	CONTACT RECORD					
Unique Document ID and Revision No:	ONR-TD-CR-21-052	CM9 Ref:	2021/38659			
Title / Topic: (include level 1, 2, 3 or 4 if applicable)	AWE Road Closure Workshop (DEPZ B Site)					
Date of Contact:	11 May 2021					
Date Issued:	12 May 2021					
Completed / Compiled By: (name, programme)						
Type of Contact: (*delete not applicable)	Workshop to test Road Closure Plan – over Teams					
mContact With: (names, position, organisation)	, West Berkshire Council Emergency Planning – lead facilitator. Participants from:  • Local Authority Highways (West Berkshire District Council, Reading Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Hampshire County Council)  • Local Authority Contractors- Volker Highways for WBDC & WBC  • Local Authority Emergency Planning (WBDC and RBC & WBC)  • Highways England Operations  • Highways England Emergency Planning  • Highways England Contractor - Keir  • Hampshire Constabulary & Thames Valley Police Roads Policing  • Thames Valley Police Operations Planning  • AWE emergency planner (					
ONR Staff: (names , role, programme)						

### **Workshop Aims**

The aim of the workshop was to evaluate the AWE Burghfield Road Closures Appendix of the AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan (OSEP). The plan had recently been developed following the significant increase in size of the Burghfield DEPZ. This workshop is one of several modules to test various elements of the OSEP. West Berkshire Council have previously agreed with ONR which elements are to be tested.

The workshop aimed to test the scope and limitations of the AWE Road Closure Plan in relation to: cross border working, activation and multi-agency coordination. A Briefing Document was provided prior to the workshop (CM9: 2021/38165)

The workshop was run with three parallel sessions covering three sectors of the plan. The plan involves a wide number of agencies both public and private contractors to work together over

Report ONR-TD-CR-21-052 Reference: 2021/38659

various jurisdictions. All the necessary participants were present and there was open, honest dialogue.

There was a significant amount of learning, identification of uncertainties, areas of good practice and a number of issues raised (main points only):

- There was a wariness shown by organisations of the radiation risk to staff required to undertake actions. More work/training may need to be done in this area to help understand/quantify radiation risk.
- It is likely that (non-M4) road closures wouldn't start to be put in place until ~ one hour following the request. Workers would need to make safe current work, collect equipment and then travel to each closure location. The M4 could be closed in ~ 20 mins. There would likely be a knock on impact on closing minor roads which may well be gridlocked so closure teams may not be able to reach closure locations. [ONR reflection: There is a question over impact/benefit/risks of closing M4].
- The M4 is a smart motorway so there may be issues with emergency services getting through quickly, although would use Red X's over one lane to create a hard shoulder.
- Suitability of equipment i.e. signage and barriers. It wasn't clear what signs should say,
  nor which types of barriers should be used on minor roads which would need to allow
  egress but could easily be breached by the public. There would not be enough suitable
  staff to control road blocks should public wish to pass. There are no known legal powers to
  restrict movement.
- Police resource would be stretched (noting there are many duties in the plan, not just road closures) and would likely call for mutual aid.
- Evacuation of the M4 services needs further consideration.
- There is a need for individual organisations to update their own plans and undergo training. A specific training package will be created.
- A trial live run of road closures of all roads (not M4) was recommended to take place in the coming months to understand how long it might take [noting the M4 is closed regularly for accidents, road works etc].
- There was some discussion on prioritising which roads to close first and the sequence to be used. This could be developed following the workshop.

Δ	dehrief i	e echar	luled for	22	lune '	2021

### 1 ISSUES

### 1.1 Issues Raised

The Contact Record can also identify issues raised as a result of the Contact, normally the issues will be recorded against duty holders present. The issue could be raised due to a potential regulatory non-compliance, now or in the future. These issues should be recorded on the ONR Issues Database after the contact and subsequently tracked and managed. In general, these will be Category 4 issues that can be easily followed up via subsequent contact/interventions. More significant issues should be categorised higher and progressed in the usual manner. Please refer to the Regulatory Issues Management process.

Report ONR-TD-CR-21-052 Reference: 2021/38659

No	Issue Title	Category	Issue Level	Licensee/Duty Holder Role	Owner (Inspector)	Completion /Review Date

# 1.2 Issues Closed

No	Issue Title	Category	Issue Level	Licensee/Duty Holder Role	Owner (Inspector)	Completion /Review Date

# **Circulation List**

Organisation	Name / Responsibility	Date
Office for Nuclear Regulation	Workstream 2, EP&R	12/05/2021
West Berkshire Council		

Office for Nuclear Regulation Page 3 of 3