

West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership PSE Round 1 Deliberative Event Report

February 2010



For further information please contact:

Helen Bidwell or Rachel McCourty
Vision Twentyone
Milton Hall
Deansgate
Manchester
M3 4BQ

Tel: 0161 200 8000

Fax: 0161 200 8010

Email: helen.bidwell@visiontwentyone.co.uk
rachel.mccourty@visiontwentyone.co.uk

Requested by:

Kieran Barr
Senior Consultation and Engagement Advisor
Cumbria County Council

CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 Introduction	
1.2 Hopes and fears	
1.3 Feedback on the Partnership and PSE Plan	
1.4 Communicating the messages	
1.5 Moving forward	
2.0 INTRODUCTION	4
2.1 Setting the scene	
2.2 Purpose of the event	
2.3 Recruitment	
2.4 Group profile	
2.5 Appreciation	
2.6 Report structure	
3.0 HOPES AND FEARS	7
3.1 Introducing the context	
3.2 Hopes	
3.3 Fears	
4.0 FEEDBACK ON THE PARTNERSHIP AND PSE PLAN	9
4.1 Feedback on how to engage residents	
4.2 Feedback on who to engage	
4.3 Feedback on the Partnership	
4.4 What is credible support?	
4.5 Drivers of public confidence	
4.6 A credible process overall?	
5.0 COMMUNICATING THE MESSAGES	13
5.1 Key messages	
5.2 Points of clarity and confusion	
5.3 Communications channels	
5.4 Responses to PSE Round 1 leaflet	
6.0 MOVING FORWARD	15
6.1 Evaluating the day	
6.2 Participants' recommendations	
6.3 Additional recommendations	
APPENDICES	i
Appendix One: Quiz results	
Appendix Two: Questions	
Appendix Three: Hopes and Fears	
Appendix Four: Local groups and information channels	
Appendix Five: Communications	
Appendix Six: Final Thoughts	

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

- In 2008, the UK Government and Devolved Administrations in Wales and Northern Ireland launched a search for an engineered, underground site or 'Geological Disposal Facility' to act as the final home for the UK's higher activity radioactive waste. The Government is inviting communities across the country to talk to them about potentially hosting this facility.
- Since around 70% of radioactive waste destined for disposal is already stored at the Sellafield site in West Cumbria, Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council have chosen to start talking to Government about the search for a site from an early stage.
- To ensure that a wide range of community interests are involved in discussions, the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Partnership has been established. The Partnership has created a Public and Stakeholder Engagement (PSE) sub-group and developed a draft PSE plan setting out the three proposed rounds of engagement to be carried out before a 'Decision (whether) to Participate' in the siting process is made.
- As part of the first round of engagement, the Partnership commissioned independent research and consultation experts Vision Twentyone to convene a one-day deliberative event aiming to:
 - Clarify understanding of the process and identify any points of confusion;
 - Gather feedback on the Public and Stakeholder Engagement Plan;
 - Understand existing survey results in more depth;
 - Inform the key messages and communications strategy as the process moves forward.
- The event was held at The Copeland Centre in Whitehaven on Saturday 6th February 2010 and attended by 25 Allerdale and Copeland residents.

1.2 Hopes and fears

- Overall, residents' key hopes for the project were that it would:
 - Create a large number of employment opportunities for local people;
 - Bring significant benefits for the West Cumbria community;
 - Lead to major investment in local infrastructure, including roads, rail and public transport.
- Residents' key fears for the project were:
 - Safety, both in the short and long term, and the scope for human error;
 - The impact of a facility on the state of infrastructure in West Cumbria;
 - The potential adverse effect of a facility on tourism and the reputation of West Cumbria;
 - The retrievability of radioactive waste;
 - The legacy we would be leaving for future generations;
 - That this was "*already a done deal*" and engagement work is just cosmetic.

1.3 Feedback on the Partnership and PSE Plan

- Participants were encouraged to provide feedback on the Partnership and PSE Plan. The following key themes emerged from group discussion:
- Residents will need to have sufficient awareness and understanding of the issues in order to develop an informed opinion. It is important that information provided to the public is balanced, simple, accessible, and demonstrates the potential impact of the issue on local people.
- The Partnership should take the debate to the people, for example via a roving exhibition, encouraging discussion at local community groups, displaying posters in areas of high footfall, or including information in local village newsletters and parish magazines. A variety of local organisations and communications channels were suggested and recorded.
- It is particularly important for the Partnership to engage with young people and tourists. The latter should be consulted in order to gauge the potential impact of hosting a facility on the local tourism industry. A range of potentially 'hard to reach' groups were also identified.
- There is little representation on the Partnership of the 'man on the street'. The Partnership might consider inviting representatives of the public to join them, along with the National Trust. The concept of 'observing members' and the composition of some of the member organisations may require clarification.
- The group found it hard to put a number on how much support/opposition could appropriately be said to constitute 'credible support' or opposition, and also found it very difficult to articulate how different geographic views should be weighted, although most agreed that West Cumbria residents should have the most say, and people outside Cumbria should get very little say.
- A number of participants felt a referendum or public vote should take place, however the group was somewhat divided as to how representative or inclusive such an approach would be. Overall, it was felt a combination of consultation and a vote or survey would be an appropriate mix in order to inform decision-making.
- Drivers behind the public's relatively low level of confidence in aspects of the process include lack of trust in local councils, national Government and politicians, and the fact that only West Cumbria has so far expressed an interest in talking to Government about the siting process.

1.4 Communicating the messages

- Participants indicated that the most important messages that should be communicated to the public and key stakeholders were:
 - The potential benefits and risks of hosting a site;
 - Possible locations, when known;
 - What the facility might look like;
 - The nature and source of waste;
 - That this issue could affect residents, and that residents are invited to take part in discussions.

- Participants felt more information was needed on:
 - What other nuclear countries are doing and how we can learn from them;
 - Details about what type of jobs are likely to be created, how many, and when;
 - The benefits of a facility below ground over current above-ground storage;
 - The potential impact on the local environment and tourism;
 - What happens regarding security after waste is deposited;
 - How waste will be transported to the site and taken underground;
 - The likely size of a site and features of a facility.
- Participants suggested a wide range of communications channels through which information could be communicated to local residents. They praised elements of the PSE round 1 leaflet, including the language used, but felt that the cover was not eye-catching enough and gave no indication that the information contained within affected local people or that their views were being invited.

1.5 Moving forward

- Participants recommended that moving forward, the Partnership should:
 - Provide regular, straightforward and honest information to the public, including pros and cons, in order to help them develop an informed opinion;
 - Consult widely, including with young people and those who are not normally interested in public matters;
 - Actively encourage feedback, and make it easy for residents to share their views;
 - Listen to these views, act on them, and demonstrate how people's views have been taken into account in order to build trust in the process.
- Based on the evidence presented in this report, Vision Twentyone also recommend that moving forward, the Partnership:
 - Ensure that all information provided to the public makes clear that the engagement process is not a tick-box exercise: no decision has yet been made on whether to participate in the siting process and feedback from the public is actively encouraged.
 - Include information in the next round of communications (for example in FAQs) that helps to avoid potential misconceptions, for example that a UK Geological Disposal Facility might take waste from around the world.
 - Endeavour to take consultation activities to the people, for example via a roving exhibition and/or providing information to a wide range of local groups. Some groups have been identified through this event; others could be brought to light via a question in the next Ipsos MORI resident survey.
 - Consider whether residents should be represented on the Partnership, or whether the Partnership should remain an 'expert group', with the views of residents continuing to be fed in via deliberative engagement.
 - Continue to engage, consult and involve a variety of stakeholders via a range of methods in order to ensure the process is inclusive and accessible.
 - Provide feedback to participants illustrating where their suggestions have been taken on board, and where they have not been followed up, why not. This will help to ensure an open and transparent process and develop trust.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Setting the scene

In 2008, the UK Government and Devolved Administrations in Wales and Northern Ireland launched a search for an engineered, underground site or 'Geological Disposal Facility' to act as the final home for the UK's higher activity radioactive waste. The Government is inviting communities across the country to talk to them about potentially hosting this facility. In its 2008 White Paper on the topic¹, the Government stated that:

- It doesn't want to force the facility upon a community: it is looking for volunteers;
- Just talking to Government about having this site does not commit anyone to it;
- It will be a long time until any construction starts, and during that time participating communities will have the right to withdraw from the process.

Around 70% of radioactive waste destined for disposal is already stored at the Sellafield site in West Cumbria and wherever the Geological Disposal Facility is located in the UK, waste will need to be transported there from Sellafield. Consequently, Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council have chosen to start talking to Government about the search for a site from an early stage in the process.

To ensure that a wide range of community interests are involved in discussions, the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Partnership has been established. The Partnership comprises the councils named above and a variety of other local stakeholder organisations, along with other organisations who attend as 'observing members'.² Its role is one of fact-finding and research gathering, not decision-making; it will lead on initial work to gather information and eventually make recommendations to the three councils on whether or not they should participate in the siting process. The Partnership is therefore predominantly concerned with the process up to a 'Decision to Participate' as defined in the Government White Paper, and not beyond.

The Partnership is aware that significant public and stakeholder engagement will be required in its work programme due to the requirements of the White Paper and the sensitivity of the subject, particularly in a West Cumbrian context. It has therefore created a Public and Stakeholder Engagement (PSE) sub-group to lead on this area of work, and developed a draft PSE plan setting out the three proposed rounds of engagement to be carried out before a Decision (whether) to Participate is made.³

2.2 Purpose of the event

As part of the PSE Round 1, the Partnership commissioned independent research and consultation experts Vision Twentyone to convene a one-day deliberative event with 25 Allerdale and Copeland residents. The purpose of the event was to:

- Clarify participants' understanding of the process and identify any points of confusion;
- Gather feedback on the Public and Stakeholder Engagement Plan;
- Understand existing survey results in more depth, including reasons behind scepticism about aspects of the process;
- Inform the key messages and communications strategy as the process moves forward.

¹ Managing Radioactive Waste Safely: A Framework for Implementing Geological Disposal. June 2008.

² Observing members such as the Department of Energy and Climate Change and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority are invited to attend and observe, but do not take part in decision-making.

³ Draft Public and Stakeholder Engagement Plan (October 2009). Document available for download at: <http://westcumbriamrws.org.uk/cgi-bin/download.cgi>

The event took place at The Copeland Centre in Whitehaven on Saturday 6th February 2010, 10am-4pm. Led by experienced Vision Twentyone facilitators, the event included a series of presentations, a quiz and question and answer sessions to help participants understand more about the issue and PSE plan, along with group discussions and plenary sessions aimed at exploring residents' opinions in-depth.

2.3 Recruitment

Participants were recruited from Cumbria County Council's citizens' panel, *Community Voice*. As part of recruitment, participants were asked two questions measuring potential participants' attitudes towards the issue, replicated from Ipsos MORI's November 2009 telephone survey of West Cumbria residents:

- **Question 1:** Assuming no commitment is made at this stage, to what extent are you in favour of or opposed to the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership discussing the possibility of locating the Geological Disposal Facility in West Cumbria with the British Government?
- **Question 2:** To what extent do you support or oppose locating the Geological Disposal Facility in West Cumbria?

Three young people were recruited from Lakes College West Cumbria in order to ensure that the under 25 age group was represented on the day. Once a sufficient number of panel members had expressed an interest in taking part, 28 participants were selected for confirmation calls in order that 25 would attend on the day. The final 28 comprised a split of men and women, a spread of age groups, a mix of Allerdale and Copeland residents and a range of attitudes.

2.4 Group profile

Overall, 25 of the 28 confirmed participants attended the workshop, of which 12 were from Copeland and 13 from Allerdale. The group included 14 men and 11 women, of a spread of ages. Two participants reported that they had a disability, and all were White British. Two of the three participants who dropped out of the event were opposed to a Geological Disposal Facility being located in West Cumbria. Consequently, the 'opposed' group was somewhat underrepresented, as summarised in the table below.

Attitude measures ⁴		Ipsos MORI survey	Selected for event (n.28)	Attended event (n.25)
...to what extent are you in favour of or opposed to the ...Partnership discussing the possibility of locating the Geological Disposal Facility in West Cumbria with the British Government?	In favour	50%	57%	56%
	Neither/ don't know	25%	25%	28%
	Opposed	25%	18%	16%
To what extent do you support or oppose locating the Geological Disposal Facility in West Cumbria?	In favour	47%	43%	44%
	Neither/ don't know	27%	36%	40%
	Opposed	26%	21%	16%

⁴ Ipsos MORI results based on all West Cumbria respondents.

Participants received £60 each to thank them for taking part in the workshop and cover travel expenses.

2.5 Appreciation

The Vision Twentyone team would like to express our sincere thanks to all of the event participants for giving up their time to share their opinions with us. Thanks also to the following individuals for taking the time to speak at the event and answer questions throughout the day:

- Mike Davidson, Allerdale Borough Council
- Alun Ellis, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
- Elaine Woodburn, Copeland Borough Council
- Rhuari Bennett, 3KQ.

2.6 Report structure

The one-day event sought feedback from residents on three main topic areas, reflected in the structure of this report:

- **Hopes and Fears:** The first session included an introduction to the day from Mike Davidson; a quiz; presentations from Alun Ellis on the national context and Elaine Woodburn on the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership; a question and answer session with the speakers; and a group discussion about hopes and fears.
- **Feedback on the Partnership and PSE Plan:** The second session consisted of a presentation from Rhuari Bennett on the Partnership's Public and Stakeholder Engagement Plan, followed by group discussions that sought feedback on what might constitute 'credible support', the PSE plan, the Partnership itself, and what drives public confidence in the process.
- **Communicating the messages:** The final session involved a group discussion on the topic of communications, aiming to establish key messages, areas of confusion, and advice on communicating with the public.

Findings from each section are outlined in Sections 3.0-5.0 which follow. Section 6.0 provides conclusions and recommendations grounded in this evidence base.

3.0 HOPES AND FEARS

3.1 Introducing the context

At the start of the day, Mike Davidson, Chair of the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership, and Helen Bidwell, Vision Twentyone lead facilitator gave short presentations to participants, providing a welcome to the event, thanking them for their time and outlining the purpose of the day.

Following an ‘icebreaker’ session, participants took part in a short quiz to test their existing knowledge. All of the answers to this quiz were contained in the PSE Round 1 leaflet sent out to West Cumbria residents in November 2009, and provided to participants prior to the event. Results are presented in full at Appendix One. In summary:

- The majority of pairs could correctly recall how far underground a Geological Disposal Facility was likely to be; how many years it is likely to be before a facility receives waste; what a facility would be made up of; and that funding to cover the costs of the Partnership’s work is coming from Government.
- Half of the pairs correctly identified that 70% of radioactive waste destined for disposal is already stored at Sellafield, and half wrongly thought it was 90%.
- The most confusion was around who will make the decision as to whether the three councils move to the next stage of discussions. The highest proportion (42%) thought the Partnership was the decision making body, a quarter thought the Government, and a quarter correctly identified that it was the councils themselves.⁵

Following the quiz, participants heard presentations from two speakers outlining the national context and role of the Partnership:

- Alun Ellis, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority; and
- Elaine Woodburn, Leader of Copeland Borough Council and former Chair of the Partnership.

Participants were then invited to put questions to the speakers. These are listed at Appendix Two.

3.2 Hopes

Participants were encouraged to discuss their hopes and fears for the project and prioritise these in order to give a sense of the issues that were of greatest importance to the group. Overall, the key hopes for the project were that it would:

- Create a large number of employment opportunities for local people;
- Bring significant benefits for the West Cumbria community;
- Lead to major investment in local infrastructure, including roads, rail and public transport.

Other hopes included that:

- West Cumbria learns more about managing radioactive waste for the future and becomes an area of expertise in this sphere, building on its existing reputation as the ‘energy coast’;
- New technology will be advanced, and potentially mean waste becomes a commodity;

⁵ 8% did not guess.

- The process is open and honest, balanced information is provided to residents, the views of residents are listened to, and for some, that the issue goes to a public vote;
- Other areas of the country express an interest in talking to Government about the issue, or the issue “*goes away.*”

3.3 Fears

Overall, the key fears of greatest importance for the project were:

- Safety, both in the short and long term, and the scope for human error;
- The impact of a facility on the state of infrastructure in West Cumbria;
- The potential adverse effect of a facility on tourism and the reputation of West Cumbria;
- The retrievability of radioactive waste;
- The legacy we would be leaving for future generations;
- That this was “*already a done deal*” and engagement work is just cosmetic.

A wide range of additional fears were mentioned. These included:

- That worldwide waste ends up in Cumbria;
- The impact of a facility on the environment, wildlife and landscape;
- That this would turn out to be a Government decision rather than a local decision;
- That residents will be “*railroaded*” or “*brainwashed*” into hosting the facility;
- That only the loudest voices would be heard in the public engagement process;
- The effect on house prices;
- The threat of terrorism, natural disasters or cover-ups;
- And conversely, that investment might go somewhere else.

A full list of hopes and fears is included at Appendix Three.

4.0 FEEDBACK ON THE PARTNERSHIP AND PSE PLAN

Participants took part in small group discussions that sought to gather feedback on the PSE plan, the Partnership itself, what might constitute ‘credible support’ and what drives public confidence/mistrust.

4.1 Feedback on how to engage residents

After hearing about the PSE Plan – including the methods the Partnership intends to use to inform, consult and engage the public during each of the three rounds of PSE – participants were asked whether they were satisfied that this approach would provide a wide range of people with an opportunity to have a say. The following key themes emerged from group discussion:

4.1.1 Generating interest in the debate

Participants indicated that in order for local residents to be engaged in the debate around the Decision to Participate, they would need to have sufficient awareness and understanding of the issues to allow them to form a view. The need to provide balanced information on the potential pros and cons of hosting a facility was perceived to be key to raising interest. Information should be in simple language and, where comments are invited, should be easy to respond to. Furthermore, this information needs to emphasise that the final decision, when it is made, will affect local people. In other words, the public need to be able to see “*what’s in it for me?*” For this reason, some participants felt that until a site is proposed, engaging the public will be a challenge. Strategies suggested to promote interest included stressing the potential effect of the decision on future generations in order to engage parents in the debate.

4.1.2 Providing information via a range of channels

Participants acknowledged that there is no single channel that will reach all residents: many people do not read their local paper, and even information leaflets delivered to every household in an area will be thrown away by some residents. However, participants suggested a range of communications channels through which information could be communicated to local people, outlined in Section 5.3.

4.1.3 Taking the debate to the people

Word of mouth was perceived to be important in raising awareness. Participants felt that one of the best ways of providing information to residents and encouraging word of mouth transmission of information was to take the debate “*to where the people are*”. This might be via a mobile stall or manned exhibition stand at local shows, festivals, fairs, markets or supermarkets; encouraging discussion at local community groups; displaying posters in village halls, schools, supermarkets, GPs surgeries etc.; or appointing someone known to the community to answer questions. Information could also be included in local village newsletters and parish magazines, which were felt to be of more direct relevance to local people than other news channels. A full list of local groups and information channels suggested is included at Appendix Four.

The idea of a discussion pack sent to local groups in order to stimulate interest and debate was relatively popular, although some noted that an element of bias could be introduced unless sessions were independently facilitated, or felt the Partnership or its member organisations would need to deliver them. Other feedback included that packs should be tailored to different audiences (for example young people) where appropriate, and that care should be taken in the design of questions to reduce the potential for bias.

4.2 Feedback on who to engage

Participants were shown a diagram illustrating a range of stakeholders already invited to take part in the engagement process, and asked if there was anyone they felt was missing. The following organisations and audiences were added to the list:

- Cadets
- Scouts
- Parent Teacher Associations
- Women's Institute
- University of Third Age
- Trade Unions
- Schools, from junior upwards, and school councils
- The farming community, young farmers and bee keepers
- Tourists.

Participants felt that it was particularly important for the Partnership to engage with young people, who stand to be affected by the process. Tourists should also be consulted in order to gauge the potential impact of hosting a facility on the local tourism industry.

Of those potentially harder to reach, the following groups and methods were suggested:

- Mothers, who could be sent info via their kids or engaged during day-to-day activities such as at toddler groups;
- Older people, who may be disinterested, but could potentially be encouraged to be interested by pointing out the potential impact on their children/grandchildren;
- People with disabilities, who may be contacted via voluntary groups;
- People who are housebound or in care-homes, and families that are carers;
- Busy professionals;
- Truck drivers;
- People in working class areas with high unemployment, where it was felt people are not used to having a say and will need encouragement that their views matter.

4.3 Feedback on the Partnership

Participants were presented with a list of Partnership members and observing members and asked for their feedback. Discussion centred on the fact there is little representation on the Partnership of the 'man on the street'. The local councils were perceived by some participants to be over-represented on the Partnership, with lack of trust a major issue, although others felt that having strong council representation was positive. Some felt the Partnership should consider inviting the National Trust to join them, potentially alongside representatives of the public, particularly young people. Participants also felt that the concept of 'observing members', and the composition of some of the members such as the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group, needed clarifying.

4.4 What is 'credible support'?

The PSE Plan presentation noted that the Partnership "*will only proceed if local people are supportive*", and went on to highlight some difficulties with the concept of 'credible support' put forward in the White Paper, particularly:

- Should we set a figure on 'credible support' or opposition, and if so, how high?
- Are all views equal? For example, how important are voices outside West Cumbria, or those that end up being a long way from any of the suitable geology?

Participants were asked to consider these questions further within group discussions. The group found it hard to put a number on how much support/opposition could appropriately be said to constitute ‘credible support’ or opposition, and after some deliberation, suggested it might be inappropriate to put a clear percentage figure on this, at least prior to a Decision (whether) to Participate. Participants also found it very difficult to articulate how different geographic views should be weighted, although most agreed that West Cumbria residents should have the most say, and people outside Cumbria should get very little say.

Participants also had mixed opinions on how a percentage figure could be achieved without excluding some sections of the community from the debate. In particular, a number of participants suggested the idea of a referendum. Whilst this appealed to many, the group were somewhat divided as to how representative/inclusive such an approach would be. On the one hand, some felt a house-to-house survey would be the only democratic way to ensure that the views of all residents are taken on board. On the other hand, some indicated that a lot of people will throw the voting slip away and so only the loudest voices will be heard, and furthermore that since the majority of people do not vote in elections, other methods are needed to encourage involvement. This might include a mix of methods and/or incentivising responses. The group also noted that percentage figures don’t take into account the strength of people’s views, and that there is a danger in a public vote that people will vote without fully understanding the issues.

Overall, it was felt that a combination of self-selected input and a vote or random sample survey would be appropriate in order to inform decision-making. If a referendum or postal vote takes place, responses need to be based on a good understanding of the issues. Therefore any vote should come later in the process, once a site is identified and residents have a better understanding of the issues under consideration.

4.5 Drivers of public confidence

Participants were presented with the following statistics from Ipsos MORI’s recent research with Cumbria residents:

55% of Cumbria residents are confident that the Partnership will take residents’ views into account. (Survey by Ipsos MORI, November 2009)

46% of Cumbria residents are confident that the Partnership can really pull out of the discussions with the Government at any stage. (Survey by Ipsos MORI, November 2009)

Looking at these statistics, participants were asked what they felt the drivers behind the public’s relatively low level of confidence in these aspects of the process might be. The key points to emerge from group discussion were that:

- People have not got much faith in Government/ do not trust politicians;
- Only West Cumbria has expressed an interest in talking to Government about hosting a facility – if the councils pull out, it will be forced through anyway;
- The Government have forced things through in the past, for example wind farms, and will do so again;
- There is a ‘healthy scepticism’ in the area towards local government – historically, local councils have not got a great record of listening to the public’s views and taking these into account;
- The NIREX experience in the 1990s may be a source of cynicism amongst residents, although only in certain localities;
- Residents feel isolated from the decision-making process – decisions are made elsewhere.

4.6 A credible process overall?

Following small groups discussions, the whole group was asked if they would be happier that the engagement process is a credible one if the views expressed during this session were taken on board. The majority felt that they would be happier with the process in this instance. Four disagreed, with the chief reason being that – because West Cumbria is the only area to have expressed an interest in talking to Government – the Decision to Participate has already in effect been made, and the engagement process is merely a ‘tick-box’ exercise.

5.0 COMMUNICATING THE MESSAGES

5.1 Key messages

Working in small groups, participants were asked to identify what they thought the most important messages were that should be communicated to the public and key stakeholders. The most common responses were:

- The potential benefits of hosting a site, such as employment opportunities, better infrastructure and facilities, and other community benefits;
- The potential risks of hosting a site, such as accidents and environmental impact;
- Possible locations, when known;
- What the facility might look like;
- The nature and source of waste (i.e. UK or global);
- That this issue could affect residents;
- That residents are invited to get involved in discussions.

A full list of responses to all of the questions in this section are included at Appendix Five.

5.2 Points of clarity and confusion

Participants were asked what they had found useful and confusing during the session. Useful points included:

- The factual information provided in Alun Ellis' talk on the national context;
- The fact that 70% of radioactive waste destined for disposal is already at Sellafield;
- Discussion of the 'get out clause' (right to withdraw);
- Explanation of where information could be found;
- Diagrammatical representations of information;
- The message that there is 'no third option': the problem of finding a final resting place for higher activity radioactive waste will not go away and we can either continue with the current storage solution or develop a facility.

Participants felt more information was needed on:

- What other nuclear countries are doing, how we can learn from them, and how areas hosting a facility have been affected, perhaps presented via case studies;
- How many jobs are likely to be created, including how many of these are short term, how many are long term, what the jobs will be in (e.g. engineering, security etc.) and how it will be ensured jobs go to local people;
- The benefits of a facility below ground over the current above-ground storage in the short and long term;
- The potential impact on the local environment and tourism;
- What happens regarding security after waste is deposited;
- How waste will be transported to the site and taken underground;
- The likely size of a site and features of a facility.

Aspects that participants had found confusing included the mention of '100,000 years', described as a "*mind-boggling period*", and similarly the depth of a potential facility. Diagrams such as a timeline and a comparison of the depth of a facility against the height of a well-known landmark might clarify these two points, respectively. Many also found it hard to visualise what waste looks like and what form it would take (e.g. solid, liquid or gas), which again could be clarified through visuals.

5.3 Communications channels

Participants suggested a wide range of communications channels through which information could be communicated to local residents, including:

- Broadcast media, e.g. TV and radio, including phone-ins
- Print media, e.g. local newspapers and village/parish newsletters
- Internet and social media e.g. Facebook and Twitter
- Advertising in different formats e.g. leaflets, posters and billboards
- ...and in different places, e.g. local events, shopping centres, supermarkets, libraries, cafes, cinemas, side of buses, waiting rooms (all types), cereal boxes, toilets, tourist information offices, video screens in service stations and GPs surgeries, and train station car parks
- More discussion-based activities with local people
- Messages out through existing stakeholder groups
- House to house survey
- Telephone hotline
- Intranets and e-shots within large companies
- Celebrity involvement.

The group had somewhat mixed opinions as to where communications should be targeted geographically: whilst some felt it should mainly be focussed on Allerdale and Copeland, others felt all Cumbria residents should receive information, and some that neighbouring counties should also be included, although perhaps less than West Cumbria.

5.4 Response to PSE 1 leaflet

The group was asked for feedback on the PSE 1 leaflet. Participants reported that the leaflet was well written and easy to understand. The timeline contained within the leaflet was also praised, with a number of individuals noting that diagrams convey a clear message. The main criticism of the leaflet was that the cover gave no indication that the information contained within affected local people or that their views were being invited. Comments included:

“It doesn’t really shout that a consultation and discussions are happening, [it] just looks like an info leaflet (so I just thought it was junk mail).”

“There’s nothing to say its anything new or that we are in discussions... It needs to say ‘This will affect you’.”

The cover was also described as *“uninspiring”* and *“not eye-catching.”* Nevertheless, participants felt that an improved leaflet should be included at PSE2, perhaps with a table listing the potential pros and cons of hosting a facility in order to demonstrate the importance of the engagement process to local people themselves. The group reported that it was happy to act as a sounding board for the next leaflet.

6.0 MOVING FORWARD

6.1 Evaluating the day

- Participants were generally positive in their evaluation of the event. All felt that the information presented to them had helped their understanding of the process, and the vast majority found the event interesting (one reported it had been ‘average’).
- Participants agreed they had been given a chance to feed their views into discussion, and the vast majority would be interested in taking part in future events (one participant did not respond to this question).

6.2 Participants’ recommendations

- The group’s final advice to the Partnership is included at Appendix Six. In summary, participants recommended the Partnership:
 - Provide regular, straightforward and honest information to the public, including pros and cons, in order to help them develop an informed opinion;
 - Consult widely, including with young people and those who are not normally interested in public matters;
 - Actively encourage feedback, and make it easy for residents to share their views;
 - Listen to these views, act on them, and demonstrate how people’s views have been taken into account, in order to build trust in the process.

6.3 Additional recommendations

- Based on the evidence presented in this report, Vision Twentyone also recommend that moving forward, the Partnership:
 - Ensure that all information provided to the public makes clear that the engagement process is not a tick-box exercise: no decision has yet been made on whether to participate in the siting process and feedback from the public is actively encouraged.
 - Include information in the next round of communications (for example in FAQs) that helps to avoid potential misconceptions, for example that a UK Geological Disposal Facility might take waste from around the world.
 - Endeavour to take consultation activities to the people, for example via a roving exhibition and/or providing information to a wide range of local groups. Some groups have been identified through this event; others could be brought to light via a question in the next Ipsos MORI resident survey.
 - Consider whether residents should be represented on the Partnership, or whether the Partnership should remain an ‘expert group’, with the views of residents continuing to be fed in via deliberative engagement.
 - Continue to engage, consult and involve a variety of stakeholders via a range of methods in order to ensure the process is inclusive and accessible.
 - Provide feedback to participants illustrating where their suggestions have been taken on board, and where they have not been followed up, why not. This will help to ensure an open and transparent process and develop trust.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE:
Quiz results

Introductory quiz

Correct answers are in bold type.

TEST QUESTION: Today's event is being held on behalf of the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership. But what does MRWS stand for?		
A	Mountain Range Water Sports	0%
B	Massage, Relaxation, Water therapy and Spas	0%
C	Medium Range Weapon Systems	0%
D	Managing Radioactive Waste Safely	100%
No answer		0%

The Government have launched a search for an engineered, underground site for radioactive waste - called a 'Geological Disposal Facility'. How deep underground is this facility likely to be?		
A	Up to 100 metres underground	0%
B	Between 200 and 1000 metres underground	92%
C	More than 2000 metres underground	8%
D	It's a trick question - the facility will be ABOVE ground	0%
No answer		0%

How many years do the Government estimate it will be before a facility is ready to receive waste?		
A	Less than 10 years	0%
B	10-20 years	25%
C	20-30 years	58%
D	Over 30 years	8%
No answer		9%

What would the Geological Disposal Facility be made up of?		
A	Natural barriers (the geology of the site)	0%
B	Man-made barriers (the waste containers...)	17%
C	Both natural AND man-made barriers	75%
D	Something else...	0%
No answer		8%

What percentage of the country's radioactive waste is already at Sellafield?		
A	90%	50%
B	70%	50%
C	30%	0%
D	10%	0%
No answer		0%

Allerdale, Copeland and Cumbria councils have started talking to Government about the search for a site at this very early stage, without any commitment to moving to the next stage. Who will make the decision as to whether the three councils move to the next stage of discussions?		
A	The councils themselves	25%
B	West Cumbria MRWS Partnership	42%
C	The Government	25%
D	The European Union	0%
No answer		8%

Who is providing funding to cover the costs of the work the Partnership needs to carry out before it can make its recommendation?		
A	The three councils	0%
B	The Government	100%
C	Private companies	0%
D	Bill Gates	0%
No answer		0%

APPENDIX TWO:
Participants' Questions

Participants' questions

Questions to Alun Ellis, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Elaine Woodburn, Leader of Copeland Borough Council and former Chair of West Cumbria MRWS Partnership:

- It's interesting only three councils have come forward, and I'm concerned that nobody else has. Why would any borough consider being involved in this process? What are the benefits?
- We're likely to have a change of Government this year. What assurance have we got that things will stay the way they are at the moment if the Government changes?
- Over 60 years we've generated around 500,000 M³; are we building a facility to hold that or more? Is the facility just for legacy waste or new waste as well?
- When will the results of the British Geological Survey be available and how?

Questions to Rhuari Bennett, 3KQ:

- We have newsletter, can information from the website go in it?
- Will there be anything on TV? We don't all get papers etc.
- Percentage in local area who support is vitally important.
- How can you possibly weight views of people who live a long way away?
- You said 7,900 leaflets were sent out to West Cumbria residents – why not all of Cumbria?

Questions noted down throughout the session:

- Percentage and locality – who decides on totals? After or before 2nd phase?
- How many other counties have shown interest?
- No 100,000 year project before, how will it be managed?
- What mechanisms for accessing public views. Problem, geology, way forward. Credibility of findings.
- No other 'offers'. 1950's, what was the plan?
- How many jobs will it create?
- Will worldwide waste come here? On site and process.

Questions noted down by facilitators i.e.:

- Who is on the West Cumbria Stakeholder Group, listed as a Partnership member?

APPENDIX THREE:
Hopes and Fears

Hopes and Fears

NB: Number in brackets after each point indicates the number of people on the table who indicated that this is was one of their top priorities.

Table	Hopes	Fears
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits to community (x6) • Local employment (x3) • Public vote (x2) • Honesty and openness • Investment in trader workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State of infrastructure (x6) • Retrievability (x4) • How safe is it? (x2) • Natural disasters • Impact on existing industry, i.e. tourism
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs (x10) • Infrastructure (x2) • Roads, rail, public transport (x1) • New technology means waste is a commodity! (x3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (x6) • Legacy we may leave (x4) • Investment goes somewhere else (x2) • Negative effect on (west coast) tourism (x1) • Terrorism (x1) • Railroaded (x1)
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep jobs local (x3) • We will be listened to (x2) • More than this room knows what's going on (x2) • New technology will be advanced (x2) • Get real investment in the local infrastructure (x2) • Might be a benefit to us (x2) • Proper information given (x1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human error (x4) • Government approach, what are the legal requirements, do we trust them (x2) • Cover ups (x2) • Actual sites, will it be managed properly (x2) • Views put forward are listened to (x1) • What are the risks • 100,000 years • Impact on the environment • Might turn out to be more risky than we realise • Loudest voices usually heard (x1)
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It goes away (x1) • More jobs/nice/area of expertise (x4) • Risk management plan adequate (x2) • Research – we learn more about nuclear waste for the future (x1) • Other places express interest – more volunteers (x1) • Incentives for more volunteers • More jobs for infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety – long term/short term (x3) • Worldwide waste ends up in Cumbria/ [we become] EU repository (x3) • Impact on tourism (x2) • Never local (political decision) (x2) • Reputation of Cumbria (x1) • Blot on landscape – what's it going to look like (x1) • Animals/wildlife (x1) • Responsibility for future generation • House prices • Brainwashed • Feels cosmetic/ done deal

APPENDIX FOUR:

Local groups and information channels

Local groups and information channels:

- Alcan Salterbeck
- Broughton Newsletter
- Cadets
- Church newsletter/e-mails i.e. our Lady & St Michaels, Worthington.
- Churches e.g. local Gosfarm/Ravenglass/Seascale Churches
- Colleges
- Cumbria Beekeepers Association
- Egremont Village magazine (internet)
- Flimby Community Hall and Partnership
- Gosfarm net – www.gosfarmvillage.net
- Intranets – such as at BNFL
- Kesmail in Keswick
- Local village and church halls – boards
- Lowes Court Egremont
- Mothers and toddlers
- National Trust
- NCT publication (for mums)
- Northern Fells Group
- Outward Bound
- Parish Councils
- Partnership members should be e-mailing out
- Preschool Playgroups Association
- Red Squirrel Conservation groups (a lot of land owners attached to this)
- Rheged
- Rotary clubs
- Round Table
- RSPB
- Scouts/Guides
- Seascale Community Parish book
- Social Services
- Solfest (10,000 capacity music and arts festival)
- Special Supplement of Times & Star and Whitehaven Weekly
- Sports centres Egremont, Whitehaven, Lakes College, St Martins College
- St Bees Parish Council
- Ste Bees Priory PCC – See Helen Taylor
- The All Hallows Centre – Fletchertown
- The Solway Buzz (Community Newspaper)
- Tourist boards/websites i.e. www.golakes.com
- Tourist travel agencies/centres
- University of the Third Age – Cockermouth and elsewhere
- University/education centres
- Village Halls
- Village newsletters
- Whitehaven Civic Hall
- Women's Institute
- Youth Councils

APPENDIX FIVE:
Communications

Communications

From the information you've heard today, what do you think are the most important messages for the public and key stakeholders? (Prompt: If you saw a news article on the process, what three things would draw your attention?)

- The risks – environment, accidents, mutant sheep – genetic effects.
- Technology/management of the process – how do you design something to last more than 100,000 years.
- The benefits to the general public. Better infrastructure, facilities i.e. hospitals etc.
- Possible locations.
- Nature and source of waste.
- Diagrams and pictures.
- Pros and Cons.
- You are invited to these discussions.
- Title – Managing Radioactivity – could be – ‘This could effect you’, time scale detailed. Something to say that your views are important and no feedback requested.
- Bright colours.
- Could have announced the delivery of booklet. Questionnaire should have come with them.
- Location.
- Employment and community benefits – compensation.
- Environment – visual impact.
- *Most people do not realise there is not a third option. It is either carry on with over-ground storage at Sellafield or an underground repository.*
- Re-open visitors centre mobile exhibition?

What else do you need to know? Think about anything you've found particularly useful today?

- 70% of UK waste at Sellafield already. Other nuclear countries are going along the same route.
- Where to find out the information.
- The get out clause.
- Impact on the local environment i.e. tourism.
- Size of site?
- We are already storing 70%. Information about the benefits of a facility below ground short term/long term over the current over land storage. What do the French do? Can we learn from other countries.
- Alun's talk – could have had more information about his talk and subjects – facts.
- Case studies – similar issues in other countries.

Is there anything you found particularly confusing?

- Long list of Partnership – who nominated them? West Cumbria – stakeholders – ‘what is that?’ details of groups are confusing – local people don't know who they are and what they do.
- Waste is confusing, what is it/what does it look like?
- 100,000 years a bit mind boggling.
- Not really, information given was quite straight forward.

What don't you need to know?

- Don't need to know some of the stakeholders views – 'we need to know everything about the whole process'.
- Should have the right to access all information.
- We need to know everything.

What methods should we use to communicate the messages?

- Media (tv/radio).
- Billboards.
- Cinemas.
- Shopping centres.
- Local newsletters.
- Local events.
- Posters.
- Cereal boxes.
- Waiting rooms (all types)
- Toilets – advertise on doors, over urinals.
- Bus advertising.
- Supermarkets – checkout tills, cafes etc.
- House to house survey.
- Awareness raised prior to survey – why it is important, regarding the discussion made.
- Internet/advertising/Facebook etc etc – papers – shop windows/collages/Hotline/free number.
- Tourist information offices.
- Sellafield – haven't been told. Re-open Sellafield visitors centre.
- Intra network.
- Countryfile – 2 weeks ago – did report on this!!)

What geographical areas should we focus on?

- West Cumbria.
- Keswick.
- Keep all areas informed.
- Cumbria, then focus on more who it affects more?
- As near to Sellafield site as possible – less time for waste on roads, rail etc.
- Maybe neighbouring countries.
- Mainly Allerdale and Copeland.

Think about the leaflet. Did you find it easy to understand?

- Yes, front cover could be more eye-catching.
- Yes, well written, easy to understand. Could be more eye-catching on the cover.
- Yes, because nothing is really in it.
- Didn't read it.
- Time scale shocking – didn't think it would take so long.
- Better as bullet points.
- I like the flow chart bit.
- Front cover dull, doesn't really shout that a consultation and discussions are happening, just looks like an info leaflet, (so I just thought it was junk mail).

Did it contain the right info?

- Yes.
- Yes.
- Not enough information in it.
- Probably won't open it to read the information in it.
- Time line for discussions to be made.
- Information on waste now and other waste that will be produced. Where is the waste now?

APPENDIX SIX:
Final Thoughts

What final piece of advice would you give to the Partnership as they move forward with this process?

- I think that the public need to know all the information to be able to understand what is proposed and if they do then they will be less concerned. I have been very interested today and learned more. I think trust is very important and the effects on future generations.
- To ensure that the public are educated and kept up to date with the process. Thus enabling them to have an informed opinion.
- To listen to the people and act accordingly to let everybody know the good and bad.
- Keep the local population aware of all stages i.e. decision making, research and development etc.
- The sooner areas of Allerdale and Copeland are screened out by the [illegible]. This will simplify and focus the process.
- To involve the local people, television stations with bulletin progress reports and telephone contact numbers for more information.
- Highlight the changes that they have implemented as a direct result of the discussions (hopefully building more trust in the process).
- Remember everyone's views count. To pull out if everyone wants them to.
- To make any feedback process easy and simple.
- Acknowledge refinements implemented as a result of consultation.
- To try to consult the people who might not normally be interested in public matters and to involve the youth of the community as much as possible.
- Keep it simple.
- To place emphasis on consultation – current leaflet looks like information only – feedback needs to be actively encouraged. I know that's easier said than done!
- Make sure the facts are true. Tell people as it is, good, bad or indifferent. Keep everyone involved informed.
- To remain in engaged with the public.
- Less use of the word facilitator.
- Keep stressing the desire to be open and consult the general public.
- To keep searching for a fully inclusive consultation process (lots of ideas of how, and several hard to reach groups were identified today).
- Generate public interest and awareness of the topic. Then, send out relevant, informative, eye-catching leaflets which allow for (and facilitate) feedback.
- Talk a bit about the chances of the process happening in another part of the country.
- Don't make sessions too over-processed. Some more facilitated open debate would be good. A little too rushed at times. Keep going and remain positive, transparent and honest.
- Give the highest possible priority/emphasis to a house-to-house (incentive) survey and narrow down the target group (too many undemocratic stakeholders).
- More detail on quantity and implications to the local infrastructure. Making people aware of what could be on their doorstep.
- Listen to the people of West Cumbria please. Would be good for the same group of people to see the progress of the Partnership, then the views could be aligned.

What would you like to see discussed at the next session?

- I would be interested to see how the process is moving along.
- The possible sites and the benefits it will bring to the area.
- Information as to where the facility will be built and who will benefit most, the people or the government.
- More information on possible locations, from Nirex research. There must be sites that are much more suitable than others.
- Comparisons with approaches by other counties with similar problems.
- The location, benefits for the community and a greater forecast for the impact of how it will affect future generations.
- Presuming we are further along, more in depth discussions on impact of a facility, pros and cons etc.
- How jobs will remain for Cumbrian people. What jobs are going.
- Clearer idea of the benefits and potential locations.
- The benefits to the area and Cumbria in general brought in on the back of the project.
- Possible geological sites. Benefits to the community. How a site would look and be constructed – environmental impact.
- The process in general.
- Specific outcomes of long-term investment by Government in the area as a result of the facility being developed in this area.
- Updates on where the process is.
- The state of the progress. Discuss new leaflet.
- Quite happy to go with what's needed.
- Weighing up the pros and cons of having the facility here in Cumbria, we need to give informed discussions.
- What Cumbria (West Cumbria in particular) would like/would not like if a repository was to be sited here. What kind of safety features the public would expect from a repository.
- Case studies of similar facilities in different countries. What advice was taken on board from this session. Outcome of geological studies.
- Any feedback you have received about the discussions today, whether it was considered a good day – helpful or informative.
- More facts about the waste. Practicalities what happens now. Got a little lost regarding the stakeholders who they were and key decision makers.
- Routes from nuclear sources (power plants) e.g. routes of transportation. How to raise the effectiveness of the targeting. Specifies on revised leaflet (present us with draft), (no more seminars when England plays Wales on the tele).
- More detail into reasons why West Cumbria and the implications that could follow. Details of what has happened in other countries and their 'fors' and 'againsts'. How the country's waste will get here!
- Groups to be approached and why. Details of next leaflet production. Production time line. Reports on areas that could be selected. When and where ads are to go and what the ads are and can help put them together. Presentation to local communities – how, what form and who presents them – maybe use 'local people'. Transport links for waste, where and when.