

West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership



Meeting Report

From 23rd June 2011

At Egremont Market Hall

Document No:	198
Status:	Adopted
Title:	Meeting Report from West Cumbria MRWS Partnership, 23 June 2011
Author:	3KQ (see note overleaf)
Notes:	Published 17 July 2011

Note:

This report is a summary of discussions at the meeting. It is compiled by independent facilitators 3KQ, operating on behalf of all participants. Note that it is meant as an aide-memoire for participants and a means of update to non-attendees, rather than a definitive record of every detail.

Facilitators/Authors: Richard Harris, Rhuari Bennett, Jane Dalton

Contacts: richard@3kq.co.uk
rhuari@3kq.co.uk
jane@3kq.co.uk

Telephone 01539 739 435

3KQ Ltd
93 Serpentine Road
Kendal
Cumbria
LA9 4PD

3KQ Ltd
Pantiles Chambers
85 High Street
Tunbridge Wells
Kent TN1 1XP

3KQ Ltd is a company that helps organisations engage the public and stakeholders around contentious issues within the environmental sector. For more information see www.3kq.co.uk.

The front cover image is an aerial view of Forsmark (Sweden) with the nuclear power plant to the right and the site investigation area Söderviken. The image was supplied courtesy of SKB Photographer Lasse Modin. See <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/page/108/International-experience.htm> for further information about Forsmark and other overseas facilities.

Executive Summary

Overview. The 18th meeting of the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Partnership took place on 23rd June 2011. 38 people attended with 14 members of the public present to observe the meeting. The main objectives of the meeting were to: form a collective view regarding the degree to which three of the criteria in the Work Programme are met (Geology; Design, Engineering and Inventory; and Siting Process); and guide drafting and preparation of the Partnership's consultation document for use in the third round of public and stakeholder engagement (PSE3).

Updates. The Community Benefits Sub-Group is working on identifying a possible mitigation package that could apply during year one of the siting process if a decision to participate (DtP) is taken. From 1st July 2011 chairing of the Partnership moves to Allerdale Borough Council. West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group has changed its membership of the Partnership to be an Observing Member. All Partnership meeting dates are being rearranged and new dates will be provided shortly. The Office for Nuclear Regulation has published an interim report on the implications for the UK nuclear industry following the Japanese earthquake and tsunami. The Environment Agency has published its review of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's proposals for the use of geophysical surveying techniques. The Department of Energy and Climate Change confirmed that the UK's commitment to the OSPAR Convention in the North-East Atlantic does not preclude development near the coast after 2020.

PSE Updates. The Partnership's latest newsletter was distributed to all homes in West Cumbria in the week of 20th June. A geology seminar took place on 20th June 2011 focusing on the suitability of West Cumbria's geology for hosting a GDF. The Partnership now has a group on LinkedIn. An online 'webinar' is being organised as part of PSE3. The tender process for expert review of the opinion survey will commence shortly.

Assessment of Criteria. This was an assessment meeting at which the Partnership was making preliminary judgements against the following criteria in its Work Programme:

- **Criterion 2 – Geology.** The Partnership agreed that it is satisfied with the integrity of the British Geological Survey screening study of West Cumbria, and that there are enough 'possibly suitable' areas remaining in the area to make further progress worthwhile. Whilst it was felt that the Partnership itself does not need to do any further work on geology *at this stage in the process*, it was agreed that the PSE Sub-Group will consider whether it should organise a further public debate(s) about the suitability of West Cumbrian geology during PSE3.
- **Criterion 4 – Design, Engineering and Inventory.** Although both criteria in this section were accepted as having been sufficiently met at this stage in the process, a number of qualifying comments were made regarding inventory, including the need for greater assurance about the influence any host community(ies) might have over alterations to the inventory in the future.
- **Criterion 5 – Siting Process.** Discussions focused on the organisational arrangements that might be in place in Stage 4 of the MRWS process should a DtP be taken, and also on how the siting process in West Cumbria might work alongside the Government's own site assessment framework. It was agreed that representatives from the three councils and CALC should meet to discuss a set of guidelines for organisational arrangements prior to further consideration of this criterion by the Partnership at its next meeting on 29th July.

For future meeting dates and more information please see the Partnership's website www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk.

1. Introduction

1.1 – Objectives

Specific objectives for the day were to:

- Form a collective view regarding the degree to which three of the criteria in the Work Programme are met (note that criteria 1 and 3 will be addressed at the next meeting):
 - Geology (Criterion 2).
 - Design, Engineering and Inventory (Criterion 4).
 - Siting Process (Criterion 5).
- Guide drafting and preparation of the Partnership's consultation document for use in the third round of public and stakeholder engagement (PSE3).

The full agenda is in Appendix 1.

1.2 – Attendance

38 participants¹ attended at Egremont Market Hall on 23rd June 2011. A full list of those in attendance is in Appendix 2. The meeting was open for the public to observe and 14 members of the public attended.

2. Updates

2.1 – Community Benefits Sub-Group

The Community Benefits Sub-Group has begun identifying a possible mitigation package that could apply during year 1 of the siting process if a decision to participate (DtP) is taken. This work includes Cumbria Tourism and Chamber of Commerce who raised this issue at the last two Partnership meetings (see the meeting reports – Document 176 Section 4.2.2 and Document 165.1, Section 3.2).

2.2 – Chairing

From 1st July 2011 chairing of the Partnership moves to Allerdale Borough Council.

2.3 – Blue Ribbon Commission

As part of a fact-finding visit to the UK, members of the Blue Ribbon Commission from the USA were observing the Partnership meeting today.

2.4 – Membership of WCSSG

West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group (WCSSG) has changed its membership of the Partnership to be an Observing Member because its remit is mainly to act as a conduit for information rather than taking decisions. This means that WCSSG will not take part in the formal decision making during assessment meetings.

2.5 – Geological Disposal Implementation Board

Tim Knowles is giving an update presentation to the Geological Disposal Implementation Board (GDIB) on behalf of the Partnership on 28th June 2011.

¹ Plus 7 from the facilitation team and secretariat.

2.6 – Partnership meeting date changes

The Secretariat is in the process of rearranging all Partnership meeting dates following publication of the council committee calendars. Future dates will be publicised via the meetings page on the Partnership website at:

<http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/meetings.asp>.

2.7 – Documents published

Since the last Partnership meeting the following documents have been published in the Documents section of the Partnership website at:

http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/all_documents.asp.

- 197. Newsletter - Summer 2011
- 194. Review of the NDA Information on Geology (Document 167) 24 May 2011 : Author - FWS Consultants Ltd
- 193. File Note from Meeting Between the NDA and the Planning Inspector for the Nirex Inquiry March 2011 : Author - NDA
- 191. Partnership Accessibility Statement May 2011
- 189. Response from DECC to Principles for Inventory Change June 2010 : Author - Charles Hendry, DECC
- 188. Letter sent to Greenpeace, FoE and CORE 9 June 2011
- 185. Reply to the NDA's Response to the Review of its R&D Programme (Document 184) 22 May 2011 : Author - Professor Stuart Haszeldine
- 184. Response to Professor Stuart Haszeldine's Review of the NDA's R&D Programme (Document 146) March 2011 : Author - NDA
- 183. Letter sent to Greenpeace, FoE and CORE 17 March 2011
- 182. Baseline for Measuring Impacts 1 June 2011 : Author - NDA
- 181. Letter sent to Partnership by Greenpeace, FoE and CORE 28 February 2011
- 180. Letter sent to Greenpeace, FoE and CORE 20 October 2010

A revised version of Document 169 has also been published.

2.8 – Newsletter

The Partnership's latest newsletter is being distributed to all homes in West Cumbria in the week of 20th June and copies will also be sent to a number of other places such as libraries and surgeries over the next few weeks. Partnership members were encouraged to make copies available to people in their own organisations.

2.9 – Exhibition stands

The Partnership has started taking an exhibition stand to town centres and events across West Cumbria ahead of PSE3, including the Whitehaven Festival on 18th and 19th June 2011. Future dates and locations will be circulated and publicised via the Partnership website. Please contact karen@ospreycommunications.co.uk with any further suggestions about where the stand should go.

2.10 – Social media

The Partnership now has a group on LinkedIn, in addition to its presence on Facebook and Twitter (@westcumbriamrws). A blog will shortly be started on the website and a range of people will be invited to be guest bloggers each week.

2.11 – Webinar

To complement the engagement activity already planned during PSE3, the Steering Group and PSE Sub-Group are intending to organize an online event. This would encourage people to engage in discussions from across the country, as well as those in Cumbria less able to leave their homes, and should appeal more to young people.

2.12 – Opinion Survey peer review

The specification for a peer review of the opinion survey methodology and questionnaire will be put out to tender shortly. Please contact kieran.barr@cumbriacc.gov.uk with any suggestions of potential reviewers.

2.13 – ONR: Interim report on implications for the UK nuclear industry following Japanese earthquake and tsunami

In May the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) published an interim report by the Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations, requested by the UK Government, in which he calls for action to be taken to learn from events at Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power station. His report identifies 25 recommended areas for review to determine if sensible and appropriate measures can further improve safety in the UK nuclear industry. A 26th recommendation calls for plans to be published by the middle of June detailing how each of these 25 matters will be addressed. The full, more comprehensive report will be published in September. The interim report is available at:

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/nuclear/fukushima/interim-report.htm>.

2.14 – EA review of NDA proposals for the use of geophysical surveying

In May 2011 the Environment Agency (EA) published a review of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's (NDA's) proposals for the use of geophysical surveying techniques in characterising any potential site(s) for a geological disposal facility (GDF). The review highlighted that:

- Geophysical surveys should be planned to make best use of them in understanding any potential site(s).
- Data management systems and interpretation software should be developed and tested in advance of characterisation commencing.
- Research and development into geophysical surveying should be monitored and incorporated where relevant.

The Partnership will continue to review the Radioactive Waste Management Directorate's (RWMD's) generic site investigation programmes and any subsequent proposals developed for a candidate site or sites. The report and summary are available at:

<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/sectors/103464.aspx>.

2.15 – Update from CoRWM

Following discussions at the Partnership meeting on 14th April 2011 (see Partnership Meeting Report Document 165.1, Section 5.8), the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) provided an update about the work that they are doing on the NDA's generic Disposal System Safety Case (DSSC). CoRWM are carrying out a science-based review of the suite of documents to determine whether RWMD has a sufficient knowledge of the science underpinning geological disposal. They are also carrying out a gap analysis, including an assessment of whether there are processes in place to deal with any gaps. The timescale for publishing the resulting report is still to be determined with the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), but it could be as late as March 2012. It was noted by the Partnership that this would be too late for it to consider as part of its own work programme.

2.16 – Update from DECC

It was noted by DECC that a number of statements have been made over the last few weeks about development of a GDF being inconsistent with protection of the marine environment. DECC stated that, whilst the UK is committed to its obligations to the OSPAR Convention for the protection of the marine environment in the North-East Atlantic, this does not preclude development near the coast after 2020. They further noted that there is clearly a need for any type of facility to demonstrate that people and the environment are being protected, and that this will be considered in due course.

DECC agreed to put this information in writing (see Document 201). See: http://www.ospar.org/content/content.asp?menu=00340108070000_000000_000000 for more information about the OSPAR Convention.

2.17 – Geology seminar

The Partnership organised a geology seminar on the evening of Monday 20th June 2011, with a particular focus on the issue of the possible suitability of West Cumbria's geology. It was acknowledged that, whilst the Partnership was not able to secure the line-up on the panel that it had invited, the seminar was still felt to be very useful. There was a good turnout, with around 100 attendees including Partnership members. The Technical Review Group (TRG) noted that the seminar highlighted that there is still quite a lot of discussion to be had about geology and the uncertainties associated with West Cumbrian geology if the MRWS process moves forward, but it was also noted that the more detailed work on geology will happen at a later stage. See also Section 4.3 below for a summary of the further discussions about the need for more work on geology.

2.18 – Information on longer-term employment opportunities

In response to a request at the last Partnership meeting, the NDA has provided more detailed information about longer-term employment opportunities/manpower requirements for a GDF (see Document 204).

3. Assessment of Criteria

3.1 – Background and description of process

The Partnership is now in the stage of holding its assessment meetings, during which it will be making preliminary judgements against the criteria in its Work Programme (see Document 13.1). The TRG has been meeting on the Partnership's behalf to pull together all of the work to date under the Work Programme in advance of the each of the assessment meetings and prepare potential conclusions on each criterion. A preliminary assessment report has been produced for each criterion to support Partnership members' assessment of progress against the criteria.

At its last meeting on 24th May 2011, the Partnership made its first assessment of how judgements would be made after PSE3 against Criterion 6a: 'Whether the Partnership's recommendations are credible given public and stakeholder views' (see Partnership Meeting Report from 24th May – Document 176, Section 6). Criteria 2, 4 and 5 were considered at the meeting today. The next meeting on July 29th will consider the remaining criteria, with a view to the Partnership agreeing its preliminary conclusions and preparing its consultation document for sign off at the Partnership meeting on 25th August.

As part of the preparation for the assessment process, Partnership members had previously been asked to consider a briefing note from 3KQ and the TRG, outlining what they and their member organisations need to do to prepare for this stage of the Partnership's work (see Document 176, Appendix 3 for a copy of the briefing note). A worksheet to aid further preparation for the criteria under discussion today was also circulated in advance of the meeting (see Appendix 3).

For each criterion, there was an opportunity to clarify anything in the assessment report, followed by a period of free time/reflection for Partnership members to discuss the criteria with colleagues in the room, including observing members. Each member organisation was then asked to express its *preliminary* view on its level of satisfaction against each criterion in turn as follows:

- ✓ We believe the criterion has been met sufficiently at this stage.
- ? There are outstanding questions needing discussion.
- X We do not believe the criterion has been met sufficiently at this stage.

This was followed by a plenary session to discuss any concerns, comments or conditions to be applied, with an aim of agreeing a Partnership view on the degree to which each criterion has been met. These plenary discussions are summarised in sections 4 to 6 below. Please also see Appendix 4 for a table summarising the indicative responses from each organisation for each of the criteria under discussion (note that these responses do not constitute 'votes').

Member organisations that were not present were:

- Barrow Borough Council.
- Carlisle City Council.
- Cumbria Chamber of Commerce.
- GMB/Unite (but see below).
- Prospect Union (but see below).

GMB/Unite and Prospect Union had submitted their views to the Programme Manager in advance – their responses are therefore included in Appendix 4.

4. Assessment of Criterion 2 – Geology

4.1 – Background and overview

The preliminary assessment report for this criterion (Document 195, Draft 1) had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

There are two criteria under the Geology criterion:

Criterion 2a) – ‘Whether the Partnership is confident in the integrity of the British Geological Survey screening work/report.’

Criterion 2b) – [Whether there are] ‘sufficient areas remaining in West Cumbria after initial screening to make further progress worthwhile.’

As outlined in its Work Programme (Document 13.1), under these criteria the Partnership is looking for:

- a) ‘An acceptable peer review process.’
- b) ‘Broad stakeholder confidence in the BGS study.’
- c) ‘Subjective judgement that the results of the screening leave enough ‘possibly suitable’ land to make further progress worthwhile.’

4.2 – Member organisation responses regarding satisfaction against the criteria

- **Criterion 2a)** – All member organisations responded with ✓. It was therefore agreed that this criterion had been satisfied at this stage in the process.
- **Criterion 2b)** – Two member organisations (South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) and Eden District Council (Eden DC)) responded with ?, all others with ✓.

4.3 – Geology seminar

A further discussion was held about the geology seminar that had been held on the evening of 20th June (see also 2.17 above). There was broad agreement from the TRG and Partnership members who had attended, that nothing significantly new had come out of the seminar that would require the Partnership to think anything different to what was already contained in the preliminary assessment report.

There were some concerns about whether the seminar had entirely satisfied the needs of members of the public. It was, however, felt that it had been useful to get across the message that if nowhere suitable for a GDF is found, it will not be sited in West Cumbria.

4.4 – Discussion regarding concerns about the need for more debate on geology

Eden DC advised that their response was due to concerns about the need for Professor David Smythe to be heard and examined in public (see the External Documents and Geology sections of the Documents section of the Partnership website for further information about the views submitted by Professor David Smythe and other inputs to the debate on geology).

SLDC agreed that there should be further examination of the views expressed by Professor Smythe before proceeding further in the process, especially as the views that he has expressed are different to those of other geologists.

Some other members, and Copeland BC in particular, felt that there was a danger of putting too much weight on one person's opinion and that enough had already been done to hear the range of views on this subject. It was also acknowledged that, whilst there will never be unanimity amongst experts, Professor Smythe's views are not in accordance with the majority view.

It was acknowledged that there is more work to be done during later stages of the MRWS process before the suitability of the geology of West Cumbria can be conclusively determined, and it was broadly agreed that there is nothing to be gained *for the Partnership* and its assessment process by having a further debate with Professor Smythe at this stage. Others felt, however, that this should be weighed against the potential for the public to perceive that the debate is not being heard or being given the opportunity to be heard, and that this perception would be damaging to the Partnership. Whilst there was some agreement that it is important to listen to and take into account the views of Professor Smythe, there were different opinions on whether it should be done now or at a later stage of the process.

Concerns were also raised about using the geology seminar as a basis for judging that members of the public want to hear more about geology, and this was compared to many positive views about the MRWS process that have been expressed at other events including the Whitehaven Festival. Concerns were, however, also expressed about the fact that the Partnership is still hearing (including at the seminar) the message that some people think the decision to host a GDF is "a done deal", and that the process is all show.

It was also noted that Professor Smythe had taken the decision not to take part in the seminar, and that his insistence on a 45 minute slot would make organisation of a proper debate difficult from a practical point of view. Concerns were also expressed that, if the Partnership did hold a further event, it might be accused of putting it on for appearances sake, as had already happened.

Agreement was not reached and it was therefore agreed that the PSE Sub-Group should discuss the options further and come up with a recommendation for the way forward. It was noted that, whatever is decided, there is a need to be very clear about what/who any further event would be for.

Eden DC agreed that they were happy with this approach as long as it is clear that the issues will be considered at some point in the future. SLDC also agreed to the proposed way forward with the proviso that something be built into PSE3 to ensure that the range of views is heard. SLDC also noted that the PSE3 process must ensure that there is adequate communication and openness to address the above concerns regarding pre-disposition, and that the appraisal of the work done in PSE3 must demonstrate the robustness of the entire process.

4.5 – Weighting of criteria and explaining risks in the consultation document

References were made to sections 5.14 & 6 (4th paragraph) in Document 195 regarding the 'risk that the geological conditions of West Cumbria *may* not provide a suitable site for a GDF that meets regulatory requirements' and a discussion was held about whether this should, as suggested in the conclusions, be recognised and described in the Partnership's consultation document.

Concerns were expressed about escalating one issue above all others, especially where this is in response to comments from one or two people. It was noted that all of the criteria have associated uncertainties and risks, and it was felt by some that the risks associated with geology should therefore not be escalated above other risks. One member requested that the recommendation in 6.4 should be reflected differently in the

consultation document, and suggested that there should instead be more of a focus on the fact that more detailed work would be done at a later stage. It was also suggested that the risks should be balanced against the opportunities that could come from hosting a GDF.

Others felt that it is perfectly legitimate, and even that the Partnership is 'obliged', to refer to the risks associated with geology as well as all other risks. It was also felt by some that it might be appropriate to elevate one or more criteria if this is deemed to be warranted.

It was suggested that the Partnership needs to accept that there will be different levels of risk, and also that there should be recognition of the fact that Partnership members will have different views on these issues.

Agreement was not reached and it was therefore agreed that these sensitivities should be noted for consideration during the drafting process.

The EA gave a reminder that staged regulation would help address some of these concerns as it enables regulatory control to be established at an early stage. Permits are issued to enable the development to proceed in discreet phases. The initial permits would not allow for the disposal of radioactive waste but for the development of geoscientific understanding of a candidate site.

DECC acknowledged that they expect to be debating the suitability of geology right until the last moment.

4.5 – Representation of BGS information

The LDNPA advised that, whilst they were satisfied that the criteria regarding geology had been met, they thought that the PSE Sub-Group should consider how the BGS information in PSE3 is represented, particularly with regard to aquifer areas, as they felt that this has not always been clearly displayed for members of the public in the past.

4.7 – Agreements and way forward

The two criteria under geology were accepted as having been sufficiently met at this stage in the process, subject to the issues outlined above. The preliminary assessment report for Geology (Document 195) will go forward for drafting of the PSE3 Consultation Document, and will also now be published on the Partnership website with reference to this meeting report for a summary of the discussions at the meeting.

In drafting the consultation document, the TRG will consider the following: how risks are reported to ensure that this is done fairly and consistently across all criteria; how opportunities/advantages can be presented alongside the risks; and the sensitivities around the differing opinions on elevating any one criterion.

The PSE Sub-Group will consider the need for further input and debate on geology for members of the public during PSE3, and will also consider how some of the information from the BGS studies is displayed.

The full Consultation Document will come back to the Partnership for discussion and agreement before publication.

5. Assessment of Criterion 4 – Design, Engineering and Inventory

5.1 – Background and overview

There are two criteria under Criterion 4:

Criterion 4a) – ‘Whether the Partnership is satisfied that the design concepts being developed are appropriate at this stage.’

As outlined in its Work Programme (Document 13.1), under this criterion the Partnership is looking for:

- ‘Acceptable design concept and flexibility thereof.’
- ‘Reassurance that retrievability is an option, and flexibility to confirm this later.’

Criterion 4b) – ‘Whether the Partnership is satisfied with the proposed inventory to be managed in a facility.’

Under this criterion the Partnership is looking for:

- ‘Knowledge of what the inventory could be.’
- ‘Principles that define an acceptable process for how the inventory could be changed, including how the community can influence this.’

The draft preliminary assessment reports for these criteria (Document 196 – Design and Engineering (Criterion 4a), and Document 187 – Inventory (Criterion 4b)) were circulated in advance of the meeting.

5.2 – Member organisation responses regarding satisfaction against the criteria

- **Criterion 4a)** – All member organisations responded with ✓. It was therefore agreed that this criterion had been satisfied at this stage in the process.
- **Criterion 4b)** – Two member organisations (Lake District National Park Authority (LDNPA) and CALC) responded with ?, all others with ✓.

5.3 – Retrievability

A question was asked about why retrievability is so site-specific. The NDA advised that there are two reasons:

- That the views of a particular community about retrievability are important, including what it means and how it might be handled.
- It is also dependent to a large extent on the geology – for example in stable hard-rock geologies keeping vaults open for long periods of time is relatively easy, whereas in soft-rock environments it might be more difficult.

5.4 – Spoil

Questions were asked about the spoil from constructing a facility including the extent of any spoil, how it might be handled/what might be done with it and whether any further information on spoil is available, including how the amount of spoil would be affected by the distance between the surface and underground facilities.

The NDA advised that spoil is discussed in its Generic Environmental and Sustainability Report which was published alongside the DSSC. They noted that the spoil from the drift

would actually be quite small in comparison to the spoil from excavating the caverns, and that, even if the surface facilities were directly above the repository, the drift access would spiral round so there would still be spoil from the drift access even if the distance between facilities was not great.

With regards to what might be done with the spoil, some of it may be used for landscaping surface facilities, some might be retained and stored close to site so that it can be used for backfilling, and there may be some spoil that has value. The NDA offered to provide further information on this if required in addition to what is in the report, but reiterated that, as a lot of these factors are very site-specific, any information would be very generic.

It was also suggested that spoil could be added to the Impacts preliminary assessment report or the Impacts schedule (Document 163, Annex A).

For further information see the NDA's Generic Environmental and Sustainability Report for a Geological Disposal Facility at:

<http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=46357>. There is also a non-technical summary at:

<http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=46362>.

5.5 – Input into the inventory by host communities

A question was asked about how the input from host communities into the inventory would work alongside the Government's proposals for funded decommissioning for new build, and concerns were expressed that the two programmes running side by side could compromise the host communities' input into and control over the inventory.

The NDA explained that the funded decommissioning programme attempts to ensure that operators of power stations will set aside funding for disposal of waste. They noted that there is nothing in the Government proposals for this programme that says that a GDF has to be ready at a certain point in time, and also noted that the programme has a number of risks/uncertainties, and one of these is the timing of availability of a GDF.

It was noted that there needs to be understanding of the connection between the two processes and that this understanding needs to be clear and transparent.

Reference was also made to the MRWS White Paper in which the Government says that there is no need to have more than one GDF if there is one that will take legacy and new build waste. This is dependent on a community being willing to have the waste *and* the geology being able to deal with it. Therefore, whilst there is an aim to have one facility it is dependent on safety, geology *and* community willingness.

5.6 – How the community might influence alterations to the inventory

It was noted by Copeland Borough Council that a lot more work needs to be done on how the community can influence the inventory and any alterations to it, if the process continues. Whilst it was acknowledged that there is a set of principles for inventory change in place, and a response to those principles from Charles Hendry (see Documents 97 and 189), both CBC and CALC feel that there will need to be something stronger in place, and something that will survive future governments, if West Cumbria continues in the process.

5.7 – Position re spent fuel and uranium/plutonium

CALC noted that the position re spent fuel and uranium/plutonium is very unsatisfactory and not very helpful at this point (see Document 187, Annex A, page 6 para.4, which

refers to the potential for these materials to be classed as waste 'at some point' in the future).

CALC also asked for clarification as to what is meant by 'Others' in the list of waste and materials in Annex A of the preliminary assessment report (page 6).

DECC advised that Annex A is an extract from a draft report on potential inventory. They confirmed that 'Others' captures a small amount of nuclear materials such as thorium, which are not strictly uranium or plutonium. They committed to attempting to make that more clear in the final report.

5.8 – Potential for more than one GDF

CALC suggested that the Partnership needs to be clearer with members of the public about the fact that there might be more than one repository. It was agreed that this would be useful as part of the context setting at the front of the consultation document.

5.9 – Other above ground facilities

CALC noted that the size/extent of the surface facilities (including the potential for encapsulation facilities and warehousing) does depend on the inventory and on whether new build waste is included. They expressed concerns about whether the Partnership has made the potential scale of the surface facilities clear enough to members of the public.

The NDA confirmed that the current proposal is not to have encapsulation facilities at the surface facilities and that, for the spent fuel that is in the inventory, the assumption is that it would arrive already packaged and ready to go underground. However, as part of the discussions with potential host communities, the exact nature of the surface facilities would be discussed and agreed.

The Programme Manager noted that there had been some criticism in PSE1 about the need for greater clarity about the potential size/scale of the facilities and other facilities that could be located at or near the surface facilities. Information about this has already been updated to accommodate the concern, including content from the preliminary assessment report (see page 11) and the latest newsletter, and will also be explicitly laid out in the consultation document.

5.10 – Agreements and way forward

Criterion 4a was accepted as having been sufficiently met at this stage in the process, and Criterion 4b was accepted subject to the comments and caveats outlined above. The preliminary assessment reports for Design and Engineering (Document 196) and Inventory (Document 187) will go forward for drafting of the PSE3 Consultation Document, and will also now be published on the Partnership website with reference to this meeting report for a summary of the discussions at the meeting.

It was noted that the proposed inventory principles were not discussed in PSE2 (see page 4 of Document 187, 2nd bullet point from the bottom) and that, as with other criteria, the Partnership will therefore need to revisit the inventory criterion after PSE3 when the public's response to the inventory principles and DECC's response to the principles is known.

CALC added that, subject to the points made in 5.7 to 5.9 above, they would like to move their organisational response for Criterion 4b) from a question mark to a tick – this is reflected in Appendix 4.

6. Assessment of Criterion 5 – Siting Process

6.1 – Background and overview

Criterion 5 is: 'Whether the Partnership is confident that the siting process is sufficiently robust and flexible to meet their needs.'

The preliminary assessment report for this criterion (Document 186, Draft 1) had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Additionally, a siting seminar was organised on 6th June 2011 to enable Partnership members to explore and test preliminary proposals for the siting process in Stage 4 if a DtP were to be taken. The outputs from this seminar are reflected in the preliminary assessment report.

As outlined in its Work Programme (Document 13.1), under this criterion the Partnership is looking for:

- a) 'Acceptable process of moving from 'possibly suitable areas' to specific potential host sites.'
- b) 'Provision for 'pause points' to allow more work to be undertaken at a potential Community Siting Partnership's (CSP) request.'
- c) 'Acceptable nature of (and limitations to) the Right of Withdrawal (RoW).'
- d) 'Acceptable CSP process can be defined.'
- e) 'Acceptable degree of Government commitment to sustain the process.'

6.2 – Member organisation responses regarding satisfaction against the criteria

Four member organisations (Allerdale BC, Copeland BC, Cumbria CC and LDNPA) responded with ?, CALC with X, and all others with ✓.

6.3 – Government consultation on its own site assessment framework

Allerdale BC and CALC both stated that they need to have seen and been able to check through the Government's consultation document on its proposals for a national site assessment framework for Stage 4 of the MRWS process before they can say that they are happy with items a) and d) in 6.1 above (also listed on page 1 of Document 186).

CALC also referred to the siting seminar, at which they felt that a general view had been reached that the Partnership's preliminary assessment report would be the lead document, but that other documents would need to be taken into account in terms of e.g. legal matters. Copeland BC thought it had been agreed at the seminar that the Partnership did not need to see the Government document, but just needed to know that it would be flexible enough to adapt and cater to local communities.

Copeland BC also stated that there is a need to understand whether the Government's framework would exclude areas, as Copeland BC would prefer to have criteria that would *identify* potential host communities rather than exclude them, as once an area has been excluded it is very difficult to go back. Copeland BC reiterated that they do not want to change the Government's criteria, but that there is a need to look at how they work alongside local processes and the Partnership's own criteria. If the Government is intending to exclude areas, Copeland BC would want something to be added to the Partnership's framework that focuses on identifying potentially suitable sites.

The LDNPA advised that they would like some assurance from DECC on the extent to which its consultation will take account of, or be consistent with, the Partnership's work on siting.

DECC confirmed that they do not see anything in their consultation framework that goes against or conflicts with the Partnership's own proposals as outlined in its preliminary assessment report. They advised that their consultation will be starting in the week of 27th June, and will run through to the end of September. They offered to talk to the Partnership and/or individuals about the consultation if requested.

DECC also stated that the consultation document and the framework that it sets out have been designed to be as flexible as possible, in order to accommodate any community that might come forward in the process. They advised that the criteria could be used in a number of ways, including being either discretionary or exclusionary. They acknowledged that there would need to be a clear explanation if any of the criteria were to be used as exclusionary, as this would be ruling out potential areas.

The NDA advised that the overarching aim of the criteria is to focus the investigative work on those areas that show the most potential, not to rule things out. They noted that, whilst there may be some safety or environmental issues that mean some sites would be excluded, that would not be the rule.

Fred Barker, the Partnership representative from the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF) confirmed that he had seen the draft consultation document and advised that, from his understanding of it, it did not contain any "hard and fast rules" and that there was nothing in it to indicate that anything would be imposed upon any future organisation.

There was a reminder that it had been agreed at a previous meeting that Fred Barker would review the consultation document on behalf of the Partnership, to see how it fits with the Partnership's own preliminary assessment report and see if there are any show-stoppers arising from it. It was agreed that all Partnership members should feed comments on the consultation document (when issued) to the Programme Manager with a view to Fred drafting an *initial* review of it before the next Partnership meeting on July 29th. It was also agreed that Criterion 5 would not be signed off until that further analysis and debate has happened.

Copeland BC noted that it should be more important for the Partnership to focus on setting up its own processes in this area, rather than focusing on DECC's. It was also noted that the DECC document is a consultation document and it is therefore not the final product.

Cumbria CC noted that additional time might be needed if members are to consult on these issues with their own constituencies, however the Programme Manager advised that, as the Partnership does not need to agree its own consultation document until the 25th of August, additional time is available for a more formal response to the Government's consultation document.

6.4 – 'National' community

The LDNPA made reference to the footnote on page 3 of the preliminary assessment report which refers to the three levels of community as set out in the White Paper. They noted that the National Park Authority has to recognise that the community for the National Park is the nation, and they asked that the Partnership give some consideration to how that can be addressed and recognised during PSE3.

It was agreed that this issue will be considered further by the PSE Sub-Group.

6.5 – Involving host communities

Copeland BC made reference to page 9 of the preliminary assessment report where the steps in the initial identification of potential site areas and host communities are outlined. They suggested that earlier steps might be needed, and also made specific reference to footnote 7 which suggests that parish councils could be invited to participate. They suggested that there is a need to identify different organisations and not just parish councils, in particular because there are areas in West Cumbria that do not have a parish or town council and that these must also be included.

6.6 – Organisational arrangements for taking the siting process forwards

A discussion was held about the organisational arrangements for taking the siting process forward should a DtP be taken.

CALC reiterated their previously stated view that, whilst they do not believe that any recommendations should be made about the structure of a future CSP, they do think that there is a need for guidelines on what the Decision-making Bodies (DMBs) should consider to help move forward in the process, and to avoid a gap between this stage and the next stage in the process. CALC also made reference to the list of revised principles for community involvement on page 8 of the preliminary assessment report, and noted that the first principle is absolutely critical in engendering trust/inspiring confidence. It was suggested that potential host communities are unlikely to have the confidence that this first principle has been properly taken on board and embedded until they can see what the organisational arrangements would be. They suggested that the best way forward to achieve this is to work up the organisational arrangements (as outlined on pages 10/11 of the preliminary assessment report) as, in CALC's view, this section does not currently go far enough.

Copeland BC advised that, whilst they agree with the need for guidelines about the involvement of 'wider interests' and other affected communities, there are several different interpretations/definitions of 'community' and this is one of the reasons that this Partnership cannot define or dictate what a CSP should look like. CALC also expressed concerns about whether the Partnership would interpret this in the same way.

Copeland BC also noted that the current Partnership structure might not be appropriate going forward and that it will be essential to come up with a structure for those that are involved in the process if a DtP is taken. They also stated that it might not be appropriate to continue as West Cumbria e.g. Copeland might want a totally different process to Allerdale, even assuming both areas moved into the siting process. Concerns were expressed about whether DECC would be happy to pay for two different administrative arrangements, but it was reiterated that it is essential to make sure any structure is right for those who might be involved, and that DECC should not have to be asked whether this is OK. Allerdale BC agreed that, once decisions about participation have been made by the different councils, the bodies that might be involved in a future CSP should be able to decide how to go forward.

The three councils and CALC all agreed that it would be useful to draw up a set of broad guidelines about the arrangements that would have to be in place, but that this Partnership should not dictate what a future CSP might look like. It was also acknowledged that there may be differences over the level of detail that has to go into those guidelines.

CALC reiterated that there is a need to give sufficient confidence prior to a DtP to the communities and the councils representing those communities, so that they know what they would be participating in if a DtP were to be taken, and so that they have confidence in the process that they would be taking part in. It was acknowledged that there may be

some differences that cannot be resolved now over the level of detail, but they agreed that, otherwise, they were broadly on the same page as the councils.

It was agreed that Allerdale BC, Copeland BC, CALC and Cumbria CC should meet before the next Partnership meeting on 29th July to agree a way forward.

6.7 – Question regarding a formal view on siting in the National Park

The LDNPA were asked when they will take a formal view on siting within the National Park. The LDNPA confirmed that it will be at the appropriate stage of the process, and that it is not at this stage.

6.8 – Commitment from the Government to sustain this process

Regarding an acceptable degree of Government commitment to sustain this process, reference was made to the conversations that the Partnership has each year with the Government about funding for the process. Copeland BC acknowledged that, whilst there are no complaints about the advice and support that had been received from DECC, with regard to the amount of time spent on discussing the level of funding, it was suggested that something needs to be included about the Government agreeing funding in a timely manner and within reasonable timescales, to avoid the Partnership having to e.g. threaten to cancel meetings.

It was agreed that this would be added in to the consultation document.

6.9 – International experience of siting processes

The NDA advised that there has been an international research project that looked at different local liaison/siting processes – more information is available at:

http://www.cowam.com/IMG/pdf_Cowam_2_WP1_ROADMAP_for_Local_Committee_Co_nstruction.pdf.

6.10 – Right of communities to object to decisions taken by DMBs

Reference was made by CALC to Principle 8 of the Principles for Community Involvement (Document 187, Page 8, Principle 8: Respect the final decisions of the DMBs). They noted that if host communities feel very unhappy with the decision(s) taken by DMBs (e.g. if not taken fairly or not having taken account of the other 7 principles) that this should not be interpreted as them having no further right to complain or lobby against the decision(s).

6.11 – Agreements and way forward

It was agreed that, with regard to the conclusions and recommendations in the preliminary assessment report (Section 4 of Document 187), all recommendations for Criterion 5 (and recommendations 1 & 4 in particular) will be revisited at the next Partnership meeting on 29th July, following the additional work on the Government's consultation document and the drafting of guidelines for organisational arrangements.

Fred Barker will carry out a review of the Government's consultation document and submit a preliminary response to the Partnership for the next meeting. All members should submit their comments to the Programme Manager to support this review.

Allerdale BC, Copeland BC, CALC and Cumbria CC will meet before 29th July to draw up a set of draft guidelines for organisational arrangements.

7. Way Forward and Actions

7.1 – Assessment of Criterion 2 – Geology

Criterion 2a (integrity of the BGS report) was accepted as having been satisfied at this stage in the process. Criterion 2b (enough 'possibly suitable' areas remaining) was also accepted as being satisfied, subject to a number of considerations for the TRG to take into account in drafting the consultation document. The PSE Sub-Group will consider the potential need for further public debate during PSE3 on the suitability of West Cumbria's geology.

7.2 – Assessment of Criterion 4 – Design, Engineering and Inventory

Criterion 4a (Design and Engineering) was accepted as having been satisfied at this stage in the process. Criterion 4b (Inventory) was also accepted as having been satisfied subject to a number of comments and considerations for the TRG to reflect in the Consultation Document, and the need for greater assurance at a later stage in the process about the influence any host community(ies) might have over alterations to the inventory should a DtP be taken. It was also noted that, as inventory and the principles for inventory change were not consulted on during PSE2, the assessment against this criterion in particular will need to be reviewed after PSE3.

7.3 – Assessment of Criterion 5 – Siting Process

This Criterion will be revisited at the next Partnership meeting on 29th July 2011, following additional work by the Partnership to review the Government's consultation document on its national site assessment framework, and drafting of a set of guidelines for organisational arrangements for the siting process should a DtP be taken.

7.4 – Dates

The forward programme of confirmed meeting dates is provided below. Please note that the previously published Partnership meeting dates have been revised, and Steering Group dates will be finalised shortly. Further details of Partnership meetings are available at <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/meetings.asp>.

Members of the public are welcome to observe the Partnership meetings (right hand column). Please contact the Secretariat for details and registration on 0800 048 8912.

Steering Group meetings 2011:	Partnership meetings 2011:
21 July	29 July (Market Hall, Wigton)
4 August	25 August (venue tbc)
<i>Future dates to be confirmed</i>	20 September (The Wave, Maryport)
	3 November (venue tbc)
	8 December (Copeland Centre, Whitehaven)
2012 dates:	2012 dates:
	31 January (venue tbc)
	21 February (The Oval Centre, Salterbeck)

7.5 – Actions. The following actions were agreed:

	Action	Who	By when
1	Put information re OSPAR convention in writing.	Andrew	30 June
2	Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for further coverage of geology (and David Smythe’s views in particular) during PSE3. • Representation of BGS information, particularly aquifer areas. 	Rhuari/PSE Sub-Group	29 July
3	Add consideration of spoil to the Impacts preliminary assessment report.	Stewart	20 July
4	Send initial comments to Rhuari on the Government’s consultation document.	All	14 July
5	Review the Government’s consultation document.	Fred	29 July
6	Circulate draft meeting report to Partnership attendees.	Jane	4 July
7	Comment on draft meeting report.	All attendees	11 July
8	Circulate final draft of meeting report and publish on website.	Jane	18 July

8. Public Questions/Comments

8.1 – Question regarding surface facilities and site investigations in the National Park

The LDNPA were asked for their views on the potential for surface facilities to be located and site investigations to take place in the National Park.

LDNPA response

The LDNPA representative first of all stated that the LDNPA welcomes being part of this Partnership. He also stated that the LDNPA recognises that, at this point, the Partnership is not in the position of screening sites or considering the National Park as a site, and that they and others on the Partnership recognise that there are planning policies and a legislative framework in place that will need early consideration. He further stated that there are certain scenarios that he would personally say would be ruled out at a later stage in the process, and that may include surface facilities in the National Park.

8.2 – Question regarding a full debate with Professor Smythe and Dr Dearlove in Allerdale

A question was asked about whether the Partnership will be considering holding a full debate with Professor David Smythe and Dr Jeremy Dearlove in Allerdale and not just in Copeland.

Partnership response

It was confirmed that this will be considered by the PSE Sub-Group.

8.3 – Suggestion for Professor Haszeldine's views to be considered alongside David Smythe's

A suggestion was made that the points made by Professor Stuart Haszeldine in his review of the NDA's research and development programme should be considered alongside David Smythe's views.

Programme Manager response

The Programme Manager advised that this is due to be considered at the next Partnership meeting on 29th July 2011.

NDA response

The NDA noted that the review by Professor Haszeldine was done for the Partnership and not for the NDA. The NDA has considered the latest input from Professor Haszeldine and has provided a draft response for the Partnership's consideration, and this includes an action plan explaining how the NDA will take into account views and advice as it move forwards with its technical work programme.

8. Acronyms/Abbreviations

ABC/Allerdale BC	Allerdale Borough Council
BGS	British Geological Survey
CALC	Cumbria Association of Local Councils
CBC/Copeland BC	Copeland Borough Council
CCC/Cumbria CC	Cumbria County Council
CoRWM	Committee on Radioactive Waste Management
CSP	Community Siting Partnership
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate Change
DfT	Department for Transport
DMB	Decision Making Body
DSSC	Disposal System Safety Case
DtP	Decision to Participate
EA	Environment Agency
EoI	Expression of Interest
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions
FoE	Friends of the Earth
GDF	Geological Disposal Facility
GDIB	Geological Disposal Implementation Board
HSE	Health & Safety Executive
ILW	Intermediate Level Waste
IPC	Infrastructure Planning Commission
LDNPA	Lake District National Park Authority
LGA	Local Government Association
LLW	Low Level Waste
LLWR	Low Level Waste Repository
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRWS	Managing Radioactive Waste Safely
NALC	National Association of Local Councils
ND	Nuclear Directorate (a department of the HSE)
NDA	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
NEA	Nuclear Energy Agency
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NII	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (of the HSE)
NNPS	Nuclear National Policy Statement
NWAA	Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates
NWDA	North West Development Agency
NuLeAF	Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum
NWAT	Nuclear Waste Assessment Team (of the EA)
OCNS	Office for Civil Nuclear Security
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation
PSE	Public and Stakeholder Engagement
RoW	Right of Withdrawal
RWMD	Radioactive Waste Management Directorate (of the NDA)
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SLC	Site Licence Company
ToRs	Terms of Reference
UKSO	UK Safeguards Office
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
WCSF	West Cumbrian Strategic Forum
WCSP	West Cumbria Strategic Partnership
WCSSG	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group

Appendix 1 – Agenda for the 23rd June 2011 meeting

Objectives of the meeting are to:

- Form a collective view regarding the degree to which three of the criteria in the Work Programme are met (note that criteria 1 and 3 will be addressed at the next meeting):
 - Geology (Criterion 2).
 - Design, Engineering and Inventory (Criterion 4).
 - Siting Process (Criterion 5).
- Guide drafting and preparation of the Partnership’s consultation document for use in PSE3.

Time	Item	Agenda Notes
08.45	Arrivals / Registration	
09.00	Welcome Agenda setting Updates and actions	Richard Harris, 3KQ
	Geology	- Clarifications - Views: ‘Have the criteria been met?’ - Discussion and preliminary decision (Document 195)
	Design, Engineering and Inventory	- Clarifications - Views: ‘Have the criteria been met?’ - Discussion and preliminary decision (Documents 187 and 196)
	Public Questions	
12.45	Lunch	Approx. timing
	Design, Engineering and Inventory	(continued...)
	Siting Process	- Clarifications - Views: ‘Has the criterion been met?’ - Discussion and preliminary decision (Document 186)
	Way Forward and Actions	
	Public Questions	
15.30	Close	

Bold type indicates papers sent out in advance of the meeting.

Appendix 2 – Attendees on 23rd June 2011

Harry Dyke	Allerdale Borough Council	
Richard Griffin	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Michael Heaslip	Allerdale Borough Council	
Tim Heslop	Allerdale Borough Council	
Charles Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Carni McCarron-Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Alan Smith	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Guy Richardson	CALC	
Geoff Smith	Allerdale CALC	
Chris Shaw	Allerdale/Copeland CALC	(Steering Group member)
Keith Hitchen	Copeland CALC	(Steering Group member)
Revd Dr Lindsay Gray	Churches Together in Cumbria	
Yvonne Clarkson	Copeland Borough Council	
Allan Holliday	Copeland Borough Council	
Steve Smith	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Paul Walker	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Elaine Woodburn	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Paul Feehily	Cumbria County Council	
Stewart Kemp	Cumbria County Council	(Steering Group member)
Richard Greenwood	Cumbria Tourism	
Mike Tonkin	Eden District Council	
Robert Allison	Lake District National Park Authority	
Judith Cooke	Lake District National Park Authority	
Steve Ratcliffe	Lake District National Park Authority	
Helen Forrester	National Farmers Union	
Fred Barker	NuLeAF	
Simon Rowley	South Lakeland District Council	
Observing Members		
Andrew Craze	DECC	
Bruce Cairns	DECC	
Simon Harley	CoRWM	
Mark Dutton	CoRWM	
Gavin Thomson	Environment Agency	
Alun Ellis	NDA RWMD	
Elizabeth Atherton	NDA RWMD	
Paul McKenna	Isle of Man Government	
Apologies		
Mick Bacon	ONR	
Jason Gooding	Carlisle City Council	
Ian Curwen	Copeland Borough Council	
John Kane	Copeland Borough Council	
Gerald Humes	Cumbria County Council	
Tim Knowles	Cumbria County Council	(Steering Group member)
Tony Markley	Cumbria County Council	
David Southward	Cumbria County Council	
Peter Kane	GMB/Unite Unions	(Steering Group member)

Robert Morris-Eyton	National Farmers Union
Marcus Swift	Prospect Union
Clare Feeney-Johnson	South Lakeland District Council
David Moore	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group

Facilitators, Secretariat and Presenters

Rhuari Bennett	3KQ (Programme Manager)
Richard Harris	3KQ (Facilitator)
Jane Dalton	3KQ (Report Writer)
Cath Little	Copeland Borough Council (Secretariat)
Sharon Walker	Copeland Borough Council (Secretariat)

Other

Paul Gardner	Osprey Communications (Communications Adviser)
Gareth Powells	Wood Holmes (Partnership Evaluators)
Stuart Smith	Wood Holmes (Partnership Evaluators)
Helen Fisher	3KQ (Consultation Document Writer)
Jenny Willis	3KQ

Visitors from the Blue Ribbon Commission

Tim Frazier	Nuclear Blue Ribbon Commission
Vicky Bailey	Nuclear Blue Ribbon Commission
Alison Macfarlane	Nuclear Blue Ribbon Commission
Mary Woollen	Nuclear Blue Ribbon Commission
Adam Van Dervort	US Embassy, London

Members of the Public and Stakeholders who attended for all or part of the meeting

Ruth Balogh	
Mrs C Beardshall	
Stuart Cowperthwaite	
David Davies	
Peter Krebs	
Fergus McMorrow	
Jean McSorley	
Sam Bains	CoRWM
Brian Clark	CoRWM
Andy Parkes	NDA
Lynn Gilmour	NDA
Liz Kay	NDA
Mark Johnson	NDA
Ian Boydon	Osprey

Other Members, Not in Attendance

Ken Williams	Barrow Borough Council
Rob Johnston	Cumbria Chamber of Commerce

Appendix 3 – Assessment Meetings Worksheet (sent out in advance of the meeting to aid preparation)

Worksheet for Assessment Meetings

You may wish to use this worksheet to help structure your response to the **key question for each criteria**: “To what degree has this criteria been met?”

Structure of the Assessment Meetings

Each of the meetings will have a similar structure. Basically the assessment of each criterion will be done in a few simple stages:

1. In plenary, asking questions of clarification concerning the Partnership Assessment Report (PAR)
2. “Freetime” to discuss the criteria with colleagues (including Observing Members) in the room and expressing your organisations preliminary view (see below) - *this will be done on the day using a flipchart table on the wall*
3. Plenary discussion aiming to agree a partnership view on the key question – “To what degree has this criteria been met?”
4. Agree the way forward

Whose View am I Giving?

You are providing a view from your organisation's perspective, knowing its priorities and interests. We recognise that this cannot be a formal or final view of your whole organisation. These views, and the resulting consensus that we aim to build in the Partnership meetings will guide the work of the Partnership and its preliminary conclusions, to be consulted upon in PSE3.

To bring focus to the discussion at the meeting we will ask you to express your views as a:

- ✓ We believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)
- ? There are outstanding questions we feel need to be discussed
- X We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)

Outputs

Please remember that we are aiming to reach consensus on a **preliminary Partnership view for consultation in PSE3**. We suggest you bear the following points in mind during your preparation:

- Please avoid simply preparing a hard ‘position’ in advance – think about how others will view the criteria and your views
- Come prepared to offer suggestions to overcome possible blocks to agreement that may occur, not just to repeat positions (reinforcing blocks)

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View (please circle)
2	Geology		
2b	Criterion: "Sufficient areas remaining in West Cumbria after initial screening to make further progress worthwhile"	Subjective judgement that the results of the screening leave enough "possibly suitable" land to make further progress worthwhile	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ? <i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> X <i>we do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
4	Design and Engineering		
4a	Criterion: "Satisfied that the design concepts being developed are appropriate"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acceptable design concept and flexibility thereof ▪ Reassurance that retrieveability is an option, and flexibility to confirm this later 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>? <i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>we do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
4	Design and Engineering		
4b	Criterion: "Satisfied with the proposed inventory to be managed in a facility"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knowledge of what the inventory could be, and acceptable process for how the inventory would be changed, including how the community can influence this 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>? <i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>we do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
5	Process		
5	Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that the siting process is sufficiently robust and flexible to meet their needs"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acceptable process of moving from 'possibly suitable areas' to specific potential host sites ▪ Provision for 'pause points' to allow more work to be undertaken at a potential Community Siting Partnership's request (if DtP taken) ▪ Acceptable nature of (and limitations to) the Right of Withdrawal ▪ Acceptable Community Siting Partnership process can be defined ▪ Acceptable degree of Government commitment to sustain the process 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>?</p> <p><i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>we do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

Appendix 4 – Table of responses from assessment of criteria

	ABC	Barrow BC	CBC	CCC	CTiC	Chamber of Commerce	Eden DC	Unite/ GMB *	Cumbria Tourism	Carlisle CC	SLDC	NFU	NuLeAF **	LDNPA	Prospect *	CALC		
Criterion 2a	✓	Not present	✓	✓	✓	Not present	✓	✓	✓	Not present	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Criterion 2b	✓		✓	✓	✓		?	✓	✓		?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Criterion 4a	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Criterion 4b	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓***
Criterion 5	?		?	?	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	X

See Section 3 for definitions of the responses.

* Unite/GMB and Prospect Union were not in attendance at the meeting but had submitted their responses to the Programme Manager in advance.

** This is an officer response from NuLeAF.

*** The original response was ? but this was changed to ✓ following the discussions.

Appendix 5 – How Members Represent their Organisations on the Partnership

All Partnership members recognise the need to update the organisations that they represent and proactively feed their views in. This is essential to prevent Partnership members becoming 'detached' from their organisation in terms of understanding, as well as maintaining the credibility of the representative role that members commit to fulfilling. The table below sets out how each organisation undertakes to do this.

Note the gaps will be filled as reporting mechanisms are clarified.

Organisation	Nominated Representatives and preferred contact details	Mechanisms Used
Allerdale BC	Alan Smith (councillor) alan.smith@allderale.gov.uk Tim Heslop (councillor) tim.heslop@allderale.gov.uk Carni McCarron-Holmes (councillor) carni.mccarron-holmes@allderale.gov.uk Michael Heaslip (councillor) michael.heaslip@allderale.gov.uk Charles Holmes charles.holmes@allderale.gov.uk Richard Griffin richard.griffin@allderale.gov.uk	Verbal progress report provided to the following meetings: - Corporate Management Team/ Heads of Service. - Regeneration Portfolio Holders. - Regeneration Managers Group (for further cascade). - Partnerships and Communities Directorate. Formal report for endorsement, or decision, would be via: - Nuclear Issues Task Group. - Executive Committee Council.
Barrow BC	Ken Williams (councillor) kenwilliams@barrowbc.gov.uk Phil Huck philhuck@barrowbc.gov.uk	Verbal update given to Leader after each Partnership meeting.
CALC (Allerdale)	Chris Shaw chris.shaw@calc.org.uk Geoff Smith (councillor) geoffandhelen@tesco.net	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Allerdale Association meetings.
CALC (Copeland)	Chris Shaw chris.shaw@calc.org.uk Keith Hitchen (councillor) keith.hitchen@btinternet.com	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Copeland Association meetings.
CALC (Cumbria)	Guy Richardson guy.richardson@calc.org.uk	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Executive Committee meetings.
Carlisle City Council	Jason Gooding jasong@carlisle.gov.uk	
Chamber of Commerce (Cumbria)	Robert Johnston rob@cumbriachamber.co.uk	
Churches Together in Cumbria (CTiC)	Revd Dr Lindsay Gray lgray782@btinternet.com	

Copeland BC	<p>Elaine Woodburn (councillor) ewoodburn@copelandbc.gov.uk Allan Holliday (councillor) allan.holliday@copeland.gov.uk John Kane (councillor) john.kane@copeland.gov.uk Yvonne Clarkson (councillor) yvonne.clarkson@copeland.gov.uk Paul Walker paul.walker@copeland.gov.uk Steve Smith steve.smith@copeland.gov.uk Ian Curwen ian.curwen@copeland.gov.uk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leader's update to full Council. - Update to Nuclear Working Group. - Update to Executive at key milestones. - Update to MRWS Task Group when needed.
Cumbria County Council	<p>Tim Knowles (councillor) timothy.knowles@cumbriacc.gov.uk Tony Markley (councillor) anthony.markley@cumbriacc.gov.uk David Southward (councillor) david.southward@virgin.net Gerald Humes (councillor) gerald.humes@cumbriacc.gov.uk Paul Feehily paul.feehily@cumbriacc.gov.uk Stewart Kemp stewart.kemp@cumbriacc.gov.uk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6-weekly written report to Nuclear Issues Working Group (NIWG). - Quarterly report to Cabinet. - Monthly report to Nuclear Issues Programme Board. - Possible insert in weekly briefing to all staff. - Link to Partnership website. - Attending Allerdale and Copeland Local Area Committees on request.
Cumbria Tourism	<p>Richard Greenwood rgreenwood@cumbriatourism.org</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep the rest of the organisation and the wider membership of CT informed. - Updates to Senior Management Team (as and when relevant). - Reports to the Executive Board and, where necessary, formal endorsement of CT's position on any decisions which need to be taken. - Email and Viewpoint (quarterly magazine to all members). - Presentation from the Partnership at a Commercial Members Meeting.
Eden District Council	<p>Mike Tonkin (councillor) mike.tonkin@eden.gov.uk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to members on 'Outside Bodies' website. - Presentation to members as Environment Portfolio Holder.
GMB/Unite Unions	<p>Peter Kane peter.kane@sellafieldsites.com</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updates given to Shop Stewards Committee. - Forward on newsletters to members.
Lake District National Park Authority	<p>Robert Allison robert.allison@lakedistrict.gov.uk Judith Cooke judith.cooke@lakedistrict.gov.uk</p>	
National Farmers Union	<p>Robert Morris-Eyton rmorriseyt@aol.com</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Link to Partnership website and Robert's contact details placed on NFU website. - 2 principal officers that cover West Cumbria updated that the process is happening and to forward any queries to Robert.

NuLeAF	Fred Barker fred.barker@nuleaf.org.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Written report to each NuLeAF Steering Group. - Referenced in e-bulletin. - Website has a GDF section which signposts Partnership meeting reports.
Prospect Union	Marcus Swift mjs17@sellafieldsites.com	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make the Partnership an agenda item at Sellafield Site Representatives Meetings, and either the General Purposes Committee or Branch Executive Council. - Send all appropriate papers to Prospect members in the Sellafield Limited Branch. - Collate questions, comments, points and general feedback. - Provide reports to Prospect's national SET Committee.
South Lakeland District Council	Simon Rowley s.rowley@southlakeland.gov.uk Clare Feeney-Johnson c.feeneyjohnson@southlakeland.gov.uk	Forward minutes and newsletters to Senior Management Team and Portfolio Holder.
Observing Members:		
CoRWM	Brian Clark briandclark@btinternet.com Mark Dutton lizmark@lizmark1.co.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verbal update to all plenary meetings. - Circulate key papers to Committee. - Insert in e-bulletin as appropriate.
DECC	Bruce Cairns bruce.cairns@decc.gsi.gov.uk Andrew Craze andrew.craze@decc.gsi.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to various meetings and colleagues with an interest in the process. - Advise Ministers who take Government decisions in this area.
Environment Agency	Gavin Thomson gavin.thomson@environment-agency.gov.uk	Report key points arising to various colleagues in nuclear regulation and NW region.
Isle of Man Government	Paul McKenna paul.mckenna@gov.im	Presentation on geological disposal given to Council of Ministers in 2009. Regular updates/scientific advice to Isle of Man Government.
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Alun Ellis alun.ellis@nda.gov.uk Jay Redgrove jay.redgrove@nda.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monthly reporting to RWMD and central communications staff. - Dissemination of Partnership minutes and Meeting Reports to staff.
Office for Nuclear Regulation	Mick Bacon mick.bacon@hse.gsi.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contact reports distributed after each contact (meeting or otherwise). - Regular report to related project groups. - Briefings taken before each meeting depending on agenda.
West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group	David Moore dmoore@copelandbc.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarterly verbal updates to SSG. - Paragraph in quarterly newsletter. - Link on website to Partnership site.