bottom.

- Other work being carried out in the education and skills arena is the Charlton Science Festival which is an annual and national event.

- The community fund, with themselves and Galloper Wind Farm, there have been three grants in the period since the last meeting: Leiston and District Swimming Club, Big Day Out –PASTEL in Saxmundham and Benhall Primary School totalling around £5,700 and for 2018 there is another £12,500 for those organisations that wish to apply.

- 3618 Janet Fendley, Suffolk Friends of the Earth wanted more details regarding the level one INES and wanted to know what the more severe one is to get a better understanding. Mr Caton explained it is designed to mimic the Richter scale for earthquakes and seismic events. The vast majority of things are zero but when you get an anomalist indication that was not expected the first level is a one.
- 3619 Bob Hoggar, Member of the Public, questioned the article about EDF referring to nuclear as low carbon energy and said he does not feel it has a low carbon footprint. Chair recognises this as a concern and it is an argument that is put forward by the government as part of the rationale for continuing new build. The article was primarily from EDF new build side and she thinks it would be best if that question was sent to Jim Crawford to answer. Mr Caton answered briefly by stating that a whole life study for the construction of Torness nuclear power station in the mid-1980s, looking at the carbon footprint of construction, mining, fuel procurement, disposal and comparison with any other energy source, the answer given is that it is far and away the lowest carbon source.
- 3620 Trevor Branton, Co-opted Member asked if it was established what the conditions were with regards to the leak. Mr Caton explains the leak was undetectable and it was under present conditions at some part during the operating cycle. It is too small to be quantifiable. Under the trading laws we have declared when the expected finish date for the outage is and that is around the middle of January.
- 3621 Jenny Kirtley, Member of the Public, wanted to know whether the radioactive leak reported recently floating around Europe showed up anywhere or whether they had any testing for this. Chair asked the Regulators to answer that, but they did not know, but they can check and see if they can provide any more information and then let everybody know in the future.
- 3622 Peter Wilkinson, Deputy Chair, is interested to know about the weld failure. Mr Caton said it is something called stress corrosion cracking, which is when certain metals are under high forces and in this case with a water environment, can develop hairline fractures when in service.
- 3623 Cllr Bill Howard, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council, wanted to know at what stage would the pin hole or leak be detected and how would it be detected. If it had gone unchecked for very long periods of time they might have been able to detect something in the monitors inside the building. Mr Caton stated the only other leak they have had in their history that has been detectable was a minor blemish around the weld and some powder boric acid, they use boric acid in the reactor cooling system, so there was traces of it around there and that was the only way it was detectable. The only reliable method of finding anything like this is to physically inspect at every shutdown and this is something that the nuclear industry developed as a policy many years ago and they have been doing that every refuelling outage now for 10-15 years.

- 3624 Bob Hoggar wanted to know when they would be going online again or coming back into production. Mr Caton reiterated it would be mid-January 2018.
- 3625 It was explained to Peter Wilkinson that there were two pins that were took out in the start of the refuelling outage where the records of the inspections of the pins were incomplete and that is out of 51,000 in the reactor. Each fuel pin when it is manufactured, the nuclear fuel goes inside an alloy sleeve called a circulon and there are two tests done on that which is an ultrasound test which takes a picture of the alloy and a pressure test. So the two pins did not have an ultrasound test done on them but passed the pressure test.
- Chair stated that the more worrying aspect was that a human error led to a record not being completed at the time and you are now relying on the manufacturing saying it is only a very tiny mistake but what was the lesson learned on that, why were the records not checked. It was a software error, the pins did have an ultrasound test but because of a software error there was a point where the same value was overwritten on one pin.
- 3626 Bob Hoggar went back to the welding problem mentioning the film The China Syndrome and welding failures pointing out the film/documentary showed they had to close their nuclear power station before it got out of control and so he wanted to know whether it is the same situation. Mr Caton answered no.
- 3627 Janet Fendley, thanked Mr Caton for bringing everything to their attention and being open and transparent.
- 3628 Mike Taylor, Member of the Public, pointed out that there is currently quite a severe erosion to the North of Thorpeness. Mike wanted to know if there is a protocol when turning the cooling system off as there is an increased risk to the erosion. Mr Caton informed Mike that there is one of the cooling water pumps back in service now. The total length of time that the main system is shut down is a couple of weeks for maintenance. There is a protocol, there is a body called the Shoreline Management Working Group which they run and every ten years there is a survey done of the undersea area around the cooling water inlets and outlets. The results of the last survey didn't indicate any detrimental effects. Chair cleared up the fact that the question is around volume and a change in temperature and if that is linked to any coastal erosion. Mike said that the 2008 environment schedule report into Sizewell sea it acknowledges that the cooling water systems have an effect on the coastal process and the concern is that whilst over years because the current flows in different directions that it can be a very dramatic change and he wondered how and if at this moment in time anybody is monitoring it. Mr Caton said not. Chair said they would forward that question to Suffolk Coastal and the Environmental Agency.
- 3629 Bob Hoggar wanted a breakdown of the 60,000,000 and how much of that has been lost income from the power station being closed down. Mr Caton said he cannot give him a breakdown.
- 3630 Chair wanted to know what happens to the national grid when Sizewell B is closed down for an extended period of time and where does the additional power come from. Mr Caton said primarily it will be coal generation because all the low generation cost sources run to the limit of their availability so right now there will be solar generation, wind generation and the majority of the rest come from gas and coal.

2b. Mr Ryan Maitland (Sizewell B Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation)

3631 The period up to the end of September

The period up until the end of September was a relatively routine period of inspection. He spoke about lifting incidents in the previous outage and the reason for doing a follow up inspection was for themselves to get assurance that the station had learnt from those incidents and put correct measures in place and as a result of that they were given that assurance.

He let everyone know that the previous Chief Inspector, Richard Savage, resigned for personal reasons two years into his post and a very experienced Mark Foy was successful in this post and is now in that position.

One of the roles in ONR is to consider the stations application to return back to service which is called condition 30 of the site licence and ultimately they are seeking the assurance from the station in that assessment of the safety for the next period of generation and this is a routine process.

Steam Generator Issue

The original defect identified that Mr Caton referred to on steam generator delta. They have examined very carefully a number of specialist inspectors are looking at this and engaging very closely into the work that EDF is doing. The importance of this is not understated. They will be seeking from Mr Caton assurance that the defects are understood, the repairs cover the full extent of the welds affected and they will be looking for a safety case in place before they go back to service.

He thanked EDF for their cooperation on this and the information flow from EDF has been very constructive and proactive which should give you reassurance.

3632 Peter Wilkinson wanted to know with regards to the stress cracking could there be any other pipe work that could have suffered the same. Mr Maitland answered within ONR there are some previous industry experts now working as a regulator that are aware of this. In terms of the wider effect, stress corrosion cracking is a topic for them to consider in the future but right now it is to consider everything relating to return to service.

Chair thought that every piece of work was planned and had a rationale of what work equipment would be used and why and then the docket would be signed off. Is there now a similar electronic system in place? How was it missed that a jib crane was not used in the lifting incidents? Mr Maitland explained that they still use dockets as they are more reliable than IT. The event in question, the detail of how to carry out that lift would not have been included in the work instruction as an experienced worker who is responsible for lifting loads would have been expected to know what is an appropriate and what is an inappropriate method of doing that work and on this occasion he chose an inappropriate method.

3633 Mike Taylor wanted to know if this was a reportable incident at the time which would have meant the incident would have been flagged up very quickly and any potential dodgy behaviour by the contractor would have been picked up and dealt with more

or less within a very short space of time as opposed to the fact at least 12 months have gone since the incident. Mr Maitland explained this particular incident was not reportable because there was no injury. The criteria that is set out in the legislation is quite specifically targeted largely towards the construction industry. They became aware of it because EDF under its arrangements under the site licence to notify us of incidents, they received the notifications under those arrangements.

- 3634 Tom Griffin-Jones, Co-opted Member, wanted to get clarification with regards to Mark Foy's post as he read that he is acting Chairman and the decision will be made before Christmas. Mr Maitland explained the report was finished and sent out before the process so Mark Foy is the Chief Inspector.
- 3635 Peter Wilkinson asked if Mr Maitland is satisfied with the argument that this has been the best placed operation to examine the fuel and are they quite happy the two dodgy pins have been best looked at. Mr Maitland stated they were only made aware of this after the reports and time scales through their own relationships with European regulators. He is content with the situation with the two fuel pins. With regards to the methodology around the oversight of quality records and quality management systems, they are looking at that as part of a wider programme of work in the near future.
- 3636 Chair asked if there was a different culture within the French companies that is causing a concern. Mr Maitland suggested that it would be helpful if questions were submitted to them and they can provide them with a more defensive written response.
- 3637 Mike Taylor pointed out that Sizewell B is made to an American standard but he noticed that there is up to four different potential quality systems that the regulators are supposed to be looking at for the Chinese and that seems to be pretty unfair both on the regulator and anybody that is looking at the quality control. Is there not one common standard that should be adopted all over the world? This question will be sent in writing.
- 3638 Tom Griffin-Jones wanted to know what the pins life expectancy is and how often they aim to replace them. Mr Caton answered this question stating that the fuel assemblies typically have three operating cycles in a reactor of an 18 month duration so two of those three are then scheduled to go back in for their third and final time in the reactor.
- 3639 With regards to the stress corrosion cracking will ONR be demanding more frequent inspection or increased instrumentation? Mr Maitland said this is something they need to review in discussion with EDF when it goes back to service. We take comfort as a regulator from the proactive inspection campaign.

2c. Ms Victoria Thomas, Sizewell B Inspector (Environment Agency)

- 3640 Victoria Thomas sent her apologies the report was circulated previously. Chair invited questions which will be forwarded to the EA.
- 3641 Janet Fendley has been thinking about the increase in the workforce that there has been recently at Sizewell B and she wondered what impact there has been on the sewage disposal plant that they have and is there any overspill into our rivers and sea. Phil said it is inspected by the local Environment Agency and they have never had a problem. Chair asked if we will ever reach a stage where it does get to a

maximum capacity. It is a commonly operated plant so it has the capacity for current Sizewell B's workforce, any contractors and any future construction on site.

- 3642 Trevor Branton points out that Sizewell A sewage plant was originally designed so that it could be expanded. So for years it was sized correctly to suit the A site. During the construction for B site, part of it can be extended to cover the 5,000 plus people on the B site. So the capacity has been there for many years and can cope with larger numbers than just the operators.
- 3643 Janet Fendley wanted to know what the capacity is for the sewage works site and how regularly is it inspected. They will get back to Janet on both of these questions.
- 3644 Tom Griffith-Jones with regards to Sizewell B wanted to know, during the outage, what the radioactive waste that is generated is and how it is generated. It is primarily solids in the form of components that are activated that are taken away at the end of service life that are mildly contaminated and they are stored on site until such times it is taken away to the appropriate depository. People wear protective clothing. When the heads lifted the discharge goes into the building which then goes out into the atmosphere in the form of steam venting.

3. SIZEWELL A REPORTS

3a. Mr Allen Neiling (Closure Director, Magnox)

3645 Safety and Compliance:

Although the staff's home site is Sizewell, some staff occasionally have to travel to different sites to do their work which means sometimes travelling to Bradwell in Essex or Dungeness in Kent. There was a road traffic accident involving a member of staff travelling from Sizewell to Bradwell, on the A12 a lorry stopped abruptly in front of them and then backed up because it missed the exit and backed into the staff member who sustained a fractured wrist. This was a reportable incident due to it being a fracture.

Plant and Structures Programme Update:

Mr Neiling showed a picture of a 500 tonne mobile crane which was erected at the Sizewell site to lift off the cooling water pump entry. It was a 51 tonne lift, the crane swung it around onto site and cut off the legs whilst it was attached to the crane and they attached a secondary crane to each of those as they were cut off and lay it all down to the ground to size reduce it. A very impressive piece of work, done safely.

They also began the asbestos removal in the administration block and that is scheduled to be done in late January/early February.

They are currently demolishing another block, which was built in the early 1990s so contains asbestos. They are tearing out all the internal walls so they can bring in a large piece of equipment and pull it down.

Work is being done on their offshore structures, they have completed the works on the old intake structure which means the entire top deck has been removed and there is just a flat platform there now. They are now going over to the outlet platform and repeating the works. The bad weather has delayed them due to the wind. The works should be completed by the end of January at the latest.

Eight horizontal CO2 tanks which were used during the plants operation and those eight tanks are now being cut up and removed from the site. Two of the tanks are now complete and there is a recycle value from this. That will be going on again for the next couple of months and the whole CO2 generation station will be taken out. That has given them the ability to clear the land around there, which will allow them to do the upcoming waste management activities that they have to do with the radioactive waste from the water treatment systems.

Projects Update:

There is a lot of work occurring in the cooling ponds. For the first time yesterday they were decommissioning and removing waste from the pond and clearing sludge from the bottom of the pond and eventually that will allow them to wash down and drain the pond. The diving company has been with them for a month and a half so they are confident that this is going to be done efficiently and very safely.

They are doing optioneering on the waste programme of how they are going to remove the actual waste and condition it, to get it off site but the waste plan is in very early stages.

Asset Care:

They do perform reactor maintenance on the cladding on the roofs on a daily basis. They have some asbestos removal projects going on and asbestos repair projects to keep it contained and safe until they are ready to bring down the entire building.

They continue to upgrade the town's main water system and getting it closer to be compliant with current regulations.

They do have some work next to the old concrete reservoirs that are shared between A and B site. They will be taking them out in the spring time but they do have some town's main water work to be done before they can take those out.

They are redoing the security fence so it is up to modern standards. They are doing a project upgrade on some fences. With regards to the sewage farm, they did have a subsidence around it that they are now addressing. The sewage farm is actually operated by the A site but it is highly integrated with how the B site is operated.

Socio-economics:

£1,000 agreed to give the Waveney bee keeper.

He encouraged groups to apply, to the good neighbour grant which is up to £1,000, per community scheme. They are keen to receive more applications.

3646 Janet Fendley wanted to know what they are going to do with the pond sludge. Mr Neiling replied the pond sludge gets collected into a tank that already has sludge in it from years of generation sludge, filtered pressure filters are in the sludge tank so it is accumulated over the years and there is enough capacity in the tank. What happens in the interim is that there will be a system that takes that sludge out into other containers that will dry and be ready for shipping off site and it will be stored at the Bradwell site then after that, long term, it will go into the geological depository. The interim storage facilities are currently designed to last between 30-50 years but could be maintained for longer than that.

- 3647 Jenny Kirtley asked what happens to the water from the plants and does it get washed out to the sea? Mr Neiling explained that it goes through the water treatment plant where it is filtered and monitored and there is an end point tank that then discharge samples are collected from and as long as it meets their discharge criteria then yes it gets put out to sea.
- 3648 Janet Fendley asked if we will have problems with collections of mud at the outlet pipes. Mr Neiling said that he is not aware of any issues with discharge of mud. They currently discharge about once a month which is very infrequent and they do not have a current problem with their discharge.
- 3649 Mike Taylor wanted to know what they are trying to do and by when. What are your short term and medium term plans? When will we be able to walk all over where Sizewell A is at the moment? Before Mr Neiling started the Chair pointed out that there was a question at the last meeting about whether the long term/decommissioning timelines might change and Jonathan is going to include the latest information in his report about that but asked Mr Neiling if he would like to talk about their timeframe. Mr Neiling said that currently they are removing the hazards and then you put the site into the condition that it can be monitored and secured while the graphite mentioned, the problem with it are either solved by decay or through finding another laboratory where all this is going to go into. Sizewell A will reach its maintenance state in 2027 so in the next 9.5 years they will get to the point where they will remove the waste, put the facilities in a condition that they will stand for the period of time that the current maintenance period asks and that is somewhere between 60-80 years in the plan currently. The Bradwell site is getting close to getting to its entry to carry maintenance meaning within the next 12-18 months they would have completed their physical works to get to that point.
- 3650 Mike Taylor asked what will be the security maintenance. Mr Neiling paraphrased to say that they will secure, monitor and respond but he cannot tell the group specifics. Jonathan Jenkin will be giving more information when he speaks.
- 3651 Peter Wilkinson wanted to know with regards to the offshore structured work, has there been any extra work done to come up with a replacement? Mr Neiling said they are going to leave them in a very similar state without all the hazards on the top and the boat docks and everything that was getting close to falling off so they will be safe. In the next five to ten years when they remove those, there was a commitment by the NDA to come up with an alternate solution, he doesn't know what that is but something has to be done.
- 3652 Chair asked that on the start of the tour on the 9th January at the A site, will they be able to look in the ponds? Mr Neiling said no, there is safety issues with you being in there, but they will take you into the conference room and they have poster boards on display.
- 3653 Chair wanted to know if there was video evidence when lifting off the cooling gantry to archive the information. Mr Neiling answered yes there is a time lapse video and allowable to release.

- 3654 Cllr Bill Howard stated that the University of Westminster did an oral history of the building of Sizewell A and will be launched soon.
- 3655 Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association is pleased to report, following a question she raised in March 2019, that she has commitment from Magnox to replace the buoys 50 metres East-ward as soon as the work is finished. She thanked anyone who had a part in that.
- 3656 Trevor Branton asked if there are any steps to save some of the heritage. Mr Neiling explained that they are required to put documentation into offsite storage and there are different level of things that they have to do. The demolition they are doing at present does not affect that.
- 3657 The question was asked about release of land. It will be NDA estate so they will make the final decisions on reuse of land.
- 3658 Sammy Betson , East Suffolk Business Association Network thinks the town should have the opportunity, which has long supported the ongoing steam generator, that they do have the heritage kept within the town or at least copies. She would also like to keep some memorabilia from the buildings demolished. Mr Neiling stated that they did donate a particular instrument to the time capsule, so that can be done.
- 3659 Janet Fendley asked, with regards to the tour on the 9th January, whether the same clothing which she wore on the last tour, that was checked for radioactive at the beginning and at the end, will have to be worn again. Allen does not think so as they will not be entering radiological areas. Chair pointed out that when they go to the B site they will wear a dose meter.

3b. Rowland Cook, Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation

3660 Site Report

Mr Cook said that he had been on site for the past two days and met with the senior management team, he had met with the safety reps and spoken to people around the site. He had looked at the chopping up of the CO2 tanks, the work being done to demolish the facilities and spoken to the teams who are working on this project and he had had some discussions with the people setting up the management systems where they are going to be managing the Bradwell site from Sizewell. He had not come up with any matters of safety of concern and he will continue to monitor and make sure it stays that way.

- 3661 Tom Griffith Jones wanted some definition of what they consider to be radioactive waste. Mr Cook said that radioactive waste is stuff that is radioactive when the operation is finished and the rules of what constitutes radioactive waste are set out in the guidance and you can see this all on the website. The question with spent fuel is that is it an asset or is it a waste because they have reprocessed spent fuel and you get useful stuff out of it that you can use again so there is a question mark on how you categorise spent fuel. The way they treat spent fuel is the way they treat nuclear waste of that capacity which is quite significant but what they do with it once they have it i.e. whether they treat it as an asset or as a nuclear waste is not up to them but it is left up to the government. Spent fuel will have a very strong level of radioactivity coming off of it and you would treat it with a level of respect that it deserves whether you classified it as spent fuel or radioactivity waste. Once you

have reprocessed spent fuel you take away the higher level activity and that gets taken through a waste process. The stuff you are left with is low level.

3662 Chair asked because spent fuel from Sizewell B is staying on site it will not be reprocessed or there is no current plan for it to be reprocessed which would then mean there is no use for it so if it is never going to be reprocessed should it not be called waste now? Jonathan will be left to answer this later on.

3663 Cllr Bill Howard wanted to know if they are happy that they are going to be transferring radioactive waste from one community to another community to be stored quite long term before it gets to an eventual earth depository. From a nuclear safety point of view Mr Cook is happy. The containers that the waste is stored in are approved containers and are very robust. The method of transport has been looked at by the transport section and they are acceptable for transferring the waste. Chair pointed out that it was a cash decision, rather than each Magnox site in the UK having its own store it was more cost effective to have them at three or four sites which are located regionally.

3c. Phil Fahey, Sizewell A Inspector (Environment Agency)

3664 They have looked at resources about how Sizewell A is going to manage Bradwell because of its care and maintenance and they have had a lot of discussion about how that is going to work. He welcomed any questions.

3665 Mike Taylor wanted to know with regards to the demolition of buildings on site there seems to be a lot of debate about monitoring of rubble and brick which has natural radiation in it. Are they satisfied with the traceability of the material coming off site and where it ends up as he thinks there is no landfill site in Suffolk but most waste goes through a transfer station? Mr Fahey was having the discussion this week about what is the waste management plan, what are the records they are going to have and where is the stuff going. It is something they are keeping an eye on.

3666 Chair asked if they have been given additional resources to cope with the increase in projects. The nonconventional waste is dealt with by the local area, the radioactive waste they meet quite regularly and talk about it. The environment agency is responsible for the disposal of radioactive waste but they do have an impact in that because if it is not managed properly on site it is going to go the wrong way when it is off site so they do keep a very close eye on what the management arrangements are.

3667 Janet Fendley had two questions. Firstly, where did the asbestos go? Mr Fahey answered there are asbestos contractors/licenced facilities that dispose of asbestos. They go to asbestos tips.

Suffolk County Council (SCC) are in consultation with options to develop a new minerals and waste local plan, when is this going to be? Mr Fahey advised it covers the whole of SCC so if you go on their website everything is on there. The consultation finishes on the 11th December.

3668 Bob Hoggar asked if low carbon will still take as long (approximately 70 years) to disassemble. Mr Fahey explained the strategy at the moment is to put decommissioning Magnox stations into care and maintenance and allow radioactivity to decay and at the end of that period there will be a decision on what to do then. Maybe clear the site after natural decay, but there could be other options available.

3d. Jonathan Jenkin, Stakeholder Relations Manager Nuclear Decommissioning Authority

3669 Update on Magnox Competition

Since the last meeting they have now served full notice to Cavendish Fluor Partnership (CFP) of the termination of the contract so the contract will terminate by the end of August 2019 in line with the Secretary of State's statement early this year. The Holliday enquiry which the Secretary of State set up to look into the Magnox competition that the NDA ran, to try and understand in better detail has now published its interim report and that sets out a number of provisional observations and recommendations which will now be fleshed out before the enquiry submits its final report next year.

The national audits office scrutinises the way the NDA as a public body spends money and had also published a report on the Magnox contract. It is on the parliamentary website and they would be happy to circulate that to you.

The NDA are co-operating fully with the Holliday enquiry and the audit office report they accept the recommendations that they have made so far and have committed to accepting the final recommendations of Holliday enquiry report next year.

They launched a digital newsletter called #decomm. That is automatically sent to anybody that has registered for the NDA e-bulleting. He pointed out that if anybody has not registered for that and would like to there is a link on their website where they can see the latest addition and also subscribe.

On Monday, 11th December they published their latest draft business plan for a period of consultation until the 4th February 2018. They welcomed any questions or feedback anyone had on that.

3670 Mike Taylor referred to the report regarding freeing off some jammed fuel and he wanted to know where it is going to end up and is there a facility for that? Mr Jenkin does not know but will find out and write to the group.

3671 Mike Taylor pointed out that at the last meeting the NDA may have taken responsibility over from EDF for dismantling the AGRs and the PWR. Who has the budget responsibility for planning that? Mr Jenkin explained that when the NDA was established they were designated a certain number of sites to the NDA so they are responsible for those designated sites. The NDA could get given more designated sites these could be EDF sites or former MOD sites so that would require a different secondary legislation and there should be a transfer of financial resources to finance that clean up. There is the nuclear liabilities fund which was to set up to make financial provision for the decommissioning and clean-up of the EDF liabilities so they have a role in overseeing. They have other responsibilities and one of

those is helping oversee the nuclear liabilities fund and ensuring it is topped up adequately to a level so that there is adequate financial provision to meet EDFs liabilities ultimately. No decision has been made definitely to transfer the EDF sites, it is certainly something that could happen but the expectation is that would be financed by the nuclear liabilities fund.

3672 Cllr Bill Howard raised his point again from the last meeting with regards to the flask path on the East Suffolk line as this is getting quite urgent now. It needs one of the interested parties to press for a change or drop that path for the flask. It is becoming more urgent as there is a new set of trains coming on the Suffolk 2019. Bill Hamilton told Cllr Howard to contact the East Suffolk Transport Association.

3673 Chair understands that there may be a wish to move their SSG website onto a more national government platform and that would mean it would be more difficult for them to control the content. Jonathan asked if he could write to the group as he only has a partial understanding which is as a government organisation they have already moved their website onto the .gov.uk web platform and that is something they had no choice in. That decision will now apply to the Suffolk licence companies as well.

4. Presentation on Reactor Decommissioning

National Meeting Update

The NDA National Stakeholder was held in West Cumbria in September. There was an overview on Magnox reactor dismantling and the stress potential because no decisions have been made.

The current strategy for dismantling Magnox reactors is really focussed on getting the reactor into a safe secure state, care and maintenance, there will then be a period lasting on average 60-80 years before the final site clearance takes place. The main benefits of that strategy firstly is there is natural radioactive decay over that period of care and maintenance which therefore allows more worker access in undertaking the dismantling of the reactors before the final site clearance. Secondly, hopefully, there will be a geological disposal facility at that point so the waste generated by dismantling the reactors can be signed directly to the GDF rather than stored on an interim basis.

There are a number of dis-benefits and risks. There is a potential risk of losing skills. Disruption to the supply chain involvement. There will be radioactive decay over that period of time but there are other hazards, asbestos in particular and so there is an increasing view that even after the long period of care and maintenance they might still use remote techniques to do the dismantling because of the asbestos risk to workers. The costs of keeping the assets in a safe and secure condition. The regulatory standards in 80 years' time is unknown. Uncertainty around legislation.

There is now more experience of using remote dismantling techniques. There is more experience of handling waste in Magnox sites. Whilst geological disposal is the policy for managing higher activity waste in England and Wales, in Scotland they have a different policy and they favour long term storage and possibly near surface disposal. There are different policies depending on which part of the UK they operate in. There are new waste routes available for low level waste (LLW)

and there is more recycling possibilities. If a shorter period is preferred at some sites then there may be an opportunity to avoid unnecessary spend on the care and maintenance side and to spend the money in a different way.

Strategy

In their last strategy that they published in 2016 there was a bit that Magnox would look at this, develop options for alternative timescales for reactor dismantling. So Magnox had done some technical feasibility work on this which the NDA has been evaluating and they now think they are at the stage where they are ready to formally review whether or not there should be a change in strategy, at least to some sites. No decisions had been made and this needs to be reviewed in two phases: one being the principle whether the times change and the other is which sites should go first if the timing is changed. In order to change the strategy they had to make a case to the government.

He will circulate the full presentation.

- 3674 Chair asked whether the strategy means supporting new build. Mr Jenkin does not think so, he went on to explain the strategy that had been released recently had a number of elements to it and there is a nuclear strand to it. He believes the change in strategy could be around opening up opportunities for the supply chain.

What are NDA doing

Data and information gathering to understand the rate of which waste will be generated by dismantling the reactors.

The work that had been done already suggested that overall the costs are mutual.

They have got a meeting of the SSG vice chairs pencilled in on the 14th February 2018 in London.

- 3675 Chair asked Cllr Geoff Holdcroft if he could give them updates or concerns that have been generated at the next meeting.

- 3676 Mike Taylor flagged up that there is a new consultation going through on EN6 national policy for nuclear from 2026 and that there is quite a significant amount of work to be done between now and March. Chair will get a link sent to anybody that wants to see that.

- 3677 Chair was pleased that today's presentation is more open and considered. She does not believe that this is a Stakeholders engagement but because of how it had been presented to a small group of people it was more of an announcement. Mr Jenkin told them that there would be more engagement next year, dates to be confirmed.

- 3678 Sammy Betson pointed out that there had been a recent survey carried out on the index of declaration nationally and thinks it is quite important that people who come from London do not necessarily think that everybody from Sizewell C is well off. Mr Jenkin stated that no area has ever been excluded from applying for or being granted funding.

3679 Chair thinks that in the future there are some serious questions that need to be asked of the NDA, ONR and other regulatory bodies on how they would cope approaching the Brexit deadline.

5. Matters Arising from Minutes and Action Tracker

5a. Minutes of the last main meeting held on the 28th September 2017

There are a few typos in the body of the minutes but nothing major.

5b. Other matters arising from minutes and action tracker or correspondence received

There are five new actions from the last meeting which are going to be added to the action tracker, which will be sent out on email.

6. **Chairman's Report**

- Mr C Wheeler has asked to be co-opted onto the group and as their new constitution that does not require a vote; anybody that wishes to be co-opted is incorporated into.
- Chair did take part in a dial-in with other chairs related to the Magnox enquiry debate and a meeting they were going to have with the Holliday enquiry chairman has been postponed.
- The meeting with the NDA about the GDF has been postponed. No new date given but the GDF consultation was going to be launched in January but has also been postponed.
- The meeting with BEIS has been postponed.

7. **Any other business**

- Chair thanked everyone for all their support and said how grateful she is for all their work. Chair wished everyone a peaceful and happy time over the next few weeks going into 2018.

Next Meeting is Thursday 19th April at Sizewell Sports and Social Club.

Glossary:

CFP Cavendish Fluor Partnership
ONR Office for Nuclear Regulation
LLW Low Level Waste