

**Intermediary Group - Melbreak Communities**

Question	Agree	Response
<b>Overview</b>		18 people took part in a group discussion facilitated by ACT.
<b>1 – Geology</b>	Yes – 1 No – 15	<p>NO:15 YES: 1 Abstentions: 2</p> <p>Geological investigations should take place throughout the UK. The best sites should be identified, and a decision made on this basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To go straight to a consideration of Cumbria alone on something as critical as this indicates that geology and safety are not being considered rigorously.</li> <li>• Within Cumbria, the BGS have only looked at minerals and water; the complex geology has been ignored. The nirex study was too narrow in its scope.</li> <li>• Without dealing with geology in a national context, the whole of the consultation is built on serious flaws, and is, in effect, back-to-front</li> </ul>
<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Not answered	<p>The group felt unable to answer these questions without the following clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the long term (1000 year +) implications? The solutions being proposed may be fine for 3 or 4 generations but what about beyond this?</li> <li>• What is the consideration being given to transport infrastructure? This may well extend throughout all of Cumbria, across to junction 40 on the M6.</li> <li>• What will the planning body be? How will it be made up? Question 2 can only begin to be answered once this is known.</li> <li>• If answers are provided without these clarifications, the 'go-forward' momentum may become irreversible.</li> </ul>
<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Not answered	<p>The group felt unable to answer this question for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decisions on how and where are so far-reaching and fundamental, that they should be the responsibility of a national and international group of experts. Such a group may well come to a decision about location within the UK which would have an impact on contents of a 'community benefits' package.</li> <li>• The wording around 'community benefits' focuses on the short and medium term, while the essence of a repository is its extraordinarily long term time scale.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Eric Robson is an owner of Osprey Communications and is currently Chair of Cumbria Tourism, there is a question mark on the independence of the text on the tourism challenge.</li> </ul>
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	Not answered	<p>The group felt unable to answer these questions for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some communities in the west of Cumbria are so desperate for short term benefits, that these benefits should be excluded from the consultation, as they will distort responses.</li> <li>• The long term social and economic needs of West Cumbria cannot be met by a community benefits package.</li> <li>• The community benefits package needs to address the needs of many generations still unborn.</li> <li>• The community benefits package will probably not outweigh the possible detrimental effect of, for example, a 3% loss of tourism income in the county which would be equivalent to £600,000 in a given year.</li> <li>• A possible destructive impact on tourism could not be just measured in regional tourism pounds; it would have a destructive effect on the country as a whole.</li> <li>• There is not sufficient information available to provide an adequate answer to this question.</li> </ul>
<b>5 – Design and engineering</b>	No – 17	<p>NO:17 Abstentions: 1</p> <p>The implications for the future of humanity in the world are caught up in this process; the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership does not have sufficient knowledge to make decisions; the best scientists in the world are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are not enough developed design concepts in the literature to allow for commentary on this question. It is irresponsible for the partnership to state they are satisfied with these design concepts.</li> <li>• What communities are being told is not enough for communities to respond to the question; communities and the partnership cannot come to a decision on this basis.</li> <li>• A clarification needed on retrievability; will the site be sealed or not? The group felt that retrievability was absolutely essential.</li> </ul>
<b>6 – Inventory</b>	No – 16	<p>NO:16 Abstentions: 2</p> <p>This is an international/global issue and needs to be addressed in this way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This calls up all the concerns about geology. The spent fuel rods are hot and will force water, gases and pollutants to the surface in faulty areas.</li> <li>• This is an issue for central government and it unlikely and inappropriate for communities to have an influence on decision making.</li> <li>• A clarification is needed on the reception of radioactive waste from other countries; will this be taken into the</li> </ul>

		<p>repository or not?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not appropriate in a consultation for this statement to be made: 'The Partnership has received what it was looking for on the inventory at this stage in the process.'</li> </ul>
<b>7 – Siting process</b>	No – 16	<p>NO:16 Abstentions: 2</p> <p>This is an international/global issue and needs to be addressed in this way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This calls up all the concerns about geology. The spent fuel rods are hot and will force water, gases and pollutants to the surface in faulty areas.</li> <li>• This is an issue for central government and it unlikely and inappropriate for communities to have an influence on decision making.</li> <li>• A clarification is needed on the reception of radioactive waste from other countries; will this be taken into the repository or not?</li> <li>• It is not appropriate in a consultation for this statement to be made: 'The Partnership has received what it was looking for on the inventory at this stage in the process.'</li> </ul>
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		<p>There was much scepticism in the group about the intention of this question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was felt that by giving a green light to a continuing search, this would contribute towards a continuing and possibly irreversible momentum; 'loss of face' is often a powerful driver in calamitous decisions.</li> <li>• It would also narrow down very quickly to one or two specific sites.</li> </ul>
<b>9 – Additional comments</b>		<p>There is a need for a panel or group of experts and wise men and women who are not connected to the area to come together and make a decision on the best place for a site in the UK. This panel should address the anxieties of the community without giving the community the responsibility for decision making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the process is 'cart-before-horse', communities will feel manipulated and protective of their integrity and will always ask the question: 'Why is this being done in this way?'</li> </ul>