

# West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership



## Meeting Report

**From 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011**

At The Wave, Maryport

Document No:	222
Status:	Adopted
Title:	Meeting Report from West Cumbria MRWS Partnership, 20 September 2011
Author:	3KQ (see note overleaf)
Notes:	Published on 10 <sup>th</sup> October 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, Helen Ashley

**Contacts:** [richard@3kq.co.uk](mailto:richard@3kq.co.uk)  
[rhuari@3kq.co.uk](mailto:rhuari@3kq.co.uk)  
[helena@3kq.co.uk](mailto:helena@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](http://www.3kq.co.uk).*

*The front cover image is a view of the facilities at ANDRA (Sweden), and was supplied courtesy of ANDRA/Veronique Paul – see <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/page/108/International-experience.htm> for further information about ANDRA and other overseas facilities.*

# Executive Summary

---

**Overview.** The 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Partnership took place on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011. 37 people attended with 12 members of the public present to observe the meeting. The main objective of the meeting was to agree the Partnership's Consultation Document for use in the third round of public and stakeholder engagement (PSE3).

**Updates.** Pieces of work on both Property Value and Brand Protection are in the process of being commissioned. A Memorandum of Understanding between Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council regarding decision making is being finalised and will soon be published. A draft submission to the Department of Energy and Climate Change's consultation on its national framework for site assessment has been written on behalf of the Partnership. The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority has published its risk register and its developing approach to issues management with a view to publishing the updated issues register in late 2011. The Ministry of Defence is intending to hold a consultation as part of its Submarine Dismantling Project, starting in late October 2011.

**The Partnership's Consultation Document.** The Partnership reviewed the entire Consultation Document (Draft 5) as a group. Updates were given on changes that had been made as a result of feedback from reviews by a lawyer and the Plain English Campaign, and from the pilot session that had been held with members of the public. Members of the Partnership were able to raise comments for discussion in the meeting and comments for noting by the drafter. All changes that were discussed and agreed were noted and a revised draft will be circulated around the Partnership. The Partnership agreed that Chapter 10 on the siting process in Stage 4 of the MRWS process required further discussions between the decision making bodies and Cumbria Association of Local Councils, particularly on the issue of voluntarism. It was agreed that the Technical Review Group should meet to discuss the draft. The Steering Group will then input further so that another draft can be reviewed at the Partnership's next meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011. The chapter, subject to time constraints, will be put through as many additional checks as possible as per the rest of the Consultation Document.

**Postponement of PSE3.** The Programme Manager outlined the likely subsequent delay to the start of the Partnership's consultation in PSE3. It will now not be able to start until late November at the earliest and there was some discussion about whether the Partnership should avoid a launch at this time of year or wait until January 2012. Although some Partnership members were not keen for such a delay, all agreed that it was best not to rush signing off Chapter 10. The PSE Sub-Group will consider the options for the timing of PSE3 and make a recommendation to the Steering Group for it to consider at its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2011. The 3<sup>rd</sup> November Partnership meeting will review Chapter 10, all other consultation materials, and the planned activities for PSE3.

For future meeting dates and more information please see the Partnership's website [www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk](http://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 two of the criteria in the Work Programme are met:
  - Community Benefits and Impacts (Criterion 3).
  - Siting (Criterion 5).
- Agree the Partnership's consultation documents for use in the third round of public and stakeholder engagement (PSE3).

The full agenda is in Appendix 1.

## 1.2 – Attendance

37 participants<sup>1</sup> attended at The Wave, Maryport on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011. A full list of those in attendance is in Appendix 2. The meeting was open for the public to observe and 12 members of the public attended.

# 2. Updates

---

## 2.1 – Property valuation protection

A short briefing has been commissioned from Galson Sciences, in response to concerns raised about understanding how property impacts could be handled. This will be available in early October.

## 2.2 – Memorandum of Understanding

A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council (the principal authorities) regarding decision making is being finalised and will soon be published.

The Cumbria Association of Local Councils (CALC) requested that the principal authorities further expand on the discussion which is being held with the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) on this topic and was referenced in a Cumbria County Council (CCC) report to its Cabinet. CCC clarified that it has requested clarification from DECC over exactly what the right of withdrawal during this current stage of the managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) process means.

Clarification was also sought by CALC as to what stage(s) the draft MoU applies to. It was clarified that the current MoU between the principal authorities only

---

<sup>1</sup> Plus 6 from the facilitation team and secretariat.

applies to the current stage, i.e. Stage 3 of the process. Once it has been finalised it will be shared with the rest of the Partnership.

### **2.3 – Documents published**

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

[http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/all\\_documents.asp](http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/all_documents.asp).

- 221. Letter to DECC Regarding Acceleration
- 219. Briefing Note on Environmental Assessments in Stage 4, by the NDA
- 217. Further Information on Research & Development, by the NDA
- 216. PSE Sub-Group Meeting Notes 27 July 2011
- 215. Partnership Meeting Report 29 July 2011

### **2.4 – DECC consultation on its national framework for site assessment**

A draft submission to this consultation on behalf of the Partnership has been sent out for comment and Partnership members were reminded to submit any further comments before the end of the week. It was noted that all comments to date had been supportive with no changes suggested.

### **2.5 – Exhibition stands**

The Partnership is continuing to hold exhibitions in town centres and events across West Cumbria ahead of PSE3. Partnership members were encouraged to help with the staffing.

### **2.6 – Consultation materials for young people**

Sections of the consultation document are being developed into materials which are suitable for schools and youth groups to use in classes, off-curriculum sessions and informal get-togethers. Connexions are again helping deliver these sessions for the Partnership.

### **2.7 – Opinion survey expert reviewers appointed**

Dr Sandy Ochojna and Professor Patrick Sturgis have been appointed as expert reviewers of the opinion survey, and have begun their work to review the broad methodological approach to the survey.

### **2.8 – Community events**

A series of dates and venues had been booked for the community drop-in events in PSE3. These will now be revised as a result of the postponement to the start of PSE3.

### **2.9 – NDA: Issues Management**

The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) has published an update on its developing approach to issues management. The approach builds on the aspects of issues management that the NDA shared with the Partnership previously. The report also includes an appendix that shows the issues currently on the issues register and how they are being grouped. This includes those issues from the Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates Issues Register (see Document f in the external documents section of the Partnership's website at <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/documents.asp>).

The NDA is working towards publication of the updated issues register before the next Geological Disposal Implementation Board meeting in late 2011. In advance of this, the NDA welcomes feedback on the content of the report, is available for download on the NDA website at:

<http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonsport/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=47986>.

The NDA has also published its risk register, which sets out those factors that could impact on its mission to deliver a geological disposal facility for higher activity radioactive waste. Please see:

<http://www.nda.gov.uk/stakeholders/newsletter/>

If you would like any more information please contact Dr Elizabeth Atherton at the NDA.

### **2.10 – MoD consultation on Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP)**

DECC gave an update that the Ministry of Defence is planning to hold a consultation as part of its Submarine Dismantling Project (previously known as the ISOLUS project) around the same time as the Partnership's consultation. The consultation will be about where nuclear-powered submarines will be dismantled and what will be done for interim storage of the intermediate level radioactive waste. The MoD consultation is currently expected to be out in late October with two national stakeholder events being held, one in England and one in Scotland, and DECC believes that the Partnership will be invited to one of these.

A request was made by the Partnership for DECC to ensure that the MoD is sensitive about the implications of its consultation for discussions about the potential siting of a geological disposal facility (GDF). It was reported that the MoD should soon be in a position to share its engagement plan with the Partnership.

### **2.11 – Brand protection work**

Cumbria Tourism and Cumbria Chamber of Commerce updated the Partnership on the progress made on commissioning the work that will look at Cumbria's brand in the eyes of visitors and consumers, including establishing a baseline and then coming up with a strategy for protecting this. Interviews will be held on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011, after which it is hoped that an appointment will be made in order for the project to be completed by mid-December 2011.

### **2.12 – Filming of the Partnership meeting**

The Partnership was reminded that a film crew from Border News, and a crew from Fluid Productions, who are seeking footage for the DVD that will be used in PSE3, would be attending part of the meeting.

### **2.13 – Actions from the previous Partnership meeting**

Action 2 (Discuss how communities beyond West Cumbria might be included in the definition of wider community). The first two references to West Cumbria (in Principles 1 and 2) in the Partnership's Community Benefit Principles were removed before the Principles were sent to DECC as they were considered to be artificial boundaries concerning timescales.

Action 3 (Consider the suggestion for the Government to consider wider opportunities for West Cumbria in relation to community benefits). This was picked up in DECC's response to the Partnership's Community Benefit Principles where DECC said they would need flexibility so that the widest possible opportunities could be gained.

## 3. Consultation Document

---

### 3.1 – Background and description of process

The Partnership meetings on 24<sup>th</sup> May, 23<sup>rd</sup> June and 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011 (see the meeting reports, Documents 176, 198 and 215) were assessment meetings at which the Partnership made preliminary assessments against all of the criteria in its Work Programme (Document 13.1). The primary objectives of the meeting today were to consider the outstanding issues against Criterion 5, the Siting Process, and to review the whole Consultation Document with a view to signing it off for use in PSE3.

Draft 5 of the Consultation Document, and a revised version of Chapter 10 on the Siting Process, were circulated in advance of the meeting.

It was noted that all of the Consultation Document had undergone a legal review and that all of the Consultation Document, apart from Chapter 10, had been checked by the Plain English Campaign and been piloted with a group made up of previous members of the Residents' Panel and other members of the public. The purpose of this pilot session was to obtain feedback on design, structure, readability etc.

The Programme Manager gave an overview of the broad changes that had already been made to Draft 5 as a result of this input. It was also noted that amendments had already been incorporated in Draft 5 from comments made by Partnership members on the previous draft that was circulated to them for comment earlier in September. Any substantive suggestions for amendments that needed agreement from the Partnership were discussed at the relevant point during the rest of the discussions as the Partnership worked through the document.

There was a reminder that the Consultation Document is a collective statement from the Partnership, and that it represents an enormous amount of work that has been carried out to get it to this stage. Partnership members were therefore encouraged to make positive suggestions for change at this stage in the process. As it would not be possible, or desirable, to cover all comments during the Partnership meeting, it was suggested that any feedback should be divided into points that need to be discussed in the meeting, and minor points for consideration by the Consultation Document writer (the 'drafter').

Partnership members were given some time to discuss and make a note of any comments they had on the document within their own organisational groups. Comments were then grouped by chapter and separated into comments for discussion in the meeting and minor comments for consideration by the drafter. The facilitator then led the whole Partnership through each of the points for discussion.

A summary of the discussions, and the way forward that was agreed on suggested changes for each chapter, are recorded below under the relevant chapter headings.

Specific wording changes that were agreed during the meeting will be reflected in the Consultation Document and are not recorded here.

It was noted that changes made to the Draft 5 of the Consultation Document will be circulated around the Partnership, and will also be reflected in the fully revised draft that will be considered at the next Partnership meeting for final sign off.

### **3.2– Chapter 1: About this consultation**

The Partnership had no substantive discussion about any changes to be made to this chapter.

### **3.3– Chapter 2: Using this consultation document**

The Partnership had no substantive discussion about any changes to be made to this chapter.

### **3.4 – Chapter 3: Background and information**

#### **3.4.1 – 2029 Aspiration**

There was some discussion about how the NDA's work in response to the Minister's aspiration to bring forward the GDF opening date to 2029 might affect PSE3. It was agreed that it did not affect the content of the Consultation Document apart from being acknowledged in section 3.1 (*What are the timescales for the Government's MRWS process?*). However, if the consultation period were to be delayed it would be important to check that this paragraph was still accurate at the time of going to press. The NDA has been asked to assess whether 2029 might be possible and clarified that it is currently scheduled to present a progress report to DECC's Geological Disposal Implementation Board on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2011. At this time that work will enter the public domain but the NDA is not expecting there to be sufficient progress to be able to change the 2040 assumption at this stage.

#### **3.4.2 – What are other countries doing?**

The Programme Manager informed the Partnership that the pilot work had resulted in requests being made to:

- a) DECC for a draft paragraph on Scottish Government Policy to be inserted in section 3.2 of the Consultation Document.
- b) DECC and the NDA for clarification over whether any other country has firmly decided on an option other than geological disposal.

These actions satisfied very similar comments made by members of the Partnership. The responses to these questions will be included in the next draft.

#### **3.4.3 – Ethics**

The Programme Manager reported that the feedback from the pilot group had resulted in a suggested redraft of the ethics section in order to stress why radioactive waste is considered an ethical issue, and why Professor Andy Blowers was asked to input into the work of the Partnership. The suggested text was agreed by the Partnership.

#### **3.4.4 – Continuation of the process**

There was some discussion by the Partnership about the nature of a decision to participate (DtP) and that the Consultation Document needs to show that, if taken, this would be a positive decision to participate further, rather than an absence of withdrawing from the process. The Programme Manager took an action to redraft the first bullet of the section *What happens if West Cumbria wants to pull out of the process?* in order to reflect this.

### **3.5 – Chapter 4: Geology**

#### **3.5.1 – Underground footprint**

The Programme Manager fed back to the Partnership that the pilot exercise had highlighted that it may be useful to give a more accurate possible maximum underground footprint for the repository (currently quoted in the Consultation Document as a range from 6km<sup>2</sup> to 25km<sup>2</sup>). The NDA acknowledged that it is a wide range but advised that it is not possible to narrow it down at this stage due to the wide range of assumptions that this calculation is based upon.

#### **3.5.2 – Areas that are ruled out**

Feedback was also received from the pilot that the reasons why areas have been ruled out by the British Geological Survey study require further clarification. The Partnership agreed that section 4.3 should be amended to make specific reference to the criteria in the White Paper.

### **3.6 – Chapter 5: Safety, security, environment and planning**

#### **3.6.1 – Critical review by Professor Hazeldine**

The Programme Manager informed the Partnership that the pilot group had suggested that the inclusion of a summary of Professor Hazeldine's views in the main body of the Consultation Document would help the reader understand the section in 5.3 on *How we developed our initial conclusions on the NDA's Research and Development programme*. The Partnership agreed to the inclusion of the proposed wording.

### **3.7 – Chapter 6: Impacts and benefits of a repository in West Cumbria**

#### **3.7.1 – Brand protection**

The Programme Manager informed the Partnership that the pilot group had suggested the Consultation Document should make it clear that the piece of work commissioned to develop a potential marketing strategy to offset any negative reputational impacts of the siting process applied to the *whole* of Cumbria. The Partnership agreed with the suggested redrafting of the relevant paragraph in section 6.3 of the Consultation Document. There then followed a short discussion about this piece of work and it was confirmed that it will be looking at tourism and food production, and the perceptions of these. The Partnership agreed that whenever this piece of work is referred to, the full scope of the work should be detailed.

### **3.7.2 – What if there is no GDF?**

The Programme Manager fed back a concern from the pilot group that there is no mention in this chapter of what will happen if there is no GDF and what this would mean for the waste currently held at Sellafield. The Partnership agreed that the Consultation Document should be amended to address this concern with wording agreed for inclusion in section 6.1.

### **3.7.3 – Rural and urban economies**

The Partnership spent some time debating whether or not the section on *uncertainties and recommendations for future work* should specifically highlight the rural economy. It was suggested that the distinction had previously been made as the Partnership felt that the urban economy was covered by existing plans and visions already in place however, in West Cumbria, further consideration needed to be given to the rural economy. It was pointed out, however, that it can be hard to make the distinction between urban and rural areas. The Partnership agreed that the section on *uncertainties and recommendations for future work* should be redrafted under one heading of *Future economic development* including reference to:

- The Partnership's expectation of some differentiation between the impacts on rural and urban economies.
- The difficulty of distinguishing between the rural and urban economies as, in reality, they are intertwined.
- Nonetheless, the Partnership's sense is that there is a particular need to look at rural communities and the impact on them.

The Partnership also agreed that any references to the economy within this chapter should refer to the 'rural and urban economy' in order to ensure that both were being considered.

## **3.8 – Chapter 7: A community benefits package**

### **3.8.1 – Questions around community benefits**

The Programme Manager fed back that the pilot group commented that the document does not seem to acknowledge that some of the key questions on benefits are not answered for example, when will precise benefits be decided? The Programme Manager suggested adding a sentence at the end of this chapter that acknowledges this, and that explains that this detail will only be sought if the next stage of the process takes place and discussions continue. The Partnership agreed to the inclusion of the proposed wording.

## **3.9 – Chapter 8: Design and engineering**

The Partnership had no substantive discussion about any changes to be made to this chapter.

## **3.10 – Chapter 9: Inventory: What might be sent for geological disposal?**

### **3.10.1 – Significant changes to the inventory**

The Partnership discussed some concerns as to what constitutes 'significant' and considered removing the word. There was a reminder that the current wording reflects the wording used in the Partnership's Inventory Principles which have been discussed with DECC. DECC reminded the Partnership that the inventory is not perfect and is likely to still include estimates at a time when/if it is agreed to go ahead with a repository. The Government would not want the wording to create a requirement for discussion every time there was a slight change in e.g. volume, but would suggest agreeing thresholds which, if likely to be breached, would require further discussions. DECC also noted that they would consider waste from new build programmes to be a significant change to the inventory. The Partnership agreed to illustrate in the text what they might see as significant changes.

### **3.11 – Chapter 10: The process for siting a repository**

#### **3.11.1 – Background and description of process**

The Programme Manager explained that the circulated draft of this chapter is still a work in progress and, as such, has not been through the legal, Plain English Campaign and public piloting checks that the other chapters have been subject to.

CALC acknowledged that good progress had been made but that the Partnership is still lacking full agreement about what voluntarism would mean in Stage 4 of the process. In addition, the chapter needs a thorough review for inconsistencies between the sections authored by different people.

#### **3.11.2 – Discussion of process options for today**

The Partnership discussed the possible options for taking this chapter forward which were to:

- Continue to discuss the chapter in the full Partnership meeting.
- Ask the Technical Review Group (TRG) to do further work on the chapter in order for the Partnership to discuss and sign off on the draft at its next meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011.
- Work on the chapter with a view to the Steering Group signing it off at their meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

The Partnership agreed that it would not be sensible for the entire Partnership to try to draft the chapter together due to the 'work in progress' state of the text. The Programme Manager explained that if the Consultation Document, including Chapter 10, is not signed off until the Partnership's meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> November this would result in a postponement in the programme of approximately 6 weeks i.e. PSE3 would start in late November/early December. With the standard 12 weeks consultation period, plus two weeks to allow for the Christmas period, this would mean that the consultation would end mid-March. The value of delaying the start of the consultation until after Christmas was raised for consideration.

It was agreed that the chapter should come to a full Partnership meeting for sign off, and in the meantime, the PSE Sub-Group will consider the options for the timing of PSE3.

### **3.11.3 – Chapter 10 way forward**

The TRG and the Programme Manager discussed the options over lunch and came back to the Partnership with the following suggested process for progression of Chapter 10 of the Consultation Document.

It was agreed that the Partnership should not fall into the trap of trying to rush the Consultation Document and that the TRG should meet in the following week to go through Chapter 10 with the aim of resolving as many issues as possible, including removing any inconsistencies and highlighting where there are still issues to be addressed. This will then be passed to the Steering Group for discussion at their meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2011. The chapter, subject to time constraints, will then be put through as many additional checks as possible as per the rest of the Consultation Document before being reviewed by the full Partnership at its meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November with a view to signing off the entire Consultation Document.

The Partnership agreed that this was the best way forward but CALC raised a concern that, as the Steering Group consists only of representatives of the three principal authorities and CALC, there are many members of the Partnership who are unaware of the areas of disagreement. Other members of the Partnership reassured CALC that they are interested but have confidence that the relevant parties will work through the differences. All Partnership members were encouraged to consider how their sector might fit into the siting process.

### **3.12 – Chapter 11: Next steps**

The Partnership had no substantive discussion about any changes to be made to this chapter.

### **3.13 – Appendices**

#### **3.13.1 – Appendix 1**

The Programme Manager fed back that this appendix will be formatted differently to ensure that people do not think this is where they should provide their answers to the consultation questions. It was agreed that this was key to ensuring people do not feel limited in how much they may wish to respond.

It was agreed that question 8 should be reworded in order to try to elicit responses about the reasons for people's views rather than simply garnering support or opposition to a possible DtP.

#### **3.13.2 – Appendix 2**

It was agreed that:

- A definition of Major Infrastructure Planning Unit (MIPU) be included in the glossary.

- The definition of voluntarism could be improved and should also be reviewed once the discussions on Chapter 10 are completed.

### **3.14 – General**

#### **3.14.1 – Use of the word repository**

The Programme Manager informed the Partnership that the Consultation Document will not be able to gain the Plain English Campaign Crystal Mark due to a number of their suggested changes being rejected. For example, one of the changes suggested by the Plain English Campaign was to swap the word 'repository' for the word 'store'. The NDA also raised concerns about the use of repository, as it could be misleading, and advised that they would prefer that GDF be used. The Partnership had a discussion on the wording that should be used to ensure that the public fully understand the nature of the facility that is proposed. This included the language which is used in other countries ('final repository'), recaps of discussions from PSE1 and PSE2 about the use of too many acronyms (including GDF), and the pros and cons of being consistent in the use of language from PSE1 and PSE2. The Partnership agreed that it would carry on using the term repository, but also agreed to review how it is introduced and defined in the Consultation Document to address the NDA's concerns.

#### **3.14.2 – Use of the word conclusions**

The Programme Manager explained that the legal review of the Consultation Document has led to all reference to the Partnership's 'initial conclusions' being changed to the 'Partnership's initial opinions'. This is due to concerns that the use of the word 'conclusions' could lead to an assumption that the Partnership is the decision making body, which is not the case.

## 4. Way Forward and Actions

---

### 4.1 – Overview document

The Partnership's Communications Advisor reminded the Partnership that the eight page overview document is intended as a summary of the Consultation Document and will be sent to all households in West Cumbria, libraries, doctors' surgeries etc., and will also be included in the full Consultation Pack. Comments on the draft were requested.

In light of the delay to signing off the Consultation Document, it was agreed that a further draft of the overview document would be signed off at the next Partnership meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011.

### 4.2 – PSE3 activity

The proposed activities and associated dates in PSE3 will be discussed at the next Partnership meeting, including whether or not the consultation should be started during December.

### 4.3 – Consultation Document

The Programme manager confirmed that, as previously, a revised version of the Consultation Document, together with a document detailing all further changes that are made to it, will be circulated around the Partnership in advance of the 3<sup>rd</sup> November Partnership meeting so that members will only have to read one further draft of the document.

### 4.4 – Any other business

A request was made to see if it would be possible to bring the 3<sup>rd</sup> November Partnership meeting forward. It was agreed that it was unlikely that a new date could be found at such short notice and Partnership members should keep the 3<sup>rd</sup> November in their diaries until informed otherwise.

### 4.5 – Dates

The forward programme of confirmed meeting dates is provided below. 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:
10 October	3 November (Egremont Market Hall)
24 November	8 December (Copeland Centre, Whitehaven)

2012 dates:	2012 dates:
11 January	31 January ( <i>Braithwaite Village Hall</i> )
7 February	21 February ( <i>The Oval Centre, Salterbeck</i> )

**4.6 – Actions.** The following actions were agreed:

	Action	Who	By when
1	Incorporate all drafting changes discussed in this meeting into the Consultation Document	Rhuari and Jane	23rd Sept
2	Draft paragraph on Scottish Government Policy to be inserted in section 3.2 of the Consultation Document	Bruce and John (DECC)	23rd Sept
3	Clarify whether any other country has firmly decided on an option other than geological disposal	DECC & NDA	23rd Sept
4	Meet to discuss Chapter 10	TRG	28 <sup>th</sup> September
5	Discuss Chapter 10	Steering Group	10th October
6	Send any comments on the 8 page overview document to Paul	All Partnership members	23 <sup>rd</sup> September
7	Circulate a revised draft of the overview document to the Partnership	Paul	3 <sup>rd</sup> November
8	Review possibility of moving 3 <sup>rd</sup> November Partnership meeting forward	Programme Manager	23rd Sept
9	Circulate draft meeting report to Partnership attendees.	Helen A	28 <sup>th</sup> September
10	Comment on draft meeting report.	All attendees	5 <sup>th</sup> October
11	Circulate final draft of meeting report and publish on website.	Helen A	12 <sup>th</sup> October

## 5. Public Questions/Comments

---

### 5.1 – Delay of PSE3 programme as a result of further deliberation on Chapter 10: Siting

A comment was made to endorse delaying the sign off of the Consultation Document in order to allow sufficient time to iron out the issues between the principal authorities and CALC in the drafting of Chapter 10 on siting: it was noted that finding agreement on these issues is crucial to the MRWS process and therefore should not be rushed.

### 5.2 – Materials at Community Events

The Partnership was asked if other organisations would be allowed to bring materials along to the community events.

#### Partnership response

There was a reminder that this had been allowed at the community events last year with appropriate labelling of the materials. The PSE Sub-Group will consider this issue and respond shortly.

### 5.3 – Concerns about the lack of media profile for the Partnership's work

A member of the public noted that, despite the Partnership's work being of international interest, both in terms of what is being discussed and the actual process for the discussions being used, the media do not appear to believe that the Partnership is at an important enough stage to warrant headline articles. This means that it is hard for a newcomer to learn about the work of the Partnership as the website has over 200 documents on it. The member of the public felt that the Partnership should be doing more to get better media coverage.

#### Partnership response

Osprey Communications, the Partnership's Communications Advisors, agreed that it is difficult to get the media interested in covering the work of the Partnership, as they see the process as happening over a long period of time and there is a lack of 'hooks' and visuals for a story. Osprey feels that there has been a reasonable amount of coverage but acknowledges that everyone would like it to be improved. It is hoped that the consultation will be a 'hook' for the media and it was noted that Osprey will be doing a lot of work around this, however, they expect it to remain a challenge for the Partnership. They added that any ideas of how to improve the media coverage are welcome.

### 5.4 – Suggestions for inclusion in the Consultation Document

A number of suggestions for wording changes to the Consultation Document were made and noted by the drafter for consideration.

A concern was also raised that Chapter 7 on community benefits does not reference how the benefits might be distributed between different parts of the community, especially what special consideration might go to the host community.

#### Partnership response

The Partnership feels that its 9<sup>th</sup> Community Benefit Principle on Distribution covers this sufficiently at this stage. It was noted that it is important that Chapter

10 of the Consultation Document makes it clear that Stage 4 is not only about the siting process but also about the community benefits process and who should be involved in those discussions. It was also noted that the Partnership is aware of what happened in Sweden with regard to the division of the community benefits package.

#### **5.5 – Partnership documents on the website**

A request was made for the list of documents organised by document number rather than by subject to be made more prominent on the Partnership's website as it is very hard to find since the website update.

It was agreed that this will be addressed.

#### **5.6 – Confusion over the 8 page supporting document**

A comment was made that as the 8 page and the Consultation Document have very different titles it might be hard for people to realise that the two are related.

Osprey Communications will look at this issue.

#### **5.7 – Consultation fatigue**

A request was made for the Partnership to ensure that the new timetable for PSE3 does not clash with other major consultations on similar subject matter, in order to help avoid consultation fatigue.

#### **Partnership response**

The Programme Manager and DECC will co-ordinate with other engagement processes to avoid this happening where possible.

#### **5.8 – Latest documents inclusion in the Consultation Document**

The Partnership was asked if the latest document provided by David Smythe would be addressed in the Consultation Document.

#### **Partnership response**

The Programme Manager confirmed that he had received the document on the 16<sup>th</sup> September but had not yet had an opportunity to circulate it around the Partnership. This raised the issue of how documents which have been received by the Partnership after the Consultation Document has been written will be included in the process. It was noted that, throughout the consultation period, any new materials will be circulated around the Partnership, and that they will be considered alongside other inputs at the end of PSE3. It was also noted that, whilst there does need to be a cut-off point for new material to be considered for inclusion in the Consultation Document, in the light of the delay to the start of PSE3 consideration would be given to whether and how any substantive new information should be reflected.

## 6. 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
ISOLUS	Interim Storage of Laid-Up Submarines
LDNPA	Lake District National Park Authority
LGA	Local Government Association
LLW	Low Level Waste
LLWR	Low Level Waste Repository
MIPU	Major Infrastructure Planning Unit
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
SDP	Submarine Dismantling Project
SLC	Site Licence Company
ToRs	Terms of Reference
TRG	Technical Review Group
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 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011 meeting

---

**Objectives** of the meeting are to:

1. Form a collective view regarding the degree to which two of the criteria in the Work Programme are met:
  - Community Benefits and Impacts (Criterion 3).
  - Siting (Criterion 5).
2. Agree the Partnership's consultation documents for use in PSE3.

Time	Item	Agenda Notes
09.00	Arrivals / Registration	
09.30	Welcome Agenda setting Updates and actions	Richard Harris, 3KQ
	<b>Consultation Document</b>	Discuss and sign off the Consultation Document and overview document, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community benefits conclusions.</li> <li>- siting process.</li> </ul>
	<b>Public questions</b>	
12.30	Lunch	approx. timing
	<b>Consultation Document (cont...)</b>	...continued
	<b>Overview document</b>	Discuss and sign off 8 page overview.
	<b>PSE3 activity</b>	Reminder of activity planned in PSE3.
	<b>Way forward and actions</b>	
	<b>Public Questions</b>	
16.00	Close	

## Appendix 2 – Attendees on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011

---

Richard Griffin	Allerdale Borough Council (Steering Group member)
Michael Heaslip	Allerdale Borough Council
Charles Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council
Alan Smith	Allerdale Borough Council (Steering Group member)
Guy Richardson	CALC
Geoff Smith	Allerdale CALC
Keith Hitchen	Copeland CALC (Steering Group member)
Peter Mason	Carlisle City Council
Revd Dr Lindsay Gray	Churches Together in Cumbria
Yvonne Clarkson	Copeland Borough Council
Ian Curwen	Copeland Borough Council
John Kane	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)
Rob Johnston	Cumbria Chamber of Commerce
Paul Feehily	Cumbria County Council
Gerald Humes	Cumbria County Council
Stewart Kemp	Cumbria County Council (Steering Group member)
Tim Knowles	Cumbria County Council (Steering Group member)
Richard Greenwood	Cumbria Tourism
Peter Kane	GMB/Unite Unions (Steering Group member)
Robert Allison	Lake District National Park Authority
Fred Barker	NuLeAF
Ian McPherson	South Lakeland District Council
Simon Rowley	South Lakeland District Council

### **Observing Members**

Bruce Cairns	DECC
John Dalton	DECC
Brian Clark	CoRWM
Mark Dutton	CoRWM
Gavin Thomson	Environment Agency
Alun Ellis	NDA RWMD
Jay Redgrove	NDA RWMD
Mick Bacon	ONR

### **Apologies**

Harry Dyke	Allerdale Borough Council
Carni McCarron-Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council
Tim Heslop	Allerdale Borough Council
Chris Shaw	Allerdale/Copeland CALC (Steering Group member)
Tony Markley	Cumbria County Council
David Southward	Cumbria County Council
Paul McKenna	Isle of Man Government
Robert Morris-Eyton	National Farmers Union
Marcus Swift	Prospect Union

**Facilitators, Secretariat and Presenters**

Rhuari Bennett	3KQ (Programme Manager)
Richard Harris	3KQ (Facilitator)
Helen Ashley	3KQ (Report Writer)
Cath Little	Copeland Borough Council (Secretariat)

**Other**

Paul Gardner	Osprey Communications (Communications Adviser)
Ian Boydon	Osprey Communications
Jane Dalton	3KQ (Consultation Document Writer)
Jenny Willis	3KQ

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

Peter Bales	
Ruth Balogh	
Hetty Baron	
Michael Baron	
Andrea Clarkson	
Patricia Howell	
Jean McSorley	
Maggie Potts	
David Wood	
John Rennilson	CoRWM
Helen Clark	NDA RWMD
John Tier	Unite

**Other Members Not in Attendance**

Ken Williams	Barrow Borough Council
Mike Tonkin	Eden District Council
David Moore	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group

## Appendix 3 – 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) <a href="mailto:alan.smith@allderale.gov.uk">alan.smith@allderale.gov.uk</a> Tim Heslop (councillor) <a href="mailto:tim.heslop@allderale.gov.uk">tim.heslop@allderale.gov.uk</a> Carni McCarron-Holmes (councillor) <a href="mailto:carni.mccarron-holmes@allderale.gov.uk">carni.mccarron-holmes@allderale.gov.uk</a> Michael Heaslip (councillor) <a href="mailto:michael.heaslip@allderale.gov.uk">michael.heaslip@allderale.gov.uk</a> Charles Holmes <a href="mailto:charles.holmes@allderale.gov.uk">charles.holmes@allderale.gov.uk</a> Richard Griffin <a href="mailto:richard.griffin@allderale.gov.uk">richard.griffin@allderale.gov.uk</a>	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) <a href="mailto:kenwilliams@barrowbc.gov.uk">kenwilliams@barrowbc.gov.uk</a> Phil Huck <a href="mailto:philhuck@barrowbc.gov.uk">philhuck@barrowbc.gov.uk</a>	Verbal update given to Leader after each Partnership meeting.
CALC (Allerdale)	Chris Shaw <a href="mailto:chris.shaw@calc.org.uk">chris.shaw@calc.org.uk</a> Geoff Smith (councillor) <a href="mailto:geoffandhelen@tesco.net">geoffandhelen@tesco.net</a>	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Allerdale Association meetings.
CALC (Copeland)	Chris Shaw <a href="mailto:chris.shaw@calc.org.uk">chris.shaw@calc.org.uk</a> Keith Hitchen (councillor) <a href="mailto:keith.hitchen@btinternet.com">keith.hitchen@btinternet.com</a>	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Copeland Association meetings.
CALC (Cumbria)	Guy Richardson <a href="mailto:guy.richardson@calc.org.uk">guy.richardson@calc.org.uk</a>	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Executive Committee meetings.
Carlisle City Council	Jason Gooding <a href="mailto:jasong@carlisle.gov.uk">jasong@carlisle.gov.uk</a>	
Chamber of Commerce (Cumbria)	Robert Johnston <a href="mailto:rob@cumbriachamber.co.uk">rob@cumbriachamber.co.uk</a>	
Churches Together in Cumbria (CTiC)	Revd Dr Lindsay Gray <a href="mailto:lgray782@btinternet.com">lgray782@btinternet.com</a>	

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

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