

Ennerdale & Kinniside Parish Council

Question	Agree	Response
Letter accompanying response form		<p>At the recent meeting of Ennerdale and Kinniside Parish Council the following question was put to councillors:</p> <p>'Does this Parish Council believe that the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Project should move forward to Stage 4 of the project, this being desk based studies to ascertain the suitability of the geology of Copeland for housing an underground repository.'</p> <p>A wide ranging debate took place and at the end of the debate the vote was as follows:</p> <p>Those in favour of the move to Stage 4: 2 councillors Those opposed to the move to Stage 4: 4 councillors</p> <p>The reasons for the decision of Ennerdale & Kinniside Parish Council not to support the MRWS Project moving to Stage 4 in Copeland are given in the attached document [the response form] and will be relayed to the following organisations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Copeland Borough Council 2. Cumbria County Council 3. Cumbria Association of Local Councils 4. Lake District National Park <p>Should you wish any further information regarding this decision then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
1 – Geology	No	<p>The Consultative Document states that the integrity of the BGS report has no significant criticism. Prof. Smythe makes numerous criticisms of this report and supports his criticisms with evidence.</p> <p>Prof. Smythe also concludes that the areas in West and North Cumbria are unsuitable or unlikely to be suitable. There is a part rebuttal by Dr. Dearlove. However Dr. Dearlove offers little or no evidence to support his position.</p> <p>The most optimistic outcome is that there is a small prospect of finding a suitable geological area. Such a situation does not justify further expenditure of public monies, until a consensus is reached between the differing expert opinions.</p> <p>Furthermore there are unclear or no criteria for identifying what constitutes suitable geology for a repository.</p>
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Safety:</p> <p>See Geology comments above as these have a bearing on Safety.</p>

		<p>We are undecided on the NDA's R&D programme.</p> <p>Regulatory and Planning Processes:</p> <p>There is uncertainty about which planning process that will be used. The planning role of the DMB councils needs to be clarified. There is a potential for conflict of interests between the councils role as DMB and as a planning authority.</p>
3 – Impacts	No	<p>Direct Impacts:</p> <p>The Issues Register is incomplete. Some aspects and impacts cannot be assessed until a specific site is found. However, there are many such aspects and impacts that could be assessed in advance of Stage 4 but this was not done.</p> <p>Long-term Direction:</p> <p>There is little note made of the long-term impact on tourism and the rural economy. It has certainly not been given the same weight as that for job creation in the energy sector.</p> <p>Economic Sustainability:</p> <p>The Chair of the MRWS Partnership has stated that the adverse impact, of high volumes of low level waste has on communities, tourism and inward investment , has not been weighed. How can we be confident that a high level waste repository will not have a net negative impact resulting in an overall lessening of employment opportunities, unless this is also weighed?</p>
4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The only reference, in the 12 Principles, to the Host Community and adversely affected groups is in Principle 1. This only states that Community Benefits are used to provide a positive contribution to affected communities.</p> <p>Principles 6 seeks to “transform the economic and social well-being of West Cumbria”. The suggestion that this transformation should not be done to the detriment of the Host Community was rejected by the MRWS Partnership.</p> <p>The 12 Principles do not offer the assurances that the Host Community and adversely affected groups will be given priority claim on Community Benefits funding.</p>
5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No Comments.
6 – Inventory	Yes	No Comments.
7 – Siting process	No	The Chair of the MRWS Partnership has confirmed that if a Host Community is unwilling to participate, then the decision can

	<p>be subjected to a review. However this same review mechanism does not apply to a willing Host community. He has also confirmed that if a DMB considers it appropriate, then it can override the wishes of an unwilling Host Community and include that community within the siting process.</p> <p>What is not disclosed is the justification, in principle, each of the individual DMBs would offer for acting against the wishes of their respective electorates.</p> <p>The Right of Withdrawal is offered as a safeguard to the affected communities. However this right is exercised by the DMBs, who have already shown that they are willing to act against the wishes of an unwilling Host Community. So why would a Host Community expect the DMBs to respect their wishes to use this right of withdraw?</p>
<p>8 – Overall views on participation</p>	<p>There are fundamental flaws in the way the MRWS Partnership has been managed, resulting in serious concerns with the integrity of the process.</p> <p>This is compounded by the Chair of the MRWS Partnership statement that councils (who are also DMBs) will be included on the Siting Partnership, despite the Partnership having not taken a view on this matter. One is left wondering what other matters are being decided without consultation.</p> <p>Fundamental questions, on how Voluntarism will operate, took over three months to be answered. Why?</p> <p>The Opinion Survey has misleading explanatory text:</p> <p>In Q2, the statement that communities would have the right of withdrawal is untrue. There is a right of withdrawal but it is not in the remit of the host community to exercise this right. The DMBs (local councils) retain this right and may not respond the community's desire to withdraw.</p> <p>In Q3, the statement that the Partnership assists the DMBs in reaching decisions does not explain the true position. The three DMBs are represented on the Partnership and actively participate in the decision to consider proceeding to Stage 4. The same DMBs will then make the final decision on proceeding to Stage 4 based on the Partnership's advice, to which they had already contributed.</p> <p>This lack of genuinely independent advice and the role played by the DMBs ought to be made clear to those being surveyed. The conflict of interest within the DMBs ought also to be explained.</p> <p>In Q4, the statement that local communities will be involved in discussions about the location of possible sites fails to explain that DMBs may act against an unwilling community's wishes, if there are difficulties with excluding any particular host community.</p> <p>The possibility, of DMBs acting against the wishes of the communities, has been confirmed by the Chair of the MRWS Partnership.</p>

9 – Additional comments		There is a lack of transparency and misleading statements arising from the MRWS process resulting in an overall lack of confidence in the integrity of DMBs to respond to the wishes of the communities they represent.