

Intermediary Group – Howgate Cluster Group

Question	Agree	Response
Overview		6 people took part in a group discussion facilitated by ACT.
1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	This is a low level of proof as to areas that could be used, what is the criteria for selecting possible sites, if one has been agreed, rock is mentioned all through the DVD, unfaulted rock, clay ancient salt deposits. Other experts (Geologists) have said that no where in west Cumbria is suitable, how does their evidence differ from the BGS survey. Nirex research looked at other areas than just Gosforth. The whole process is flawed at every step. What about the water table, will water still flow through the rock, what are the safeguards surrounding water in the longer term.
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	What are the regulatory bodies, do they currently exist and who are they, if they are being developed at what stage of development are they, if they are not already formed how can we comment on their effectiveness. An office for Nuclear regulation could be a good thing, proof of the pudding etc. If regulatory bodies are kept separate it would be easier to make more accountable. Safety security and the environment could come under one regulation but planning is a completely different entity, doesn't belong with the other three, the fourth point it is unclear if anything is being done. There are many examples of planning decisions being made by national bodies in the national interests, how much will the community views be recognised in that instance.
3 – Impacts	Yes	Will future jobs be for local people, are our workforce currently geared up for these jobs and what will be done to ensure that they are. What will be the chance of bringing in an outside workforce. We need to look at the wider benefits that this could bring, what other environmental projects could be linked in to this, other infrastructure projects, use it as an opportunity to think outside the box.
4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	What comes with the site benefits should be associated with the wider developments to the area. People are unclear about what those future benefits will be. What about some benefits now, before a site is built, couldn't some benefits be negotiated with communities during the consultation process, Hinkley point are in the process of building a new nuclear power station and a community benefits package is already in place prior to its development. Surely we deserve some benefits for going down this road.
5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Not being an engineer I am not in a position to disagree or to say no. No one has ever built a repository before, there is no technology available to learn from, difficult to foresee what the future will look like. Today's waste could be tomorrow's fuel, retrievability should be kept as an option.

6 – Inventory	No	There is huge jump between the low level and the upper level. All the high level waste is at Sellafield, what about intermediate level and low level waste, there is big discrepancy between the levels of waste that would be deposited. What about the nuclear submarines being de-commissioned, there is uncertainty about what nuclear waste we have got and where it is. Surely it is not that difficult to identify current waste and then predict future waste then an inventory could be agreed which would better inform the community. Could it not be re-used once it is underground, if changes to the inventory need to be made for future waste then it would have to go in the repository regardless as there would be no where else to put it, especially if this was the national storage for nuclear waste.
7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	There is still concern that no other area is being considered so does that mean the further down the line this process goes the harder it will be to withdraw, it is surely likely to make it more difficult. No definition of requirement, where are the requirements for this repository, if there are a number of boxes to tick to ensure all the criterias are met, what are those boxes, what is the criteria to meet and surely if it cannot be said that any facility will be 100% safe then it should not go ahead, or is that too high to be achievable. Where is Greenpeace, CORE etc, what are their views.
8 – Overall views on participation		Whilst the option to withdraw is there then we should go ahead to the next stage.