

**Intermediary Group - South Copeland Tourism Group**

Question	Agree	Response
<b>Overview</b>		12 people took part in a group discussion facilitated by ACT.
<b>1 – Geology</b>	No	Insufficient expert information available to be able to make a decision about moving to the next stage. What model is being used to determine what areas are being ruled in and out. What about the environment, the unique landscape. It is down to the framework that is being used as to what is or isn't suitable. The process is a one dimensional thing, should it be looked at taking into account the landscape above any proposed site. You have to trust the BGS survey. There is a lot of water taken from underground, what will be the impact on that, will the repository be below the water level. Consensus that the group did not agree with the decision to put waste underground based only on the threat of terrorism, is this not a case of out of sight out of mind. Why can't it be above ground, if future generations cannot be trusted to manage the waste above ground how can they be trusted to manage it below ground. The density of population in West Cumbria is greater than in France or Finland and therefore presents different issues. What about the 18 million visitors to the county per year. The group did not agree with the partnerships opinions.
<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Not Sure/ Partly	Not enough in depth detail to be able to make a decision, there needs to be a spatial plan. There should be a three dimensional model. With only one route north and south what will be the emergency procedures, exclusion zones, is it wise to have so much lethal waste in one area particularly with a possible new nuclear build, what about emergency evacuation procedures, all of this with still only one main road, are we in danger of having all our eggs in one basket. If this is a voluntary process what is the plan b, as no one else wants it and if West Cumbria says no what then, would it still go ahead despite objections by the community if it is in the national interest to have it. If there is no realistic plan b will it be imposed. Is this just a paper exercise. there are still lots of if's and but's, I would like to see a plan b or even a plan c and d, something to show that there are alternatives accepting that something has got to be done. The film mentions that the repository would be "back filled" surely it must be monitored, in time everything comes back to the surface. How predictable is the waste, where is the clarity between legacy waste and new waste, does new waste not have to be stored above ground for 100 years because it is still hot or is that not now the case, not enough information. Will the goal posts change in the future, will waste from other countries be buried here, what will be the monitoring process, how can we communicate with future generations.
<b>3 – Impacts</b>	No	How much is the Lake District brand worth and can it be linked to the nuclear industry, how compatible are they, or are they not incompatible and tourism will suffer as a result. Visitors come to the area because of the scenery not because of the nuclear industry. Will the added infrastructure created to support the nuclear

		industry not have a detrimental impact on the environment and the tourism industry, people don't come to Cumbria and expect large roads they come for the peace and tranquility so added infrastructure will be no added benefit. Destroying the tourism industry in order to create a small number of long term jobs. The impact on tourism businesses in the area, would they survive if this was built on our doorstep. Overall there may be short term benefits to the community but the long term impact would be negative
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	No	Is this not compensation or a buy off because the area will be so dramatically changed. What will be the impact on property values, will there be compulsory purchases of property, how can we make decisions on behalf of future generations as to what they might need. What are the set of principles agreed by the partnership with government. Business rate reduction might just create more investment but would it be the right type of investment and how that investment might change the area. Who will be involved in those negotiations as to the specifics of any benefits package. Over all the consensus of the group was that they could not agree with the partnerships opinions.
<b>5 – Design and engineering</b>	No	What will the tunnels be lined with, there is not enough detail on the design structure, could the heat from spent fuel not be used to heat homes. What about the 100 years of storage of new waste that will have to be stored above ground. The film mentions that we can't trust future generations to manage the waste, why. What will be the impact on mineral rights for people who live above the repository. What about vibration impacts for people who live above the site and in the surrounding area. How will the design fit in with residential populations, is a sight being looked for where there is nothing. If the site is going to be back filled, how can it still be retrievable.
<b>6 – Inventory</b>	Not Sure/ Partly	Will the inventory distinguish between legacy waste, new waste and low level waste. No detail on exactly what will go in the site, what about future decisions on bringing in waste from other countries. What will the principles be and how realistic is that local, communities will be able to influence what is buried.
<b>7 – Siting process</b>	Yes	The ordinary person on the street will not have sight of all the information before making any decision. The MRWS has conducted their research in a fair and proper manner. The question is more about the politicians who are making the decisions about the next stage, are they capable of reviewing the information and making the correct decision. Politicians are short term focussed, they make decisions on current issues, this is about our futures. How do we give people a voice, referendum or opinion survey. Voluntarism is always going to be difficult as not everyone is going to take the time to be involved.
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		The further down the road the process goes the harder it will be to withdraw. The group felt that there were still a lot of unanswered questions before they could make a decision to move to the next stage.

