

## **Sizewell A and B Stakeholder Group (SSG)**

**Minutes of the Sub-Group meeting held at 7.00pm on Monday 31<sup>st</sup> October 2011**

**at Leiston Community Centre**

### **Item 1. Attendance.**

- 1.1 Present: Cllr Richard Smith (RS), Chairman; Mr Trevor Branton (TB); Mrs Maureen Carr (MC); Mr Michael Clark (MiC); Mr Declan Foyle (DF); Cllr John Geater (JG); Ms Joan Girling (JoG); Cllr Trevor Hawkins (TH); Cllr Terry Hodgson (TeH); Ms Pat Hogan (PH); Cllr Bill Howard (BH); Mr John Lockyer (JL); Cllr David Mayhew (DM); Mr Nigel Smith (NS); Cllr Andrew Nunn (AN); Mr Richard Rope (RR); Mr Pete Wilkinson (PW)
- 1.2 In Attendance: Louise Franks (LF), Minutes
- 1.3 Apologies: Cllr David Bailey, Mrs Shirley Clydesdale, Mr Colin Tucker

### **Opening comments**

- 1.4 Chairman welcomed everyone and in particular MiC who had recently been unwell.

### **Item 2. ONR Report on Fukushima and the SSG Public Meeting**

- 2.1 Chairman drew attention to the published final report, authored by Dr Weightman and noted to be 315 pages in size. Members heard this had been made available on the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) website since 11<sup>th</sup> October 2011. Chairman reported that he recently attended a meeting of the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum, a local government group, where the Assistant Chief Inspector for the ONR, Dr Andy Hall, gave a briefing about the report. Chairman reported that he has tried consistently since the last SSG meeting to secure a public meeting with the ONR, to which Dr Large would subsequently be invited, but without success. He added that when discussed, Dr Hall had expressed no issue with attending or sharing a meeting with Dr Large, however, he thought that the ONR were planning to hold a regional meeting in Ipswich. Chairman has followed this up but has achieved no real commitment to a meeting. He has secured a promise of funding for coach transport from the site to the ONR regional meeting from the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) if this was confirmed to be held in Ipswich.
- 2.2 Chairman expressed his frustration and concern that the ONR had not agreed to attend a Public Meeting in the local area and suggested that the alternative may be to seek support from the local MP, Therese Coffey, to provide leverage in this matter. Members discussed this, added their own concerns and encouraged the Chairman to contact the MP and continue to press for a public meeting.
- 2.3 PH suggested that if the ONR agree to a regional meeting in Ipswich, then a public meeting held prior to this, to which Dr Large could present his concerns, would enable the SSG to understand an independent expert's issues with the final ONR report and enable the SSG to pose these concerns at the regional meeting. TeH suggested organising a public meeting date with Dr Large and to subsequently invite representation from the ONR. TB added that the ONR were independent regulators and that a representative of the nuclear industry should also be invited to ensure balanced opinion. RG expressed his strong support adding that surely a 315 page report was sufficient for any interested party to understand the viewpoint of the ONR. JL added that he felt it unwise to only seek the view of Dr Large without the views of the nuclear industry being represented.
- 2.4 JoG expressed concern about the timing asking what the SSG were hoping to achieve from the public meeting, questioning whether this was additional knowledge or understanding the opinion

of different experts. Chairman advised that this was an opportunity for the public to be provided with a summarised version of findings and to hear alternative views of these. JoG added that the wording of the public meeting should be considered and after some debate it was agreed that this should be “Japanese Earthquake and Tsunami; Implications for the Nuclear Industry” to match the title of the ONR report.

- 2.5 Chairman concluded that the majority view supported the following actions:
- Chairman to approach Therese Coffey and ask for her leverage to arrange a local public meeting hosted by the ONR to which Dr Large and a representative of the nuclear industry would be invited. To allow a fortnight for response.
  - If the above was unsuccessful, to invite Dr Large to attend a public meeting and subsequently invite representation from the ONR and from the nuclear industry.
- 2.6 JL added that as the SSG representative of Dan Poulter MP, he would be happy to also request leverage for the public meeting from this MP. This was agreed.
- 2.7 PW arrived and was briefed on the debate thus far. PW advised that the Nuclear Consultation Group were holding a meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> December in Ipswich at which Andy Blowers from Bradwell site was speaking. PW agreed to circulate the information he had regarding this.

#### **Actions**

- i **The Chair to contact Therese Coffey MP and JL to contact Dan Poulter MP to seek leverage for a public meeting to be held to which an ONR representative, a representative from the nuclear industry and Dr Large could be invited. If this approach proved ineffective after two weeks, to arrange a public meeting at the convenience of Dr Large and subsequently invite representation from both the ONR and the nuclear industry.**
- ii **PW to circulate information about the Nuclear Consultation Group meeting.**

#### **Item 3. Emergency Planning – review of group position**

- 3.1 Chairman drew attention to the ONR report describing the requirement contained therein for the nuclear industry operators to undertake a review of their emergency planning arrangements and submit a report by June 2012. He reminded members that the SSG had previously agreed not to consider emergency planning further, but in the light of the ONR report suggested that this decision should be reconsidered and agreement sought about how to go forward.
- 3.2 BH expressed concern that the public has a lack of understanding and information about emergency planning arrangements and that this subject should be re-opened.
- 3.3 PW questioned what the ONR report states regarding emergency planning and this was debated. Chairman identified the relevant section as an annex D (p165-172) and agreed to circulate this section to members.
- 3.4 JoG questioned the national picture for emergency planning and who would have an overview. She advised that the Nuclear Emergency Planning Liaison Group had held a meeting during April 2011 and produced 6 pages of recommendations. JoG expressed her concern that the public do not fully understand emergency planning. PW quoted from a document authored by Nuclear-free Local Authorities that is being circulated to all Local Authorities, referring to the recommendations contained within the ONR report. These were noted to include consideration of whether evacuation plans for a wide range of civil contingencies including nuclear emergencies are robust. Also that the Nuclear Emergency Planning Liaison Group (NEPLG) were to review the capacity and capability of the UK's nuclear response arrangements to effectively manage a UK or overseas nuclear incident. He concluded that there is work being

undertaken by the UK Government. JoG expressed concern that the emergency plans are not consistent throughout the UK.

- 3.5 RG reminded members that the County had an emergency plan for all contingencies and not just a nuclear incident. This was noted to be in the public realm under the Suffolk Resilience Programme. He advised that the variety of possible scenarios and the context in which they may happen made it impossible to prescribe detailed evacuation plans and that there should be trust that there was a robust process involving the emergency services. Chairman drew attention to the diagram explaining the process contained within the ONR report.
- 3.6 DF suggested that the SSG could contact the NEPLG to enquire how the SSG could contribute to the review of emergency plans. Chairman reminded members that he had been mandated at the last SSG meeting to ensure that there was an item on the agenda for the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee meeting, to be held Thursday 3rd December, concerning the emergency planning review. It was noted the Chairman would be in attendance at this meeting and would feed in the concerns of the SSG sub-group expressed this evening.
- 3.7 BH suggested that the plans were not robust and that the public do not understand what the local plan was. This led to further debate about the consistency of plans throughout the UK and the rationale behind regional variations. It was agreed that the focus of the SSG should not be whether regional variations are justified.
- 3.8 Chairman suggested that the robustness of emergency plans was critical given the phased evacuation that occurred in Japan.
- 3.9 PW expressed concern that the local emergency plans were not implementable, adding that the information provided to the public was elementary and insufficient. He proposed the following minimum standards for the information provided:
- Describe what information would be gathered about a nuclear incident in terms of what actual radioactivity the public would be exposed to, the characteristics of the radioactivity, the bio-accumulation characteristics and the uncertainty about what the actual impact of those exposures would be.
  - Distribution of the information to be effective
  - Re-evaluate the current 2.4km evacuation zone currently in place
  - Prove the "implementability" of the plan and ensure that the public understand that the possibility of evacuation is real.
- 3.10 NS commented that he felt that the public had no idea what the emergency plans entailed beyond staying indoors, closing the windows and listening to the radio. PH described the extent of knowledge of residents within the current zone as guidance contained on the calendar and a supply of Potassium Iodate tablets replenished every 2 or 3 years. Members debated the supply of Potassium Iodate tablets to the rest of the public at some length.
- 3.11 A debate about the need for an additional road to enable effective evacuation ensued and there was an exchange about whether objecting to an additional road could prevent any future nuclear station being built.
- 3.12 DF sought clarification about whether the SSG wanted to increase their knowledge of existing emergency plans or have an input into the review of these or both. Chairman suggested the SSG would want both with emphasis on the latter, adding that gaining a consensus opinion from the SSG was difficult. DF stressed that contacting the group undertaking the review was a priority and asked members to agree this. Chairman asked the members if they wanted to give their views to the national review of emergency planning. TeH expressed concern that a consensus view could not be achieved. TB described the range of views already expressed. Chairman suggested a starting point could be for all members to consider the extract of the

ONR report (annex D) and details of the four points made by PW in paragraph 3.9. Members agreed that Chairman should circulate these as soon as possible.

- 3.13 PW asked whether the members felt that the emergency plans were sufficient and stressed the importance of taking action if they were not. A heated debate about how emergency plans can be measured as effective ensued and the issue of evacuating tourists visiting the area in addition to residents was raised. JL added that orderly evacuation relied upon the public bodies like the police and the fire brigade and expressed his concern that the fire control centre had been moved to Cambridgeshire.
- 3.14 AN commented that the emergency plans must remain flexible as the nature of the emergency cannot be predicted and questioned how detailed information covering all eventualities could be provided. He added that the advice to stay indoors, close windows and listen to updates on the radio was sensible. This was debated heatedly. JoG commented that too much information was as bad as too little.
- 3.15 DF suggested that members find out how SSG members could feedback into the review of emergency plans rather than debating what to feedback, given the range of views being expressed.
- 3.16 JoG expressed concern that the Radiation Emergency Preparedness Public Information Regulations 2001 (REPPPIR) notice boards have been absent for some 9 months meaning that tourists would have no idea what to do in an emergency, adding that these are now being replaced by EDF energy.
- 3.17 TB advised that the ONR report recommends that the technical evaluation and scientific assessment of an event and the decision about how to subsequently deal with it needs to be re-evaluated. For a nuclear event this initial response was noted to be the responsibility of the licensee.
- 3.18 JoG asked who would be undertaking the review and this was clarified as the Nuclear Emergency Planning Liaison group. PW questioned whether the Local Authority were also contributing to the review. Chairman agreed to find out about this.
- 3.19 PW stated that he felt that the strength of the SSG was to present a collective view as this would carry more weight. He asked whether members wanted to constructively contribute to the emergency planning review. Chairman suggested that the SSG should contribute and described the difficulty of agreeing a collective view. RG stated that unless the SSG could agree how to improve the emergency plans then it would be better to consider the review outcomes. PW disagreed saying that once the review had happened it was too late to comment.
- 3.20 At the request of the Chairman, PW described what he would like the SSG to contribute to the review, making the following key points:
- That the emergency plans should comply with REPPPIR
  - Information provided by the Emergency Planning committee should be comprehensive and agreed with a group of informed individuals appointed by the SSG that includes independent experts and members of the community.
  - Information should include the different types of radioactivity released in an accident, the properties of these, their bioaccumulation characteristics and any uncertainties about their impact.
  - Circulation of information should be distributed throughout the area likely to be affected including areas where people normally congregate.
  - Detailed emergency planning zones should be established similar to those in Japan of up to 20km.
  - Plan for the worst eventuality and ensure the public are aware.
  - Test to ensure that the plans are implementable.

- 3.21 TeH asked about the practicalities of what the public should do in the event of an emergency. TB expressed concern that the SSG do not have the capability and knowledge to make technical decisions. PW clarified that it was recommendations not decisions.
- 3.22 JoG clarified that within the boundaries of the power station site, the licensee was responsible for REPPIR and offsite the responsibility rests with the Local Authority. She recommended that the Chairman writes to the County Council with SSG recommendations regarding complying with REPPIR. JOG quoted from REPPIR stating that part of the responsibility was for the LA to alert, protect and assist the public in the event of an emergency including how the public could protect themselves. She expressed concern about how individuals could get Potassium Iodate tablets if they were resident outside of the current emergency zone and this was discussed.
- 3.23 Chairman asked members to suggest how to go forward. BH reminded members of the actions already agreed. JL emphasised the need for basic information and not to raise public concern by being too technical, stressing the importance of ensuring information was appropriately disseminated. TB suggested that the SSG ascertain what emergency plans were currently in place. DF suggested that the SSG cannot decide the technical aspects of the plan but certainly can and should influence how the public are kept informed about the updated emergency plans. Chairman agreed to find out more about the Nuclear Emergency Planning Group and how the SSG may input suggestions.
- 3.24 PW summarised that the recommendation should be to comment on the appropriateness of the emergency plan and how it is disseminated in the wake of the ONR report and events in Japan. He suggested that the SSG need to decide the content of the comments. He described why he felt that the size of the evacuation zone was currently inadequate. NS added that there should be more guidance for the public. JoG stressed the importance of ensuring that plans could be implemented and raised the issue of appropriate protection for the emergency services. DF assured members that there were sufficient emergency suits for all fire fighters.
- 3.25 Chairman suggested that PW's proposals and annex D of the ONR go to the SSG meeting for discussion. JoG suggested that these details were emailed in order that members could consider and 'reply all' with comments, enabling a recommendation to be formulated and brought to the next SSG. Chairman clarified that as the next SSG meeting was scheduled for 1<sup>st</sup> December, SSG members had four weeks to formulate a recommendation.
- 3.26 JoG asked the Chairman to ask the local MP who the right Government Minister was to influence. NS commented that although there was a national framework that local circumstances should be taken into consideration and that the SSG were well placed to comment on the latter.

#### **Actions & Recommendations**

- i PW to email details of his proposal to the secretariat and Chairman ensure that these are circulated with annex D of the ONR report to all SSG members to enable a recommendation to be formulated and brought to the SSG for consideration.**
- ii Chairman to clarify what the LA's contribution to the emergency planning review will be.**
- iii Chairman to find out more information about the Nuclear Emergency Planning Group and ascertain how to input suggestions.**
- iv Chairman to ascertain who within Government should be advised of SSG views.**

#### **Item 4. Any Other Business**

##### 2012 Community Report

- 4.1 Chairman advised that a sub-group meeting would be held in January (17<sup>th</sup> or 23<sup>rd</sup> depending on venue availability) to consider and finalise a first draft of this report to enable final approval by the full SSG in March and subsequent distribution to households in April. Chairman suggested that the Japanese event and subsequent response in the UK is the lead item. He sought suggestions from members and the following additional items were agreed:
- Review of events on the A and B sites
  - Spotlight on a committee member
  - Broad overview of SSG work
  - Progress of decommissioning at Sizewell A
  - Outtage at Sizewell B
- 4.2 Members debated whether Sizewell C should be a topic and agreed that this depended on whether EDF Energy had established their own community forum. MC advised that premises in Leiston had been earmarked to enable the community to give their views. Chairman agreed to enquire about this when he next visits the Sizewell B site.

##### Letter from Dunwich Parish Meeting (dated 16.10.11) and Chairman's reply (dated 25.10.11.)

- 4.3 Chairman drew attention to the copies of the letters tabled at this meeting (copied below). The views of MiC, sought earlier in the evening at this meeting, were that the circumstances surrounding the decision for joint representation for some parishes on the SSG have not changed and that he would support the Chairman in re-enforcing this decision. Chairman explained the background:
- Dunwich Parish Meeting had objected to Sheena Robertson being described as their joint representative with Westleton Parish Council.
  - Chairman had replied stating that this description would no longer be used and encouraging them to retain their joint representation.
  - The letter dated 16.10.11. was received which requests separate representation.
- 4.4 Members discussed whether it was feasible to allow distinct representation for individual parishes. RG commented that as the SSG has a representative of the Suffolk Association of Local Councils (SALC) amongst its members, that Dunwich Parish Meeting could have access via this route. Chairman commented that if Dunwich did not wish to remain paired with Westleton, then Westleton should be invited to pair with another local parish not currently represented, such as Kelsale or Darsham. Members expressed concern that enabling individual representation would further expand the SSG membership and agreed to recommend that joint representation from Parish Councils should remain.
- 4.5 Next full SSG meeting to be held at Aldeburgh Community Centre at 10am on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> December 2011.

#### **Actions & Recommendations**

- i Chairman agreed to enquire about the Sizewell C community forum and community consultation arrangements.**
- ii SSG to consider the recommendation that joint representation from Parish Councils should remain.**

The meeting closed at 9.20pm

## DUNWICH PARISH MEETING



Cllr Richard Smith,  
Gap House,  
8 Albion Street,  
Saxmundham,  
Suffolk IP17 1BN.

16th October 2011.

Dear Cllr Smith,

### Dunwich Parish Meeting representation on the Sizewell A and B Stakeholders Group

At our regular gathering last Friday, the Dunwich Parish Meeting (DPM) were fortunate to receive a first ever briefing from Sheena Robertson about the activities of the Sizewell Stakeholders Group (SSG).

Dr Robertson is listed in the SSG Constitution as jointly representing both Westleton Parish Council and Dunwich Parish Meeting. It appears, however, that the Dunwich Parish Meeting have never been given an opportunity to decide how they might best be represented at the SSG.

At Friday's session, the Parish Meeting asked me to write to you to request that Dunwich be allowed distinct representation the SSG. If this is possible, for example through distinct DPM membership of the Group, then the Parish Meeting will collectively select an appropriate representative.

The DPM would be grateful for your positive response to this request and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Simon Strickland'.

Simon Strickland  
Chairman, DPM.

(copy)

## Councillors

---

Simon Strickland Esq  
Chairman  
Dunwich Parish Council  
Marshside, St James Street  
Dunwich  
Saxmundham  
Suffolk  
IP17 3DT

Richard Smith MVO  
Councillor for Aldeburgh and Leiston  
Gap House  
8 Albion Street  
Saxmundham  
Suffolk  
IP17 1BN

Tel: 01728 602714  
Mobile: 07545 423817  
Email: richard.smith4@suffolk.gov.uk  
Web: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Date: 25 October, 2011

Dear Mr Strickland

### DUNWICH PARISH MEETING REPRESENTATION ON THE SIZEWELL A & B STAKEHOLDER GROUP

I write to acknowledge your letter of 16 October and its contents, which I will draw to the attention of Stakeholder Group members at a Sub-Group meeting on 31 October.

I have previously taken steps to delete Dunwich's representation from the Group, following the request in your previous letter. My request to you to reconsider received no reply.

As Chairman, I cannot recommend that Dunwich has separate representation. At present this is reserved only for the towns of Leiston, Aldeburgh and Saxmundham and all the local parish councils (and the Parish Meeting in the case of Dunwich) were paired with each having one joint representative, an arrangement that seems to work well everywhere, except in Dunwich! I see no reason at all for Dunwich to be treated differently.

The Sub-Group is not a decision-making body, but it will forward a recommendation to the next Stakeholder Group, which meets in public, on 1<sup>st</sup> December, so it will not be until after that meeting that I will write to you again.

Yours sincerely



**Richard W L Smith, MVO**  
Chairman, Sizewell A & B Stakeholder Group (and County Council representative)