

# West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership



## Meeting Report

**From 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

At Braithwaite Memorial Hall, near Keswick

Document No:	298
Status:	Adopted
Title:	West Cumbria MRWS Partnership Meeting Report, 25 June 2012
Author:	3KQ (see note overleaf)
Notes:	Published on 11 July 2012

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

# Executive Summary

---

**Overview.** The 24<sup>th</sup> meeting of the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Partnership took place on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012. The main objectives of the meeting were to: agree the PSE3 Report for publication; and to review the draft Partnership's Final Report and agree amendments.

**Updates.** The Ipsos MORI opinion survey report will be published shortly following the completion of additional analysis on whether views differ if people live in rural or urban areas, and within/outside of the National Park. The source data will also be published.

**PSE3 Report.** The Partnership signed off the report from its third round of Public and Stakeholder Engagement (PSE3). The report includes a summary of the submissions to the Partnership's consultation, which was held between November 2011 and March 2012, and the Partnership's responses to the issues raised. An interim version will be published shortly with a note explaining that the only subsequent amendments will be the addition of references to the Partnership's Final Report once it has been finalised and published.

**The Partnership's Final Report.** The Partnership considered its Final Report to Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council. Discussions focused on the outcomes of actions commissioned as a result of the issues raised in the consultation, draft revisions to the Partnership's initial opinions and the content of the report under the key topics of the Partnership's work programme. The meeting focused primarily on:

- Overarching issues, including steps that are being explored with the Department of Energy and Climate Change to put key aspects of the MRWS process onto a statutory basis, and concerns that had been raised about whether the process that has been adopted by the UK Government meets international guidance.
- Geology, including an update on the meeting with the Geological Society of London, and the options for carrying out earlier geological screening to reduce uncertainty about the suitability of West Cumbria's geology.
- The siting process in Stages 4 and 5 of the MRWS process, including the addition of more detailed information on the role of a community siting partnership in future stages.
- Public and stakeholder views, including the extent to which the Partnership feels that there was broad support for its initial opinions, recognising that the opinions have changed in some instances.

**Next steps and way forward.** The next meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2012 is scheduled to be the last Partnership meeting. The Final Report is due to be signed off at this meeting before it is handed over to the three Councils, in advance of them making a decision about whether to enter the Government's siting process without commitment. This decision is currently due to be made by all three Councils in October 2012.

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:

1. To agree the PSE3 Report for publication
2. To review the draft Final Report and agree amendments, including:
  - Results of actions commissioned at the last Partnership meeting.
  - Chapters of the Final Report.
  - Draft final opinions.

The full agenda is in Appendix 1.

## 1.2 – Attendance

35 participants<sup>1</sup> attended at Braithwaite Memorial Hall near Keswick on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012. A full list of those in attendance is in Appendix 2. The meeting was open for the public to observe and more than 25 members of the public attended.

# 2. Updates

---

## 2.1 – Opinion survey report

The Ipsos MORI opinion survey report was due to be published shortly after the 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 Partnership meeting. There has been a slight delay in finalising the report due to the requests made at that meeting for Ipsos MORI to carry out additional analysis on whether views differ if people live in rural or urban areas, and whether they live within/outside of the National Park. The report is now due to be published very shortly.

[The final report was received and published on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012 and is available at <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/documents.asp> as Document 281, with the source data provided as Document 281.1.]

## 2.2 – Input on geology

The Partnership requested Dr Jeremy Dearlove of FWS Consultants Ltd to carry out a review of consultation submissions on geology. His response was circulated as Document 285 in advance of the meeting. Two responses to this review have since been received from Professor David Smythe and Professor Stuart Haszeldine. These will be published on the Partnership website shortly.

[The documents from Professors Smythe and Haszeldine have since been published and are available in 'Criterion 2 – Geology' and 'External Documents' at <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/documents.asp>.]

---

<sup>1</sup> Plus 5 from the facilitation team and secretariat.

## 3. PSE3 Report

---

### 3.1 – Background

At its 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 meeting, the Partnership discussed and signed off the initial Summary of Views, which provided a summary of the responses to the Partnership's consultation and listed the key issues raised under each criterion (see 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 meeting report – Document 274, Section 4). The Partnership also continued to work through the issues emerging from the consultation and considered actions and drafting suggestions for responding to the issues raised (see Document 274, Section 5).

The draft PSE3 Report which was considered at the meeting today comprises the Summary of Views, the agreed PSE3 Responses and introductory/closing chapters outlining the context to the consultation and the next steps. The aim at the meeting today was to sign off the draft PSE3 Report for publication.

Partnership members were given an opportunity to make any final comments and the discussions are summarised below.

### 3.2 – Publication

It was suggested that it might be useful to delay publishing the PSE3 Report until the Final Report has also been published, to enable the inclusion of specific references to the responses to and outcomes of some of the bigger issues that were raised in the consultation. In order to ensure that information about the Partnership's responses are in the public domain sooner than this, it was agreed that the PSE3 Report should be published as in 'interim' version with a note explaining that the only amendments will be the addition of references when the Final Report has been finalised and published.

### 3.3 – Response to Geology issue 8

Issue 8 for geology relates to suggestions from consultees that the NDA should publish criteria of what constitutes suitable geology. The Cumbria Association of Local Councils (CALC) stated that they do not feel that the Partnership response answers this question, as the White Paper and the Stage 4 Framework for Site Assessment simply say that the proposed criteria should take account of the geological setting. It was acknowledged that there is no satisfactory answer to this question at present and it was therefore agreed that the sentence relating to the Stage 4 Framework and the White Paper should be deleted.

It was also noted that the reference to the Stage 4 Framework should refer to the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) rather than the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA).

### 3.4 – Agreements and way forward

It was agreed that the PSE3 Report could be signed off for publication subject to the amendment agreed in 3.3 above. An interim version will be published shortly with a note explaining that the only subsequent amendments will be the addition of references when the Final Report has been finalised and published.

# 4. The Partnership's Final Report

---

## 4.1 – Background and overview

The remainder of the meeting focused on the Partnership's draft Final Report. The following documents were circulated in advance of the meeting and were referred to during the discussions:

- Draft Final Report
- Table of updates on actions commissioned by the Partnership (Document 291)
- Draft final opinions (Document 289)
- The NDA's responses to actions requested by the Partnership (Document 286)
- DECC's responses to actions requested by the Partnership (Document 287)
- Community Siting Partnership roles and tasks in a potential Stage 4 (Document 290)
- Letter from the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) (Document 284)
- Letter from the Environment Agency (EA) (Document 293)
- Letter from the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) regarding geology (Document 282)
- Letter from FWS Consultants Ltd (Dr Jeremy Dearlove) providing a review of consultation submissions on geology (Document 285)

There was a reminder that any drafting agreements/suggestions made at the meeting today, and all subsequent amendments made by 3KQ and the drafting group, would be incorporated into the next draft of the Final Report which will be circulated in advance of the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2012 Partnership meeting. Partnership members will therefore have the opportunity to see any revisions before the final content is signed off.

The primary focus at the meeting was on chapters 6, 8, 13 and 14, and the actions/draft final opinions for all chapters. Partnership members were asked to submit their comments on the content of the remaining chapters directly to 3KQ.

Significant areas of discussion are summarised in 4.2 to 4.7 below. Minor amendments that were suggested or agreed are not detailed in this report and will be reflected in the next draft of the Final Report.

For each chapter the discussions focused in turn on:

- General updates and updates/outcomes of the actions commissioned by the Partnership (Document 291).
- The chapter content/text.
- Consideration of the draft final opinions including any advice to the Decision Making Bodies (DMBs) (Document 289).

## 4.2 – Chapter 6 – Overarching issues

---

It was noted that this is a new chapter and the drafting group is still working on its overall structure. It was suggested that further consideration needs to be given to how the chapter fits together both in its own right and in relation to other chapters, particularly with regard to the need for more clarity about how the final opinions on overarching issues will relate to advice given to the DMBs.

### 4.2.1 – Update on actions (Document 291, actions 1-4)

#### **Action 1 – Putting MRWS on a statutory basis**

An update was given about the meeting that had taken place between Copeland BC, Allerdale BC, CALC and DECC, to discuss putting key areas of the White Paper onto a statutory basis. It was noted that there had been a good level of agreement at the meeting about the importance of doing this at an early stage.

DECC has produced a discussion paper which is in the process of being finalised, and new text for putting five key areas of the White Paper onto a firmer footing has been written. The exact mechanisms for how this would be achieved would be determined in Stage 4 in consultation with a Community Siting Partnership (CSP) if the process moves forward.

CALC advised that they welcome the move to include commitments to putting the White Paper on a firmer footing in the Final Report, as it deals with a lot of the issues that they have raised.

It was suggested that, whilst ‘statutory’ is understood to have a fairly specific meaning, there is a need for more clarity about the meaning of ‘other means’ in the draft text, and to make it clear that any commitments that are made must be binding.

DECC confirmed that this is what is intended, and advised that they are happy to review the wording to agree text that everybody will be content with.

It was also agreed that the drafting group should consider how to put a shorter end date on when this will happen, rather than it just being by the end of Stage 4.

#### **Action 2 – DMB decision making**

It was confirmed that the DMBs have agreed text that sets out how they will work together in the lead up to making a decision about participation and that this will be published on the website shortly. The main difference is that Copeland Borough Council has now confirmed that the decision about participation will be made by their Executive rather than the Full Council.

#### **Action 3 – National process, actions from DECC**

It was noted that some of the actions from DECC have not yet been incorporated into the draft Final Report and this will be completed in the next draft.

- **National geological screening** – CALC expressed dissatisfaction with DECC’s response to the issue of national geological screening (Document 287, page 3, para 1) as they do not feel that DECC’s explanation that applying

exclusion criteria to every part of the UK 'would be prohibitively expensive, time-consuming and unnecessary in a voluntarist process' addresses the issues about identifying more promising areas on a national basis.

Additionally, in a recent letter to CALC, CoRWM advised that they had experienced difficulties when they looked at the criteria for identifying more promising areas, however, these difficulties were not explained. CALC have asked CoRWM to provide a more detailed explanation but this has not yet been received. CoRWM agreed to look into this and respond as soon as possible.

- **International guidance** – The NDA responded to this action (see Document 286, pages 2-3).

CALC expressed disappointment with the NDA's response, particularly in relation to the statement that 'a process involving voluntarism followed by consideration of geological and other important factors is consistent with international guidance'. CALC noted that international guidance makes repeated references to making a selection on the basis of geological setting with account taken of other factors and, whilst there are references to voluntarism and issues of veto, they feel that the NDA's explanation/justification is 'stretching' the interpretation of the guidelines.

Churches Together in Cumbria (CTiC) agreed with these concerns and reiterated their previously stated view that it would have been better to do things the other way round or look at a larger area than "two small parts" of Cumbria.

The NDA reiterated their view that the UK's approach of seeking volunteers first then carrying out geological screening is consistent both with international guidance and with approaches adopted in other countries. They acknowledged that the guidance can be interpreted in different ways, but argued that it does not make a difference to the outcome, in that the end result should be a geologically suitable site that is accepted by a willing community.

DECC advised that the relevant paragraph in the guidelines refers to 'investigation of a large region', and not the entire country. They also emphasised that having a voluntarism-based approach does not mean that there is not a sufficiently technically-based process, rather the Government has decided to adopt a process that engages with people and asks for permission for the geological work to take place, instead of dictating where the site is going to be.

CTiC acknowledged this, but highlighted that there are major public concerns about this issue, with many people feeling that something will be designed to fit a site in this area as it is the only area that has volunteered, rather than because it is geologically suitable. They also suggested that better information is needed to help people who are not academic experts in this field understand the issues.



#### **4.2.2 – Chapter 6 text**

##### ***Advice to the DMBs***

CALC asked the drafting group to review this section. They suggested that it would be useful to set out a clearer programme for Stage 4, and reference the more detailed indicative programme for Stages 4 and 5 that are outlined in Chapter 13.

##### ***Risk***

It was suggested that this section could do more to acknowledge the complexity of the risks involved throughout the process. The current impression is that West Cumbria has to go into Stage 4 before uncertainties can be removed, with the implication being that, given time, the uncertainties will be removed whereas this is not the case. It was also suggested that the risk of spending taxpayers money to no avail should be covered.

##### ***The Government's MRWS policy and geological disposal***

CALC noted that they would like to see an expansion of what is included under this general heading to deal with issues about Government policy and international guidelines. They suggested that this could be split into two discussion points: consistency with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) guidelines with appropriate references to the geology section of the Final Report; and some comment from the Partnership on what has been heard from the NDA and DECC.

##### ***Doubts about right of withdrawal***

A discussion was held about whether it is correct to say that the Partnership does not see anything in the White Paper that makes it harder for the right of withdrawal to be exercised in Stage 4 than Stages 1-3. Some felt that this should be left out, as technically it is not true as West Cumbria has not yet “joined” the process. Others felt it is clearer if it is left in.

It was agreed that the drafting group should review the wording to make it accurate whilst ensuring that the feeling in the Partnership that it would not be particularly difficult to withdraw from the process during Stage 4, and that there are no further obstacles in the next stage than there are at the moment, is not removed.

#### **4.2.3 – Draft final opinions (Document 289, page 12)**

##### ***Statutory footing***

There was a reminder that, as outlined in 4.2.1 above, a revised final opinion has already been drafted and will be included in the next draft of the Final Report for approval at the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2012 meeting.

##### ***Acceleration of the MRWS process***

It was noted that care needs to be taken about tying any future partnership and the DMBs into commitments that cannot be delivered on, and it was suggested that ‘local agreement’ should be changed to ‘agreement of the DMBs in close liaison with the CSP(s)’.

***Audit of the NDA (and the regulators)***

The ONR and DECC noted that 'audit' has a particular legal meaning, and suggested that a different word should be used. DECC also suggested that the audit processes that already exist should be used wherever possible, however, it was noted by the Partnership that this relies on audits of the NDA/regulator being on the list of planned activities. The Partnership also emphasised that there has to be something in place to make sure that any future partnership can carry out independent scrutiny/evaluation of the regulators and the NDA.

## 4.3 – Chapter 8 – Geology

---

### 4.3.1 – Meeting with the Geological Society of London

Partnership representatives attended a meeting with the Geological Society of London on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2012. The notes from this meeting have been published as Document 292.

The primary purpose of this meeting was to see if the Society still stands by its assertion that the whole of West Cumbria cannot be ruled out on the basis of what is known about the geology at this stage. The Society confirmed that they do still stand by that view, and that nothing they have seen in the consultation submissions has changed that assertion.

The Society was also asked about their independence and funding. They confirmed that they do not receive any money from the Government and that all funding comes from member fees, publications and conferences etc. The Society confirmed that, whilst they do not carry out consultancy work themselves, they are happy to coordinate panels of experts and provide advice on who to approach to seek independent expert input.

### 4.3.2 – Updates on actions (Document 291, section 5)

The responses requested from CoRWM and Dr Jeremy Dearlove have been received and are published as Documents 282 and 285 respectively.

### 4.3.3 – Chapter content

***Overarching public and stakeholder concerns about uncertainty*** – Some felt that there is no need to include a specific comment on the dilemma about whether further geological assessments should be carried out before a decision about participation or at the start of Stage 4. Others felt it should be kept in. It was agreed that the drafting group should review this section.

### 4.3.4 – Draft final opinions (Document 289, pages 2-3)

There is general agreement in the Partnership about the need to reduce uncertainty about geology. There are, however, different views on when the work to reduce this uncertainty should be carried out, and whether the Partnership should present options for the way forward on geological assessment to the DMBs or just provide them with information about the Partnership's findings for them to make their own decision.

CALC and SLDC stated their preference for the Partnership to advise the DMBs *not* to make a formal decision about participation until a credible appraisal of West Cumbria's geology has shown that there is sufficient potential to justify proceeding.

Copeland BC, Allerdale BC and Cumbria CC disagreed with this and suggested that the Partnership should simply present their findings to the DMBs. Concerns were also expressed about tying the hands of the DMBs by presenting them with just one or two options as there may be other options that they want to consider.

It was also noted that the DMBs do understand the need to carry out initial geological assessments during the earlier part of Stage 4.

South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) noted that there are concerns about there being so many members of the DMBs on the Partnership, and suggested that the Partnership needs to be clear about where it stands on geology as a *Partnership* to avoid perceptions that the DMBs are just another version of the Partnership. They also reiterated their previously stated concerns about the potential for “increased fetters” on the right to withdraw the further the process goes down the route of investigations.

DECC reminded the Partnership that the decision is about whether to start the process where this work will take place, and noted that there is a danger of creating a new process. They also noted that the Partnership had earlier agreed that exercising the right of withdrawal would not be any harder in Stage 4 than it is now.

The NDA confirmed that they are currently looking at how geology will be handled in Stage 4, and this includes the option to assess geology first.

CALC emphasised that the work that they are talking about does not precisely match the work that would be carried out in Stage 4. They see the need for a very specific piece of work to address the issues raised by people such as Professor Smythe, and the views from the Nirex Inspector/Assessor that the prospects of finding a site in West Cumbria are poor.

Whilst CALC accept that the majority view is that not enough is known at this stage to decide one way or the other, they feel that this is not enough to balance out the views that the prospects are poor. There are also considerable public concerns about these issues, and CALC therefore do not feel it is unreasonable to ask the NDA to provide a more detailed explanation as to why the prospects are sufficiently promising in West Cumbria to justify proceeding further.

A number of suggestions were made for taking this forward including expanding the opinion to say that a range of views/concerns have been heard, listing the issues that the DMBs might want to take into account, and making it clear that the Partnership is presenting the DMBs with a range of options but it is up to them to decide.

It was acknowledged that it is unlikely that the differences in opinion can be resolved, and it was therefore agreed that the drafting group should attempt to summarise where the Partnership is collectively at and reflect the areas of disagreement, including a clear statement of both sides of the argument. The proposed revised wording will be included in the next draft of the Final Report.

## 4.4 – Chapter 13 – Stages 4 and 5 of the MRWS process

---

### 4.4.1 – Document 290 – CSP Roles and Tasks in a Possible Stage 4

In addition to the progress made with DECC regarding putting aspects of the White Paper onto a statutory basis (see 4.2.1 above), Document 290 has been developed to set out the likely roles and tasks of a CSP during Stage 4 if the process moves forward. It is intended that the content of Document 290 will be incorporated into Chapter 13.

CALC stated that they are happy with the content of Document 290 as a whole, although some overlap with other existing text was noted.

It was agreed that further information about the roles and tasks of the DMBs should be added to the document to aid the reader's understanding of the role of a CSP. It was also confirmed that, as per the White Paper, the assumption is that the NDA would be a member of any CSP(s), but would not be involved in local decision making.

A discussion was held about whether the word 'should' imposes a particular course of action on a CSP. Whilst some felt that it would be more appropriate to change this to 'could', others felt that this would water down the views and opinions of the Partnership. It was also noted that the Partnership is *advising* the DMBs and they can choose to accept or ignore this advice.

### 4.4.2 – Updates on actions (Document 291, section 6)

**Evaluation** – Wood Holmes confirmed that they have given a verbal update on early evaluation outputs to the Steering Group and they will put this into writing shortly.

**Legal view on how a DMB should balance the 'public interest' and a minority community interest** – In relation to this action CALC also made reference to the text in Chapter 13 regarding '*Weight given to local communities*'.

CALC noted that, if it is not legal for a DMB to delegate the decision about a right of withdrawal, one might assume that it cannot be legal for the Government to do so on a national basis. CALC further noted that, as the Government has decided proactively to work through a principle of voluntarism at a national level, this should mean that it can also be done at a local level. CALC suggested that further legal advice should be sought on this issue.

Cumbria County Council stated that the DMBs have essentially accepted the framework that the Government set out in the White Paper. They have proceeded on the basis that the County Council and other relevant local authorities would be the DMBs in this process, and would therefore be the bodies that can exercise the right of withdrawal. They reiterated that legal advice has confirmed this.

CALC acknowledged that the DMBs might not want to pursue this issue but suggested that the Partnership should properly investigate whether adopting a policy that would only proceed with those communities who are willing to proceed

would be legal. They also reiterated that this issue was raised during PSE3 by a number of parish councils and other communities that have concerns about their ability to opt out of the process.

DECC acknowledged that they do not have all the answers on the legal views, but stated that Government policy is set out in the White Paper and if they were to do anything different to that it would be challenged legally. They reiterated that the White Paper sets out that DMBs will make the decisions with advice from the CSP(s), including that the right of withdrawal would be exercised by the DMBs. They also reiterated that the Government will not site a GDF in a community that has not volunteered or that has withdrawn from the process.

It was suggested that CALC and DECC should discuss this issue to see if there are any useful/succinct questions that DECC can answer.

#### **4.4.3 – Chapter 13 content**

##### ***Summary of the Government's proposals for Stage 4***

- ***Stage 4a – Identifying potential sites***

The NDA suggested that this should be amended to include the option for a further stage of geological screening to be carried out at this stage.

##### ***Summary of the Partnership's proposed steps for the siting process***

- ***Step 2: New partnership***

It was suggested that the various reviews that are suggested should include a review of the decisions made by the DMBs and DECC.

- ***Step 3: Initial identification of Potential Site Areas***

- ***The role of the new partnership/gauging credible local support***

CALC suggested that the overall impression in this section is that a potential host community's objections will be listened to so long as they do not affect the overall process. They noted that an early section of the chapter includes advice to the DMBs that they should consider negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding with the CSP(s) about the way decisions would be taken and potential host community views taken into account.

CALC proposed some revisions to this section to make it less prescriptive. The drafting group will work on including CALC's suggestions, which will then be reviewed by the full Partnership before agreeing them.

##### ***Paragraph on organisational arrangements for any future CSP***

This paragraph states that existing Partnership arrangements are unlikely to be appropriate in Stages 4 and 5, however, CALC noted that it is not clear from the bullet points under '*The Partnership's suggested steps for organisational arrangements*' how this statement would be infringed if similar arrangements were to be replicated. CALC therefore suggested alternative text for three of the bullet points, including making a more definite recommendation that the main elements of process management, including chairing, should be independently provided.

CALC suggested that, if the community is to have full involvement and participation it is all about trust, and they therefore suggested that a further

amendment should be made to show that membership of a CSP should reflect the balance of interest and that a CSP should operate at arms length from the DMBs.

Concerns were expressed about the level of change that Partnership members were being asked to take on board and it was suggested that the revised text needed to be viewed before a decision could be made.

Copeland BC and Cumbria CC stated that they could not accept these changes and preferred to retain the original text. Cumbria County Council also reminded the Partnership that there are a number of statements in this chapter about consensus working in the future and that they are committed to this. They also emphasised that they are not trying to block every proposal that is put forward, but the prescriptive nature of the proposed amendments is not helpful for the future and ties the hands of the DMBs to too great an extent.

It was noted that the draft final opinions mention proceeding with caution, independent running of the CSP and operating 'at arms length', and CALC were asked whether these elements provide sufficient safeguards for potential host communities. CALC reiterated that the issue is about engendering confidence in communities during Stage 4, and that to do this future arrangements need to be seen to have different characteristics to the current Partnership arrangements. They therefore feel that this needs to be covered earlier in the chapter.

Cumbria County Council expressed concerns that this implies that the current Partnership process is not fair and they do not agree that this is the case. CALC reiterated that their position has always been that they do not consider it to be an ideal or balanced partnership for this kind of work. They assured the Partnership that they are trying to find ways for CALC and the parishes to be happier about the arrangements in Stage 4 and that they are trying to find constructive ways of closing the gap between the different positions.

Given the long-standing nature of this issue, it was suggested and agreed that the nature of the disagreement should be set out in the Final Report. The drafting group will revise the text to reflect this and the revisions will be seen by the Partnership in the next draft of the report.

#### **4.4.4 – Draft final opinions**

In line with the agreement above, it was suggested that the differences in view should also be captured in the final opinion, including reference to these differences in the body of the chapter. It was also agreed that the bullet points are overly prescriptive and the drafting group was asked to review this and remove them if possible.

## 4.5 – Chapter 14 – Public and stakeholder views

---

### ***Indicator 1- Broad support for the Partnership's initial opinions***

CALC stated that they do not accept the statement that there is overall broad support for most of the Partnership's initial opinions subject to some changes and qualifications made in the Final Report. They asked that this statement *not* be included as they do not feel that it reflects aspects of the consultation responses that did not express broad support.

CALC suggested that parts of this section should be replaced with text that was included in an earlier draft of the PSE3 Report, which included narrative (since removed from the PSE3 Report) about the difficulty of applying this qualitative indicator. In CALC's view, this text would provide better recognition of what the public said, and would more clearly acknowledge that responses from members of the public show that there is not broad support overall.

It was noted that the existing statement is intended to be read alongside the content that follows which makes it clearer that there is disagreement in the Partnership about whether or not there is broad support. Some felt that so long as the structure of the existing content was revised it would give a fair reflection, but CALC reiterated that they cannot accept that there is broad support for most of the Partnership's initial opinions. Concerns were expressed that CALC's proposed text says that there is *not* broad support, which is a fundamental change from the existing text.

It was agreed that the drafting group would revisit this section and look at how the proposed text could be amended to reflect the overall position, as well as how to reflect the different views on the extent to which there is or is not broad support.



## **4.6 – Update on actions and draft final opinions for the remaining chapters**

---

There was a reminder that the actions commissioned by the Partnership led to lots of clarifications from the NDA and DECC (Documents 286 and 287) and these have not yet all been incorporated into the final opinions. All revisions will be seen by the Partnership in the next draft of the Final Report for consideration on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2012 before the report is signed off.

The key areas of discussion for the remaining chapters on actions (Document 291), draft final opinions (Document 289) and the NDA/DECC responses are summarised below.

### **4.6.1 – Design and Engineering**

It was noted that the reason for including a timeline on retrievability in the draft final opinion (Document 289, page 4) is to address issues raised in the consultation about the need for more clarity on this issue. Partnership members were also reminded that they had agreed to revise/strengthen their opinion on this issue to acknowledge the strength of feeling that had come through in the consultation.

### **4.6.2 – Safety, Security, Environment and Planning**

Several actions for this criterion were commissioned (Document 291, actions 7-15). The actions on security and transport were still underway at the time of the meeting.

**Action 7 – SEA** – A discussion was held about the meeting held with the NDA and DECC regarding the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process. Carrying out a SEA is a legal requirement to look at the environmental effects of major programmes that may have environmental consequences. This includes looking at ‘reasonable alternatives’, including alternatives to geological disposal, alternative processes/running order of key stages, whether or not a voluntarism approach is adopted and alternative sites.

The Partnership is keen to make sure that there are no legal pitfalls in future years if the process proceeds, but also that alternatives are being dealt with satisfactorily. The meeting explored all of the issues surrounding this, and it was also confirmed that an environmental assessment that covers quite a lot of the ground of an SEA was carried out during Stage 3, but it did not include consideration of the alternatives.

The NDA explained that they intend to do a full SEA in Stage 4 if the process moves forward, and confirmed that this assessment would consider alternatives. They also explained that there is a scoping stage at the beginning of a SEA during which discussions with a wide range of stakeholders would take place about what is going to be assessed and how. This debate would include what alternatives would be considered in the assessment.

It was noted that the key issue for the Partnership is whether it is content for all of this work to be done/considered in Stage 4, or whether it should be asking the DMBs to upgrade the work the NDA has already done in Stage 3 to more fully cover the question of reasonable alternatives.

A question was asked about whether the DMBs would be in a difficult position if they made a decision to move forward without an SEA having been conducted. The NDA responded to say that this is not the case, and reiterated their belief that the SEA process is very robust.

It was agreed that the officers who attended the meeting with the NDA should meet to discuss this further and propose a way forward and draft text for consideration by the Steering Group at its next meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> July and for the Partnership on 19<sup>th</sup> July.

**National Park** – It was confirmed that the final opinion in the draft Final Report (Chapter 10) now includes text about the Lake District National Park.

Reference was made to the statement in the text of Chapter 10 that any intent to impinge on the National Park ‘would require consideration of alternative sites to be exhausted in order to satisfy planning policies and national frameworks’. The National Park was asked whether this means alternative sites in West Cumbria only, or whether they take the view that alternative sites over a larger area or even nationally would have to be considered.

The Lake District National Park Authority (LDNPA) advised that the authority has discussed this, but has not yet reached a definitive view. It was noted that this is the crux of the argument as to what is meant by ‘reasonable alternative’.

The LDNPA asked whether it would be appropriate to form an opinion or piece of advice regarding the National Park in the Partnership’s Final Report. The drafting group agreed to discuss this and draft something as appropriate.

#### **4.6.3 – Impacts**

The following points were raised about the draft final opinions (Document 289, pages 7-9):

- **Direct impacts**

Cumbria Tourism confirmed that the brand protection strategy work has now started.

It was agreed that a statement should be included about the option for a CSP to independently review the SEA both at scoping and assessment stage.

A discussion was held about whether there should be a specific bullet point for mitigation of blight. It was noted that specific aspects of blight are included in the list of impacts (including e.g. Property Value Protection Plans), however blight in general terms is not covered and it was suggested that it needs to be defined more specifically if it is to be included.

- **Long-term direction**

A discussion was held about the distinction between urban and rural economies and what it means in the context of West Cumbria. There was a reminder that this emerged from the GVA study on impacts, in which the views about the potential impacts of a repository varied between urban and rural

communities. It was agreed that the drafting group should consider how this is worded.

- ***Economic sustainability***

It was agreed that the distinction between long-term visioning and economic sustainability needs to be made clearer.

#### **4.6.4 –Community Benefits**

With regard to DECC’s responses (Document 287, page 6), it was confirmed that:

- The legal advice on seeking a legally-binding agreement with the Government on community benefits will be published shortly. It was noted that the advice is that this can be done, but the sensible time to do it is at the same time as making other aspects of the MRWS process legally binding.
- DECC officers have confirmed that the revised Community Benefits Principles that were agreed at the last Partnership meeting should not cause a problem for the Minister to agree. The Partnership is currently waiting on a letter from the Minister confirming this.

#### **4.6.5 – PSE views**

The Partnership agreed that the text of the chapter outlines the degree to which each indicator has been met, and that forming an additional ‘opinion’ on each indicator is unnecessary.

## **4.7 – Agreements and way forward**

---

Partnership members were asked to email any outstanding comments on further substantive changes to 3KQ before the end of 28<sup>th</sup> June 2012.

All revisions to the draft Final Report will be incorporated into the next draft of the report for consideration by the Steering Group at its next meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> July. A final draft will be circulated to the Partnership a week in advance of the 19<sup>th</sup> July Partnership meeting. Partnership members will also be sent a list of paragraph numbers that have been substantively changed.

Partnership members were reminded to book time into their diaries between 12<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> July to read through the draft report, and to book time during this period with any colleagues who need to input into the final wording.

The meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> July is scheduled as the last Partnership meeting. It was agreed that the meeting should be held open to run until 6 p.m. if required.

## 5. Way Forward and Actions

### 5.1 – PSE3 Report

The PSE3 Report was signed off for publication. An interim version will be published on the Partnership website shortly with a note explaining that the only subsequent amendments will be the addition of references when the Final Report has been finalised.

### 5.2 – The Partnership’s Final Report

All of the agreed amendments and drafting changes to the draft Final Report will be incorporated into a revised draft for consideration by the Steering Group on 9<sup>th</sup>.

The next draft report will be circulated to the Partnership on 12<sup>th</sup> July with a view to it being signed off at the 19<sup>th</sup> July meeting prior to handing it over to the DMBs. The DMBs are currently expected to make a decision about participating in the next stage of the process in October 2012.

Partnership members were reminded to schedule in time with colleagues who need to input into the wording of the Final Report between the 12<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> July.

### 5.3 – Future meeting dates

The forward programme of meeting dates is provided below.

**NB The Partnership meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2012 is currently scheduled as the last meeting. If required, the meeting may continue until 6 p.m. The venue for this meeting has changed from Egremont Market Hall to Hunday Manor Hotel near Workington.**

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

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

Steering Group meetings 2012:	Partnership meetings 2012:
9 July	19 July (Hunday Manor Hotel near Workington)

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

	Action	Who	By when
1	Respond to CALC regarding difficulties encountered in relation to identification of criteria for national geological assessment.	Brian Clark/ CoRWM	6 July
2	Provide written summary of early evaluation outputs.	Stuart Smith/ Wood Holmes	6 July
3	Email Document 251.1 containing details of opinion survey script to Irene Sanderson.	Rhuari	28 June

4	Ask Ipsos MORI whether they can provide information about data analysis software.	Rhuari	28 June
5	Draft text regarding SEA and consideration of reasonable alternatives.	Officers who attended SEA meeting	6 July
6	Consider and complete drafting changes to Final Report as discussed/agreed in this meeting.	Rhuari/Helen/drafting group	26 June
7	Circulate draft meeting report to Partnership attendees.	Jane	3 July
8	Comment on draft meeting report.	All attendees	10 July
9	Circulate final draft of meeting report and publish on website.	Jane	17 July

## 6. Public Questions/Comments

---

### 6.1 – Statement from Keswick Town Council

The Mayor of Keswick Town Council gave a statement saying that the council originally made a decision to support the MRWS process on the basis that, whilst they do not necessarily support a GDF anywhere in Cumbria, history has taught that you are not able to have your view unless you are involved. However, the public misinterpreted this decision and thought that because the council wanted to stay in the process they were giving it the thumbs up. The council has therefore revisited the decision and changed their view to being that they want to come out of the process.

The Mayor further noted that, if the council had had a geological view, it would have been much easier to have made this decision, and it would also have been at far less expense. He stated that it is paramount to have the geological information and that “you do not build houses on poor foundations”.

### 6.2 – Question regarding content of opinion survey

Concerns were expressed about whether the information that was included in the opinion survey might have skewed the way that people responded, and a request was made to see the text that was read out to know on what basis people voted for or against the process.

It was noted that the full questionnaire that was used is published as Document 251.1 and the Programme Manager offered to send this document to the questioner. There was a reminder that the draft questionnaire was put out for public comment, and it was also noted that there was very little substantive content in the final questionnaire.

### 6.3 – Question regarding fracking

In response to a question about whether the implications of fracking will be considered, it was confirmed that fracking would be included in the list of potential impacts during any possible Stage 4.

### 6.4 – Statement and a question

The following statement was read out:

“No geological criteria from the NDA going forward, insufficient funding to do what other countries have done in looking for the best sites first, no letters at the start of the process to ask us how we felt, no agreed written procedure to exercise a right to withdraw although it is mentioned as an option continuously throughout the consultation document. In summary I have no confidence in this process, and I certainly feel entrapped. Here in Above Derwent of Allerdale we have no democratic representation that lives here and knows us. Where is the procedure by which a parish that does not want to volunteer to be considered as a potential host community can now withdraw from the MRWS process? Who do we work with?”

In response, reference was made to the process outlined in the consultation document for how a CSP would attempt to manage the site identification process if the process were to go ahead, including managing concerns that might come forward from specific communities.

It was noted that there may be a number of potentially suitable areas and some may have more support than others. Whilst the process would want to move forward with as much support as possible, it was confirmed that there is a potential scenario where a specific community does not want to move forward in the process but support exists across the broader area involved in the siting process. In such a case it may be that the interests of the wider community would outweigh the interests of one small particular community.

With regard to the comments about democratic representation, a councillor from Cumbria County Council noted that, wherever people live, they will have a parish, a borough and a county councillor. He gave assurance that, whilst it has been made clear that the borough and county councils will be the DMBs and that the parish level will not have a vote, councillors would make every effort to take on board everybody's viewpoint.

The member of the public suggested that the voluntary approach and the White Paper clearly state that a parish would have the right to withdraw. DECC confirmed that the White Paper does not say that parish councils have the right of withdrawal, and that it would be exercised by the DMBs. Whilst the questioner acknowledged this, she also reiterated that the question is about whether there is a procedure that allows a parish that wants to withdraw from the MRWS process to do so.

CALC confirmed that there is no procedure for parishes to withdraw at this stage. They noted that this is why CALC are trying to shore up the process and get provisions within the process to try and safeguard the position of potential host communities.

A further member of the public expressed his support for the way in which CALC were trying to bridge this gap with the purpose of building trust with the local communities. He also stated that the efforts of the DMBs to resist CALC's suggestions had built further mistrust.

#### **6.5 – Question regarding analysis of the opinion survey data**

In response to a question about whether there would be a means by which members of the public can analyse the data from the opinion survey, it was confirmed that the data will be published. With regards to a request for access to data analysis software packages/facilities, it was confirmed that software licensing agreements would prevent this. A number of alternative approaches were suggested including asking university departments to assist or searching for free software. The Programme Manager agreed to ask Ipsos MORI if they can set out options for how data can be analysed.

#### **6.6 – Question regarding watering down of geological criteria**

A question was asked about the extent to which people can be confident that geological criteria will not be watered down from the criteria used in previous studies, especially given the level of distrust that had been cited at the meeting.

The NDA stated that all of the appropriate criteria will be used at the appropriate times in the process, and gave assurance that there will be no watering down of the geology criteria. They reiterated that, if the process proceeds, there is a huge



amount of work to be done, and acknowledged that, whilst there would still be a high level of uncertainty until the end of Stage 5, there is a lot of work that can be carried out at the start of Stage 4. They also noted that they would expect any CSP to appoint its own geological experts to ensure that the work is done properly and that this would be welcomed by the NDA.

#### **6.7 – Question regarding source of certain consultation responses**

A question was asked about how the Partnership received 69 identical consultation responses that gave support to proceeding in the process.

In response it was noted that consultation responses were received in a number of different ways. The Partnership was aware of particular interest groups on various 'sides of the fence' who encouraged and coordinated their members to fill in consultation responses through e.g. letters or comments slips. It was confirmed that all responses were checked to ensure that they had different names and postcodes, and it was also confirmed that every response that was received was included in the consultation analysis.

## 7. 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
URL	Underground Research Laboratory
WCSF	West Cumbrian Strategic Forum
WCSP	West Cumbria Strategic Partnership
WCSSG	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group

## Appendix 1 – Agenda for the 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012 meeting

**Objectives** of the meeting were:

1. To agree the PSE3 Report for publication
2. To review the **DRAFT** Final Report and agree amendments, including:
  - Results of actions commissioned at the last Partnership meeting.
  - Chapters of the Final Report.
  - Draft final opinions.

Time	Item	Agenda Notes
09.00	Arrivals / Registration	
09.30	Welcome Agenda setting Updates and actions	Richard Harris, 3KQ
	<b>PSE Report</b>	Sign off and publication, with discussion as required (Doc 288)
	Tea/Coffee	
	<b>Final Report</b>	Chapter by chapter discussion and agreements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on actions commissioned (Doc 291)</li> <li>• Chapter text</li> <li>• Draft final opinion (Doc 289)</li> </ul>
	<b>Public Questions</b>	
12.30 / 13.15	Lunch	
	<b>Final Report (continued)</b>	<i>Include a break for tea/coffee at about 1430</i>
	<b>Way Forward and Actions</b>	Review progress Confirm the next steps for drafting and any other actions
	<b>Public Questions</b>	
16.00	Close	

## Appendix 2 – Attendees on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012

---

Richard Griffin	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Charles Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Michael Heaslip	Allerdale Borough Council	
Carni McCarron-Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Guy Richardson	CALC	
Chris Shaw	Allerdale/Copeland CALC	(Steering Group member)
Geoff Smith	Allerdale CALC	
Keith Hitchen	Copeland CALC	(Steering Group member)
Steven O’Keeffe	Carlisle City Council	
Revd Dr Lindsay Gray	Churches Together in Cumbria	
Yvonne Clarkson	Copeland Borough Council	
Allan Holliday	Copeland Borough Council	
John Kane	Copeland Borough Council	
Elaine Woodburn	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
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)
David Southward	Cumbria County Council	
Richard Greenwood	Cumbria Tourism	
Mike Tonkin	Eden District Council	
Peter Kane	GMB/Unite Unions	
Robert Allison	Lake District National Park Authority	
Ian McPherson	South Lakeland District Council	
Simon Rowley	South Lakeland District Council	

### **Observing Members**

Bruce Cairns	DECC
Peter McDonald	DECC
Brian Clark	CoRWM
John Rennilson	CoRWM
Gavin Thomson	Environment Agency
Elizabeth Atherton	NDA RWMD
Alun Ellis	NDA RWMD
Mick Bacon	ONR

### **Apologies**

Alan Smith	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Jane Meek	Carlisle City Council	
Ian Curwen	Copeland Borough Council	
Steve Smith	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Paul Walker	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Mark Dutton	CoRWM	
Tony Markley	Cumbria County Council	
Paul McKenna	Isle of Man Government	
Judith Cooke	Lake District National Park	

Stephen Ratcliffe	Authority Lake District National Park Authority
Robert Morris-Eyton	National Farmers Union
Marcus Swift	Prospect Union

**Facilitators, Secretariat and Presenters**

Rhuari Bennett	3KQ (Programme Manager)
Richard Harris	3KQ (Facilitator)
Jane Dalton	3KQ (Meeting Report Writer)
Helen Fisher	3KQ (PSE3 Report & Partnership's Final Report Writer)
Cath Little	Copeland Borough Council (Secretariat)

**Other**

Paul Gardner	Osprey Communications (Communications Adviser)
Stuart Smith	Wood Holmes (Partnership evaluators)

**Members of the Public/Stakeholders** who attended for all or part of the meeting  
*(N.B. – the names of those who signed the attendance sheet are detailed below)*

Dr Clare Bayley	DECC
Jay Redgrove	NDA RWMD
Nicky Leggatt	NDA
Jane Fiona Cumming	NDA
Phil Matthews	NuLeAF
Margaret Throp	
Geoff Davies	
Christine Mitchell	
David Wood	
Bill Miller	
R Williamson	
Alan Tyson	
John Hetherington	
Fergus McMorro	
Peter Rigg	
Mary Lawley	
Karen Lockwood	
John Birch	
Sally Birch	
Jill Donnington-Smith	
Rod Donnington-Smith	
Clyde Mitchell	
Patricia Howell	
Eleanor Paxon	
Paul Paxon	

**Other members who were not in attendance**

Frank Cassidy	Barrow Borough Council
Rob Johnston	Cumbria Chamber of Commerce

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.

Organisation	Nominated Representatives and preferred contact details	Mechanisms Used
Allerdale BC	Alan Smith (councillor) <a href="mailto:alan.smith@alldale.gov.uk">alan.smith@alldale.gov.uk</a> Tim Heslop (councillor) <a href="mailto:tim.heslop@alldale.gov.uk">tim.heslop@alldale.gov.uk</a> Carni McCarron-Holmes (councillor) <a href="mailto:carni.mccarron-holmes@alldale.gov.uk">carni.mccarron-holmes@alldale.gov.uk</a> Michael Heaslip (councillor) <a href="mailto:michael.heaslip@alldale.gov.uk">michael.heaslip@alldale.gov.uk</a> Charles Holmes <a href="mailto:charles.holmes@alldale.gov.uk">charles.holmes@alldale.gov.uk</a> Richard Griffin <a href="mailto:richard.griffin@alldale.gov.uk">richard.griffin@alldale.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	Frank Cassidy (councillor) <a href="mailto:frankcassidy@barrowbc.gov.uk">frankcassidy@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	Steven O'Keeffe <a href="mailto:StevenO@carlisle.gov.uk">StevenO@carlisle.gov.uk</a> Jane Meek <a href="mailto:janeme@carlisle.gov.uk">janeme@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></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:morriseyt@aol.com">morisseyt@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	<p>Phil Matthews  <a href="mailto:philip.matthews@nuleaf.org.uk">philip.matthews@nuleaf.org.uk</a>  Stewart Kemp</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Written report to each NuLeAF Steering Group.</li> </ul>

	<a href="mailto:stewart.kemp@nuleaf.org.uk">stewart.kemp@nuleaf.org.uk</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>