

**Intermediary Group – Silloth Locality Group**

Question	Agree	Response
<b>Overview</b>		7 people took part in a group discussion facilitated by ACT.
<b>1 – Geology</b>	No	The Nirex report from the 90's, why is that no longer accepted. Is this something that we are being pointed down the road of their observations, there appears to be conflicting reports about the results from Nirex and the latest geological survey. What about the potential of climate change and rising sea levels, how will that affect a repository, what other potentil impacts could there be from siting it along the coastline, the water table in this area is saline, how will that affect any underground facility. Human failure, who will remember 100,000 years into the future, how can decisions be made now that ensure that any site will be geologically safe. The group felt that more information was needed on the geology but accepted that further investigations needed to be made.
<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	No	What about future planning policies, would such a large development not be decided at national level if it was decided that it was in the national interest as has happended elsewhere and is happening regularly with wind turbine developments when local objections are being overuled by a national panel. How realistic will the opportunity to withdraw at any stage be, even at the 11th hour.Is this about safety above and below ground, what will determine what will be above and what below ground. What will be the size of the overground facilities and how safe will they be. We think the terrorist threat is a red herring if continued storage above ground continues. Could it not be managed better whilst it is in sight rather than buried underground out of sight. Why isn't the money being spent on this research looking at alternative methods of storage, at least then we would have some options to consider. How safe will any retrievability options be, could they not equally be an oppportunity for terrorism. How realistic is it that communities will have a voice on important decisions as to safety and security.
<b>3 – Impacts</b>	No	Tourism against jobs, no evidence of how many jobs could be developed balanced against the loss of tourism, will there be a reduction in investment that is not linked to nuclear,thereby denying the oportunity for other industries, partuclarly at a time when the facility is being developed. How will the area be compensated, Sellafield has held back development in the county on other industries, further investment in nuclear will only reduce other oppportunys further. What industries might have been here without Sellafield, there have been positives and negitives. Where is the evidence that Sellafield has brought prosperity to the west of the county, there are still large areas of deprivation. Where is the evidence that further expansion of nuclear will bring economic benefits to the area.
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	No	What are the principles that have been agreed with government, which government and what about future

		governments. Without further information about what those reasonable opportunities are likely to be, and how communities could be involved with negotiating any benefits package it is difficult to make a decision. Sceptical about whether we could have any influence, recent experience of community benefit packages from a windfarm development does not fill you with hope, there was supposed to be a visitors centre linked to the Robin Rigg development that is yet to appear. A lot of unanswered questions.
<b>5 – Design and engineering</b>	No	Can the engineers be trusted to come up with the best development, something that will stand the test of time, when Sellafield was built no provision was made for nuclear waste. Where is the evidence that whatever is designed and built will last for 100,000 years. We don't feel we have sufficient knowledge about what is being proposed from a design point of view as it is difficult to imagine the scale of things. Will the material being retrievable or will it be buried for good, what if something unforeseen happens, if it is not accessible how can any problem be addressed. Will it be a one off development or will this be something that will need to grow as further waste is produced, and be almost be a continuing developing site.
<b>6 – Inventory</b>	No	Insufficient information on what the inventory will look like, what will be in there, old waste, new waste, low level waste, how sure are we that the inventory will change in future years which could mean that waste from other countries could be taken requiring further expansion of the site. The impacts would be felt more in the west than in the rest of the county if changes to the inventory were made meaning that it could mean additional development below and above ground, rather than it being a one off development with future activity only being required to manage the site.
<b>7 – Siting process</b>	No	The windfarm examples of communities being against developments and then being overturned does not fill you with confidence. I don't believe that a community has a chance if a site in our area is identified, there is more likelihood it will go ahead based on a national need rather than local objections, what governments say and what actually happens can be quite different. The recent siting a windfarm on unsuitable land requiring far more work than was originally planned to make it suitable does not fill you with confidence. We live in an area of the county that is heavily populated, there is no one area where substantial areas of the population will not be affected unlike other countries where this process is likely to happen in areas of low population. There will be reluctance on behalf of communities to agree that this will not be a huge change to people's lives and those of subsequent generations.
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		Can we ever pull out. We feel that something needs to be done with the waste but feel that other options have not yet been considered, or if they have we don't know of them, we need further options before any decision about underground storage being the only option can be supported.