



Sizewell A & B Stakeholder Group Meeting

Venue: Sizewell Sports & Social Club, King Georges Avenue, Leiston IP16 4JX

**Wednesday 15 March 2023
0900 hrs registration for 0930 hrs start**

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence and declarations of interest

2. SIZEWELL A REPORTS

- a. Sohail Ashraf (Site Director, Magnox) *
- b. John Rogers (Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation) *
- c. Peter Reynolds (Environment Agency) *

3. SIZEWELL B REPORTS

- a. Robert Gunn (Station Director, EDF) *
- b. Daniel Gregory (Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation) *
- c. Alex Lord (Environment Agency) *

4. NDA REPORTS

- a. Simon Napper (NDA)*

5. MAGNOX CORPORATE UPDATE

- a. Bill Hamilton (Magnox)*

6. Matters arising and questions from minutes and action tracker:

- a. Minutes and actions of meeting held on 12 October 2022
- b. Other matters or correspondence received

7. Chairman's Report*

** After each of these agenda items, and following questions from Group members, there will be an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions.*

Next meeting: 29 June



Site Stakeholder Group

OFFICIAL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG) HELD AT SIZEWELL SPORTS & SOCIAL CLUB WEDNESDAY 12 OCTOBER 2022

Attendance

Members

Marianne Fellowes
Pete Wilkinson
John Carey
Cllr Nicky Corbett
Janet Fendly
Pat Hogan
Trevor Branton
Cllr Peter Palmer
Richard Parlone

Chair
Deputy Chair
Staff Rep, Sizewell A
Leiston Town Council
Suffolk Friends of the Earth
Sizewell Residents Association
Co-Opted Member
Aldeburgh Town Council
Staff Rep, Sizewell B

Operators and Officers

Sohail Ashraf
Alex Lord
John McNamara
Kirsty Ramsden
John Rogers
Niki Rousseau
Sean Verrall
Sarah Johnson
Peter Reynolds
Bill Hamilton
Marjorie Barnes

Site Director Sizewell A
EA Inspector SZB
Communications Manager, NDA
Communications SZA
ONR Inspector SZA
Communications SZB
Plant Manager SZB
Minute Taker
EA Inspector SZA
External Affairs Director, Magnox
Communications Officer, Sizewell C

Members of the public

Jenny Kirtley
Mike Taylor

Apologies

Rachel Fulcher
Joan Girling
Robert Gunn
Cllr Russ Rainger
Cllr James Mallinder
Neal Evans

Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth
Co-Opted Member
Station Director Sizewell B
East Suffolk Council/Snape Parish Council
East Suffolk Council
Emergency Planning, Suffolk County Council

OFFICIAL

1. INTRODUCTION & APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

4766

List of attendees will be made available as part of the minutes.

Marianne Fellowes welcomed the group to the meeting. Marianne explained that the meeting will be recorded for the purposes of the minutes only.

Marianne recognised the death of Queen Elizabeth II, acknowledging her service and family. A minute's silence was held.

Bill Howard had tendered his resignation from the SSG. He was thanked for his contributions. There were no new declarations of interest.

2. SIZEWELL B REPORTS

A. Sean Verrall, Sizewell B (SZB)

4767

Sean introduced himself as the Technical and Safety Support Manager at SZB. Robert Gunn was meeting with an industry oversight body. Sean introduced Richard Parlone as the station representative for the SSG. Sean welcomed questions after the presentation.

4768

Safety Performance and staffing

- The station had operated at full power through the period, contributing 3% of the UK's low-carbon electricity.
- There had been no recordable injuries.
- There had been no reportable nuclear incidents.
- There had been no environmental incidents.
- There are 536 EDF staff, including nine apprentices, two industrial placements, two trainees and 10 visitor centre staff.
- There are around 250 year-round contract partners.
- An aspiration for longer term operation is to increase headcount onsite, employing more from the local community.

4769

Sizewell B Refuelling Outage 2023

- Outage will begin on 17 February 2023.
- The duration will be seven weeks, requiring 1,000 specialist workers.
- Significant maintenance and inspection work will take place on the primary circuit.
- There will be work on the secondary side, including replacement of turbine components.
- £50 million to £60 million per year is invested to keep the plant running safely.

4770

Dry Fuel Storage – 3rd Campaign

- The third campaign finished in 2021. It had paused part-way through due to evidence of a pinhole leak on one of the fuel assemblies in one of the casks. The leak is safe and sealed within the container in the fuel building.
- SZB is working with the ONR and EA on a safety case to move the cask to the dry store building for 15 years. SZB is hopeful the case will be approved, and the cask will be moved by year-end.

4771 Sizewell B Relocated Facilities

- Work is being done to help facilitate pre-works for potential SZC construction.
- The ground of the former Coronation Wood is being prepared to relocate some storage, some administration offices and the visitor centre from the north of the site.
- The area was levelled to start construction in 2023.
- The original SZA reservoirs have moved.
- The soil and sand are being recycled.

4772 Amenity and Accessibility Fund

- £300,000 has been put into the fund over time to invest in local businesses and charitable organisations.
- The investment delivery project team had helped Hollesley School build sustainable facilities.
- £15,000 had been invested into the fund in the past year.

4773 Science in the summer holidays

- Science workshops for young people had been held in the visitor centre.
- Young people are being encouraged into STEM subjects.
- The visitor centre received publicity. It is open Monday to Friday and offers tours of the site.

4774 Recycling at Sizewell B

- Recycling performance on site is strong. 90% of domestic waste is recycled.
- Old plastic piping is being used by the community.

4775 Prime Minister Boris Johnson visited Sizewell B and C

- Boris Johnson visited on 1 September 2022 to demonstrate government support for nuclear power.

Sean invited questions from the SSG.

4776 Janet Fendley: Regarding the dry storage, you said the cannister with the pinprick hole was going to be moved for 15 years. What happens then?

Sean Verrall: We are exploring extending the period beyond 15 years, justifying that it would be safe to store as long as the rest of the cannisters, which is a 100-year safety case.

Another option we are exploring with HOLTECH is an overpack, which is a second, hermetically sealed cask to sit over that cask. The third option, which is part of our approved safety case, is to return the cask to the fuel building and take the fuel out and place back in the storage pond. Sizewell B is actively assessing the relative merits of all 3 options, but the preferred short-term proposal is to move the cask to the Dry Store Building; this is the basis of the Safety Case that is currently being assessed by the ONR.

Janet Fendley: When I had a tour of the dry store building, none of this was predicted. We were reassured about the building.

Sean Verrall: You should still be reassured because the safety of the fuel in storage has not been compromised. That is the basis of the safety case we are putting through to the ONR, to demonstrate that there is no increased risk to personnel or the public.

Janet Fendley: Yet you are going to wrap it up or do other things with it.

OFFICIAL

Sean Verrall: We may not. There are three options. One could be that it is justifiable and well bounded by the existing safety case to leave it for up to 100 years. We are not concerned around the safety aspects. That is the case we are making to the ONR.

Marianne Fellowes: The over jacket might be part of the first solution, even before it leaves the building. You cannot refuel currently, with container where it is. You are saying it is safe to move it, but the ONR current safety case is it is not safe without an over jacket or some other method.

I understand that the lid has never been cut off one of these containers, including in America. When you say you could take the fuel out, the word is 'could' and it is not demonstrated that could be done safely. Is that correct, there is no safety case approved?

Sean Verrall: That is correct. They are not saying it is unsafe. We do not have an approved safety case.

Regarding reversal, I cannot comment internationally. There have been one or two instances around the world where that has been done, but it is not a frequent operation.

Richard Parlone: It is not. Our current safety case allows us to reverse. A revised safety case is to make the procedures safer. We will use a milling machine rather than a blade cutting tool. We have demonstrated cutting open a cask and have done the assessments.

Marianne Fellowes: Is that since the incident happened? You were ordering a replica. Was the testing of the cutting of the lid done after this was found? It was not done originally.

Richard Parlone: In 2016, it was part of commissioning the safety case for the dry store. We demonstrated cutting a cask using a lathe tool, which is a sharp blade. It worked, but we have now demonstrated an enhanced cutting based upon our milling machine. We have twice demonstrated cutting a dummy lid open.

Marianne Fellowes: A case with fuel in has never had the lid cut off.

Richard Parlone: It has not at SZB. I would have to search internationally because it is a rare event.

Pete Wilkinson: If you have put a safety case into the ONR, it presumes that you have settled on one of the options. Could you tell us what that option is? Is it the overpack option? That was indicated by the ONR when I met with them. Could you explain the consequences of the other options and why you are not using them?

Sean Verrall: The safety case that we have put in is for the transfer to the dry store building for a temporary period. The overpack is a piece of work we are doing in parallel. That will be subject to a separate safety case. That is not to solve the short-term problem.

Pete Wilkinson: If you go for the overpack, what costs are you looking at?

Sean Verrall: I do not know. You are talking many millions of pounds. It is a different design of over cannister. We would also need to make changes to the handling equipment in our dry store facility to enable us to move that overpack. It is a design that HOLTECH licences.

Pete Wilkinson: Does it have implications for other foul fuel that you have?

Sean Verrall: No, the case we are putting to the ONR is only for one cask. Before we move into our fourth campaign in late 2024 or early 2025, we will need a long-term solution.

Marianne Fellowes: You said you needed this by late 2024 for the fourth campaign. Do you need to do something before the next outage?

Richard Parlone: That was the date from my head for the next outage. I believe it is early 2025. We are looking at how that fits in with our outage programme.

Marianne Fellowes: Do you have to take the fuel out when you do the outage?

Richard Parlone: We have sufficient capacity in our fuel storage ponds to manage a fuel cycle. At some stage, we will need to remove a cycle's worth of fuel. I will check the exact date.

Sean Verrall: It is fluid. We are looking at sequencing that with other major campaigns.

Richard Parlone: We may do a mini campaign.

Alex Lord: From an EA perspective, we are interested in any associated liquid and gaseous discharge. We are satisfied at the moment that the cask is sealed. We will be interested when it comes to a potential rework. We will have to ensure that the operator understands any associated discharge and that the site facilities are able to deal with those.

Sean Verrall: The safety case considers the nuclear and the environmental regulatory aspects.

Action

SZB to confirm date of next fuel (full or partial) cycle.

4777

Trevor Branton: Regarding the dry fuel store, the third option is returning the cask to the fuel building and taking the fuel out. What would then happen to the fuel?

Sean Verrall: The fuel is safe in the cask. By removing the lid and putting the fuel back into the ponds, we are restoring the original safety case approved condition, which is the fuel being stored underwater in storage ponds. We can leave it there for the life of the power station, but we would need to think about end of station life, decommissioning and processing. By taking the fuel out and putting it into the ponds, it is inevitable that we will have to take it back out, put it in some form of cannister and handle it again. The overall radiological and cost implications do not make sense. We are demonstrating for ONR and EA approval that the fuel is currently safe within its cannister, so there is no need to take it out.

Trevor Branton: There would be no time limit that the fuel could remain in the ponds.

Sean Verrall: We have a safety case from the original design of the plant that allows us to store fuel with those deficiencies indefinitely.

Mike Taylor: For every tonne of fuel loaded in SZB, EDF is supposed to put money into the nuclear liability fund (NLF). We cannot see from the accounts that EDF have put money into that account. I cannot get answers from BEIS.

Sean Verrall: I am confident we will be making that payment. That is the basis of the funding of the NLF.

NEW ACTION: Sean Verrall to check whether EDF was contributing to the NLF.

Marianne Fellowes: Remind me how much the container holds?

Sean Verrall: There are 24 fuel assemblies in the cask. Each fuel assembly has 264 pins.

Marianne Fellowes: It is not just the one with the pinhole that must be separated. When it was detected, there was a pipe attached and the decision was made to seal that. You cannot identify which of the pins it is. All of them need to be treated differently, until we find which it is.

4778

Janet Fendley: You showed photographs of work being done where Coronation Wood used to be. You said that the soil was being moved north of the site. Where is that going?

Sean Verrall: I am not familiar with the detail, but it is within the Sizewell-owned land. There is an identified area where we are storing that soil. If SZC is approved for construction that would be reused to reduce the amount of new material needed.

Richard Parlone: As part of the relocating facilities project, soil retention areas were identified as part of the planning permission.

Janet Fendley: I am pleased to hear you saying, 'If SZC is given approval,' because it seems that the Government is overstepping democracy. We have investigations that recommend not building SZC because of the water and the environment. The EA are also doing investigations.

Marianne Fellowes: It was disappointing that no time was allocated for Boris to meet any local representatives or organisations. There was lack of engagement with the community, despite his office being asked on numerous occasions to visit.

4779 Peter Palmer: Having an outage in February under the current circumstances, you might be under some pressure not to have it.

Sean Verrall: It is something that both Government and the company have been looking at. The timing is constrained by the fuel within reactor. We have explored whether the cycle of operation could stretch into the spring, but we cannot. The company is looking at other aspects beyond SZB, for example the West Burton plant, making sure that will remain available to generate. We are also looking at the projected lifespan of some AGR plants, which were projected to shut down in 2024 or 2025, to extend them through the energy crisis.

4780 Jenny Kirtley: In the next outage, will you be looking at the problems that EDF have with their plants in France in relation to SZB, as many are the same age?

Sean Verrall: That is the inspection of primary circuit pipework. In France on some of the newer plants, they have discovered a phenomenon called stress corrosion cracking on some pipework connecting to the reactor primary circuits. We are a very different design of plant. We do not believe that problem is an issue for us. However, supported by the regulators, we have a programme of work for the next outage to undertake inspections similar to the French plants. We are reassured by the existing inspection programme and the different design.

4781 Mike Taylor: During the outage you might want to check the cooling system, where there is a door missing or displaced on the inlet.

Sean Verrall: That is part of the works. We will be doing diving operations offshore and inspecting the cages over the water intakes. We expect to find one of the gates detached and are ready to repair.

4782 Mike Taylor: Are the people doing work such as the thermal sleeves and nozzles being exposed to extra radiation or are they clean operations?

Sean Verrall: Richard has just written the Local Authority Registered Provider (LARP) report to cover that work. Some does involve accrual of dose. We need to demonstrate that the dose is as low as reasonably practicable. We have a comprehensive package of measures to control that.

4783 Jenny Kirtley: Is the seal alive?

Sean Verrall: Yes, it is, and very healthy still.

Marianne Fellowes: Will the seal be removed?

Sean Verrall: We made one further attempt to retrieve the seal from the forebay, but it was unsuccessful. Our backstop is the outage, where we will be draining parts of our forebay area. That should give us a backstop position where we should be able to retrieve her. We have had the seal charity from Lowestoft down on a couple of occasions to check on her welfare.

4784 Pete Wilkinson: I wanted to ask about the length of time of the outage. Are you being overly optimistic to say it is only going to be seven weeks? There is a huge amount of work to do.

Sean Verrall: Our plan shows a critical path of 45 days. We have submitted a business plan backstop of a week and a half beyond that. Based on the detailed planning, we are confident, assuming we do not find anything unusual.

4785 Peter Palmer: This is the second time I have been in these meetings and heard about this stressed corrosion cracking in stainless steel pipes. Are the ones we are talking about small bore or are they large bore pipes in the French reactors?

Sean Verrall: It is pipework of between four and eight inch diameter, so it is relatively small bore. These are connections to the primary coolant circuits, so they do not affect the ability to cool the reactor, but they are connections that supply water for different purposes to the reactor circuit.

Peter Palmer: This tends to happen in pipe connections where you just butt the pipes straight onto a large chunk of stainless steel, rather than having a bell end or something to take the stress away. I am wondering why the nuclear industry are not taking the precautions.

Sean Verrall: The plants are very well designed. This is a unique phenomenon. We could talk about it separately. It is believed the stress corrosion cracking develops through a phenomenon called thermal stratification in the pipe and a cycling of temperatures. There is no shortfall in the fundamental manner of connection to the primary circuit or design of those wells' components. It is a phenomenon discovered after 25 or 30 years of operation as an in-service degradation mechanism.

Peter Palmer: There are ways of mediating the situation.

Sean Verrall: I do not know the detail of what the French are doing, but they will be looking at design changes and changes in inspection regimes' scope. We are tied in with them.

4786 Marianne Fellowes: When nuclear power stations are given approval to be constructed, part of the equation is safety and performance; the predicted number of years of output. Part is cost. Since SZB has been operating, the cost is potentially going to change dramatically if we need oversleeves on fuel canisters and replaced pipework. There is great trust within the industry that what you are doing is green, affordable and safe. Can you see how things like this make the public and others think, 'We did not think of that at the time'?

Sean Verrall: The costs of these are considerable. There is no doubt about that. When you put forward a business case for construction projects you make forward projections on the cost of the electricity from that asset. We are well bounded by our original assumptions. There will always be an assumption of the need to invest and spend a lot of money to sustain a plant.

4787 Trevor Branton: You mentioned the work that is to be done in the forthcoming outage, particularly with the turbine work. Is any of that had to give any enhanced output, for example modifications that will increase the efficiency and hence the output from the units?

Sean Verrall: None of the work we are doing in this outage is making any claim on the increased output from the power station. Some of the work we do on the turbines might recover a few fractions of a megawatt of output through efficiency and use of more modern techniques of design and materials, but none is planned to increase the power station output.

4788 Marianne Fellowes: Is there any update on the approval to source uranium from Canada or Australia? Currently the uranium in the fuel elements produced in Europe are sourced in Russia.

Sean Verrall: This is an EDF group question. The fuel for this outage and the fuel for the next outage in RO19 was all purchased pre sanctions applied to Russia. The company is running a project at a French group level to source elsewhere.

4789 Marianne Fellowes: We have had an email from the head of emergency planning at Suffolk County Council. He has provided an update on the last exercise but will meet with us to talk about the extended population from SZC construction and if the population size of the work has been factored into demographics.

Pete Wilkinson: It is not just a question of whether SZC goes ahead, but what that is going to do to the population and the potential critical zone. It is generally accepted that the

emergency plan is not worth the paper it is written on it. The demographic density criteria is 5,000 people per square kilometre in proximity to the plant. Looking at the situation today, the density is met. In the case of SZC going ahead with an influx of 4,000 workers, SZB undergoing an outage and an increase in housing in the area, you are looking at density of population over 5,000 per square kilometre close to the plant. Is there not going to be any opportunity to get those people out in the event of an accident at SZB?

Sean Verrall: That would be part of the submission and the final approval for construction. We are in a low population density area here compared with a number of other nuclear plants, who have effective offsite emergency arrangements that have been demonstrated. I would challenge it not being worth the paper it is written on. Our arrangements are agreed and approved by the various regulators, including the ONR, and are demonstrated on a regular basis. Under the REPPiR regulations, we regularly review the effectiveness of those arrangements. We would need to be able to demonstrate that we could enact effective arrangements before those changes take place.

Pete Wilkinson: If it did happen, the effects of it will take years to recognise anyway. There is no way that you could expect to evacuate the whole of Leiston, for instance, in the event of an offsite incident that contaminated the town. The DPZ is one kilometre from the site. There is a 30-kilometre radius that is supposed to be capable of being evacuated, but that is a duck and shelter type area. In the event of unplanned for, unlegislated for accidents that give a lot of offsite radiation, people would be at risk. Would that therefore have an implication on the operation of the plant?

Sean Verrall: The head of emergency planning at Suffolk County Council manages the offsite aspects of the plan through the Suffolk County Council. We interface with him. I am satisfied with our onsite arrangements and the interface with those that are managed under REPPiR regulations. I do not have any concerns around the topic you are raising. That would be a good topic to discuss with the head of emergency planning at Suffolk County Council.

Pete Wilkinson: You keep saying he is going to come along. He never arrives.

Marianne Fellowes: If he is not able to attend the next meeting, we will have a subgroup meeting on this issue, on a date that he provides and open it up to as many people as possible. In support of what Peter said, the modelling of traffic is only done on a computer. There has never been a simulated or real evacuation of people.

Mike Taylor: Suffolk County Council is not represented here by anyone. Suffolk County Council revised the Vectos plan. I was sent a copy. That is the computer modelling of how things should be.

Alex Lord (Environment Agency)

4790

Alex introduced himself as the EA's lead inspector for SZB.

4791

Alex presented a report on the EA's activities since the last SSG. The template of the report is open to change. The report was taken as read.

4792

Inspections on liquid waste management indicated appropriate management at SZB. EDF had carried out sufficient sampling of waste with checks and assurance on the data. Inspection of training and authorisation aspects had demonstrated a good level of environmental resource onsite and long-term resilience. The annual review of safety and environment (AROS) had shown good environmental performance over the past year and continued compliance with the permit. An asset management inspection had been carried out and there were no enforcement actions over the period.

Data on discharges and environmental monitoring had been submitted and reviewed. Discharge of gaseous Carbon-14 continued to drop. It was currently at 66% of the annual limit and was expected to drop over future fuel cycles. Other discharges remained at 20% of their annual limits or lower.

On incident management, the site had carried out exercise EAGLE, which was the REPIR level two exercise. SZB was a Category 1 responder under the Civil Contingencies Act so

had attended the multi-agency response and had increased its own incident management response. The objectives for the exercise had been met.

Alex invited questions from the SSG:

4793

Pete Wilkinson: Does the Environment Agency do a calculation looking at the cumulative impact of all the discharges, gaseous as well as particulate, or do you assume they are all safe?

Alex Lord: We use the limits as specified in the permit. We do ongoing environmental monitoring, detailed in our RIFE report, which we publish annually. We calculate dose associated with those environmental levels of radionuclides for the Sizewell area. This is within relevant dose constraints.

Pete Wilkinson: There is no safe radiation dose. They all have an impact. I am asking if you take a cumulative impact assessment of all the radiation discharged from SZB and make a calculation about the health impact. Do you assume it is zero because it is all safe and below the regulated limits?

Alex Lord: We take Sizewell as one site. There are dose limits set by Government and we comply with those dose limits. For the Sizewell site, they are well within the relevant dose constraints.

Pete Wilkinson: You are not answering my question. Do you do a calculation to find out what the health impact and the general environmental impact is of those cumulative doses, or do you assume that they are all zero?

Alex Lord: We do not assume they are zero. We calculate dose and comply with relevant dose limits as set by Government.

Pete Wilkinson: How many people die as a result that discharges from SZB?

Alex Lord: We calculate a cumulative dose from all of the sites and we are satisfied that they comply with the relevant Government dose limits.

Pete Wilkinson: The dose limits might still be killing people, might be giving people disease or whatever it might be. There is a health impact from exposure to radiation. Does the Environment Agency calculate what that impact is in the population locally?

Alex Lord: We take our advice on public dose from the relevant experts, the UK Health Security Agency. We calculate dose and we have assessed doses as being acceptable for the site.

Pete Wilkinson: The dose has an impact. I am asking if you calculate the impact on health. The answer is no.

Marianne Fellowes: We have an outstanding question with the UK Health Security Agency. That will be the subject of a further conversation.

Given the current dose limits that apply to SZB, if SZC was approved, constructed and was generating at the same time, does that mean the dose rates that are allowed for SZB would need to be changed?

Alex Lord: There are UK dose constraints based on entire dose to an individual person and dose from an individual source. There is a limit on what Sizewell A, B and C could contribute.

4794

Mike Taylor: There was concern about the sewage outfall. There are a number of contaminants in there other than the obvious. Who is doing that work? Are you keeping an eye on that particular issue?

Alex Lord: We do. As well as the radioactive substances environmental permit, the sites have water discharge authorisations. There are number of limits on those permits including relevant to water quality. We expect the site to monitor those variables and report to some of that information. In terms of general water quality of beach areas, we do assessments but not relevant to the individual sites. That will be relevant to bathing quality, which is a separate part of the organisation, but we do monitor.

Jenny Kirtley: Should SZC go ahead and they need a desalination plant there, how long is it going to be before the sea is not safe to swim in?

Alex Lord: We assess beach quality. I am not sure what it is at Sizewell. Those will be under the site permits. We will continue to monitor whether the sites are compliant with those. The desalination plant will require approvals from the Environment Agency.

Jenny Kirtley: There is a worry that the new Government are diluting our environment permits. Will you stick to it and not be swayed by Government pressure to approve some of these dangerous permits?

Alex Lord: One of the main reasons for the SZC public consultations was to show that we are applying sufficient scrutiny to these applications, are asking the right questions and ensuring the limits that are put in the permits are what we deem to be safe and appropriate.

Jenny Kirtley: Things happen where EDF do not agree with you, such as at Hinkley.

Alex Lord: I am aware that the EA disagreed with the applicant's modelling by the operator appealed against the EA's deemed refusal of the permit variation application. This appeal was seen by the Secretary of State and the appeal was subsequently thrown out.

Marianne Fellowes: At the public consultation, there were three environmental permits for SZC. For one on the use of diesel generators, Aldeburgh Town Council commented on it, but there is still a lot of uncertainty. Permitting may be a topic we need to look at separately. It does impact on SZB because the question is in relation to permits across the whole area.

3. SIZEWELL A REPORTS

A. Sohail Ashraf (Site Director, Magnox)

4795

Sohail introduced himself and explained that he is also the Site Director for Bradwell. Sohail welcomed questions after the presentation.

Sohail delivered his report and highlighted the following points:

4796

Safety, compliance and environment:

- A site review had been carried out by the EHSS&Q team with a positive outcome and minor areas of learning that had been put into action.
- The grid substation land transfer is continuing.
- The black redstart nesting boxes are being reviewed for the turbine hall demolition and will be implemented in the near future.
- More human performance (HP) training is being done in small groups with positive engagement and feedback.
- The annual water consumption report will be shared. Usage has decreased from 8,419m³ in 2021 to 5,617m³ from September 2021 to September 2022. The 30m³ of demineralised water supply has been used.
- From the combined sewage treatment site, 22,500m³ has been discharged from January 2022. This is a combination of human waste, rainwater and processed water.

- For chemicals used for cleaning onsite, there is a COSHH steering group that regularly interacts with the supply chain and partners to ensure the most sustainable products are used. A list of avoided products will be shared. There is a Chemdoc database to manage controlled substances.

4797 Sizewell Sustainability Group

- For energy usage, there is continuing transition to LED lighting and installation of air conditioning.
- For water use, waterless urinals will be trialled in the next year.
- Reducing plastic usage is being investigated.
- The business planning round is looking at projects for the next two years that can bring usages down further.

4798 Turbine Hall – demolition

- The two-year isolations and diversions project has been carried out.
- The contract has been awarded to Erith contractor, which is experienced in turbine hall demolitions with Magnox. A presentation has been shared at recent site visits and will be shared more widely. The mobilisation has been completed. Asbestos remediation work has started.
- The SSG and residents' visit has been held. More engagement will be planned for 2023.

4799 Asset management

- South Road widening will be done for the vehicle access to the demolition project.
- Welfare improvements are being done for reactor building.
- Concrete civil repairs are an ongoing programme.
- The top duct t-hanger inspection has been completed. Some minor works have been included in planning.
- Air conditioning replacement is continuing.

4800 Bradwell annual inspection

- The fourth annual inspection campaign is in progress, running until early December 2022. The programme is currently ahead of schedule.
- The team is working well with the supply chain to support Bradwell.
- Trends will be examined at the end of the programme, to see if the frequency of inspections can be reduced.
- Over 200 tasks will be carried out in the 2022 inspection.

4801 Apprentices

- 33 Magnox apprentices have started during September. The aim is to continue this throughput and grow the workforce in the local community.
- Two apprentices have joined in mechanical and electrical roles at Sizewell. Any experience gaps are being filled with help from the supply chain.

4802 10 years of Magnox socio-economic funding support 2012-2022

- Magnox has awarded £9,165,583 of funding across all 12 sites.
- 62 applications have been supported at Sizewell, with a total funding award of £293,206.

4803 Sizewell applications 2022-23

- There are currently no funding applications, and they are encouraged.
- Good Neighbour funding has been increased to £2,000, with £6,000 to allocate per site. Kirsty Ramsden and her team were available to support applications.
- Haf Morris managed any applications for more than £2,000.

4804 10-year Magnox Anniversary Story

- The full report is available to view.

Sohail invited questions from the SSG.

4805 Janet Fendley: What is HP training?

Sohail Ashraf: Human Performance training.

4806 Janet Fendley: You talked very early on in your presentation about the use of plastics. When I was there, we saw lots of very new plastic barriers.

Sohail Ashraf: They are brand new barriers. Erith have brought those onto site. They recycle and reuse those. Because of the number of projects they have, they had to bring in more to support our project. They are easy to move around, easy to configure at PC sites and are stable once in place. We are talking about a project life scale of two to two and a half years.

NEW ACTION: Sohail Ashraf to investigate alternatives to plastic barriers.

Sohail Ashraf: They also have diesel generators onsite. We have shared some of our learning from Bradwell where we have been using push boxes. We predict a £38,000 saving in terms of energy and fuel usage. On all of these things, we want to have continued discussion and dialogue about how we can improve and share learning. Similarly, Erith are sharing some of their learning.

4807 Pat Hogan: Several of us visited your turbine hall, which was worthwhile for the communication and trust issues. One of the leading lights in Erith has a World Demolition Award, for safety. It was worthwhile to meet those people.

Marianne Fellowes: It would be helpful if we had the full presentation to send to members and any visuals. We hope that the planned contracted works will continue to be funded over the next few years, because there is financial uncertainty. We hope you will be able to keep to budget and time.

4808 Mike Taylor: My question goes back to what you said about Bradwell, where what you perceived to be groundwater was coming up into one of the basements there. As sea level rises, is the ground water likely to rise to a point where it might impact the building there?

Sohail Ashraf: We continue to monitor that on an annual basis. We have a team there that carry out routine monitoring, outside of the annual inspection campaigns. We continue to work to our end state.

4809 Pete Wilkinson: In terms of your sustainability programme, you are going to have a lot of roof space left. Have you thought about photovoltaic cells?

Sohail Ashraf: It is one of the things we will start talking about with our engineers when we are looking at decommissioning. There has to be a cost-benefit analysis, because it is not an easily accessible area. If we are bringing in portacabins, that is very small scale, but that drying facility is coming with an integrated solar panel on the roof.

What we built into the South Road widening project is looking at using some of those existing materials. Those who have been on site recently will have seen that there is block work. Could we reuse that rather than bringing in new material? Those are things that we will continue to assess going forward. They are great opportunities.

4810 Jenny Kirtley: What is the timeframe for the demolition of the turbine hall?

Sohail Ashraf: Demolition of the turbine hall, overall the project has a two-and-a-half year duration. It has started.

Jenny Kirtley: If SZC was to go ahead and SZB is still running, how will that impact access to the site?

Sohail Ashraf: We have an interaction meeting with SZB and work on those things with them. Regarding the demo activities, as part of our planning permission, we can only work within

certain hours in terms of removal of equipment. We have a transport plan, which the contractors have produced and which we review constantly. There are going to be peaks and troughs, but it is about communications and management. There will not be significant volumes of traffic.

Jenny Kirtley: Are you including SZC traffic in this assessment?

Sohail Ashraf: This assessment is purely to do with that project. Overall, we have that interaction meeting with B site and we will talk about B site there. We have also recently had some dialogue with C site, who were showing us some of their future arrangements. It is infancy days, but we will be looking at how we interact with each other.

Marianne Fellowes: They did say there would not be many large HGVs required. Lots of things would be cut up on site and made into smaller, more manageable loads.

Sohail Ashraf: It is standard sized vehicles that you will see on site. The concerns would be about seeing vehicles that have escorts in front of them because they are so wide. We will make sure that we have reduced everything to what can be on a standard HGV.

Marianne Fellowes: We did ask if the crane can be reused or recycled. We will provide all those answers after.

Action: Presentation and Q&As to be sent and circulated

4811 A point raised by Erith staff themselves was one of the managers struggled to find accommodation this summer because of the volume of tourists. With additional workforce for the demolition project, additional workforce for an outage, additional workforce for a potential new build, there is a limit. We do need to acknowledge that there is an impact in the local economy, potentially, of additional works.

4812 You mentioned needing more young people to enter the industry and having two apprentices at Sizewell. I would hope that there is also apprenticeship availability in admin and hospitality, because there are many local hotels, restaurants here that had to close their kitchens.

Sohail Ashraf: We want to encourage that growth, because any of that investment is going to drive investment in the local community. You would hope that some of the other organisations would take up on the apprenticeships that are available as well. It is not just through the Government-funded routes.

4813 Marianne Fellowes: Thank you for including the Bradwell update. It is important that we do learn lessons from there and also, if you have any video from the demolition of turbine halls that Erith has done elsewhere, we would be interested to see.

Sohail Ashraf: There was a short clip that we did share with you last week, which was where they took the turbine hall crane off in the rails. I will see if I can get that as a clip that I can send via the e-mail system. If I can, I will share that as well.

4. NDA REPORTS

A. John McNamara (NDA)

John delivered his report to the SSG and highlighted the following points:

4814 New Ministers

- There is a new Prime Minister and there have been other changes in Government.
- Jacob Rees-Mogg is the new Secretary of State for BEIS.
- Graham Stuart is the new junior Minister for State for Climate Change.
- The Government affairs team were determining what these changes will mean for NDA.

4815

NDA Working

- NDA is continuing with hybrid working and mostly working in the office two to three days per week.
- Stakeholders are met face-to-face as much as possible.

4816

Annual Report and Accounts 2021-2022

- The annual report and accounts were published after the last SSG meeting.
- Presentations can be given on the contents of the report. It is available online. It includes progress, milestones and areas to improve.

4817

NDA Business plan

- More information on the plan can be sent to the SSG. It is an annual publication and is preceded by a public consultation. It will begin in December 2022 and run into January or February 2023. The consultation will be live for eight weeks.

4818

Economic Impact Assessments

- NDA's Director of Social Value and his team have released updated assessments of the economic impact of NDA's activities. There is a focus on Sellafield, North Wales and Dounreay.
- There are learnings from Magnox.
- There is an online exhibition of the assessments.

4819

AGR transfer

- Magnox will be the key interface with EDF energy as the AGR stations transfer.
- Hunterston B stopped generating power on 7 January 2022. It will be the first AGR to come across. There will be a defueling period before the AGR stations came under the NDA and Magnox's responsibility.
- Factors to consider include staffing, social value impacts and Magnox doubling in size.
- Works are expected to continue for up to 15 years.
- Hinkley Point B will be the second AGR to come across. AGRs will also come from areas the NDA group does not currently have a footprint in.
- NDA and EDF can arrange a talk about defueling of the AGRs.

4820

Cwmni Eginio

- A memorandum of understanding has been signed with Cwmni Eginio, a Welsh Government agency set up with BEIS agreement to take up small-scale modular nuclear power in North Wales, particularly at Trawsfynydd.
- The Welsh Government is interested in developing SMRs at Trawsfynydd and a gigawatt station in Anglesey.
- NDA is involved in this as part of the Government's new energy security policy. It is targeted at producing security of supply for the UK through home-grown sources of energy. Fuel still needs to be imported for reactors, but this can be sourced from friendlier countries and stockpiled.
- NDA's role will likely be in helping potential developers to understand the land to take forward projects. Cwmni Eginio will deal with the developers directly. NDA will facilitate visits to sites and its forums will be used to connect all the stakeholders.

4821

GDF Siting process

- There are now four Community Partnerships: three in Cumbria and one in Lincolnshire.
- Nuclear Waste Service can be invited to present on the nuclear waste disposal process.
- Other communities are interested in joining the GDF process. Communities need to come forward to enter the working group to establish if there is enough community interest in the dialogue.
- The Community Partnership is a more official engagement involving local authorities.

4822

Sizewell land transfer

- NDA has been in negotiation with EDF for two years. It has visited SZA to visualise the land.
- The deal was closer to completion and NDA was inclined to sell the land to EDF.
- The option is for three years. EDF can lease the land but then will likely have to follow through with the freehold purchase.
- The purchase would mitigate the use of Pillbox Field and allow the NDA to maximise use of land.
- The DCO required EDF to have security for the land as an owner, not a leaseholder.

4823

NDA – ‘Keeping the conversation going’

- All SSGs with NDA sites had been represented at the stakeholder event. Marianne Fellowes and Pete Wilkinson had attended, as had Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council. With 170 attendees, it had been the largest stakeholder event for any nuclear organisation.
- Stakeholders had been updated by the CEO on future plans, including the restructuring of the NDA group into four pillars, and had the opportunity to ask questions.
- The next location has not been confirmed.
- There will be feedback from the event.

John McNamara invited questions from the SSG:

4824

Marianne Fellowes: I would like the presentations that were given to be made available so we can send those out.

John McNamara: They have gone out. I will resend them.

Pete Wilkinson: The links have gone out, not the presentations themselves.

Action: to send presentation and Q&As

4825

Marianne Fellowes: If the transferred land is going to be used as laydown and storage, what will be its long-term use? The laydown and storage is only to facilitate the relocation of SZB and during the building of SZC. If it is always going to be used as laydown materials, we were told it is use was needed to prevent Pillbox Field being used as car parking. Where will the car parking go?

Niki Rousseau: It is outage laydown area. The car park has moved to where the outage laydown area was going to be, on the other side of the road.

Marianne Fellowes: Will it only be used every 18 months for three months' lay down outage?

Niki Rousseau: No, it will be used continuously because there are still materials and plant equipment that is only used during outages that is stored there permanently.

Marianne Fellowes: I have asked for a full copy of the memorandum of understanding so we can read what that means in terms of roles and responsibilities. The headlines are around the NDA now facilitating the development by providing land or assisting with land transfer.

John McNamara: It is Government-owned land, so the Government ultimately will decide what happens to it.

Marianne Fellowes: It is really interesting when we say Government-owned land, because the Government does not own land. The Government administers land on behalf of the people. Every area is different and in Wales it may be that the local communities are supportive of what is being suggested, but it is about recognising that the NDA was set up to decommission and for the benefit of local communities in the environment. It was not set up to facilitate the continuation of the industry. This is a new aspect that has been brought into it. How do you balance those two competing priorities?

John McNamara: You are right, there is a balance there. Even when the NDA was founded, part of it was to maximise the value of our land. That was in the original Energy Act.

Marianne Fellowes: Value not just monetary. It is value to the community as well.

John McNamara: It covers getting value for the land but also creating social value for the community. That is why the Welsh Government has set this development agency up. We are facilitating. It is not all about NDA. There is some other land available that is not NDA land, which is near or part of nuclear site licences. However, the vast majority of nuclear site licenced land is going to be in NDA control, so it is a factor in new build if that is going to be Government policy. The Welsh Government in connection with BEIS has taken that forward, because there are strong opinions.

Not everyone in North Wales is happy about the nuclear development, but the communities or the equivalents of the SSGs and the local authorities in those areas are pro new nuclear development. We would be fulfilling the remit there to maximise the value of the land, because people would be buying it off us. That money would go back to the taxpayer, and we would be ensuring that we support that particular area's socio-economic development and employment going forward.

Pat Hogan: This instance of land transfer or arrangement is to save Pillbox Field having to be used. That has been and continues to be a buffer zone. We would very much not like to see that developed in any way. If this particular bit of land saves that, we would very much like that to go ahead. To even think of it being sold to other companies or any other use would compound the problem.

Marianne Fellowes: We are not saying that we want greenfield sites to be used and brownfield sites not used. The only reason that Pillbox Field was needed was because the design of SZC is too big to fit into the SZC allocated land. It is not because they are going to save the greenfield site anyway. They have to take part of SZB, which was Coronation Wood and Pillbox Field, not part of SZA. The principle of land being offered first to industry, as opposed to what stakeholders want, is what I am questioning.

4826

Pete Wilkinson: You talk about people being in favour of nuclear power in Wales, or at least the local authorities. It does not necessarily mean that the majority of people are in favour. We heard from EDF that 66% of people in East Suffolk were in favour of nuclear power or of SZC. It turned out to be 66% of 1,000 people, not 66% of 250,000 people. I would be cautious about supporting new build in Wales. There are a lot of people I know that do not want it at all.

4827

We heard that the SSG at Sellafield are involved in discussions with the NDA and EDF about land use around Sellafield site. It is not comparable to what happens around here, but they are involved in a discussion about land use strategy. Could we transfer that model to this area so we could be involved in the discussion about land use and the local community could get involved in these discussions about the long-term strategy about land use?

4828

You mentioned that the NDA are in discussions with communities about GDF. They are not involved in communities at all. They are involved with a few people in those areas that are designed to be the forerunners of discussion with the community. The community is not going to be asked about whether they like what is going on or not for about 15 years. It is an area of democratic deficit with the GDF process. I know they have local authorities there and you could say that it is a democratic representation, but the communities are not involved and will not be involved in a definitive way for a long time.

John McNamara: We are happy to get someone from nuclear waste services to give a presentation, because what happens with the GDF has an impact on all of our sites.

Pete Wilkinson: I co-chair the discussions at the exchange. It is not the communities that are involved in these discussions. It is a few people in those communities.

John McNamara: It is the democratically elected councils of those communities. There is an opt-out, which will be a public vote.

Pete Wilkinson: That is 15 years down the road.

Marianne Fellowes: It is about the language we use. The slide says, 'Discussions are continuing with other communities.' What Pete is saying is discussions with community are continuing with representatives of communities.

John McNamara: That was why there was an offer for a presentation, to clarify some of this. The point I was making was, when you go to a community partnership, you have reached the second stage where the local authority has decided they want to take this deal. There is a cut-off point. There are democratic considerations there. When I refer to other areas, it might just be a few landowners, but there must be a starting point. The second step involves the local authorities. Finally, there is a public vote for people that live in area to decide whether they want it or not.

4829

Mike Taylor: You talked about the nuclear liabilities fund, which I had already alluded to earlier in the discussion, because I cannot see whether money from EDF has gone into that fund to top it up.

Marianne Fellowes: You have agreed to take that away, John.

John McNamara: I can take it away, but I can partly answer it now. It is online and EDF have been paying into it.

Mike Taylor: My analysis as an amateur of the accounts does not show that EDF have put more money in than has been taken out over a number of years. It may be that I am misreading it.

B. John Rogers (Site Inspector, Office for Nuclear Regulation)

4830

John introduced himself as the ONR inspector for SZA and other sites, including the GDF.

4831

John delivered his report verbally and highlighted the following points:

In the last quarter, a licence condition 14 and 15 inspection has been carried out for implementing the site safety case and for the periodic review of the safety case. There has been a discussion of whether the safety case needs a 10-yearly review. It has been agreed with Magnox that this is not needed. This is a recognition of SZA's position in its decommissioning journey with nuclear risk and hazard reduction. The recent review has been rated green.

- There is significant conventional Health and Safety risk associated with the remaining work. Sohail Ashraf's team manage this with contractors, regulated by the ONR. There have been two Health and Safety inspector visits recently, and there is continuous dialogue. These inspections are not related to licence conditions. All regulations come from the Health and Safety at Work Act. This does not include ionising radiation, but that is not forgotten.

- On pond skips, there has been discussion with the NDA. An NDA paper is expected on proposals for managing contaminated metal in the UK.
- Sizewell, Dungeness and Oldbury are conducting radiological sampling and analysis of their remaining pond skips soon. Good work has been done with independent contractors to find the safest way to do this with high dose rates. Magnox had previously given an incorrect characterisation of the dose.
- Regulators need to be involved in land transfer discussions for relicensing and re-permitting. SZA has provided a draft relicensing application.
- SZA has carried out an onsite Level 1 emergency exercise. The outcome was an adequate demonstration of the arrangements.

John invited questions from the SSG:

4832 Marianne Fellowes: In terms of the relicensing, currently there is no application to relicense as laydown storage.

John Rogers: No formal application has been received from SZA or SZB.

4833 Marianne Fellowes: Did you say something about a new campaign on wet ILW?

John Rogers: I did.

NEW ACTION: Sohail Ashraf to update on the wet ILW campaign.

C. Peter Reynolds (Environment Agency)

4834 Peter introduced himself as the EA inspector for SZA.

- The SZA turbine hall has been inspected and discussions have taken place with the environment team regarding minimising the environmental impact of demolition waste.
- The review of quarterly reports of discharges has been done and all were under 1% of the set limits.
- There will be an inspection on the management arrangements for the site to ensure that resources and systems were adequate for compliance with permit conditions.
- Peter hopes to meet with staff to discuss plans for retrieval of fuel element debris from the vaults and the pond skips.

Peter Reynolds invited questions from the SSG:

4835 Marianne Fellowes: Some of the questions shared earlier about the outfall of waters and sewage need more unpicking. We can do that next time.

Peter Reynolds: Send questions through on the non-radioactive outfall. Our area colleagues will regulate that discharge permit. The flows are monitored, but we can get more specific reporting, if you would like.

Marianne Fellowes: Your work will be with the local council in terms of noise, activity and dust connected to the turbine hall demolition and the standards around that.

Peter Reynolds: Many of those responsibilities are with the local authority regulation of noise. The local area would be concerned specifically with non-radioactive impacts and non-radioactive waste disposal, but there will also be conditions around nuisance.

Marianne Fellowes: Do you meet with representatives from East Suffolk District Council that look after things like dust and noise to keep them updated? I understand they have a huge vacancy rate within the department. It is about knowledge transfer too. What is the ongoing working partnership and the level of understanding?

Peter Reynolds: I cannot comment on that at an area level. As a nuclear regulation group looking at radioactive waste, I have had no interactions with the county council. When I used to regulate industry, we would periodically meet with the local authorities because there was more overlap. We have meetings occasionally with our area colleagues and that is something I will bring up with them, to see how they ensure there is adequate knowledge exchange.

Marianne Fellowes: I am conscious that we are about to start a major project at SZA with the turbine hall demolition. It would be something that the local authority needs to be aware of and engaged in.

Sohail Ashraf: From a compliance team perspective, we have engaged with the local authority. It is more managed through Magnox as a client. We can see if there are opportunities to improve that communication.

Mike Taylor: There was a district council officer at the meeting who was completely new to me. Whether he is going to be a point of contact for any issue, whether the station is or the EA is would be of interest.

Marianne Fellowes: He was not from the environmental team. He was from the planning team. It was a prime example that he was brand new to the nuclear industry. He is now one of the main points of contact in the planning team for the nuclear industry.

Action: Peter Reynolds to answer questions regarding water and sewage output

5. MAGNOX CORPORATE UPDATE

A. Bill Hamilton (Magnox)

Bill introduced himself as External Affairs Director at Magnox, having moved previously from the NDA. A gap in information had been identified between the site directors and the NDA about Magnox activity. The site chairs had agreed that there should be a standing item in their regular meetings to discuss wider Magnox issues.

Bill delivered his report to the SSG and highlighted the following points:

4836

Regeneration

- In the next 10 years, Magnox will increase from 3,000 to over 6,000 employees, managing 12 sites to at least 20, and the annual budget will increase from £500 million per year to over £1 billion per year.
- A transition programme named 'Regeneration' is working to ensure that the company is fit for purpose. Everyone needs to be involved.

4837

Future Missions

- The Future Missions team will bring in the sites defueled by EDF to be decommissioned.
- They will manage the joining with Dounreay, other civil sites and radioactive waste forms that could be managed by Magnox.

4838

External Communications

- Magnox communicates across a range of media platforms, particularly communicating with young people to bring them into the workforce.

4839

Employee engagement

- An NDA survey was conducted in 2021 and the analysis is being engaged with.
- Another employee survey is live.

4840

Delivery – Spotlight on asbestos

- There have been changes in regulatory control because of the reduction in radioactivity on Magnox sites.
- The largest issue on many sites is asbestos. This continues to be managed very well.

4841

The Magnox Socio-economic Scheme

- The NDA has provided £1.02 million for the scheme in the last financial year.
- Additionally, through the good relationship with the NDA's socio-economic team, a further £964,000 of NDA funding has been received for Magnox sites to support communities.

4842

Marianne Fellowes: We have a meeting coming up in Manchester with Magnox, where I will be asking more detailed questions about the growth of the company and lessons learnt from the Holliday report.

4843

MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES AND ACTION TRACKER

- A. Minutes of the last main meeting held on 8 June 2022 have been circulated and amendments have been received.
- B. The Actions Tracker is not available. Marianne Fellowes, Pete Wilkinson and the secretariat will chase outstanding items.
- C. Marianne Fellowes and Pete Wilkinson attended the NDA stakeholder event in September and will attend the Manchester Magnox meeting. They can share the agenda and take forward any questions.

4844

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Marianne thanked all present for their attendance. Best wishes were sent to Tracey Finn, who will be retiring.

Proposed dates were provided for 2023 meetings. Attendees would be given two weeks to provide their preferences. A sub-group would meet with the head of emergency planning at Suffolk County Council.

If anyone needed any further correspondence, they should get in touch with Marianne. If anyone would like to attend either of the national meetings, they should also let Marianne know as it was important that Sizewell was represented at these events.

Meeting Closed

Sizewell Stakeholder Group

Sizewell B report – March 2023

Sizewell B report – March 2023

1. Safety performance and staffing

Station Safety Performance

We measure our safety performance against top tier indicators, including nuclear reportable events, environmental events, and staff and contract partner recordable injuries.

During the period of the report there have been:

- No recordable injury
- No nuclear reportable incidents
- No environmental incidents

Staffing at Sizewell B

We currently have **536** EDF staff this includes **9** Apprentices, **2** Industrial placements, **2** Technical Trainees, and **10** Visitor Centre staff and 250 year round contracting partner's.

2. Operations

Sizewell B Refuelling Outage 2023

Friday 17 February marks the start of an £82million investment programme at Sizewell B with the launch of the station's 18th refuelling and maintenance outage.

It also marks 28 years of service for the UK's youngest nuclear power station which will have racked up 243TWh of low carbon electricity, the equivalent of meeting the needs of every home in Suffolk for 178 years!

Power station workers will complete over 10,000 routine maintenance and inspection tasks and replace a third of the fuel during the 66 day which takes place every 18months.

As well as refuelling the reactor, we will also deliver major investment and routine maintenance work during the outage:-

- Reactor Coolant Pump hydraulic exchange and inspection
- Structural weld overlay of pressuriser nozzles
- Condensate Storage Tank alignment
- Turbine Generator 2 rotor replacement
- Thermal Sleeve inspection
- Inspect of primary circuit pipework

The power station will once again work alongside a local supply chain in addition to international partners. James Fisher Subtech is one of the many local suppliers, based in Lowestoft the company will provide diving support for marine inspection, maintenance and repair services within the power station and with associated marine infrastructure.

Preparation work for the outage begins at least two years in advance of refuelling the reactor as part of a ten-year strategic plan at the power station.

Turbine Generator 2 was brought offline on Wednesday 15 February, reducing the station to half power and then Turbine Generator 1 was switched off on Friday 17 February, bringing the station officially offline.

Refuelling outages are always busy periods for us and for the area. We aim to minimise the impact to the local community wherever possible.

3. Sizewell B and community news

Dry Fuel Storage at Sizewell B update

During the final stage of processing one of the fuel storage casks, an anomaly was identified in the form of a pin hole in the cladding of a single fuel pin. This was detected through sample analysis of the Helium gas that is used to cool the fuel inside the cask which is part of the normal monitoring process. This is not an uncommon issue for dry fuel store users around the world.

A safety case has been approved by the ONR for management of the cask and the cask has now been safely moved to the Dry Fuel Store.

Relocated facilities update

Relocated facilities work continues to progress with the first concrete pours for the new training facility taking place during February.

Negotiations for utilisation of land within Sizewell A in preference to Pill Box Field, are progressing well.

Construction of new land management facility near the Emergency Response Centre, Sizewell Halt

EDF will be building a new land management facility near the existing Emergency Response Centre (ERC) at Sizewell Halt. The facility will be a single story building containing office space, a meeting room, storage area, welfare facilities and a maintenance workshop, with parking. The facility will be used by EDF's land management team and contractors from Freedom who have been with us for many years. There will be approximately 6 people using the facility for general office work and for storage and maintenance of the land management equipment and vehicles, which are used for managing the Sizewell Estate land.

The new facility will replace the existing land management base at Upper Abbey Farm. A number of alternative sites on/near the Sizewell Estate were considered and the location near the ERC was determined to be the most appropriate.

Subject to the contractor appointment process, construction of the facility is currently scheduled later this year.

10 years of supporting community projects in Suffolk - Amenity and Accessibility Fund

An annual grants scheme set up when construction of a Dry Fuel Store at Sizewell B power station began has marked 10 years of funding community projects with almost £300,000 awarded in grants over the past decade.

The Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Amenity & Accessibility Fund aims to improve the environment and natural character of the area by awarding grants to projects that sustainably improve the amenity and accessibility of the area.

2012-13 was the first year of the Amenity & Accessibility Fund and over the past decade more than 80 projects have been funded across Suffolk with close to £300,000 awarded to communities and grassroots organisations.

Funding for the Amenity & Accessibility Fund is provided by EDF, with an initial one-off payment of £120,000 made when construction of a Dry Fuel Store for spent nuclear fuel at Sizewell B power station began, in addition to further annual payments by EDF of at least £20,000.

Improving accessibility and enhancing the local amenity within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is a key ongoing priority, both in terms of physical barriers such as making sites wheelchair friendly and removing steps, to engaging with new and underrepresented groups in the surrounding areas.

The fund has supported a wide range of organisations, from some of the Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty's most loved and historic landmarks, to education providers and local primary schools.

Projects funded through the fund include the renovation of Butley Ferry, accessible ramps at RSPB Hollesley Marshes, restoring heathland in Rendlesham Forest, planting new fruit orchards on public land in over 20 parishes across Suffolk, and providing accessible activities for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

The Amenity & Accessibility Fund is being managed by EDF, East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council in consultation with the Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty who administers the fund.

This year's Amenity & Accessibility Fund has £25,000 of funding available to communities, and is open now for applications, closing on 10th March 2023.

You can find out more about the Amenity & Accessibility Fund, and all the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty's grants at www.suffolkcoastandheaths.org/managing.

Contacts:

Marjorie Barnes, Head of Regional External Affairs
Tel: 07515295488, 01728 653378
Email: Marjorie.barnes@sizewellc.com

Niki Rousseau, Community Relations
Tel: 01728 653258
E-mail: niki.rousseau@edf-energy.com



Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)

Site Report for Sizewell A

Report for period 1 October – 30 December 2022

Foreword

This report is issued as part of ONR's commitment to make information about inspection and regulatory activities relating to the above site available to the public. Reports are distributed to members for the Sizewell Site Stakeholder Group and are also available on the ONR website (<http://www.onr.org.uk/lrc/>).

Site inspectors from ONR usually attend Sizewell Site Stakeholder Group meetings where these reports are presented and will respond to any questions raised there. Any person wishing to inquire about matters covered by this report should contact ONR.

Table of Contents

1. Inspections	3
2. Routine Matters	3
3. Non-Routine Matters.....	4
4. Regulatory Activity	4
5. News from ONR.....	4
6. Contacts	4

1. Inspections

1.1. Dates of Inspection

The ONR site inspector made inspections on the following dates during the report period 1 October – 31 December 2022:

5 October

2. Routine Matters

2.1. Inspections

Inspections are undertaken as part of the process for monitoring compliance with:

- the conditions attached by ONR to the nuclear site licence granted under the Nuclear Installations Act 1965 (NIA65) (as amended);
- the Energy Act 2013
- the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 (HSWA74); and
- regulations made under HSWA74, for example the Ionising Radiations Regulations 2017 (IRR17) and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 (MHSWR99).

The inspections entail monitoring the licensee's actions on the site in relation to incidents, operations, maintenance, projects, modifications, safety case changes and any other matters that may affect safety. The licensee is required to make and implement adequate arrangements under the conditions attached to the licence in order to ensure legal compliance. Inspections seek to judge both the adequacy of these arrangements and their implementation.

In this period, routine inspections of Sizewell A site covered the following:-

- Emergency preparedness

This inspection, which was rated "Green" under the ONR Inspection Rating Guide, covered a demonstration of the licensee's on-site emergency plan.

Members of the public, who would like further information on ONR's inspection activities during the reporting period, can view site Intervention Reports at www.onr.org.uk/intervention-records on our website www.onr.org.uk. Should you have any queries regarding our inspection activities, please email contact@onr.gov.uk.

2.2. Other Work

During the period the ONR site inspector attended the SSG meeting on the 12 October, and held a meeting with the licensee and ONR licensing specialists to discuss the proposed relicensing of the site to release land to Sizewell B.

3. Non-Routine Matters

Licensees are required to have arrangements to respond to non-routine matters and events. ONR inspectors judge the adequacy of the licensee's response, including actions taken to implement any necessary improvements.

Matters and events of particular note during the period were:

A report was received as the on-site emergency and security arrangements were briefly impacted by the failure of an electrical component. ONR is satisfied with the actions taken by the licensee to recognise the failure and to promptly re-instate adequate arrangements. There was no risk to the public as alternative arrangements were made to maintain the on-site and security arrangements following automatic notification of the failure to site staff.

4. Regulatory Activity

ONR may issue formal documents to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements. Under nuclear site licence conditions, ONR issues regulatory documents, which either permit an activity or require some form of action to be taken; these are usually collectively termed 'Licence Instruments' (LIs) but can take other forms. In addition, inspectors may take a range of enforcement actions, to include issuing an Enforcement Notice.

- No LIs, Enforcement Notices or Enforcement letters were issued during this period.

5. News from ONR

For the latest news and information from the Office for Nuclear Regulation, please read and subscribe to our regular email newsletter 'ONR News' at www.onr.org.uk/onrnews

6. Contacts

Office for Nuclear Regulation
Redgrave Court
Merton Road



Bootle
Merseyside
L20 7HS

website: www.onr.org.uk
email: Contact@onr.gov.uk

This document is issued by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR). For further information about ONR, or to report inconsistencies or inaccuracies in this publication please visit <http://www.onr.org.uk/feedback.htm>.

© Office for Nuclear Regulation, 2023

If you wish to reuse this information visit www.onr.org.uk/copyright.htm for details.

Published 01/23

For published documents, the electronic copy on the ONR website remains the most current publicly available version and copying or printing renders this document uncontrolled.



Office for
Nuclear Regulation

ONR Site Report

Sizewell B

ONR Site Report

Sizewell B

Report for period: 1 October – 31 December 2022

Issue No.: 1

Publication Date: 03-23

ONR Record Ref. No.: 2023/15123

Foreword

This report is issued as part of ONR's commitment to make information about inspection and regulatory activities relating to the above site available to the public. Reports are distributed to members for the Sizewell Local Community Liaison Committee and are also available on the ONR website (<http://www.onr.org.uk/lc/>).

Site inspectors from ONR usually attend Sizewell Local Community Liaison Committee meetings where these reports are presented and will respond to any questions raised there. Any person wishing to inquire about matters covered by this report should contact ONR.

Contents

1.	Inspections	4
2.	Routine Matters	5
3.	Non-Routine Matters	8
4.	Regulatory Activity	9
5.	News from ONR	10
6.	Contacts	10

1. Inspections

1.1. Date(s) of Inspection

ONR inspectors made inspections on the following dates during the report period 1 October to 31 December 2022:

- 10 – 13 October;
- 21 – 24 November.
- 12 – 15 December.

2. Routine Matters

2.1. Inspections

Inspections are undertaken as part of the process for monitoring compliance with:

- the conditions attached by ONR to the nuclear site licence granted under the Nuclear Installations Act 1965 (NIA65) (as amended);
- the Energy Act 2013;
- the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 (HSWA74); and
- regulations made under HSWA74, for example the Ionising Radiations Regulations 2017 (IRR17) and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 (MHSWR99).

The inspections entail monitoring the licensee's actions on the site in relation to incidents, operations, maintenance, projects, modifications, safety case changes and any other matters that may affect safety. The licensee is required to make and implement adequate arrangements under the conditions attached to the licence in order to ensure legal compliance. Inspections seek to judge both the adequacy of these arrangements and their implementation.

In this period, routine inspections of Sizewell B covered the following:

- staff training, qualifications and experience;
- incidents on the site.

LC12 – duly authorised and other suitably qualified and experienced persons

The nominated site inspector for Sizewell B discussed the authorisation process with individuals who had recently been authorised, and with those who are responsible for authorising them. He saw evidence in the form of processes and procedures, mentor guides, training material and written examinations. Further, he discussed the process with the site's independent nuclear assurance (INA) team. He was satisfied, as a result, that the authorisation process is being applied as set out in the corporate process, is robust, and should produce high-quality supervisors who understand control and supervision in general and the requirements and constraints of their roles in particular. Further, he was content on the basis of the interviews he conducted and the feedback from INA that the process is delivering such individuals in practice.

LC7 – incidents on site

The nominated site inspector for Sizewell B reviewed a sample of recent investigation reports, and discussed the reports with the relevant authors. He was content that the investigations had identified direct and root causes and, in particular,

where human error was identified there was an understanding of the factors leading to it. Actions had been placed to prevent recurrence and were being progressed. He considered the investigators to be appropriately qualified and experienced to investigate the incidents in question.

He also discussed the training and monitoring of investigators and investigations with the corrective action plan coordinator, and was satisfied that the incidents of highest significance are investigated by well-qualified and experienced investigators. Less significant investigations are carried out by technically competent individuals who have either undergone appropriate training or who are being mentored by an experienced investigator. The licensee demonstrated that progress with, and effectiveness of, investigations and their subsequent action plans is tracked at the corrective action review board.

In addition to the above inspections, system-based inspections were conducted considering the operation and maintenance of the following systems:

- flooding defences;
- the chemical and volume control system (CVCS) and emergency charging system (ECS).

Flooding defences

Specialist inspectors from the hazards and civil engineering topic areas sampled:

- training records for several roles relevant to flooding hazards, and compared these with the role profile requirements.
- technical specification requirements for segregation barrier doors (which are important for segregating safety trains from hazards, including flooding). They were able to trace operational limits and conditions to relevant safety cases, and into more detailed surveillance and local instructions.
- instructions for demountable flood barriers. They were satisfied that the instructions clearly communicate the required actions that operators need to undertake in the safe execution of work.
- instructions and maintenance routines for a priority sump alarm relevant to internal flooding. They saw evidence that the safety device is available and routinely maintained.
- several maintenance records to ensure EDF NGL were adequately implementing their maintenance and surveillance routines. They found examples of good practice, but also examples of poor practices relating to the maintenance of some nuclear safety classified building roofs. They further identified that the surge chamber tidal flaps have never been inspected. They sampled specific evidence demonstrating that measures are in-place to address the shortfalls, but raised a

level 4 regulatory issue to track these LC28 shortfalls, which the ONR civil engineering specialist inspector will monitor to closure.

Overall, the inspection team considered that Sizewell B had adequate arrangements for controlling risks related to flooding hazards. They did, as noted, identify some matters for improvement and have raised a regulatory issue to ensure required corrective actions are undertaken.

CVCS and ECS

The inspection was carried out by chemistry and fault studies specialist inspectors, who sampled:

- training records for CVCS and ECS system engineers. They were content that all "essential" role requirement training was completed for the ECS system engineer, who is responsible for the health of the system, and was content with handover arrangements for the incoming CVCS system engineer.
- inventory control, chemical control and ECS operability safety functions. They were content appropriate limits and conditions were evident for each of these functions in technical specifications or equivalent documentation.
- implementation of limits and conditions in written instructions. This included routine reactor inventory balance and leak response in the event of a fault. For both routine and fault conditions, the team was content adequate instructions were in place to deliver compliance with limits and conditions.
- high level system health metrics and individual maintenance records for CVCS pumps and valves and ECS charging pumps. Regarding high level plant health metrics, they identified good practices relating to inclusion of a chemistry metric and sensitivity to underlying plant condition and numbers of plant defects. For specific CVCS and ECS pumps and valves, the team was content maintenance records were complete and adequate.

Overall the team judged that the CVCS and ECS systems met the requirements of the safety case. While minor issues were identified, they were satisfied these were resolved during the inspection.

Members of the public, who would like further information on ONR's inspection activities during the reporting period, can view site Intervention Reports at www.onr.org.uk/intervention-records on our website www.onr.org.uk.

Should you have any queries regarding our inspection activities, please email contact@onr.gov.uk.

2.2. Other Work

Dry fuel store multi-purpose canister (MPC) 19

In November 2021, during the ongoing dry fuel store campaign, we were notified that routine checks had revealed the presence of a damaged fuel element in the dry fuel store multi-purpose canister (MPC) that was currently being loaded.

The safety case for long-term storage of fuel at the dry fuel store only covers undamaged fuel. As a result, as fuel from the spent fuel pond is loaded into MPCs for long-term storage in the dry fuel store, there are a number of checks to ensure that the fuel that has been loaded is not damaged. It was one of these checks that identified the damaged fuel. The checks prevent MPCs with damaged fuel from being sent to the dry fuel store, but do not stop it from being stored in the spent fuel pond building.

There was no immediate safety consequence to this discovery, as the MPC was safe within the fuel building. The licensee therefore carried out an optioneering exercise to consider the best option for dealing with MPC. It concluded that most appropriate solution was to transfer the MPC to the dry fuel store and store it there for a limited period (up to 15 years) while a more permanent solution was developed (on the basis that, at any time, the MPC could safely be transferred back to the fuel building and the damaged fuel retrieved to the spent fuel pond).

A safety case submission providing a justification for the chosen solution was produced by the licensee, and in November 2022 we completed our assessment of the case. We raised no objection to the justification presented, on the basis that the MPC will maintain its integrity for the 15 year maximum storage period, and that the fuel can safely be retrieved from the MPC at any time if required. We did, however, raise a regulatory issue to track progress with the more permanent solution, in particular to make sure that the solution is developed as fast as is reasonably practicable.

3. Non-Routine Matters

Licensees are required to have arrangements to respond to non-routine matters and events. ONR inspectors judge the adequacy of the licensee's response, including actions taken to implement any necessary improvements.

There were no such matters or events of significance during the period.

4. Regulatory Activity

ONR may issue formal documents to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements. Under nuclear site licence conditions, ONR issues regulatory documents, which either permit an activity or require some form of action to be taken; these are usually collectively termed 'Licence Instruments' (LIs) but can take other forms. In addition, inspectors may take a range of enforcement actions, to include issuing an Enforcement Notice.

No LIs, Enforcement Notices or Enforcement letters were issued during this period.

5. News from ONR

For the latest news and information from ONR, please read and subscribe to our regular email newsletter 'ONR News' at www.onr.org.uk/onrnews.

6. Contacts

Office for Nuclear Regulation
Redgrave Court
Merton Road
Bootle
Merseyside
L20 7HS
website: www.onr.org.uk
email: Contact@onr.gov.uk

This document is issued by ONR. For further information about ONR, or to report inconsistencies or inaccuracies in this publication please visit <http://www.onr.org.uk/feedback.htm>.

If you wish to reuse this information visit www.onr.org.uk/copyright.htm for details.

For published documents, the electronic copy on the ONR website remains the most current publicly available version and copying or printing renders this document uncontrolled.

Sizewell Sites Stakeholder Group Report

This report covers the Environment Agency's regulation of Sizewell A & Sizewell B nuclear sites and related issues for the period September 2022 to January 2023.

Our Regulation

We regulate radioactive waste disposals and discharges to the environment. We do this by placing limits and conditions in environmental permits, which helps us to ensure that radioactive waste discharges are minimised, and that the environment is protected. We carry out a variety of regulatory activities to check for compliance with our regulatory requirements, including site inspection, review of documents and arrangements and any reports of events.

Details of our assessments and any non-compliances identified are included in Radioactive Substances Compliance Assessment Reports (RASCARs), which are placed on our public register. See the 'further information' section at the end of this document to find out how to request documents from our public register.

We regulate and control other activities through our environmental permits, including surface water discharges to surrounding water bodies and emissions to air from emergency diesel generators. We are also the joint competent authority, alongside the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR), for the Control of Major Accident Hazard (COMAH) regulations that apply to Sizewell B. At the previous SSG we were asked to provide more information on our interactions with other regulators in areas such as statutory nuisance. We have provided further information at the back of this report.

Site regulation

Sizewell A

We held monthly remote meetings with Magnox to discuss work taking place on site that could have an environmental impact. We reviewed the quarterly discharge monitoring and environmental monitoring reports for Sizewell A.

In November, we inspected management arrangements at Sizewell A. Aspects we investigated included: maintenance of the organisational baseline, management of environmental performance, and organisational learning from experience. No non-compliances were identified.

Sizewell B

Alongside our inspection programme, we have maintained bi-weekly telephone and regular email contact with EDF, and routine review of returns. In September 2022 we carried out an inspection of asset management at Sizewell B. Relevant information on asset condition is gathered through a range of scheduled, proactive and reactive activities, and is collated and stored on the Asset Management System (AMS). Information is presented at appropriate groups and boards, which provide oversight and assurance of asset management. Specialist functions, including Environment, provide oversight and management of specific issues. No non-compliances were identified. In January 2023 we

carried out an inspection of EDF's governance and leadership at Sizewell B. We will issue our report in due course.

We reviewed proposals for the spent fuel storage cask 'MCP19'. We confirmed to ONR that we had no objection to the permissioning of moving MCP19 to the dry fuel store, given no impact on permit compliance or discharges. We reviewed initial proposals for reversal, which would be managed in line with station BAT requirements and permit compliance. Should reversal eventually be pursued, we will carry out a more detailed review to ensure waste and compliance aspects are fully considered and that BAT is applied.

Enforcement

We have not taken any enforcement actions at Sizewell A or Sizewell B in the period since the previous SSG meeting. The operators have remained compliant with the requirements of their permits, or with the requirements and standards of our Regulatory Position Statements, where applicable and in use.

Environmental Permitting

Sizewell A

There have been no changes to Magnox's Sizewell A permits in the period since the previous SSG meeting. No changes are planned in the near future.

Sizewell B

There have been no changes to EDF's Sizewell B permits in the period since the previous SSG meeting. No changes are planned in the near future.

Discharge Reports

The sites' environmental permits require the operators to use BAT to manage their operations and ensure their impacts on the public and wider environment are minimised. Disposal of wastes – as solids, liquids, or gases – can only be made via permitted routes or by transfer to permitted sites. Magnox and EDF are required to report liquid and gaseous discharges to the environment to us on a regular basis. These reports are placed on the public register. We examine these reports and detail our assessment of their performance through RASCARs.

Sizewell A

At Sizewell A Magnox are required to report liquid and gaseous discharges to the environment to us on a quarterly basis, within 30 days of the end of the quarter. Reports received in October 2022, covering the reporting period July to September 2022 showed that all liquid and gaseous discharges from Sizewell A were at levels well within permitted limits.

No discharges were made via the main radioactive effluent route during the reporting period.

Low volumes of treated effluent were discharged from the sewage treatment plant, which serves both Sizewell A and Sizewell B sites. The plant is managed by Magnox. Effluent is monitored at quarterly intervals for the presence of tritium or caesium-137. No radioactivity above limits of detection was reported in samples taken during the period covered in this report.

Gaseous discharges from Sizewell A are low. Variations in gaseous discharges are slight as the site's reactors are now "breathing" passively. There is no forced flow of air through the reactors and discharges follow a seasonal pattern, tending to increase with warmer or more humid conditions, and decrease when the temperature or humidity drops.

Sizewell B

Liquid and gaseous discharges from Sizewell B have remained within permitted limits for the period July 2022 to November 2022 (inclusive), and returns were submitted to us within the required timescales. 12-month cumulative gaseous discharges of carbon-14 remained less than 76% of the annual limit, with other gaseous discharges less than 21% of respective annual limits. Liquid discharges were in-line with expected levels and remain less than 26% of respective annual limits.

In November, we issued a consent for the repatriation from Belgium of radioactive wastes associated with the refurbishment of the Reactor Coolant Pump (RCP). The RCP was previously dispatched to Belgium for treatment and recycling. Under the Transfrontier Shipment of Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel Regulations, radioactive wastes must be repatriated under authorisation by the Environment Agency as competent authority. All the wastes to be repatriated can be dealt with by current site processes and arrangements, and once returned to Sizewell B, will be processed and consigned for disposal.

Environmental Monitoring

We carry out sampling and analysis under our independent environmental monitoring programme, in association with the Food Standards Agency. The results of this work are published in our annual Radioactivity in Food and the Environment (RIFE) report. The Sizewell sites are considered together for the purposes of environmental monitoring.

The monitoring data for the calendar year 2021 was published in RIFE report 27 (RIFE 27) in November 2022, and can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/radioactivity-in-food-and-the-environment-rife-reports>

For Sizewell, the total dose for the representative person was 0.016mSv in 2021, down from 0.017mSv in 2020. This figure still equates to less than 2% of the government derived limit to protect members of the public, The attributed dose of 0.016mSv, corresponds to less than 1% of the average dose across the UK population of 2.7mSv, received from all sources including from natural radiation and medical sources. Levels of radioactivity found in the environment remain low.

In parallel to this programme, the operators are required to carry out their own programme of environmental monitoring and to submit the results of this programme to us on a periodic basis. This is carried out jointly by Magnox and EDF. We received the latest environmental monitoring report in December 2022, for the quarter July to September 2022.

An elevated radiation dose-rate was recorded on a quarterly thermo-luminescent dosimeter (TLD) at one location on the Sizewell B site perimeter fence. The result was expected and due to the positioning of an ISO waste container awaiting acceptance for transport to the Low-Level Waste Repository (LLWR). We were informed of the expected dose-rate as well as when it was confirmed, and did not deem further action necessary. The container has since been dispatched for disposal.

Individual sand and sediment samples at Southwold and Minsmere from July indicated higher levels of caesium-137 and potassium-40 respectively, compared with the previous 12 results. The Southwold result was due to a tightening of the range of the previous 12 results, and the Minsmere result is thought to be due to sediment of a smaller particle size being collected compared with the previous 12 results. This increases the surface area per unit mass and consequently adsorption of radioactive elements increases with finer-grained materials. The results remain below regulatory concern and demonstrate the effectiveness of the operators' programme and analysis in identifying and informing results of interest. The results continue to be consistent with our independent programme and do not indicate any other concerning results or trends. We make the information from both operator and our own environmental monitoring programmes available on our public register.

Water Quality

At a previous SSG we were asked about water discharges and the Environment Agency's water quality monitoring around the Sizewell coast. There are number of environmental monitoring programmes around Sizewell driven by various legal requirements, such as the Water Framework Directive and Bathing Water Directive. These are managed by the Environment Agency.

We set limits and conditions on the disposal of liquid radioactive effluent into the North Sea from the power stations through our permits as reported above. We also place limits and conditions on the non-radioactive components of liquid discharges through water discharge activity permits issued to each site. Sources of these discharges include cooling water (in the case of Sizewell B), and treated sewage effluent (in the case of Sizewell A) Water discharge permits include limits on volume, residual oxidants, temperature, nitrite, hydrocarbon, ammonia, and pH.

The station operators are required to monitor discharges and report compliance to us against these permit conditions. We inspected Sizewell A discharge arrangements twice a year until 2019, when we varied the Sizewell A discharge permit. Since moving to its new discharge permit, Sizewell A self-monitor and are required to report flow records and any breach of limit to us. For the Sizewell B discharge, we conduct our own check monitoring programme and collect and analyse three or four samples per year. Sample results are entered to a central Environment Agency database system which automatically flags any non-compliance to the relevant environment officer (based in Ipswich), who will then contact the site operator to investigate the reasons for the non-compliance.

Since 2015 we have issued EDF two non-compliances against its discharge permit for Sizewell B, relating to ammonia exceedance in 2018, and an unpermitted discharge of Jacket Water Coolant from an Essential Diesel Generator in 2020. Both were given risk category 3, meaning they were associated with a minor impact on the environment, however the latter resulted in a warning letter being issued to the operator. Since 2015 there have been no non-compliances against the Sizewell A discharge permit. Other than these events the results of both the operator and Environment Agency monitoring show that the composition of the Sizewell A and B water discharges are compliant with the permit limits.

There are four bathing beaches in the area designated under the Bathing Waters Directive: two at Lowestoft and two at Southwold. The EA carries out microbiological monitoring of the seawater at these sites, with up to twenty samples taken during the

bathing water season between May to September each year. The results are compared to the microbiological standards set by the Directive and compliance assessed. All four sites have achieved the minimum bathing water quality standards for the past five years. For the majority of the period a more stringent, non-compulsory, higher quality, microbiological standard has been achieved. More information on Bathing Water Directive standards can be found at this website: <http://environment.data.gov.uk/bwq>, including the most up to date results and historical compliance for individual bathing water sites.

The Water Framework Directive assesses and manages the water environment through a six-yearly cycle of planning and implementing measures. The Suffolk Coast water body that includes Sizewell extends from Lowestoft down to Felixstowe. There are six monitoring locations in this water body, each location is sampled 12 times per year. The monitoring locations are best placed to monitor nutrient inputs into the coastal waters from sewage treatment works (at Lowestoft, Aldeburgh, Felixstowe and Southwold) as well as inputs from the Deben, Ore/Alde and Blyth estuaries. Discharges from the Sizewell sites are not a contributor of nutrients to the water body. Samples are subject to basic water chemistry analysis and combined with elements such as biological and morphological data to give an overall Water Framework Directive classification. The most recent (2019) classification for the Suffolk Coast is Moderate.

Sizewell C

The 12-week public consultation on our proposed decision to grant three permits relating to the planned Sizewell C nuclear power station concluded on 25 September 2022. We will now consider each response as part of the next stage of our determination, and publish our final decision in due course. More information can be found at: <https://consult.environment-agency.gov.uk/psc/sizewell-c-environmental-permits-information-page/>

Industrial action

Unison and Prospect trade unions have informed the Environment Agency that their members are taking part in industrial action from 12 December 2022. This is continuous action short of strike for an indefinite period (only working contracted hours; taking all scheduled breaks; having full rest time between shifts; not doing any unpaid work outside contracted hours; and disconnecting from work electronics outside contracted hours and during rest breaks). One strike action day has been confirmed for Unison. Where there is a threat to life or property from major incidents officers will step in as emergency 'life and limb cover' has been agreed.

Further Information

The Environment Agency's Nuclear Regulation Group (South) (NRG(S)) is responsible for the environmental regulation of radioactive waste disposals on or from nuclear licensed sites in southern England and Wales. We work closely with local Environment Agency teams as well as external bodies such as the Office for Nuclear Regulation.

The Environment Agency's Lead Regulators for the Sizewell A and B sites are Peter Reynolds and Alex Lord, respectively.

NRG(S) Address Environment Agency, Nuclear Regulation Group, Red Kite House, Howbery Park, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, OX10 8BD

Email nrg.south@environment-agency.gov.uk

Local Office Address Environment Agency, Icen House, Cobham Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP13 9JD

A public register service is available on the GOV.UK website at:

<https://environment.data.gov.uk/public-register/view/index>

Alternatively you can request access to public documents directly by contacting the Customers and Engagement Team in the Wallingford office. Please email:

WTenquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk

Further information on our role in regulating the use of radioactive substances and related activities on nuclear licensed sites can be found on the Environment Agency pages of the GOV.UK website at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-regulation-in-the-environment-agency>

Our enforcement and sanctions policy is publicly available on the GOV.UK website at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-agency-enforcement-and-sanctions-policy/environment-agency-enforcement-and-sanctions-policy>

UK Health Security Agency has placed guidance on ionising radiation dose comparisons on the GOV.UK website at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ionising-radiation-dose-comparisons>

Ref number	Brief description	Who responsible	Update/comments and suggested STATUS
4610	Report sent to SA to be forwarded to PHE to comment re: impact of low level radiation on public health	PW	Public Health England was replaced by UK Health Security Agency and Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. East of England regional contact identified, in process of sending questions for answer. OPEN
4611	Rim net data to be circulated to members so level at individual collection sites could be understood.	EA	Information is published. EA requested to assist in obtaining local data per site. OPEN
4624	SZA land NDA to provide lease & freehold documentation, ahead of follow up meeting with Land team	J McN/NDA Land team	Presentation at next SSG meeting 8 th June 2022. OPEN. Simon Napper to give an in-depth update 15 March 2023
4657	Taishan – damage to fuel rods, circulate report when received	RG	We have no further information, when more information becomes available, we will share with the SSG - OPEN
4681	Future fuel storage and update/attendance by EDF Energy so they can address SZC overlap issues	Secretariat to invite	Request sent to EDF. OPEN.
4737	Clarification required on planning for SZA relocation facilities	Carolyn Barnes	EDF provided formal notice they were switching to the second relocated facilities consent (DC/20/4646/FUL) in July 2022, they will be implementing the second consent. EDF's letter of notification is on Public Access under DC/20/4646/FUL if they want to read it (the notification of switch of permission was built into the section 106 agreement so we were expecting it). A note on Mike Taylor's point – it is Sizewell B relocated facilities, not Sizewell A. For full context if they find it helpful, there are currently two applications in relating to the Sizewell B relocated facilities application; reserved matters for the welfare and admin buildings (DC/22/2823/ARM) and a discharge of condition

			application (DC/22/2822/DRC) – both of which relate to the second relocated facilities application, the one EDF will be implementing. OPEN Both applications (a discharge of condition application DC/22/2822/DRC and reserved matters application for the welfare building and admin building DC/22/2823/ARM) were positively determined at the end of 2022. We are still awaiting a reserved matters application for the visitor centre, submission date not known. We currently have an application in for discharge of condition 12 in relation to landscaping to the west of the Western Access Road, which will likely be positively determined in the next few weeks (DC/22/5001/DRC – can be viewed on Public Access). EDF are progressing the second relocated facilities application (DC/20/4646/FUL) following notification of the switch from the first permission to the second permission in summer 2022.
4749	Clarification required SZB regulators to respond in relation to fish monitoring requirements.	Peter Reynolds	The Environment Agency does not regulate the intake, but rather the discharge. Sizewell B is not required by its environmental permits to carry out ongoing monitoring of fish impingement or entrainment. We do not undertake ongoing monitoring of fish impingement or entrainment, but the determination of our permits and the DCO require assessment under the Habitats Regulations – as is being done for the prospective Sizewell C site. Information on fish impingement and entrainment at Sizewell B was collected by Cefas on behalf of Sizewell C, and I would point to the attached EDF response to a previous SSG query for associated data. OPEN

4806	Investigate alternatives to plastic barriers	SA	Our sustainability team are looking at other options to the plastic barriers with respect to the future. As other projects come into flight, the sustainability team will be liaised with in advance. OPEN
4810	Request for presentation of the Turbine Hall demolition from Sohail.	SA	Presentation and Q&As to be sent and circulated The team are coming to present at the SSG on progress, and will show the footage of a similar demo (assuming the technology at the Sports and Social Club) are available OPEN
4821	Request to arrange attendance at SSG/presentation by Nuclear Waste Services on the GDF and waste disposal	John McNamara	Guy Esnouf, the Director of Communications for NWS has said he would be happy to come to Sizewell for the June meeting to give a comprehensive update on work with community partnerships on the GDF OPEN
4833	Request for Sohail to update on the new campaign for wet ILW.	SA	Sohail Ashraf to update on the wet ILW campaign Will ask the programme team to attend an SSG later in the year, or early next year. - OPEN
4835	Request for Peter R to update on water and sewage output	Peter Reynolds	Answer questions regarding water and sewage output

CLOSED ACTIONS

Ref number	Brief description	Who responsible	Update/comments and suggested STATUS
4604 (3)	Are staff/contractors told about the Radiological Disease compensation scheme?	SA and RG	Yes, on the internet and also promoted by Magnox and Trade Unions. CLOSED
4604 (4)	What is SZA annual budget?	SA	NDA produce annual accounts, projects not necessarily site specific spend. See link on attached document. We can request more information on specific elements if required – Information available through the annual accounts provided by the NDA CLOSED
4604 (5)	What is latest plan for Graphite core decommissioning?	SA	Using info from lead-and-learn site of Trawsfynydd. Shall we ask for a report? When there is more information available from the development and implementation of the Trawsfynydd strategy in future years, we will share this CLOSED
4662	Where was fuel rod manufactured that developed pin hole?	RG	We are unable to determine the source. It's either a BNFL or

			Siemens (Framatome) sourced assembly. CLOSED
4670	ISI for control rod mechanism and other questions – to be answered	RG	This has been answered comprehensively - responses provided to SSG in 2022 as per attached - CLOSED
4671	What public consultation on revised REPPiR emergency planning requirements?	RG	The extraordinary SSG meeting has taken place where Neal Evans came along to outline the off-site plan - CLOSED
4672 (ii)	Would SZB work with SCC Highways regarding speed limit on Lovers Lane	RG	This is a matter for Leiston Town Council to pursue with the Highway Authority (SCC). LTC reps on SSG could request LTC to consider. CLOSED
4673	Prof Henderson report (small fish in cold water system) – comments needed from EA and SZB	CW to provide, AL & RG to respond	Report and question forwarded to EDF and EA for comment. See Response to 4749 CLOSED
4776	SZB to confirm date of next fuel (full or partial) cycle.	Sean Verrall & Richard Parlone	Refuelling Outage 19 is planned to take place in October 2024. CLOSED
4777	Check whether EDF was contributing to the NLF.	Sean Verrall	EDF has been contributing to the Nuclear Liabilities fund – please see attached report. CLOSED

4824	Request to circulate presentation and questions from 'Keeping the Conversation going' via John McN	John McNamara	To send presentation and Q&As JM has the presentation which he will send CLOSE
------	--	---------------	---