

**Intermediary Group - Aspatria Rural Partnership**

Question	Agree	Response
<b>Overview</b>		7 members of the Aspatria Rural Partnership took part in a group discussion facilitated by ACT.
<b>1 – Geology</b>	Yes	What about the evidence from other experts, when will we see what their opinions are. If this is what the structure is then surely we must accept at this stage, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that they have done their job properly. It has got to be worth moving to the next stage. I understand that there is a contrary view from another expert that the whole of the county is unsafe but we don't know what that says, will that view be incorporated at some future stage.
<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Not Sure/ Partly	Not wholly convinced of this section particularly how independent the regulatory bodies are and how they are going to be verified. Who can be 100% certain or is that being unrealistic, the group felt they couldn't endorse the principles as they didn't fully understand them. We are being asked to comment at this stage on the principles but more importantly these are more relevant to future stages once potential sites are identified. We could say yes if we took it exactly as it says but there is still room for re-assurance.
<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes	If seen in its totality it could be a good thing for West Cumbria with the potential for spoil from the site being used for other projects i.e a barge across the Solway, there should be long term benefits to the area especially if it is combined with other opportunities but that would need to be well coordinated. Diversification should be the key taking advantage of every opportunity.
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	Not Sure/ Partly	We need a bit more than just principles, they may well be developed in time but we need more specifics before making any firm decision. Community benefits should be seen in its broadest sense and not just by individuals, rate reductions across the board would be a suggestion. Compensation needs to be considered for any damage caused to the environment, other disruption caused in the building process, even obstruction of views. As this area potentially could be housing the waste from across the country then any community benefits and compensation package should reflect that. The wording is too weak, we need commitments not just principles, this is very much political speak and by no means detailed enough to make firm decisions.
<b>5 – Design and engineering</b>	Yes	Retrievability should not just be an option but should be a definite, there should be a built in process to ensure retrievability. We would agree with all the principles at this stage.
<b>6 – Inventory</b>	Not Sure/ Partly	What about the decision to house other people's waste, if the site is safe should we not consider other people's waste if the price is right. Any changes as to what is placed in the site should be made with the

		communities input. How much storage can it take, presumably the site will be based on what waste will be produced in future years as well as what is already being stored overground, surely that can be measured at this stage. Community involvement in agreeing that inventory and any changes to it must involve the community. Would feel alot happier if the final decision was made by the community rather than politicians.
<b>7 – Siting process</b>	Not Sure/ Partly	Point one in the opinions is fair enough. There is still some confusion as what geographically is West Cumbria, north Allerdale is in West Cumbria, do the population of this area really understand that it could be sited here and that they would have to be involved. How difficult is it going to be to get a consensus, the partnership should be praised for trying but will have to try much harder to get the right relationship with the community. Dont fully understand the second point other than not underestimating the task ahead. Is it going to be possible?
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		We think that the councils should go ahead with moving to the next stage without making any committments to have it providing that the next stage will not be payed for from local taxes. What work is being done to measure the impact on tourism of just the consultation process, a brand protection study.
<b>9 – Additional comments</b>		This should be an opportunity to look at other initiatives that would benefit the community, a joined up thinking approach should be seriously considered. Lets have some imagination shown.