

West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership



Meeting Report

From 19th July 2012

At Hunday Manor Hotel near Workington

Document No:	302
Status:	Adopted
Title:	West Cumbria MRWS Partnership Meeting Report, 19 July 2012
Author:	3KQ (see note overleaf)
Notes:	Published on 9 August 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
rhuari@3kq.co.uk
jane@3kq.co.uk

Telephone 01539 739 435

3KQ Ltd
93 Serpentine Road
Kendal
Cumbria
LA9 4PD

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

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

Executive Summary

Overview. The 25th and final meeting of the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Partnership took place on 19th July 2012. The main objective of the meeting was to agree the Partnership's Final Report and arrangements for its publication.

Updates. The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority is convening a new group for potential users of the UK geological disposal facility (GDF). The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) explained that the UK was taking title of four tonnes of German plutonium, to be used in the UK's anticipated re-use programme.

The Partnership's Final Report. The Partnership considered and agreed its Final Report to Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council who are the decision-making bodies (DMBs) in the MRWS process in West Cumbria. Discussions focused on final amendments to the report and discussions about key remaining issues including:

- DECC's response to the Partnership about putting the MRWS process on a legal footing.
- The impact of DECC's announcement on plutonium on the Partnership's final opinion on the inventory.
- Differences of view between Partnership members on some issues.

Next steps and way forward. This was the last meeting of the Partnership. The Final Report will now be finalised and handed over to the three Councils, for their formal consideration in advance of them making a decision about whether to enter the Government's siting process for a GDF or not. This decision is currently due to be made by all three Councils on 11th October 2012.

It is anticipated that the Final Report will be published on the Partnership's website in mid-August. Printed copies will be distributed to Partnership members, members of the three Councils and libraries throughout Cumbria. Its publication will be notified to members of the public and stakeholders via the e-bulletin, a press release, a newsletter to all households in West Cumbria and advertorials.

Closure of the Partnership

Now that it has completed the work that it was set up to do, the Partnership will formally close and will not meet again unless invited to do so by the DMBs.

Until the three Councils make their decisions about participation, a 'bridging group' will be set up. This group will be responsible for overseeing communications activity, supporting the deliberations of the DMBs up until the point of them making their decisions about participation, and handling public/media enquiries.

For more information please see the Partnership's website:

www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk.

Everybody who has participated in and contributed to the Partnership's work was thanked for their time and effort.

1. Introduction

1.1 – Objectives

The objective for the day was to agree the Partnership's Final Report and arrangements for its publication.

The full agenda is in Appendix 1.

1.2 – Attendance

40 participants¹ attended at Hunday Manor Hotel near Workington on 19th July 2012. A full list of those in attendance is in Appendix 2. The meeting was open for the public to observe and more than 14 members of the public attended.

2. Updates

2.1 – Documents published

Since the last meeting, the following documents have been published in the Documents section of the Partnership's website at www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk:

- 303. Letter from DECC regarding the Partnership's Community Benefits Principles
- 300. E-Bulletin 19, July 2012
- 299. Legal Advice on Voluntarism and the Public Interest
- 298. Meeting Report 25 June 2012
- 297. Decision Making by the Decision-Making Bodies in the MRWS Process
- 296. Legal Advice on Making Voluntarism Legally Binding
- 295. Discussion Note on Codifying Elements of the MRWS Process
- 294. Notes from Meeting with the NDA regarding Strategic Environmental Assessment
- 293. Letter from the Environment Agency
- 292. Notes from Meeting with the Geological Society of London
- 288. PSE3 Report
- 283. Steering Group Minutes 13 June 2012
- 281. Ipsos MORI Opinion Survey Report

2.2 – Document 297

In relation to Document 297 (Decision Making by the Decision-Making Bodies in the MRWS Process), the Cumbria Association of Local Councils (CALC) said that, at present, the published document makes no reference to the reason why the DMBs are not taking a decision through Full Council as suggested by the MRWS White Paper. CALC's understanding is that the constitutions of the three DMBs do not allow that process and that it is a decision for the Executive/Cabinet. They suggested that the general public need to be advised of the legislation affecting this (which CALC believes to be the Local Government Act 2000 Section 13 which

¹ Plus 5 from the facilitation team and secretariat.

may have been amended by the Localism Act 2011). It was agreed that Document 297 would be amended and republished.

2.3 – Ipsos MORI additional analysis

The Ipsos MORI report on the opinion survey that has now been published (Document 281) includes the additional analysis that was requested on whether views differ if people live in rural or urban areas, and whether they live within/outside the National Park.

2.4 – Publication of the Final Report and associated communications

It is anticipated that the Partnership's Final Report will be ready for publication in mid-August once it has been graphic designed. It will be published on the Partnership's website, circulated to Partnership members and passed to Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council for their formal consideration.

In addition, there will be:

- Notification via the regular e-bulletin sent out to everyone on the database.
- A press release.
- A newsletter to households in West Cumbria, largely duplicating the Executive Summary of the Final Report. This will also be put in places like libraries.
- Advertorials in the Cumbrian newspapers.

2.5 – Geological disposal facility (GDF) Users Group

The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) is convening a new group for 'potential users of the UK geological disposal facility to be kept up to date on, and influence, development work including advising on specific requirements and identifying opportunities to work together'. The group has met twice in January and April 2012 and the minutes of these meetings are available on the NDA's website.

2.6 – DECC update on plutonium

The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) provided the following statement in advance of the meeting:

'We currently have 118 tonnes of plutonium in the UK to be managed. We have set out policy for future management of this plutonium and said that overseas-owned plutonium can be managed in the same way as UK-owned plutonium (by future MOX production). 28 tonnes was owned by overseas companies.

With regard to the recently published Written Ministerial Statement on the management of overseas owned plutonium in the UK (see http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/news/wms_plut_ger/wms_plut_ger.a.spx), we have made a contractual change to make 4 tonnes of German-owned plutonium available to them in France so that it can be physically supplied as MOX from the existing French plant rather than shipping separated plutonium from the UK.

The end result is that we still have 118 tonnes of plutonium in the UK with the same intention of re-use through future MOX production. 4 tonnes of it now has a different ownership (UK) and is available for us to use in future UK MOX fuel.

The Germans have MOX fuel available to them for use in reactors now, before they are closed.'

The Partnership stated that they were very uncomfortable with DECC's timing for this decision, and that the way in which community representatives were informed of it was not acceptable.

Further discussions were held about this issue when discussing the inventory chapter of the Final Report – see 3.4 below.

2.7 – Discussions between CoRWM and CALC regarding national geological screening criteria

An update was given on an action from the previous meeting for the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) to respond to CALC regarding the difficulties that CoRWM encountered in relation to identification of criteria for national geological assessment. It was noted that discussions between CALC and CoRWM about this issue are ongoing and should be resolved shortly, however it is not felt that it is central to the Partnership's Final Report.

3. The Partnership's Final Report

3.1 – Background and overview

The meeting focused on finalising the Partnership's draft Final Report. A revised draft had been circulated in advance of the meeting following discussions at the last Partnership meeting on 25th June 2012 (see meeting report, Document 298), and subsequent revisions to the previous draft.

A number of amendments and wording suggestions that had been discussed during the week preceding the meeting were also tabled for consideration and agreement by the Partnership. Partnership members considered the tabled amendments and any further drafting suggestions for each chapter, with the Executive Summary considered last.

There was a reminder that any agreements made today would be the final amendments to the report: there was no 'contingency meeting' to deal with further changes.

The significant areas of discussion and amendments that were agreed are summarised in 3.2 to 3.14 below. Not all of the minor amendments that were agreed are detailed in this report – all changes will be reflected in the finalised version of the Final Report.

3.2 – Chapters 1 to 5

The tabled amendments were all accepted and an amendment to the explanation regarding access to the underground facilities from the surface facilities was also agreed.

3.3 – Chapter 6 – Overarching issues

The majority of the tabled amendments were accepted, including:

- Making it clearer that a community siting partnership's (CSP's) work programme should help to clarify when uncertainties will be addressed.
- An amendment to the Partnership's response to public and stakeholder concerns about the right of withdrawal.
- An amendment to the advice to the decision-making bodies (DMBs) on the timing of an independent review of the NDA's research and development (R&D) programme.

Putting the MRWS process on a legal footing

The Partnership has now received a letter from the Minister of Energy agreeing to a legal footing for the MRWS process (Document 303). It was therefore agreed that a new paragraph should be added to reflect the current position (including a reference to Document 303), and that the draft advice to the DMBs regarding this issue should be amended.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

Revised text clarifying the situation regarding the requirement for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for development of a GDF, including the assessment of 'reasonable alternatives', was discussed and agreed. This included clarification that the work that the NDA has already done on generic

environmental assessments is not part of the legal requirements.

CALC asked where the information in a footnote that stated that an SEA is not a legal requirement prior to Stage 4 had come from. It was confirmed that the NDA had provided this statement. The NDA acknowledged that legal points can be argued and it was agreed that the footnote should be removed.

Clarity regarding decision making

A discussion was held regarding a tabled change regarding the need for agreement from a borough council, Cumbria County Council and the Government to proceed *at any stage* in the MRWS process. This change was proposed in the light of the letter from the Minister of Energy to all three DMBs (Document 240) which refers to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the three Councils about their decision making (Document 235). A debate was held about whether the letter refers to a decision about participation in Stage 4 of the MRWS process or decisions throughout the process at any future stage. The exact wording of the letter was revisited and it was acknowledged that, whilst the MoU makes reference to Stage 4, the letter from the Minister is a little more generic and could be read in one of two ways. It was agreed that, as the letter states that in the event of a decision to participate, the Government and the local authorities would need to review and agree an appropriate decision-making process and timescales going forward, the original/existing text should be used.

3.4 – Chapter 7 – Inventory

The tabled amendment regarding the wording of the Partnership's opinion on UK waste only was accepted.

Scottish and military waste

It was noted that the revised section in the draft report on Scottish waste does not answer the question of whether UK policy overrides Scottish policy, meaning that Scottish waste would go into a repository.

The NDA stated that they do not think that this is the case. They confirmed that Scottish waste is still part of the UK Radioactive Waste Inventory (UKRWI) as it has not been taken out, however they are working with the Scottish Government on a strategy to implement Scottish policy, which is for near-site near-surface storage and disposal. As that strategy develops, the NDA expects that Scottish waste will be taken out of the inventory.

On this basis it was suggested and agreed that the wording should be updated to reflect this. It was also agreed that an amendment should be made to say that the strategy should be discussed with the CSP as it is being developed with the Scottish Government.

A question was asked about the impact this has on the decommissioning of submarines in Scotland. The NDA confirmed that this is Ministry of Defence waste and is therefore covered by UK policy and not Scottish policy.

DECC announcement regarding plutonium

A discussion was held regarding DECC's announcement regarding the transfer of title of the German plutonium (see 2.6 above).

The Partnership reiterated their concerns about the timing of this announcement and noted that it also relates to issues about trust, and strengthens the need for a change mechanism process for the inventory to be in place.

The representative from DECC apologised that this announcement was not notified to the Partnership in advance, and agreed that the timing of the announcement had not been ideal. By way of explanation, DECC noted that the Government's current "direction of travel" is for the re-use of plutonium and not for it to go into a GDF, and it was suggested that their colleagues who are dealing with this matter did not, therefore, think that it was something that the GDF team needed to know about.

In response the Partnership noted that, even if this is the case, there would still be impacts on a GDF in the long term as the re-use of plutonium will still result in waste arisings of spent fuel. As DECC has confirmed that there are no current plans to change the policy on overseas waste, it was suggested that the waste arisings will not be returned to Germany and will therefore be included in the inventory for disposal in a GDF.

The DECC representative advised that his understanding is that the high level waste that would come from reprocessing would be returned to Germany.

The Partnership reiterated that they need DECC to understand that the Partnership does not think it is acceptable to a community that overseas plutonium is included in the inventory for disposal. It was also noted that the current policy in the Final Report is that it would not be included. It was suggested that it would be useful for a Q&A to be developed in relation to this issue so that explanations are available if questions are raised. DECC agreed to work with the Partnership to develop such a Q&A.

The need for a definition of UK waste was discussed and it was suggested that it would be useful to define what UK waste is in the Final Report. It was, however, acknowledged that it is very complex to try to define this clearly, and whilst DECC offered to try to draft a definition with the Partnership during the lunch break it was eventually agreed that a footnote should be added noting that the decision regarding the German plutonium may be inconsistent with the Partnership's position that a GDF should only accept UK waste (allowing for substitution) and advising the DMBs to seek clarification of the implications from DECC as a matter of urgency.

It was also agreed that a reference to the UKRWI should be added.

Classification of wastes

It was agreed that the explanation of the baseline inventory should be amended to reflect the wording in the MRWS White Paper to make it more clear that spent fuel and plutonium are not currently classified as wastes.

3.5 – Chapter 8 – Geology

There were no tabled amendments.

Clarity of comments on geology

Minor amendments to the wording regarding the complexities of West Cumbrian geology were agreed to make the text more clear for the reader.

Environment Agency input on geology

The Environment Agency noted that the content of their emailed responses to the Partnership's request for inputs on geology is not included in the report. They offered to publish their responses in a document that can be referenced in the report.

3.6 – Chapter 9 – Design and engineering

There were no tabled amendments and no comments.

3.7 – Chapter 10 – Safety, security, environment and planning

There were no tabled amendments and no comments.

3.8 – Chapter 11 – Impacts

The tabled amendment regarding the wording on existing above-ground storage arrangements was accepted. No other comments were made.

3.9 – Chapter 12 – Community benefits package

The tabled amendments were accepted including changes to the Partnership's Community Benefits Principles in the light of the response from DECC (Document 303), and the addition of '*things like*' to the phrase: 'We would expect it to be a substantial long-term investment in *things like* infrastructure... etc.'.

Localism Act in relation to community benefits and the MRWS process

A discussion was held about the wording of the Localism Act not yet having been 'tested in court' and the need to 'watch carefully' how the Localism Act affects the MRWS process. Some felt that this was "overly dramatic", particularly in relation to community benefits, but others felt that, as the Act is new, there are some issues around cohesion with other legislation and the statement that it will have to be tested in due course is, therefore, absolutely true. There was a reminder that this issue was raised in the consultation specifically in relation to community benefits, but it was also noted that there are areas within the Act that could impact on the whole MRWS process. It was therefore agreed that the paragraph relating to the Localism Act should be moved to Chapter 6 (Overarching issues) and the advice changed to be wider than community benefits.

3.10 – Chapter 13 – Stages 4 and 5 of the MRWS process

The tabled amendments were accepted including an addition to the guidance on the set up of a CSP(s), an addition to the role of the DMBs in Stages 4 and 5, an amendment to the Partnership's final opinion on Stages 4 and 5, and revisions to the bullet points about the role and set-up of a CSP to make them clearer and remove duplications.

(See also 6.1 below for details of a question asked by a member of the public regarding the stage at which representatives of potential host communities would

be part of a CSP. Following this question a new footnote was suggested and agreed for Chapter 13 to remove any ambiguity about this issue and make it clear that potential host communities would be part of a CSP from the outset, and that there would be certain points during Stage 4 where more in-depth involvement of residents in potential host communities would occur.)

3.11 – Chapter 14 – Public and stakeholder views

Summary of responses to the Partnership's consultation

Proposed new text summarising the responses made during the Partnership's formal consultation was agreed.

How to reflect difference in Partnership member views on some of the opinions/advice

Revised wording was agreed to reflect the difference in views between Partnership members on the extent to which the opinions and advice (specifically in Chapters 8 and 13) reflect the public and stakeholder views received. It was also agreed that the statement about it being up to the DMBs to make up their own minds on the credibility of the Partnership's opinions and advice as part of their decision-making process should remain.

3.12 – Chapter 15 – Taking forward the Partnership's work

It was noted that this is a new chapter that has been added since the 25th June 2012 Partnership meeting. It includes information about the bridging period between the Final Report being signed off and the DMBs making their decisions about participation, and brings together a summary of all of the Partnership's opinions and advice. All of the opinions will be cross-checked for consistency with the previous chapters.

3.13 – Appendix 1 – Explanation of technical words and phrases

It was agreed that the definition of the British Geological Survey should be changed to the definition in the MRWS White Paper. A number of definitions in the draft report are still to be completed but as these are factual it was agreed that their content does not need to be approved by the Partnership.

3.14 – Executive summary

The content was agreed subject to the inclusion of any changes outlined above that also apply to the Executive Summary, and the amendments/additions below:

- **Background** – That it would be useful to make it clear that the report is a “snapshot in time” and that it can only be based on the information that the Partnership has at this time (possibly to be included in the main body of the report).
- **Impacts** – The addition of ‘*Changes in employment*’ to the list of potential impacts.
- **Overarching issues (Trust)** – An amendment to reflect the fact that the Ministerial letter regarding putting the MRWS process on a legal footing has been received (see 3.3 above).
- **Public and stakeholder views** – That the new text agreed for Chapter 14 (see 3.11 above) should be duplicated here to reflect what has been agreed for the body of the main report.

3.15 – Agreements and way forward

All revisions to the draft Final Report will be incorporated into the final version of the report which will then undergo a final check before being graphic designed. The report should be ready to publish on the Partnership's website in mid-August, with printed versions available shortly afterwards.

4. Closure of the Partnership

4.1 – Closure of the Partnership and communication during the interim period

It was formally noted that the Partnership's business has now been completed and the Partnership will not meet again unless invited to do so by the DMBs. In order to continue with Partnership-related activities, a 'bridging group' will be formed which will be responsible for overseeing communications activity, supporting the deliberations of the DMBs up until the point of them making their decisions about participation, and handling public/media enquiries.

In this interim period, updates to former Partnership members will be circulated as required. If substantial business arises during the bridging period there may be a need to come back to Partnership members for their input.

The main contacts for any queries during this period will continue to be Cath Little (Partnership Secretariat) and Rhuari Bennett of 3KQ.

The Final Report is due to be published on the Partnership's website in mid-August and printed copies will be available shortly afterwards. Information about its publication will be disseminated via:

- A press release.
- A newsletter to all households in West Cumbria and distribution to libraries etc.
- Advertorials across Cumbria.
- Updates to the Partnership's website.
- The regular e-bulletin to contacts on the Partnership's database.

4.2– Decision making by the DMBs

The decision about participation by all three DMBs is currently scheduled for 11th October 2012.

4.3 – Evaluation

Wood Holmes, the Partnership evaluators, were asked to give an update on the process and timescales for their evaluation of the Partnership's work. They advised that they have been evaluating the process as they have gone along and have just finished evaluating PSE3 – a short section on this is included in the Final Report in Chapter 14.

In terms of the wider work of the Partnership, their intention is to publish a report towards the end of September 2012. Wood Holmes are currently in the process of booking dates with people to discuss issues such as lessons learned, reflections, what has worked/has not, and learning for future partnerships here or elsewhere in the UK. Anybody who wants to be involved in this process, including NGOs, should contact Wood Holmes.

Wood Holmes were also asked for a brief summary of their findings so far. They acknowledged that it is difficult to give a succinct response as the evaluation covers three years of work. They also advised that most members are aware of the key issues and that these will be covered in the report, including e.g. trust, how the Partnership is constituted, how to continue to engage with wider

members of the public, how partnerships should work and the difficulty of striking the balance between having a thorough process and one that is 'inclusionary'.

In terms of the purpose of the evaluation, it was noted that the role of evaluation has traditionally been to capture lessons learnt. However, this evaluation has also included elements of audit and scrutiny. There is an ongoing debate about who the report is for e.g. the Partnership (which no longer exists), the DMBs, DECC and the NDA, other authorities who might take part in the MRWS process, the general public, wider scrutiny and so on. At the moment the thinking is that it will be for all of the above.

It was agreed that a paragraph about evaluation should be included in the next Partnership newsletter.

4.4 – Closing words

In concluding the Partnership's work, members were asked if they would like to say anything about the business of the Partnership and their experience of it.

Cumbria County Council stated that it has been an exceptional experience and it is quite unique in terms of Government process in this country. Comparisons were made with the history of Nirex in the 1990s and reference was made to the substantial amount of work done by CoRWM to develop Government policy since that time. They stated that everyone here should be proud of everything that the Partnership has done, and expressed hopes that the experience here will influence a different level of engagement in the whole country.

They noted that the independent facilitation has worked, and, whilst some people (especially the politicians) have found it very challenging, it has been very valuable. They suggested that the DMBs should take heed of what has been done in this Partnership.

Everybody was thanked for their collaboration, cooperation, contributions, challenge and advice. In closing, Cumbria County Council stated that it has been a fascinating process that history will have comments about and that people should have pride that they have been involved in it.

Copeland Borough Council stated that they do not think that anybody can argue about the time, commitment and effort that has been put into three years of work. Whether the process goes forward or not, everybody has been part of a unique partnership and should be proud of what has been done. They noted that they are particularly proud of insisting that the Partnership carry out the amount of PSE that it did, and that they have not been part of or known about any process that has done as much in this regard as the Partnership. Osprey Communications and 3KQ were thanked for the work that they have done, and for making the Partnership members work in a new and different, although sometimes uncomfortable, way.

Allerdale Borough Council stated that it has been quite a journey for everybody and that members should congratulate themselves for reaching the end and producing a report of such quality. Whilst the report does not have all the answers, it does give Allerdale Borough Council the information they need to move to making a decision about participation.

CALC stated that, if there is a decision to move forward in the process, they are glad to hear that the Partnership has actually broken new ground in the way it has worked together, and that having independent facilitators is worthwhile. They thanked the CALC officers and all other organisations for their work.

Partnership members, 3KQ, Osprey Communications and Cath Little were all thanked for their contributions.

5. Way Forward and Actions

5.1 – The Partnership’s Final Report

All of the agreed amendments and drafting changes to the draft Final Report will be completed, and it will undergo a final check before it is graphic designed. It is due to be published on the Partnership’s website in mid-August and printed copies will be available to distribute shortly afterwards.

5.2 – Next steps

Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council are all due to make their decisions about participation on 11th October.

5.3 – Bridging group

The Partnership’s business has now been completed and the Partnership will not meet again unless requested to do so by the DMBs. A ‘bridging group’ will be formed in the interim period up to the point that a decision about participation is made by the three Councils. This group will be responsible for signing off any communications and handling public/media enquiries. Updates to former Partnership members will be circulated as required and if substantial business arises during the bridging period there may be a need to come back to Partnership members for their input.

5.4 – Actions

The following actions were agreed:

	Action	Who	By when
1	Amend Document 297 to explain the regulations affecting the DMBs’ decision making.	Steve Smith	4 August
2	Provide the Environment Agency’s comments on PSE3/geology in a document that can be published and referenced.	Gavin Thomson	20 July
3	Develop a Q&A on overseas waste policy, particularly in relation to the recent update regarding German plutonium.	John Dalton (in liaison with Paul Gardner)	4 August
4	Complete drafting changes to the Final Report as discussed/agreed in this meeting.	Rhuari/Helen	24 July
5	Circulate draft meeting report to Partnership attendees.	Jane	27 July
6	Comment on draft meeting report.	All attendees	3 August
7	Circulate final draft of meeting report and publish on website.	Jane	10 August

6. Public Questions/Comments

6.1 – Question regarding timing of membership of host communities in the CSP

Reference was made to Chapter 13 on Stages 4 and 5 of the MRWS process (and Stages 4a and 4b in particular). It was noted that there appears to be a lack of consistency about when potential host community representatives will be members of a CSP, and the Partnership was asked whether they would be members from the outset or later.

Partnership response

CALC responded to say that it should be from the outset, and suggested that if the wording does not tie in with this it should be reviewed. It was noted that specific wording that is intended to refer to engagement with the wider communities themselves and not just their representatives might be causing confusion/ambiguity. However, assurance was given that the assumption is that the CSP would include representatives from the host communities at the outset, and it was also noted that the section on the set-up period of a CSP clearly states this.

N.B. After lunch a new footnote was suggested and agreed for Chapter 13 to remove any ambiguity and make it clear that representatives of potential host communities would be part of a CSP from the outset, and that there would be certain points during Stage 4 where more in-depth involvement of residents in potential host communities would occur.

6.2 – Question regarding a future referendum

The Partnership was asked whether host communities will be given the opportunity to express their views on involvement in the MRWS process through a referendum or a specific vote, and whether the Partnership *believes* that a host community should be given the opportunity to do so.

Partnership response

The Partnership acknowledged that this is one of the questions that is very difficult to answer and that it is too early in the process to do so. As potential host communities are narrowed down, a CSP would be involved in discussions and agreements on how tests of support would be applied. Reference was also made to sections of the Final Report that refer to gauging credible local support (including whether there is support amongst potential host communities for moving forward in the process), and the options for mechanisms for doing this, including representative opinion polls and/or referendums.

6.3 – Question regarding transparency about composition of Partnership

The Partnership was asked if it would consider being more open and transparent in the Final Report about its own nature and composition, including the number of places available for each member organisation.

Partnership response

The Partnership agreed to include this information in Chapter 4 under Membership.

6.4 – Question regarding inclusion of views of specific Partnership members

A member of the public stated that it is widely known that very strong views were expressed by CALC, Churches Together in Cumbria (CTiC) and South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) that they felt it was not appropriate to go forward to Stage 4 of the MRWS process, and the Partnership was asked why these views are not identified in the Final Report.

CALC response

CALC clarified that the position they took in April 2012 was that they had concerns about the MRWS process here in West Cumbria, however the critical phrasing at that time was 'as currently envisaged' and their position was in relation to concerns about the situation at that time.

Since then, CALC have been heavily engaged in the drafting of the Partnership's Final Report to try to go as far as they can to address issues that they originally raised. CALC feel some progress has been made, but, as can be seen in the Final Report, there are still areas where they dissent from the majority view.

They also noted that the CALC County Executive was due to meet shortly when the CALC position would be reviewed. It will therefore be a matter of reading what is in the Final Report alongside public statements that CALC will make in due course.

CTiC response

CTiC stated that they raised two issues. One was that they felt that it would have been better to have carried out a geological survey across the nation, and they noted that they have written to the Government on this issue and have received replies. This is, however, separate to the process that is happening in this area and is not a criticism of what is happening here.

They further noted that CTiC covers a wide variety of different denominations and groups, and there were concerns from one particular group about wider and later issues including how a site would affect local businesses. That concern has been passed on, but overall CTiC are happy with what has happened within the Partnership process.

SLDC response

SLDC stated that they are satisfied that the views that they have expressed that are different to some other Partnership members are expressed in the Final Report, particularly regarding geology.

6.5 – Question regarding the definition of UK waste

Reference was made to earlier discussions about the definition of UK waste and the request for DECC to provide a definition. Concerns were expressed about DECC's statement that their ability to do this over lunch was dependent on who is available. It was stated that the Final Report is meaningless without that definition, and the Partnership was asked if it is truly fulfilling its duty of care if it fails to form a definition of something that is in their title.

NDA response

The NDA responded by making reference to the UKRWI which describes the wastes that are currently intended for geological disposal. Whilst there are some materials that are not currently declared as waste that might in the future need to be managed by geological disposal, for the vast majority of wastes it is clearly defined. They further noted that it is also subject to finding a community that is willing to host a GDF and that this means also being happy to host what is in the inventory.

Partnership response

The Partnership acknowledged that there is a current definition but it could be revised in the future. They also noted that information has been provided for the “possible minimum and maximum inventory”, and one of the reasons the inventory has not been defined is that it has not yet been agreed what would be acceptable to go into a GDF. If it comes to that point a change mechanism process will be agreed, and therefore any changes to the inventory would have to be agreed with the local community.

Some members expressed sympathy with the questioner and agreed that the situation is not clear. It was acknowledged that, whilst the Partnership has a statement that a GDF should be for UK waste only, this has not been defined, and although the inventory is subject to negotiation it was felt that it is reasonable to say that the Partnership should be able to answer the question about what UK waste is.

(See 3.4 above for the outcome of the discussions regarding this issue.)

6.6 – Statement regarding enforcement of community benefits

With regard to community benefits and enforcement, a member of the public requested that the Partnership press for legislation and statutory enforcement of these matters, rather than just guarantees from the Government.

6.7 – Question regarding spoil

In relation to spoil, a member of the public expressed concerns about spoil taking up just under one page in the Final Report and stated that he thinks that the issue is being brushed to one side. He advised that he was involved with the Channel Tunnel when it was being designed, and that two major impacts that they were concerned about were economics and spoil, with consideration at the time being given to filling a valley in an Area of Outstanding National Beauty with spoil. He further noted that a 12m bund around a 1km² site is a “great” impact, as well as the transport of spoil, and that spoil should be considered as a factor in deciding whether to move forward or not.

Partnership response

Partnership members expressed wholehearted agreement with the questioner and his concerns, and it was noted that both areas that he raised would be the subject of a lot of discussion later on in the process if West Cumbria moves forward. It was further noted that there is a need to look at how to minimise the impact on the environment and the economy, and that there could be valuable input from people like those who have this kind of experience.

One Partnership member noted that he had also had concerns about spoil. Research that he carried out showed that, although spoil extraction would take place for more than 100 years, the *annual* maximum amount of spoil generated would be less than 10% of existing quarry extractions in Cumbria and less than the amount extracted annually from one quarry in Cumbria that has recently closed.

NDA response

The NDA noted that the environmental assessments would consider spoil as part of the SEA, including how it would be transported offsite if required.

6.8 – Statement regarding the Final Report and voluntarism

Concerns were expressed by a member of the public about why members of the Partnership who have concerns and have said they want “out”, have put their names to this “sneaky” document that also now has plutonium in it. The Partnership was asked if it agrees that “compensation is meaningless if you don’t agree to this anyway”. She also stated that “75% of parishes that have voted have said no, that’s where voluntarism is”. She further stated that the letter to the DMBs from Charles Hendry (Document 303) is “meaningless” and ripped a copy of it up.

Partnership response

The concern was noted.

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
UKRWI	UK Radioactive Waste Inventory
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 19th July 2012 meeting

The **objective** of the meeting is to agree the Final Report and arrangements for publication.

Time	Item	Agenda Notes
09.00	Arrivals / Registration	
09.30	Welcome Agenda setting Updates and actions	Richard Harris, 3KQ
	Final Report	Chapter by chapter discussion and agreement of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - text - opinions and advice
	Tea/Coffee	
	Final Report	Continued
	Public Questions	
12.30/ 13.15	Lunch	
	Final Report	Continued Executive Summary of Final Report <i>Break for tea/coffee at about 1430</i>
	Way Forward and Actions	Review progress Confirm next steps (drafting/publication) and any other actions
16.00 OR 18.00 latest	Close	18.00 close is a contingency – we aim to finish at 16.00. To be followed by a farewell afternoon tea if time allows.

Appendix 2 – Attendees on 19th July 2012

Harry Dyke	Allerdale Borough Council	
Richard Griffin	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Charles Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Michael Heaslip	Allerdale Borough Council	
Alan Smith	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
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	
Ian Curwen	Copeland Borough Council	
Yvonne Clarkson	Copeland Borough Council	
Allan Holliday	Copeland Borough Council	
John Kane	Copeland Borough Council	
Steve Smith	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	
Tim Knowles	Cumbria County Council	(Steering Group member)
Richard Greenwood	Cumbria Tourism	
Mike Tonkin	Eden District Council	
Peter Kane	GMB/Unite Unions	
Robert Allison	Lake District National Park Authority	
Judith Cooke	Lake District National Park Authority	
Robert Morris-Eyton	National Farmers Union	
Stewart Kemp	NuLeAF	
Marcus Swift	Prospect Union	
Simon Rowley	South Lakeland District Council	
Observing Members		
John Dalton	DECC	
Conor Ritchie	DECC	
Brian Clark	CoRWM	
John Rennilson	CoRWM	
Gavin Thomson	Environment Agency	
Elizabeth Atherton	NDA RWMD	
Alun Ellis	NDA RWMD	
Mick Bacon	ONR	
Apologies		
Carni McCarron-Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Jane Meek	Carlisle City Council	
Paul Walker	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)

Mark Dutton	CoRWM
Tony Markley	Cumbria County Council
David Southward	Cumbria County Council
Bruce Cairns	DECC
Paul McKenna	Isle of Man Government
Stephen Ratcliffe	Lake District National Park Authority
Ian McPherson	South Lakeland District Council

Facilitators, Secretariat and Presenters

Rhuari Bennett	3KQ (Programme Manager)
Richard Harris	3KQ (Facilitator)
Jane Dalton	3KQ (Meeting Report Writer)
Helen Fisher	3KQ (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
Brice McKirdy	NDA
Adam Dawson	NDA
David Wood	
Mr & Mrs Megan	
Steven Quas	
Clyde Mitchell	
Colin Wales	
Marianne Birkby	
J Tear	
E Dinsdale	
D Pickthall	

Other members who were not in attendance

Frank Cassidy	Barrow Borough 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.

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

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

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