

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)
HELD AT SIZEWELL SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB,
KING GEORGE'S AVENUE, LEISTON IP16 4JX
ON THURSDAY 16TH MARCH 2016 AT 09:30**

IN ATTENDANCE

Cllr M Fellowes	- Aldeburgh Town Council	<i>SSG Chairman</i>
Mr P Wilkinson	- Co-opted Member	<i>SSG Vice Chairman</i>
Cllr D Bailey	- Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Dr C Barnes	- Suffolk Coastal District Council	
Mr C Betson	- East Suffolk Business Association Network	
Mr T Branton	- Co-opted Member	
Mr J Broom	- Suffolk Friends of the Earth	
Mr M Brophy	- Radioactive Waste Management Ltd (RWML)	
Mr P Fahey	- Environment Agency Sizewell A Inspector	
Cllr J Fisher	- Saxmundham Town Council	
Mr S Fox	- SSG Secretariat	
Mr T Griffith-Jones	- Co-opted Member	
Cllr T Hodgson	- Suffolk Association of Local Councils	
Ms P Hogan	- Sizewell Residents Association	
Cllr B Howard	- Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	
Insp M Jackson	- Suffolk Police	
Mr J Jenkin	- Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)	
Cllr M Jones	- Aldringham-cum-Thorpe & Knodishall Parish Councils	
Mr P Montague	- Sizewell A Closure Director	
Mr P Morton	- Sizewell B Station Director	
Mr S Napper	- Radioactive Waste Management Ltd (RWML)	
Mr S Parr	- Environment Agency Sizewell B Inspector	
Ms N Rousseau	- Public Relations Officer Sizewell B	
Mrs J Sparkhall	- Minute Taker, Sizewell A	
Mr M Taylor	- Friends of the Earth Representative	
Ms V Thomas	- Environment Agency	
Mr C Tucker	- Sizewell B Staff Representative	
Cllr M Whitby	- Dunwich Parish Meeting	

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Ms J Girling
Mr C Wheeler
Dr J Tait
Mr B Hoggarth

CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS

3377 Chair welcomed all attendees and directed their attention to the 'welcome' opening PowerPoint slide displaying the SSG principles. Chair then went on to provide domestic arrangements and asked all speakers to use the microphones and to introduce themselves.

1 WELCOME, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3378 Chair welcomed the following:

- Simon Napper, Radioactive Waste Management Ltd (RWML)
- Mark Brophy, Radioactive Waste Management Ltd (RWML)
- Mark Jackson, Suffolk Police

3379 Apologies for absence were received from:

- Rowland Cook, Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) Sizewell A Inspector
- Graham Moorcroft, Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) Sizewell B Inspector
- Andy Osman, Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit
- Russ Rainger, Snape Parish Council
- Janet Fendley, Suffolk Friends of the Earth (rep. Jack Broom)

3380 Additional declarations of interest were sought but none were forthcoming.

2 SIZEWELL A REPORTS

2a. Mr Peter Montague (Closure Director, Magnox)

3381 Mr Montague, Closure Director for Sizewell A updated the group and covered the following points:

- Safety and compliance:
 - Safety and compliance has continued to be good
 - No injuries or first aid events on site for 20 months
 - No personal contamination events
 - No environmental events, but there was a near miss regarding the use of scales out of the calibration date
- Lifetime plan:
 - The care and maintenance closure date for Sizewell remains April 2027
 - The cooling ponds will be drained and stabilised August 2019
 - Sizewell A will take on the management of Bradwell when it enters Care & Maintenance (C&M) state
 - The Sizewell A Magnox workforce recognises there will be continual overall reduction in numbers as we progress our C&M preparations towards closure
- Projects update:
 - The Ponds Programme continues to prepare for decommissioning. Divers will be used at Dungeness first and then arrive at Sizewell in August 2017
 - The Waste Programme is now established and is preparing for waste retrieval. A containment is required to be designed and built to safely access the FED vaults
- Asset Care Projects:
 - Currently have abseiling teams on the reactor building checking and repairing cladding

- Asbestos management has received increased funding and resources
- Several roofs have been repaired to prevent water ingress and protect internal equipment and structures
- Four diesel stacks and the pedestrian bridge have been taken down following severe corrosion being identified
- A deterrent system for gulls has been installed to reduce the problem on site during the nesting season and is now in operation
- Socio-economics:
 - We have approved over £5,000 of funding for projects through our Good Neighbour Scheme this Financial Year
 - We are keen to receive more applications. More details are available at magnoxsocioeconomic.com
 - Recently helped fund musical instruments at Snape School and refurbishments for Aldeburgh Rifle Club

3382 Ms P Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association wanted an update on the C&M programme for the rigs. Mr Montague advised that the rigs are in a deteriorating state and there are no plans to remove them until 2024. Work will take place on the rigs next month to remove some of the loose material such as the handrails. There are also plans to remove the landing platform and ladders so that members of the public do not put themselves at risk. It is also planned to put signage up advising that it is a dangerous structure. Sizewell A staff currently maintain the navigation lights, these will be removed and new navigation lights will be placed just off the structures using floating buoys. Mr Montague clarified that this was in collaboration with the maritime organisation.

3383 Ms Hogan requested that the fishermen are given at least 48 hours' notice before any work begins and also made Mr Montague aware of the Kittiwakes already pairing up and ready for nesting. Mr Montague assured Ms Hogan that his staff will avoid upsetting the birds but the structure needs maintenance. Work was planned for February and unfortunately there was a protracted delay getting through to the relevant maritime organisations.

3384 Mr M Taylor noticed that Veolia were supplying pond filtration equipment to various Magnox sites, yet was under the impression that once the pond is drained down, there would be no additional filtration systems to purchase. Mr Montague explained that Sizewell A will use the existing pond water treatment facilities which will abate the filter and remove the ions from the water. It is all part of the existing permit and it is not envisaged varying the permit to do that. Once the ponds are drained down, Sizewell A will need a much smaller water abatement system and a mobile active effluent treatment plant is being looked at as part of the ponds programme but it will not be for ponds water.

3385 Mr T Branton wanted more information on the ponds stabilisation work and whether the walls would be scabbled as previously suggested. Mr Montague confirmed that scabbling was used at Trawsfynydd's ponds using remote robots that continually broke down, taking decades to complete. Hunterston used ultra-high pressure water to clean the pond walls which had been successful. Hinkley used low pressure washing using the pond water. This did not increase the activity that was left in the pond wall and avoided putting more water in the pond. The process cleaned the pond walls down to the level needed and has proved very effective. It may be used at Sizewell. At present, divers are being utilised to size reduce some of the material in the ponds and the site is looking at whether or not the divers can clean the pond walls whilst they are in there. Mr Montague was conscious that working under water using divers carries its own hazards. Mr Montague went on to say that polyurea coatings have been used on the pond walls at Bradwell. Extensive discussions have taken place with the ONR on the suitability of such coatings and whether the site could apply coatings used on asbestos to fix fibres into structures but the expectation is to only carry out this process once as it needs to be in place for around 50-60 years.

- 3386 Cllr D Bailey, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council, advised that concerns have been raised by the residents about the sheer amount of land that would be required at the stage two consultation of Sizewell C. Cllr Bailey wanted to know if any consideration had been given to bring the C&M programme forward so land could be made available from Sizewell A as residents are anxious that no more land is allocated from other areas than is absolutely necessary. Mr Montague explained that there is a huge decommissioning programme for the Magnox sites, Sellafeld and Dounreay. The NDA contract and the funding is split into two phases and demolition for Sizewell will begin in phase two in 2021 – this is when the majority of the demolition will be carried out to reduce the site and the site footprint. There has already been a lot of work to turn the south side buildings cold and dark but the money and funding is not available yet. Mr Montague went on to explain that the buildings have to be taken down safely as some still have residual asbestos. Everything is on a business case and his focus is on removing the radiological hazard and stabilising the asbestos hazard on site.
- 3387 Chair confirmed that the SSG is not the forum to discuss specific issues on new build but the group is able to do so if it impacts on the existing sites. Chair reiterated that if the funds were available and while there are existing staff with the relevant knowledge available there would be the capacity to clear the site. Chair wanted it noted that the group want to ask the NDA to work with BEIS to provide more national funding as new build has been determined by the government to be in the interest of the country and residents would prefer that land is utilised from existing sites rather than taken from the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) land and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) land etc. Chair summarised that should new build happen at Sizewell then there should be minimisation of external land use from the existing nuclear sites.
- 3388 Mr T Griffith-Jones wanted to know the sums of money involved to remove the cold and dark structures. Mr Montague could not specifically say but estimated around tens of millions of pounds. Mr Montague went on to say that this year Sizewell A, for a very low volume of work, had spent around £21m without knocking a single building down. EDF have no need to pay for the demolition as the NDA have those funds to do it, but the funding is phased until 2032 based on the Lifetime Plan (LTP) on the whole business that defines what needs to be done, how much it is going to cost and when it will be done. Sizewell A takes a risk based approach to decommissioning the site and currently the buildings pose no risk to the staff or the environment and money is spent where the risk is. Chair claimed that it is a risk based approach versus destroying the AONB.
- 3389 Mr Taylor asked one of three questions on behalf of Ms Fendley who could not be present and wanted to know the definition of ‘negligible risk to the public’. Mr Montague said the term was used in the ‘Investigation into Unusual Environmental Monitoring Results’ report and the discovery of strontium-90 (Sr-90) at Aldeburgh beach. The term means it is a risk that is too slight or small in amounts to be of importance. It is real, but it is effectively a statistical anomaly that is generated in reports.
- 3390 Mr Montague went on to answer Ms Fendley’s second question which was: ‘why does Sizewell A have to deter nesting birds?’ Mr Montague advised that the situation has got worse year on year. Both herring gulls and black-back gulls are a nuisance and last year the site was coated in guano, damaging roofs and blocking the gutters. The site has to spend money on people working at height to clear the roofs and during the nesting period they are pretty aggressive when working around them and it has now got to the point where something had to be done. Mr Montague said that a falconer was used for two or three years and as a falconer himself, he knows that it does not work very well unless they are there all the time. The laser is new technology; it does not harm the gulls. It is a green light and on a foggy day it can be seen. It is programmed to sweep each roof that it can detect and as it moves, it is something unusual and that unsettles the birds. It is hopeful that it deters them from nesting.
- 3391 Mr Montague recorded the third question from Ms Fendley: ‘in the report, it talks about Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), where did they go?’ Mr Montague advised that these occur in cooling material inside high power electrical cables and Sizewell A was the last site

that had any that required registering and the last was removed in February. The PCBs went to Slickers in Ipswich, which is a waste disposal company and the site has duty of care to check that the material is treated properly by the disposal company. Mr Montague was pleased that the PCBs have gone from site as it is a zero tolerance from the EA if it is lost or not disposed of appropriately.

- 3392 Mr P Wilkinson, co-opted member, was concerned that any reference to low level radiation, exposures and risks should not be an interpretation of the way the site views it. It should be an acknowledgement that there is uncertainty. A couple of meetings ago, the group had suggested that the best thing to do was to put a parentheses after any assessment such as 'to the best of our knowledge' or 'in our opinion' so that it acknowledges the fact that there is doubt and uncertainty. 'Negligible' is again a value judgement that the site has made and it might not be 'negligible' to the person that has contracted cancer from it. Mr Wilkinson asked that the reports reflect the uncertainty and acknowledge the uncertainty. Mr Montague advised that he was not writing a report but reflecting the report that was produced about the unusual environmental monitoring results. Mr Montague went on to say that he was not putting out any formal academic response; he was relaying the information based upon the investigation following discussions with Mr P Fahey, the site's EA inspector.
- 3393 Mr Wilkinson also wanted to know about the graphite in the core and what is going to happen to it and when. Mr Montague confirmed that it will remain until final site clearance which will be around 60-70 years' time. The graphite will remain in the core, in the reactor pressure vessel within the reactor building. Mr Wilkinson wondered whether it was dependent on a repository being identified. Mr Montague said that if there was a repository in a years' time, the site would not remove the graphite. The strategy is that the graphite is not presenting any risk at the moment; it is in a very safe place and to retrieve it now would be hugely expensive and would incur pretty significant doses to the workforce carrying out the work. Mr Montague went on to say that similar retrieval work is being pioneered at Dounreay and Sellafield on the Windscale Advanced Gas Cooled Reactors (WAGR), but that is because it is of a different design and needed removing. Mr Montague reiterated that the graphite at Sizewell is in a very safe state and will not be retrieved until final site clearance.
- 3394 Ms J Girling, member of the public, was interested in the graphite core and how long it will remain particularly as there is no repository. Ms Girling was also concerned about how the graphite would be transported, whether road or rail and wondered at some point, Mr Montague could update the group on the weight of the graphite and where it will go? Ms Girling was worried about leaving it for future generations as she cannot envisage a repository being built for another 40 to 50 years which means Sizewell A will have C&M of the graphite core for some time. Who would be responsible for it if there is no NDA? **Mr Montague admitted that he did not have the figures for the total mass of graphite and said he would get this information to the group next time.** Mr Montague believes that the graphite will probably leave site by rail, but currently, there are no transport plans as the scheduled retrieval is too far in the future and facilities may be different in 2100. Mr Montague reassured the group that currently the graphite is in a very secure and safe state and the plan is to retrieve it and put it in a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF). During C&M, regular routine inspections will be carried out to ensure the remaining plant is not degraded.
- 3395 Mr B Hoggarth, member of the public, was concerned that the closure of Sizewell A would still leave the reactor vessel with all the hazards still in place. Mr Hoggarth recalls that the media reported the reactor would simply be covered by a dome and grass would grow over it. It appears that it is much more complicated than that and it is being left for the future generations to deal with and there are no real solutions at the moment. Mr Montague advised that the site will be managed and kept safe to ensure that there are no discharges now or in the future that would affect the environment and that is why, with the EA, the site has made sure it has the correct monitoring in place to ensure that the remaining plant is not affecting the environment from the buildings and the external dose rates emitted from those buildings. Mr Hoggarth wanted to know what Sizewell would do if the buildings started to affect the environment. Mr Montague assured Mr Hoggarth if that scenario

occurred, then it is the responsibility of the Magnox hub on behalf of the NDA to manage it. Chair summarised and said that there is a need for ongoing strategies and capacity to manage the legacy at Sizewell for many years and that would involve either governmental structures, local parish and town council structures or other solutions to be in place for the foreseeable future. Mr Montague advised that Magnox will manage these sites and when Sizewell A gets into C&M, it will be unmanned with remote monitoring. The hub organisation will monitor the site and be responsible for planning the routine inspections and checking any degradation, checking on storm damage etc. and to be able to respond to any scenario on the site. The site has been investigating this technology which is in use for many different businesses and it is working with the ONR and particularly Bradwell. As Bradwell will be the first site entering C&M, there will not be a hub to manage it, so Sizewell will monitor Bradwell and that principle will then be extended to other sites as they go into C&M. Mr Montague assured the group that the site will not be abandoned and there will be constant monitoring.

2b. Mr Rowland Cook (Site Inspector, Office of Nuclear Regulation)

3396 Chair had received apologies from Mr R Cook and a quarterly update for 1st October to 31st December was provided prior to the meeting.

2c. Mr Phil Fahey (Environment Agency)

3397 Mr P Fahey advised that it has been a quiet period with one inspection in December and no non-compliances were found. Mr Fahey informed the group that the EA were notified by the operator that environmentally significant equipment had not been calibrated in the required timescale. It was found that there were two minor breaches to the permit but as there was no environmental impact the EA enforcement response was to give advice and guidance to the operator – the two low class breaches were: the equipment was not calibrated and the root cause was there were no systems in place to ensure they were calibrated properly.

3398 Mr Griffith-Jones thought it was irresponsible to put out unsupportive statements in the EA Geological Disposal leaflet such as: 'In our view, geological disposal is an environmentally safe and sustainable option for long-term radioactive waste management' and wanted to know what experience the EA had because it is a complete new technology and it is not understood how it will operate, it has not yet been designed, it will not come into operation for decades and yet the EA is trying to persuade the public that it is 'safe and sustainable' – Mr Griffith-Jones believes that nuclear is not sustainable as a sustainable system would sort itself out whereas the nuclear system is not, it produces large quantities of highly toxic waste for generations to come. Chair felt that Mr Fahey could direct this to RWML. Mr Fahey admitted that he is not an expert on geological disposal but this is the EA position. The EA will generate and have generated waste that needs to be kept for a long time and it is the EA view that the geological disposal is the best way to do that. The Radiological Waste Management experts are available and will show how the system works and other countries are looking at a similar system as well. Mr Fahey advised that the EA would publish the leaflets to assist and highlight the EA regulations to offer more information. Mr Griffith-Jones does not think the documents are an acceptable way for the EA to put the subject across and will take the matter further but appreciates that it is not Mr Fahey's area of expertise and wanted to know who he should make his observations to as both documents are unacceptable.

3399 Ms Girling noticed at the bottom of the leaflet that it states how to get involved if there is a site selection nearby and asked how would the group know who is putting the sites forward for recommendation, would it be the County Councils? Chair suggested that the question is raised during item four on the agenda and the RWML presentation on the GDF.

3400 Mr Wilkinson supported Mr Griffith-Jones on the remarks made on the briefing note as geological disposal being described as safe and the geology will create the barrier and it will prevent radioactivity reaching the surface, which is not true. The repositories are designed to leak, they have to leak because of the decay that happens and the gas build up would be released to the atmosphere. If the EA is going to promote a geological disposal,

Mr Wilkinson wanted the EA to at least acknowledge that there are some uncertainties. Mr Wilkinson believes that the RWML have hundreds of unresolved uncertainties about disposal which needs reflecting in the promotional materials. A geological disposal site will have huge environmental problems associated with it that have to be resolved. Chair noted the statement of uncertainty and will address it at the RWML presentation.

2d. Mr Jonathan Jenkin (Nuclear Decommissioning Authority)

- 3401 Mr Jenkin highlighted a few items on the NDA monthly report including a couple of updates since the report had been published. Mr David Peattie has been appointed as the new Chief Executive, he joins the NDA from a career in BP and has formerly taken over the role. Mr John Clarke, the outgoing Chief Executive will stay on for a period of time to support Mr Peattie before he retires in June.
- 3402 Mr Jenkin updated the group on the pensions consultation, as part of the government policy and to reform public sector pensions across the whole public sector, the NDA have been consulting on two proposed changes to nuclear pensions schemes: a career averaged revalued earnings (CARE) arrangement and a pensionable pay cap. Since the report, there have been a number of negotiations and discussions between the NDA, trades unions and the government and a third option has now been added which is a variation on the career averaged scheme but involving certain enhancements including contributions and also a different phasing in of that arrangement. The consultation has now been extended to April and the trades unions will be holding a consultative ballot recommending the adoption of the third option in due course.
- 3403 In December, Mr Jenkin advised Mr Tom Smith was appointed as Chairman, Mr Smith had served as a non-executive director of the NDA for some time and had now taken over from Mr Stephen Henwood who retires after serving nine years as Chairman.
- 3404 Mr Jenkin highlighted other stories such as the Harwell site in Oxfordshire that has just celebrated its 70th birthday. Mr Jenkin mentioned the further good progress from Sellafield regarding the clean-up of the higher hazard facilities and the removal of radioactive sludge from the oldest nuclear fuel pond on site. Mr Jenkin went on to talk about £3 million worth of funding that has been made available to support innovation to find new decommissioning techniques – the funding has been made jointly available between the NDA, Sellafield Ltd and Innovate UK. Consultation has been concluded on the Draft Business Plan on 3rd February, and Mr Jenkin thanked contributors and advised that the NDA have been spending the time in-between reflecting on comments and updating the plan accordingly and the plan has been submitted to government ministers for approval and it is hoped the final business plan will be published by the end of March. Mr Jenkin welcomed the launch of the Nuclear Skills Strategic Plan to ensure that the industry as a whole (not just decommissioning but New Build as well) has the right skills and the right people available at the right time. The plan sets out 19 strategic actions on how to do that and each of the actions, in due course, will be developed into a more detailed set of plans. Finally, Mr Jenkin spoke about Mr John Clarke who is stepping down in June and the receipt of a lifetime achievement award in recognition of his service to the industry at the Nuclear Industry Association (NIA) dinner in December.
- 3405 Cllr B Howard, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council, wondered if the NDA have had any feedback from staff actually working in the nuclear industry regarding the pension scheme as when this kind of consultation has happened previously, the morale dropped amongst the people who are affected by it. Mr Jenkin said that the NDA are very conscious that the pension consultation is a very significant issue for everyone and had affected morale in some areas and that is why it was very important that there have been constructive discussions between the NDA, the government that is leading the policy across the whole public sector and the trades unions. Through those discussions, there has been agreement on a third option which will now be subject to an extended consultation period. Mr Jenkin understands that the trades unions believe that this is the best option at the moment that has been agreed upon. Mr Jenkin confirmed that the NDA are conscious that these issues are very sensitive and they do affect morale. Mr Montague was asked to comment and he advised that as expected, morale on the site was pretty low which he is trying to manage.

Mr Montague explained that it is a very tricky time to keep people focused on working safely whilst staff are thinking about the past 30-40 years spent working towards something that may not or will not be there. It is something that occupies his management team quite a lot, so they need to make sure workers are not thinking about or talking about their pensions whilst out on the plant particularly if they are working at height or in the ponds area. Mr Montague stated that it is a challenge for his management team but it is the direction the government has decided to go and nuclear work has been caught up in probably what was aimed at other civil servants. Mr Montague confirmed that he is not involved in any pension negotiations but has to manage the workforce during this period to keep them safe and concentrating on the job at hand.

3406 Cllr Howard also commented that he was really surprised that Essex County Council (ECC) agreed to accept waste from other plants around the country, in this case Dungeness A and Sizewell A. Mr Jenkin emphasised that it was a planning decision following the normal planning process, the clear advice that was given to the relevant planning committee was in line with national policy. The NDA strategy which has been consulted upon widely and approved by ministers quite clearly states that they are looking at more cost effective ways of managing waste including consolidating the storage of waste in fewer locations. Mr Jenkin understood there were quite strong views either side but wanted to relay the context for council decision that is supported by national policy. Mr Jenkin went on to say that there were conditions attached and the key one was that Magnox had to prepare a transport management plan for the transportation of waste from Sizewell and Dungeness to Essex and that has been recently completed.

3407 **Chair wanted Mr Jenkin to include in the report to take back to the NDA the matter raised about releasing land earlier. Mr Jenkin confirmed that he will take that back to the NDA and give consideration to it.**

3408 Chair commented on the consultation on the draft business plan which unfortunately coincided with the stage two Sizewell C consultation. The stage two consultation was over the Christmas period and the NDA also had their draft business plan consultation ending 3rd February and Chair wanted to know why that was allowed to happen as the NDA must have known that the stage two was going ahead at the time. Chair thanked the NDA for offering to delay the consultation but it was not an option for the group at the time. Mr Jenkin apologised for the timing of the business plan consultation for this group. Mr Jenkin explained that it is very difficult to get a balance that suits all the stakeholders in the country. The most important point Mr Jenkin emphasised was that the NDA timescales are driven by the Energy Act. The Energy Act states that the NDA has to have an approved plan in place by 1st April each year and it needs to be consulted on. Mr Jenkin went on to say that the NDA were very limited in terms of when they time their consultation in order to fit in with that legislative timetable and of course, they have to then build in some time to allow ministers to respond to and approve the plans. Mr Jenkin confirmed that the NDA will do their best each year to fit it with individual needs but reiterated that they do have limitations that are placed on them.

3409 Chair wanted the NDA to comment on the fact that the ONR have decided not to attend the SSG meetings at the Magnox sites and read out a statement from them: 'our policy with the Magnox decommissioning sites is that we are scaling down the number of meetings to be more proportionate to the low levels of nuclear risk on these sites and as part of this it is intended to limit the attendance at SSG meetings to one per year from now on' – Chair understood that if the group had questions, they can field them through the Sizewell B ONR representative, however, it was unfortunate that neither were present at the meeting. Chair went on to say that in the past, the police also went through a phase where they apportioned resource to risk which was a good strategy but then there is the perception of crime that they recognised they needed to allocate resources to. Chair went on to say that the ONR need to remember that there is a nuclear risk (an actual risk) but there are also issues that the public want to ask questions about and therefore the SSG still need an ONR representative resource allocated to Magnox sites over a long period of time while they are being decommissioned and formally requested that the NDA address that issue. Mr Jenkin was aware from attending other meetings that the ONR are adopting that approach which is

being described as a more proportionate approach to regulation and attending site meetings. **Mr Jenkin advised that the NDA would be happy to have the conversation with the ONR. Mr Jenkin went on to say that Mr Hamilton, at the last meeting, mentioned that the NDA are carrying out a long overdue review of the local engagement arrangements which has not been looked at since 2009. The current guidance does expect the regulators to attend each meeting and the NDA have to be sensitive to the fact that the ONR is quite rightly an independent organisation that makes its own decisions on how it allocates resources and that includes meeting attendance. Mr Jenkin confirmed that the NDA will have the conversation with the ONR.**

- 3410 Cllr Howard wanted to know how the ONR are funded? Chair advised that the bulk of the money comes from the nuclear industry that goes into a government pot.
- 3411 Mr T Branton remembers being involved in discussions with the first Chairman and Chief Executive of the NDA when they visited site in the early days of setting up the NDA. At the time both were very cognisant of the fact there was a skilled pool working on the site and they both stressed how important it was that there was a future offered to those employees that included salaries and final salary pensions to look forward to and both were very aware, as were government ministers, that if the skilled pool was diluted and people started going off elsewhere, then the decommissioning would become a far more protracted and expensive operation. Mr Branton went on to say that he was most concerned that the government is probably three or four administrations beyond when those terms were originally agreed.
- 3412 Cllr Bailey reiterated his concerns about the points he made on site clearance and wondered if the NDA have given full consideration to making land available for future development as the residents do require as much cooperation as possible to make this land available.
- 3413 **Ms Girling believes that the question on pensions concerns the entire group and wondered if it would help if the Stakeholder Group sent a letter to central government to state their concern.**
- 3414 Ms Girling was concerned about the Sizewell Stakeholder Group, in particular the SSG funding. Ms Girling explained that she did not know the exact funding for the SSGs but knew that both Chair and Deputy Chair received some kind of remuneration. Ms Girling was worried that there may be some cutbacks and it has never been fully understood just how beneficial the group is. Ms Girling stated the group could be seen as difficult and obstructive but, in her view, without an opposition, the group would not achieve results. Ms Girling wanted to know if there was a reason why the group is not told what the funding is as there are times when it would be advantageous for members on the committee to invite a guest speaker. She understood what Mr Hamilton said at the last meeting that any additional money to fund guest speakers would be decided by the NDA but that does not appear fair because as Ms Girling understood it, EdF also fund the meetings. There needs to be a lot more consideration at the next AGM on the NDA and EdF cooperation to ensure that the group continues with perhaps a few alterations to its constitution but not to dilute it to the point where members of the public cannot make their comments known and available to the press. Ms Girling hopes that the NDA review will allow continuation of sub-group meetings to discuss issues in depth and that the Chairperson is invited to the review. As a member of the public, Ms Girling feels that it is even more important, particularly with Sizewell A in the decommissioning phase and Sizewell B still operational, that the group get the best cooperation and best answers to continue.
- 3415 Chair confirmed that with 12 years involvement, first as member, a Vice Chair then as a Chair, there has never been a published budget. The group have never been able to know if there is funding available that they could use for training or for public awareness raising events on certain topics. The group has always been told if there is something specific they want to do, they can ask the NDA if they can do it, but it is down to the NDA to advise whether it is an appropriate use of that funding and whether the activity matches their remit. Chair went on to say that Sizewell B contributes £11,000 per year to the group as half the

agenda is about Sizewell B, but the group does not know the amount topped up from the NDA. The group is not allowed to have the transparency of knowing the cost of the venues, the emoluments and the expenses to provide the SSG secretariat and an admin team from the Sizewell A site. Previously the group were allowed to regularly hold sub-group meetings between regular meetings to progress matters of discussion and action, and Chair believes that is the reason why the quarterly meetings now take longer. Chair advised that they can have sub-group meetings but they need to be managed by the group including covering the cost of the venue and admin support. The NDA must also approve the content. Chair explained that although the official aim of the SSGs were to be an independent conduit of information between the industry and the public, at the moment, the group are being asked to operate by the NDA and with NDA approval. Chair requested that if members wish to have a sub-group meeting or training on particular topics, to let her know and she can formally ask the NDA and will share the answer that she receives back.

- 3416 Ms Girling still felt uncomfortable that EdF are contributing towards the costs of the meeting and the NDA seem to control what is discussed. Mr Jenkin thanked Ms Girling for her contribution today but does not think that he can cover or reply to every point that she has raised, partly because Mr Jenkin might not know the answer but also it is important to listen, think about and reflect on the group's concerns.
- 3417 Mr Jenkin wanted to emphasise that there is no intention of diluting or diminishing the quality of the engagement when the NDA review the guidance on how it engages with Magnox and other site operators. If anything, the NDA are trying to refresh it so that the groups are representative and they are challenging the NDA, the regulators and site operators which involves difficult questions. The review is really about trying to make sure it continues and strengthens.
- 3418 Regarding the EdF contribution and the question around NDA control, Mr Jenkin advised that firstly, the NDA reconstituted the old liaison committees as Site Stakeholder Groups and that involved making them more independent and having an independent Chairmanship. Although costs are shared where there are A and B sites, Magnox provide the secretariat for all the Site Stakeholders Groups, so while there is cost sharing, the NDA as the body, established the SSGs and indirectly provided the secretariat through Magnox and as a public body as well. So NDA money that contributes to the SSG work is ultimately public money and that is why historically the NDA have been in charge of writing the guidance. In reviewing the guidance, the NDA will be consulting with EdF and sharing the ideas as it develops with all the Site Stakeholder Groups and there may be sub-groups to consider the detail. **Mr Jenkin will take the sub-group situation back to the NDA and discuss how that is managed and financed, but his understanding at the moment is that the SSG needs to put forward a simple business case as to why it needs a sub-group.**
- 3419 Mr Griffith-Jones was disappointed to learn that sub-groups will not take place and highlighted an area where further information was needed such as the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) comments on Sizewell B. Mr Griffith-Jones has been requesting a sub-group meeting since the IAEA's comments were received last summer. Attendance at previous sub-groups has proved very informative and Mr Griffith-Jones drew attention to a meeting presented by a guest speaker from the ONR who was an expert in the structure of the Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV). Mr Griffith-Jones considers that the cost of a sub-group would not be prohibitive and it is essential that the group discusses the latest IAEA report. Finally, Mr Griffith-Jones feels that the NDA are failing to fulfil their duty in funding the sub-groups and if the NDA are not going to allow the group to act as an independent body, the group should look at being completely separate, that can act locally and deal with issues that require greater scrutiny. Chair hopes there will be some compromise in the future and the group will be able to put topics forward and be able to meet to discuss them.
- 3420 Chair asked Mr Jenkin to add the group's good wishes to the retirees of the NDA and welcome in the new members into the organisation.

2e. Any other questions (from members and the public)

3421 Mr C Wheeler, member of the public and Friston resident, had a question about the East Suffolk Line trains that run from Lowestoft to Ipswich. The aim of the train operating company and the community rail partnership is to run an evenly spaced hourly timetable on every week day but in actual fact it is not possible to do it. The reason being that there is a slot reserved in the morning and afternoon timetable of every week day for a Sizewell freight train that blocks the single track section between Woodbridge and Saxmundham, the result being that instead of running an evenly spaced hourly timetable, there is a hundred minute gap between the train for example from Saxmundham to Ipswich that departs at 08:17 and the next available train does not depart until 09:57. Mr Wheeler believes there could be a good historical reason for this and proceeded to read a note from his rail enthusiast colleague recently that read: 'I do try to keep a daily check on how the East Suffolk Line operates. The Sizewell path is virtually never used for proper freight traffic. It appears to be used approximately once every four months for what appears, from my observations to be a locomotive and an empty wagon. Ironically a train had access to Sizewell branch this morning and was scheduled to pass Saxmundham at 06:10 ahead of the normal passenger train service, the problem was that it ran an hour late and screwed up the morning peak timetable. I cannot find any evidence of it returning, so it might have something to do with the planned engineering work tonight'. Mr Wheeler noted that there was a Network Rail engineering train parked in the railway siding and visible from the SSG venue today. Mr Wheeler wanted to know if there was an explanation and whether there could be a better solution. The train operating company and the community rail partnership have both asked for the Sizewell paths to be released on the basis that they promised to reinstate them if they were subsequently required. Chair was interested as to whether company money is being paid to the rail companies to hold that open when there is no need. **Chair went on to say that every day the public schedule is disrupted for something that is not being used and the group will need answers through the national rail contact or through the District Council – Dr C Barnes, Suffolk Coastal District Council will look into the matter.** Chair was not aware of the issue and thanked Mr Wheeler for bringing the matter to the group's attention.

3422 Ms Girling advised that for some reason a freight train has been using the railway for the last ten days in the evenings between 22:45 and 23:15 and is parked in the siding today. Ms Girling wanted to know if anyone from Sizewell can explain. Both Sizewell representatives were unaware of any train activities and believe it is Network Rail engineering works. **Dr Barnes has offered to investigate the matter.**

3 **SIZEWELL B REPORTS**

3a. **Mr Paul Morton (Station Director, EdF)**

3423 Mr Morton, Station Director from Sizewell B updated the group that covered the following points in the last three months:

- Safety performance and staffing:

Mr Morton advised that Sizewell B continued to have a very strong safety performance and as a station, the site is fleet leading in terms of their overall safety performance, environmental performance and nuclear safety performance.

- No injuries to staff (737 days, over 2 years);
- No nuclear reportable incidents (2305 days, over 6 years);
- No environmental incidents (843 days, over 2 years);
- 528 EdF Energy staff – 15% female and 50% of those in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) related roles;
- Includes 18 Apprentices – currently 3 female apprentices – all apprentices from within Norfolk/Suffolk, contractual to live within 25 mile radius of station from third year;
- 250 year round contracting partners.

- Dry Fuel Store (DFS) – first campaign update:
 - A Licence Instrument has been issued permitting the movement of nuclear fuel into Sizewell B Dry Storage Facility;
 - The building and casks are passively cooled; the building can store 143 storage casks – sufficient storage capacity to cover the anticipated operating lifetime of the power station.
- Relocated Facilities at Sizewell B:
 - Environmental scoping report submitted to Suffolk Coastal District Council;
 - Scoping Opinion has been received which will inform the environmental impact assessment carried out for the proposed works;
 - Sizewell B will consult with key stakeholders and the local community on the proposals and carry out further technical and environmental assessment ahead of submitting a planning application, there is no fixed timetable for the consultation on relocated facilities at this stage;
 - The planning application would identify any significant adverse impacts as well as any measures needed to mitigate those impacts;
 - The proposed facilities would include a new Sizewell Visitor Centre as well as replacement offices, storage, workshops, welfare, training and parking facilities; the new facilities would be established before the existing buildings are removed;
 - Mr Morton picked up on the point raised during the Sizewell A reports and confirmed that Sizewell B do liaise with Sizewell A and talk about opportunities for the site to interact for land and facilities. Mr Morton verified that this has been regularly achieved with issues such as car parking and it does have a positive impact with the use of land. The site is continually pursuing opportunities, but the two businesses' timelines need to align and the sites are constantly looking to take that opportunity when they can.
- Sizewell B Refuelling Outage 2017:
 - Sizewell B power station will be brought offline in November 2017 to begin its fifteenth refuelling and maintenance outage;
 - An extra 1,000 specialist workers will join the Sizewell workforce and provide a boost to the area's hotels and businesses;
 - During the approximately five week period they will carry out over 10,000 separate pieces of work which have been carefully planned during the last two years;
 - As well as refuelling the reactor, we will also deliver major investment and routine maintenance work during the outage:
 - Turbine one routine maintenance and upgrade of turbine one monitoring systems
 - Overhaul of one of four main cooling water pumps
 - Replacement of a reactor building cooler
- Education and skills:
 - Sizewell B is working with the Engineering Design Trust supporting a group of 25 school girls from local schools who have taken up a challenge to reduce energy usage at school;
 - Apprentices from the station are mentoring the teams;
 - Aim of the project is to inspire girls to study science and increase the connection between their studies and potential future careers – part of EdF Energy's 'Pretty

Curious' ongoing programme to inspire more girls to consider science and technology careers.

- Sizewell B Sponsorships and Donation fund:

£10k per year, summaries of projects awarded to date totalling £6,510:

- Leiston Long Shop Museum, leaflet production	- £1,000
- Leiston Film Theatre – pantomime	- £750
- Leiston Town Football club, pitch advertising	- £500
- Leiston Town Council – Sizewell village sign	- £750
- Leiston & District Community Partnership – Leiston Big Weekend	- £700
- Leiston Children's Centre Defibrillator Appeal	- £250
- The Rotary Club Saxmundham, Heritage Coast run	- £500
- Yoxford Two Charities, Grand Summer Fete	- £100
- Rendham Fete	- £100
- Tunstall Bowls Club	- £50
- Aldeburgh Carnival, prizes for float procession	- £500
- Aldeburgh & Thorpeness Rugby Club, club renovation	- £1,000
- Aldeburgh Primary School – Laptop appeal	- £260

3424 Cllr Howard wondered why the visitors' centre is at the site rather than in the town. The town council would prefer the visitors' centre located in the town because it would enhance the tourist centre, would fit in with the Long Shop museum and could reach a broader section of residents and tourists. Mr Morton understood the request and realises the benefits that would bring. However, the important part that the visitors' centre offers is the site tours; not only do visitors interact with the models, engage in the educational activities and informative equipment, they are then given a site tour, the feedback from the tour is very positive. Logistically, if the centre was not located on site, the tour would be far more difficult to organise. This was the balance when deciding where to locate the centre.

3425 Mr Taylor understood that the apprentices still train at HMS Sultan. In view of EdF's plans in the area, would it be suitable to have their education carried out by local training providers or at local colleges in a more general area of engineering? Mr Morton advised that the apprenticeship EdF have with Sultan is amongst the best in the country and achieves international awards. EdF regularly assess and vet the training. The facility covers both the naval industry and Network Rail, so it has a scale of equipment and machinery that colleges struggle to offer. It is important to an apprentice's education to see on a very large scale some of the pieces of equipment they will work on. They get opportunities to understand that scale of equipment and work on it directly and that is not something they could do in aggregated colleges around the country. It is a four year apprenticeship with two years at Sultan and the second two years back on site. The apprentices become part of the local community when they begin their career development. There are some advantages to using HMS Sultan and in balance that is why EdF use them. Mr Morton advised that the training is assessed regularly by EdF and the site is in the process of reviewing it at the moment.

3426 Ms Girling wanted to know how long the Dry Fuel Store (DFS) licence is in place for. Mr C Tucker, Sizewell B staff representative and nuclear safety engineer, advised that there is a single site licence for the site at Sizewell B that includes the DFS which is Site Licence number: 63. The ONR do not issue licences for a fixed period of time for facilities, they licence it on an ongoing basis with a periodic review every ten years. Although the DFS has a safety case for 100 years, it is still licenced on a ten yearly basis in the same way as the rest of the site. Ms Girling clarified that the whole site licence is ongoing and reviewed

every ten years and the DFS does not have a separate licence, it is incorporated in the existing licence.

- 3427 Ms Girling advised that residents have already been consulted on the Sizewell C application and the relocation of the visitors' centre to Coronation Wood. Ms Girling went on to say that Leiston Town Council was looking for some cooperation between EdF and the town so the town could benefit from the visitors' centre. Ms Girling revisited the earlier conversation about the best use of land and wondered whether there is anywhere else on the estate that could suitably house the centre that would benefit both EdF and Leiston? Mr Morton has talked about the positioning of the visitors' centre and there is no perfect answer and that was why the site has gone through the various options of analysing where it needs to go. Mr Morton confirmed that in consultation with Sizewell C, there will only be one visitors' centre. Mr Morton advised that currently the site is reflecting any input and consideration will be given to the volume of opinion to decide what needs to be done in terms of mitigation before it gets to the point of the planning application. The consultation process is designed to drive out those decision making activities and Mr Morton asked that options and concerns are fed into that consultation process. Ms Girling wanted to know if members of the public would be able to contribute as she has been advised that the Environment Impact Assessments were for statutory bodies only and would EdF be prepared to discuss options with the town council before the planning application is submitted. **Mr Morton said he would consider this and is very open in seeking views of everyone including local residents and local councils to achieve the best outcome.**
- 3428 Responding to Mr Hoggarth's question, Mr Morton advised that there will be 1,000 workers on top of the 528 headcount already on site during the Refuelling Outage scheduled for November this year.
- 3429 Mr Hoggarth wanted to know if the refuelling rods will go into the ponds or will they transfer to the DFS. Mr Morton explained EdF's campaign is to move spent fuel into the DFS, with a view to make room in the fuel ponds for the next two outages to come. The fuel that will be removed from the reactor will be placed in the ponds and will remain in the ponds for a period until it gets to a level of decay that is appropriate for dry storage. Mr Morton confirmed that older fuel is ready to go into the DFS now. The first cask has been loaded with a range of ages and the make-up of fuel that goes into each cask is calculated to understand the energy stored – 143 casks can be stored in the DFS. Mr Hoggarth wanted to know how they would be moved in their entirety when a GDF is available. Mr Morton advised that the plan is to move them to the GDF and the exact design of transport vessels will be designed at some point in the future. After a further query from Mr Hoggarth, Mr Morton confirmed that the store is designed purely for Sizewell B's fuel and not Sizewell C.
- 3430 Mr Griffith-Jones queried the Generic Design Assessment (GDA) process that was highlighted in the report and wanted to know if it was going to be designed and built in China. Mr Morton advised that decisions have not yet been made and it is a question for Sizewell C. Mr Morton confirmed that it is a Chinese design and part of the GDA is that it needs to go through UK law and legislation which is one of the most stringent safety standards in the nuclear industry world. The detail of manufacturing contracts is way down the design and construction process at this stage. Chair advised Mr Morton that the difficulty including Sizewell C activities on their report are that the NDA does not allow the group to discuss or give time to them.
- 3431 Mr Griffith-Jones did not think the comment in the report that nuclear is 'reliable low carbon energy' should be used because it is not.
- 3432 Mr Griffith-Jones took objection to Sizewell B's reference to a Dry Fuel Store when it is nuclear waste and while it has been fuel in the past, it is not going to be fuel in the future and it has no future as fuel, and therefore it is nuclear waste.
- 3433 Mr Griffith-Jones went on to mention that EdF claim the DFS facility is 'a mature technology' – Sizewell B will have the building in situ for at least 100 years and the technology is less than 20 years old and is not a mature technology. EdF do not know what is going to happen to it in that period of time. Mr Griffiths-Jones believes that Sizewell B needs to stop

pretending that it knows more than it does. No one knows what is going to happen and how the waste will be disposed of. For the time being, Mr Griffith-Jones considered that there is a nuclear waste dump on Sizewell B and it will be there for an uncertain, unpredictable and a very long time. It is nuclear waste that is not beneficial to any living species and Mr Griffith-Jones reiterated that it is toxic waste and is not dry fuel. Chair advised that this has been explored by the group in the past and the official category is that it is a resource of zero value – there is no policy currently to have that reprocessed as fuel and the facility was paid for by the Nuclear Liabilities Fund (NLF). Chair summarised that it is a dry store for spent fuel and is officially categorised as ‘spent fuel’.

- 3434 Mr Hoggarth wanted to know the nationalities of the additional 1,000 workers for the Outage. Mr Morton advised that EdF go through Areva, a French multinational group that specialises in nuclear power. Areva hire French, British and American employees and all three of those nationalities would be present at the Outage in November. Mr Morton went on to say that there would be a small proportion of French and American workers but EdF do not legislate on nationality.
- 3435 Ms Hogan thanked Sizewell B for their approachability to Sizewell residents and their willingness to help them and thanked Mrs Niki Rousseau for often anticipating residents’ concerns. Ms Hogan noted that Sizewell B has registered residents’ concern on the use of the Pill Box field, the new entrance on to the road and Coronation Wood.
- 3436 Mr Tucker advised that there is always this perception with the terminology ‘waste’ that it is thrown away and forgotten about. Sizewell B are not doing that, it is inherent in the safety case of the dry store that it is under continual review. The company looks at similar facilities around the world with a view what happens. The casks are inspected and temperatures are monitored, so it is not a ‘waste dump’ in the sense that it is just throwing it away and forgetting it, it is a process under continual review and if there is something that happens around the world that affects the site’s view of the safety of the dry fuel then the fuel would have to be repackaged. Chair advised that there is ‘waste’ at Sellafield that is continually monitored and it is acceptable to call it ‘waste’. It is not throwing it away, but it can still be actively monitored.
- 3437 Mr C Betson, East Suffolk Business Association Network, commented that the EdF apprenticeship scheme is of the highest quality and matches that of previous renowned excellent apprenticeships such as those offered by Rolls Royce and Vicar training.
- 3438 Mr Taylor wanted to know if EdF are supportive of making the approach road from both stations to the Abbey Road junction a 40 mph limit. Mr Morton had been in discussion with the Sizewell Residents group and there is a lot of interest in reducing the speed limit. Mr Morton took an action to speak to the local council and the highways agency and is supportive of introducing it and would like to play a part on bringing it to fruition. Mr Morton is happy to go on record offering support to this and has been for the last 12 months.
- 3439 Mr Taylor wanted to know if coming out of the European Union would affect nuclear safety rules and would the group support a call to correspond with the local MP and possibly the minister of state responsible for the nuclear industry to ensure the industry does not disregard any regulations that affect nuclear safety. Mr Taylor went on to say that it is important that the UK keep up-to-date with the rest of the world and to have this recommendation reinforced by EdF as to what they expect from the government moving forward in what can be a very difficult time, so that the group has the confidence in what is going on that affects its safety. Chair said the group did ask each of the regulators to provide a statement on the impact of ‘Brexit’ and any regulations. Chair has received statements back but they are very generic so the group will seek specific information. Mr Morton advised that Brexit and European Legislation is creating a huge amount of work for his organisation and they have only just starting to talk with government around what that means for the company and having some specifics to work through. Mr Morton assured the group that, as an operator, EdF have no desire to dilute any implications of European legislation and would like to retain the high standards that are held in the UK. EdF are cooperating with government to work with them to clarify that position. Mr Morton felt it fair

to say that when Brexit was first announced, they did not foresee that the breakaway from the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or Euratom), for instance, would be automatically part of Brexit – the information had surprised them.

3440 Mr Griffith-Jones was in a meeting with the Rt Hon Ben Gummer MP recently. Mr Gummer reassured him that it was the government's full intention to maintain all the provisions of Euratom. Mr Gummer advised Mr Griffith-Jones that he did not know the exact reasons for the split but it was something to do with the two treaties being linked. Mr Morton concurred the intent to maintain all of the elements of Euratom which was directly linked to Brexit and was unavoidable.

3b. Mr Graham Moorcroft (Site Inspector, Office of Nuclear Regulation)

3441 Chair had received apologies from Mr G Moorcroft and a quarterly update for 1st October to 31st December was provided prior to the meeting.

3c. Ms Victoria Thomas (Environment Agency)

3442 Ms Thomas, Environment Agency for Sizewell B updated the group and advised that it has been a quiet period but they had recently undertaken an inspection of gaseous discharges from the site and found no non-compliances. Ms Thomas had also spent the last two days looking at the discharge points, she will give a further update as soon as this information has been collated.

3443 Ms Thomas went on to present the following monitoring results for quarter three:

- What do we require?:
 - Define, document and carry out an environmental monitoring programme
 - o Reported quarterly to EA (publicly available)
 - o Three months retrospectively
 - Sizewell B manages the programme for both sites
 - Separate to monitoring done by the EA and Foods Standards Agency
- Why do we ask?:
 - Monitor environmental effects of permitted discharges
 - o What, when and how
 - Objectives and principles
 - Source-Pathway-Receptor model
- Sizewell Programme (Operator):
 - The current programme has a wide range of monitoring and sampling locations:
 - o 13 radiation monitoring locations in the local area
 - o 10 passive shade monitoring locations (changed monthly)
 - o 1 milk sample, which will soon cease
 - o Sampling of up to 10 species of fish, molluscs and crustacean during the year
 - o 13 coastal locations for radiation monitoring
 - o Biannual radiation monitoring of the strandline close to the power stations
 - o Radiation monitoring of local fishing equipment
 - o 5 locations where grass and soil samples are taken
 - o 5 locations where sand/sediment samples are taken
- Q3 Results (July – September 2016):

- Sizewell A perimeter fence dose rates
 - o 13 fixed dosimeters
 - o No unusual results
 - o Annual average results $\leq 0.25\text{mSv}$
- Off-site dose rates
 - o 13 fixed dosimeters
 - o 2 arcs around site at 1km and 6km
 - o No unusual results
 - o Annual average results $\leq 0.25\text{mSv}$
- Beach/estuary dose rate monitoring
 - o 11 locations monitored quarterly
 - o 2 locations monitored annually
 - o No unusual results
 - o Net dose rates all $< 10\text{nGy}$ per hour
- Passive shade monitoring
 - o 10 shades deployed in an arc around Sizewell
 - o Replaced monthly
 - o 11 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
 - o No positive results during the quarter
 - o All results less than the limit of detection (0.1-0.3Bq per shade)
- Milk sampling
 - o 1 sample collected in Q3 (milk sampling will cease in Q4)
 - o 12 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
 - o No positive result during the quarter
 - o All results less than the limit of detection (0.1 – 0.6Bq per litre of milk)
- Grass/herbage sampling
 - o 5 locations sampled quarterly
 - o 12 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for (C-14 is measured in Q3 only – all $< 8.8\text{Bq (kgC)}$)
 - o Analysed for concentration (Bq per kg) and loading (Bq per m^2)
 - o No positive results during the quarter
 - o All results less than the limit of detection (< 0.1 to $< 1.1\text{Bq per kg}$ or < 0.1 to $< 0.8\text{Bq per m}^2$)
- Marine sand/sediment samples
 - o Samples taken quarterly from 5 locations
 - o 11 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
 - o Positive Cs-137 result recorded at Southwold

- 5.3Bq per kg
- Not unusual, similar to last quarter
- Annual contamination monitoring of fishing equipment
 - Equipment used by local fishermen at Sizewell
 - Not carried out in Q3
- Fish, crustacean and mollusc sampling
 - Oyster, crab, skate, flounder and bass
 - Collected from local fishermen quarterly (species depends on season)
 - 11 of the most common isotopes associated with operational and decommissioning nuclear power stations analysed for
 - No positive results
 - All results within the limit of detection (0.1 – 1.5Bq per kg)

3444 Cllr Howard wanted to know why there was only a biannual monitoring of the strandline. Ms Thomas advised that they monitor biannually because it is proportionate to the risk and it is taken at the appropriate frequency, but they also undertake soil and sand samples alongside. Cllr Howard advised that Strontium-90 was found on the strandline. Ms Thomas advised that this was not through the radiation detection measurement monitoring, it was found through radioanalytical analysis of the sand and sediment and therefore it was a different sample.

3d. Any other questions (from members and the public)

3445 No further questions were raised and a short comfort break was taken.

4. PRESENTATION ON THE GDF FROM RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT TEAM

3446 Mr Simon Napper announced himself as working in the stakeholder engagement team at RWML and introduced Mr Mike Brophy, head of community engagement at RWML. Mr Napper began by stating that the siting process for a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) has not yet started and will depend on three key elements:

- The waste is suitably packaged
- The geology is suitable
- The crucial element is that the community in that area are willing to host the facility.

3447 Mr Napper went on to say that RWML is a limited company and are a subsidiary of the NDA and are a government body which was set up to manage radioactive waste effectively, to protect people and the environment with a specific mission to deliver a GDF. Part of that is to develop radioactive waste management solutions. RWML will work together with waste producers to ensure the waste is disposal ready and therefore does not have to be repackaged before going into the GDF once it has started operating.

3448 Mr Napper explained that the UK has a varied mix of different radioactive waste: High Level Waste (HLW); Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) and Low Level Waste (LLW). There are also items that are not classified as waste yet such as Plutonium; Uranium and Spent Fuel which RWML are planning for and presented the following:

- Radioactive waste in the UK:
 - each reactor an enhancement on previous installations, even within individual programmes like Magnox, Advance Gas-Cooled Reactor (AGR) etc.
 - a number of 'one-off' or experimental reactors, as places like Harwell and Dounreay
 - result is a multiplicity of different waste streams, comprising a range of different substances

- UK has experience of dealing with a wide variety of radioactive materials and structures
- RWML ensures that waste is packaged today so that it is disposal-ready. This approach benefits all parties

- UK Government positions:

Mr Napper went on to say that most (if not all) of the nuclear countries have adopted GDF as the way forward and it is the best way to deal with disposing of nuclear waste. Mr Wilkinson interrupted and corrected Mr Napper to include the phrase 'given the current state of knowledge'. Mr Napper repeated that the international accepted best practice is to use a geological disposal facility.

- Finland:

Mr Napper advised that Finland has granted RWML's equivalent, Posiva, a construction licence to go ahead with the emplacement of spent fuel. Final disposal is due to start in the 2020s. Sweden is expected to be in a similar situation within the next year or so and France will start emplacement in the 2020s. Mr Napper went on to say that RWML are not doing anything different from the rest of the nuclear community, and they are sharing best practice around the world. One area that distinguishes the different programmes is the different national cultures. Communities in Finland have been engaged with discussions but they have a different background and they do things in a slightly different way. To make it work in the UK, Mr Napper advised that RWML will develop a 'UK way of doing things'.

- Geological disposal – 2014 White Paper overview:

The white paper in 2014 set out a number of actions (three specific listed below) which had to be completed before RWML could start the formal siting process. Once in place, the government hands over the programme to RWML to deliver the GDF. RWML will then find and engage with communities to work with them which is a long term process. Mr Napper went on to say that he does not expect to start constructing a GDF for another 15-20 years. The GDF will then be in operation for around 100 years before it is sealed. The ONR and EA will scrutinise the RWML safety case. Mr Napper confirmed that a GDF will not be built unless RWML and the regulators are confident that it can be built and operated safely.

- Initial actions:

- National geological screening
 - o Public Consultation completed
 - o Mapping what we know (and what we don't) about the relevant aspects of geology
 - o Publishing the outputs
- Land use planning
 - o GDF designated a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
 - o The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) to hold consultation
 - o Parliamentary scrutiny
- Working with communities
 - o BEIS to hold public consultation

Mr Napper finished the presentation with a video which can be viewed on their website: www.gov.uk/rwm. Further email details were listed: GDFenquiries@nda.gov.uk; rwmfeedback@nda.gov.uk; mike.brophy@nda.gov.uk; simon.napper@nda.gov.uk;

3449 Mr M Brophy introduced himself as head of community engagement at RWML and gave a brief overview of his career. Mr Brophy reiterated that RWML are in the early stages of a long process and his role is to work with colleagues in RWML, BEIS and alongside two key

regulators to engage communities in this programme and policy. The national screening is taking place at the moment so RWML are getting to know the geology, but this is currently a desk study and Mr Brophy assured the group that there are no bore holes being dug.

- 3450 The government is at the stage of producing a policy to see how the recommendations in the White Paper can be delivered and RWML is engaged with that. Questions have been raised about how to engage with the community; what is the definition of community; what are the responsibilities of people in the community; what are the responsibilities that RWML have; where are the joint responsibilities and who are the decision makers? Mr Brophy said that the group would be notified when the consultation is ready and urged the SSG and their networks to take part in that consultation. It is particularly important that the communities with this group's expertise, knowledge, history, experience and learning are there in that policy.
- 3451 Once the policy is consulted on, responsibility is handed over to RWML to take forward and Mr Brophy's role is to engage in communities. The key point here is that if the geology is good and workable in an area, it will not go ahead if the community does not want it. It is a consent base voluntarist process. Likewise, if a community really wants a GDF as it would be a guarantee of jobs but the geology is not appropriate, then again, it will not go ahead.
- 3452 Mr Brophy also mentioned that there is provision in the White Paper that the cost to the community should be cost-neutral – there is a real desire to encourage the community to come forward, and if they do, they are inconvenienced as little as possible and that will be an important part of the process.
- 3453 In learning lessons from previous examples, the communities have been spending time and money on the planning process and there now sums of up to £1m available in certain engagement – if there is a very strong willingness for a community to engage in this process and there is opportunity to form a partnership, then those communities can draw down some funding of up to £1m a year while they are engaged in that level of process. Mr Brophy explained that as the process gets more involved and there are site investigations, then there is up to £2.5m for those communities. Beyond that and once the facilities are up and running, there will be a much greater amount dependent on the scale of construction and issues from that. Mr Brophy reinforced the fact that it is a community consent based approach and the communities need to be willing and that is the way the White Paper has been set out and that is what RWML have to deliver.
- 3454 Mr Wilkinson wanted to know if the geology is perfect and the community is against it, it would not go ahead but did that mean RWML would prioritise the geology over the community. Mr Brophy advised that all criteria have to be met and that is how the White Paper is set up. Mr Wilkinson advised that this new position was very different to what RWML have said in the past. RWML have said that whatever the geology, they would manufacture a repository that would match and deal with that geology. Mr Wilkinson wanted to know if RWML have changed their policy. Mr Brophy advised that it was a government policy. Mr Wilkinson believed that it was RWML's policy that a repository could be built for any geology. Chair concurred with Mr Wilkinson as she was involved with the original consultation process. She paraphrased RWML's position at the time that they would adjust the containers to provide the barriers should the geology not provide the correct protection but there may be one or two instances where it is not suitable. Mr Napper confirmed that it is unlikely that there will be a perfect geology and there could be a choice on the physical side, provided the multi-barrier system gives the level of safety that RWML and the regulators are happy, but then, the community side must also be happy to host it. Mr Brophy reiterated that one is dependent on the other. This is unique across all examples where internationally there are geological disposals and RWML have looked at what has happened in other countries and decisions have been based on geology first then community second. The communities have been engaged perhaps, but there has often been a priority for the geology and a priority for the political will. Here, in the UK, both sets of criteria need to be met.
- 3455 Mr Wilkinson thinks that RWML have avoided using a geologically developed map of the UK to show where the potential priority areas would be for a GDF as he believes this would

create division between communities. RWML now appear to play two ends against the middle to get the best deal. Mr Brophy agreed, the government is trying a different tact and will work with communities from the start. Mr Brophy confirmed that RWML do not have a map prioritising areas. Mr Wilkinson was worried that a GDF would be placed in say, Cambridgeshire when 90% of the waste is in Sellafield. Mr Brophy advised that, at the moment, the government policy states that if only one community comes forward and they are based in Cambridgeshire and the geology is suitable for that area, then it could be transported to Cambridgeshire. Mr Brophy said that waste is already being transported across the country to Sellafield now and therefore transportation would not be a big issue. Mr Wilkinson asked if RWML would be comfortable in transporting 140 tonnes of plutonium across the country. Mr Brophy said that it would be done in small pieces but that could be raised as an issue for UK plc and the community to decide what they want to do.

- 3456 Mr Wilkinson said that the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) in its final report in 2006 stated that disposal is the best option with the parentheses 'given the current state of knowledge' and the recommendations to government were that they continually investigated what other options may be around that were better than a GDF. Mr Napper confirmed that the White Paper clearly states that RWML's commitment is to review any developments in this area and they regularly publish an alternatives report which looks at the rest of the developing knowledge to see what the alternatives are. To date, no other options have been developed which would make RWML or anyone else in the international community change their minds that a GDF should be the preferred option. Mr Napper went on to say that some other technology may occur, but the key concern here is that the current generation created this waste and it is not fair to leave the solution to another generation yet unborn. It needs to be dealt with now and RWML have to take what is available now. Mr Napper recommended that if it can be done safely then it should be done today. Mr Wilkinson agreed that this should be the case for legacy waste, but nuclear waste is another issue altogether. Mr Napper said that regardless on the whole debate on New Build, there is still 70 years of legacy waste which has to be dealt with.
- 3457 Ms Girling wanted to know who RWML mean when they say 'community' as earlier RWML referred to the community as decision formers. Mr Brophy said that there will be a definition of a community in the context of the policy that comes out in the consultation document and reiterated how important the document is and urged the group to scrutinise it when it is published. Community means different things to different people and there are communities of interest such as coastal authorities etc., so the definition is quite broad but Mr Brophy went on to say that the policy would initially define quite a wide area and will then hone it down to the 'host' community and that might include two different counties. Mr Brophy went on to example an opposite situation where one land owner may want to put themselves forward as they have enough space to host a GDF but they cannot identify themselves as representing the whole community and would therefore need to broaden the scope. Mr Brophy added that it was a difficult question that needs to be resolved.
- 3458 Ms Girling wanted to know how long the GDF would be monitored before it is sealed. Mr Napper advised that nothing will go into the GDF unless it has been prepared to be disposed of already and will be packaged before it gets to the GDF for permanent disposal. It will be sealed in because it has been built and engineered to stay there permanently. Ms Girling's major concern is that the packages would be put into the GDF and forgotten about and she feels that it is really dangerous over a long period of time and there has to be a way of monitoring what is happening. Ms Girling could not see at any point during the presentation that monitoring would be carried out from the first package delivered to the last. Chair summarised that there would be lots of uncertainties on whether it would be retrievable in the future to allow new technology. Questions about whether it will be sealed or not or whether there would be packaging facilities at the host site or the donating site, for example Sizewell may want to use a packaging facility. There was no mention on the slides on how the waste would be transported. It appears that nothing has been agreed or set in stone and there are huge questions to be resolved. Chair went on to ask whether the GDF would be marked in the hope that people forget about it and no one disturbs it. Mr Brophy offered to come back to the group to go through it in more detail once the

government has put out the consultation document on the policy. Chair said there is a desperate need for more information and more awareness for all communities across the UK and believes a consultation this year is too soon as there are not enough people out there that know some of the language used today. Chair thinks that the government must plan in some training at schools using geologists and in two or three years' time, perhaps there would be enough people that can be consulted. Mr Brophy advised that RWML are waiting for the policy on how the White Paper will be enacted. The GDF was first recommended in 1957 as an appropriate model. One of the areas that Mr Brophy is preparing RWML and its partners is to make sure all the information made to them is available on day one when the consultation document is published. Mr Brophy mentioned that there is an issues register held by RWML and the NDA and if there are any questions, they can be put on the register for action. If a question cannot be answered, and it is significant enough, then some research may be commissioned to get that knowledge. Part of Mr Brophy's work is to help communities to have the capacity and capability and knowledge base to ask questions. Mr Brophy confirmed that the upcoming consultation is based on the policy of how RWML can work with communities.

- 3459 Mr Brophy picked up on the point about knowledge and information and stated that a community has the right to withdraw until quite a long way into the process. If the community felt that it still did not have enough information, still wasn't convinced or still not received the reassurances that it wanted and even though it might have been engaged in the process for two years, there is a mechanism to be agreed right at the beginning of the engagement that the community has the right to withdraw. RWML cannot influence that and it would be independent of RWML's engagement in the partnership and likewise, RWML have the right to withdraw if the process is taking too long or they feel the geology will not work. It is important that the community is aware that it can make decisions further down the line and they understand that they are not setting off on a track they cannot then get out of.
- 3460 Mr Tucker wanted to know if the national geological screening on the timeline would result in a map of suitable and unsuitable areas and was that the intent. Chair intervened and advised that the government had decided that they would never produce a map for that purpose. Mr Tucker then wanted to know what the purpose of the screening exercise was for. Mr Napper advised that the screening exercise will show at a very high level, what is known about the geology across the UK and this has been divided up into 13 areas that are quite large blocks of territory and based on the British Geological Survey (BGS) process and it will be used as an invite to start discussing on the high level desk top basis, some areas that on face value may be worth talking about. Mr Napper went on to say that sometimes there is a feeling that the geology may only work in a tiny proportion of the country and that may not be the case but also there are very few areas that will be ruled out in that process.
- 3461 Chair wanted a response to Mr Hoggarth's question that if no communities come forward and agree, what is Plan B? She also wanted to know if there would be a public referendum or the decision reserved for the elected representatives from the District or County Councils. Mr Napper advised that they are seeing around the world that there is no need for a Plan B and it is working providing the communities are engaged and RWML believe that it is a workable solution in the UK. Mr Brophy interjected and advised that if there was a Plan B, it would be through private legislation. In terms of planning requirements, all necessary permitting would need to be applied for and all the planning reviews, constraints and analysis would then take place on top of that with the regulators. Referring to Chair's question about whether or not there would be a public referendum, Mr Brophy advised that this part of the process is still undecided and would be in the draft policy. The group would have a chance to influence that process and CoRWM have already suggested some mechanism for voting to be decided by the community.
- 3462 Mr Wilkinson urged RWML when they produce the information for the communities to consider involving constructive critics. There are people who want to see this happen but in the correct way and there is a need to get the right sort of support, involvement and inclusion and that also should include the doubts and uncertainty around the science on this

issue. Mr Wilkinson went on to say that the Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates (NWAA), an independent group of experts providing information and advice on the risks posed by radioactive waste, produced a document to the RWML issues register of over 100 issues and the process by which they are being resolved is obscure. They are still being looked at by sets of consultants who are paid by RWML and do not involve anyone that would be considered a constructive critic, like for instance, someone from the green movement or the non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that carry some sort of reputation. Mr Wilkinson advised RWML to get those people involved because then the communities will know that issues will be genuinely resolved rather than just a tick box exercise – joint fact-finding is the perfect mechanism for this type of project. Mr Brophy agreed and added that the process should also alleviate opposition.

- 3463 Ms Girling wanted to know that if the GDF is a National Strategic Infrastructure Project (NSIP), would it go through the process of planning inspectors and would the statutory consultees be the County and the District Councils or will it involve the whole community or just the host community around the site. Mr Brophy said that the community shared process would make a recommendation (using a poll or referendum) to government to go forward and then the planning would begin for a NSIP which ultimately sits with the secretary of state.
- 3464 Chair said there could have been a sub-group meeting with wider public attendance just on this issue alone. This model of how RWML talk to the community and what questions might ask has hopefully helped RWML think about how they need to put meetings and presentations together in the future. Chair went on to say that in terms of compensation packages to communities engaged in the storage of waste, the only other case in point is that the longer it takes to achieve, in education, getting agreement, sorting out geology, transport issues etc. for the host and donating sites, the longer spent fuel will be held at Sizewell and there is no compensation package for this community for that. The only package received was through Section 106 from the building of the facility, there was no package for storage of the fuel and the longer it takes, the longer the Sizewell community is hosting this facility on behalf of UK plc. Chair believes that one disposal facility will be too difficult for any community and any council to actually agree upon, but if there was more flexibility in the sense of more than one facility then there may be an agreement from the community to host a GDF. Mr Napper advised that the White Paper does prefer one GDF but there could be more than one and the option is there.
- 3465 Dr Carolyn Barnes from Suffolk Coastal District Council was concerned about the different barrier levels and the community will not agree until it is understood what the different barriers are for. Mr Napper advised that the barriers were not an either/or and would be mutually reinforcing to add layers of protection and not as a reserve should one barrier fail. The different barriers are there to carry out different specific protection and each carry out a different function. Mr Napper summarised that it is basically a single barrier that has different elements in it. Chair thanked both Mr Napper and Mr Brophy for their attendance, their expertise and knowledge. Chair looks forward to the next round of consultations and perhaps how the group can help RWML going forward.

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND ACTION TRACKER

5a. Minutes of the last main meeting held on 8th December 2016

3466 Chair had not received any changes or questions from the previous minutes.

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

3467 Hard copies of the action tracker were not available today but Chair proposed that she will put together a list of the top outstanding actions from the tracker and send them out by email and get everyone to contribute.

5c. Other matters of relevance from members or the public (to be notified to the Chair in advance)

3468 No other matters received.

6. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

3469 Chair did not offer a report but thanked all guest speakers and members for their attendance.

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday 15th June 2017, Aldeburgh Community and Sports Centre.

Meeting closed at 13:10

DRAFT