



Working in Partnership Copeland

Minutes of the 12th meeting of the Copeland GDF Working Group

Held at **Microsoft Teams**

On **Monday 27th September 2021**

Commencing at **13.00**

PRESENT:

Voting Members:

Mark Cullinan	Independent Chair
Gary Bullivant	Irton Hall Ltd
Cllr David Moore	Copeland Borough Council, Councillor & Nuclear Portfolio Holder
Cllr Andy Pratt	Cumbria District Association of Local Councils (CALC), Chair
Mark Walker	Genr8 North (attended part of the meeting)
Gillian Johnston	RWM Community Engagement Manager

Supporting Attendees:

Pat Graham	Chief Executive Copeland Borough Council
Steve Smith	Copeland Borough Council, Nuclear Projects Manager
Rob Ward	Nuclear Sector Manager for Copeland Borough Council
Nick Gardham	Independent Facilitator
Chris Shaw	Cumbria District Association of Local Councils, Copeland Liaison Officer
Barnaby Hudson	RWM Siting Manager
Steve Wilkinson	RWM Project Manager
Gillian Thorne	RWM Working Group Communications Lead
Claire Dobson	RWM Copeland Community Coordinator
Anne Broome	RWM Copeland Community Coordinator
Sue Shepherd	RWM Copeland Community Coordinator
Bruce Cairns	RWM Chief Policy Advisor (attended for agenda Item 9)
Richard Griffin	RWM Senior Policy Advisor (attended for agenda Item 9)

In attendance:

Karen Agnew	RWM Secretariat Copeland GDF Working Group
Jordan Pugh	Arvato Copeland Ambassador
Kelly Anderson	RWM Community Engagement Manager

APOLOGIES:

David Faulkner	Private Resident
Serife Gunal	Traverse

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS



- The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendees confirmed and apologies announced. Genr8 North delegate will be attending the meeting at a later point. Voting members confirmed in attendance.

AGENDA 1: IDENTIFY VOTING MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP, ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST, MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING.

- Recorded voting members from each organisation. Dave Faulkner sent apologies. Genr8 North joining at later point.
- Any changes to voting members to be notified.
- Assuming members attending the meeting hold the vote for themselves/their organisation unless they say/declare otherwise.
- Minutes of previous meeting are a correct record – correct record of the meeting confirmed.
- Confirmation of no required amendments to members declarations of interest.

**AGENDA 2:
OUTSTANDING ACTIONS AND REVIEWS**

Chair reviewed outstanding actions.

Ref 120821	Meeting Action Log	
CWG001	Illustrations of funding examples to be circulated after the Working Group meeting	GJ Completed
CWG003	Circulate Community Partnership Agreement and Terms of Reference	CD Completed
CWG003	Arrange final review meeting with RWM and Legal regarding CPA and ToR	HC/CD Completed
CWG003	Working Group agreement to CPA and ToR to be noted at meeting on 27 th September	KA ongoing
CWG003	Working Group members invited to suggest amendments	Completed
CWG003	Further discussion with Working Group to discuss the role of CALC and IP	Completed
CWG003	Engine Room slide to be circulated to Working Group Members	KA Completed
CWG005	Questions from pop-up events will be circulated to the Working Group	KA Completed
CWG005	A meeting to be arranged with the Chair and Workstream conveners.	Completed
CWG006	Comms Slides to be shared after meeting	Completed
CWG006	RWM CEM and RWM HoRC to arrange meeting to discuss Launch Readiness presentation	Completed
Ref 120821	MEETING DECISION LOG	
CWG003	CIF Funding confirmation of mechanism recorded in Minutes	KA
CWG003	The CPA and ToR will not be signed by the Working Group as this will be at the discretion of the CP members	ALL
CWG003	The Chair confirmed that they would accept the role of interim Chair in a Community Partnership(s).	Chair
CWG003	Membership of Selection Panel – Consensus agreed	ALL
CWG003	Selection Criteria – Consensus agreed	ALL
CWG003	Interim Membership – Consensus agreed	ALL
CWG003	Include Town & Parish Councils in the wording of the relevant block within the Engine Room Slide and record decision in Minutes	RW/KA
CWG003	Workstream 3 progress to be presented to Working Group on 27 th September.	

**AGENDA 3:
OPPORTUNITY FOR UPDATES FROM WORKING GROUP MEMBERS**



A Working Group member provided an update on the Exhibition Roadshows. This was a good opportunity to meet different people from across the communities whilst listening to all their views. The Chair noted how enthusiastic that the Community Engagement Team were. The popularity of the geologists demonstrated that the people who attended were interested and informed.

The Chair attended the CCC locality meeting and gave a presentation. They were pleased to meet in person and the presentation was well received. The Chair also attended the Invest in Cumbria launch in Carlisle, which he felt was interesting and informative.

The arrangements for briefing of Parish Councils has not gone down well, some complaints received regarding the short time scales.

The intention of the briefing is to advise the councillors of the outcome of today's Working Group meeting.

The Chair stated that the CALC briefing was a courtesy to give the Parish Councillors a briefing prior to this being released to the press and had hoped that they would appreciate this courtesy. The Chair stated he would be happy to do this earlier or later in the day if that works better.

It was clarified to Working Group members that the briefing to CALC is the same as the briefing to CBC and prior to the press release. The Working Group took advice from the CALC representative with regards to the time and 11am was the time suggested.

A Working Group (CALC) representative confirmed that the reason for the suggestion of this time was to maintain confidentiality.

Q - Would it be ok for CALC to release a further note to Parish councillors stating that we have an announcement?

A – A Working Group member replied that they'd rather this didn't happen as there's several other steps that need to be followed carefully.

CHAIR – review at the end of the meeting.

No further updates from WG members.

AGENDA 4: PROGRESS AGAINST DECISION DECK

The Decision Deck was shared with the Working Group and a recap of the decisions made at the previous meeting. It was confirmed that the slides shown reflected what was shared at the previous meeting and have since been updated.

No questions from the Working Group.

AGENDA 5: WORKSTREAM 1 OBJECTIVES SUMMARY REPORT

The engagement work started online due to Covid restrictions, the data shows that the online engagement was effective and allowed the development of relationships with members of the community. Once the restrictions were lifted a number of 'in person' pop up events, meetings and public exhibitions took place. The summary of the themes discussed were shared.

Policy and Process

e.g., What is different this time?

Geology and Siting

e.g., Where will it be built and how will it affect me?

Science

e.g., How does it work? What are you storing there? How will it impact me? Will it be safe?



The Community Partnership will have to consider these questions carefully in future engagements as they were recurring themes/questions across all the engagements.

Q – How successful were the door drop leaflets in raising awareness of the events and were many people encouraged to attend because of them?

A – Yes, a lot of people brought the leaflet in and a number of surveys which were on the back were completed.

Q – Yonder Survey, are the results of the earlier survey considered within meeting Workstream1 objectives? This survey suggested that 55% of people are against a GDF?

A – The Chair referred to policy, the Working Group objective was to start the conversations which is what the engagement has achieved.

Q - Is the Working Group happy to say that we have discharged the objectives of Workstream 1?

A - Yes

The Working Group confirmed that we have met the objective of Workstream 1 and this is formally recorded in the minutes.

No further questions.

AGENDA 6:

WORKSTREAM 2 - OBJECTIVES SUMMARY REPORT

Based on the original areas put forward by the Interested Parties (IP's), RWM completed a series of initial evaluations. Based on those findings, the Working Group was formed. The Working Group decided to exclude the Lake District National Park and the proposed extension from consideration of hosting a GDF. A Search Area identification workshop utilised a series of GIS datasets to support the Working Group discussions. Each electoral ward was discussed on its own merits by the Working Group members. 4 electoral wards were identified, and it was decided that they would be divided into 2 separate Search Areas. RWM completed a further Search Area Evaluation which findings complimented the original evaluations and concluded that both Search Areas and the inshore adjacent area to Copeland Borough have the potential to host a GDF.

The 2 Search Areas identified for consideration within by the Working Group are;

'Mid Copeland Search Area' – Gosforth & Seascale and Beckermest electoral wards, retains consideration of the inshore area adjacent to Copeland Borough and commitment to exclude from consideration the area within the Lake District National Park to host a GDF.

'South Copeland Search Area' - Black Combe & Scafell and Millom electoral wards, retains consideration of the inshore area adjacent to Copeland Borough and commitment to exclude from consideration the area within the Lake District National Park and proposed extension to host a GDF.

Q – Can I confirm that there is insufficient underground geology in the South of Copeland Search Area?

A – As 20 km² may be required to characterise the geology, the South of Copeland Search Area (which is only defined on land) is unlikely to be able host an underground facility, however it could host the GDF surface infrastructure works and access the inshore area.

The Working Group confirmed that we have met the objective of Workstream 2 and this is formally recorded in the minutes



No further questions.

**AGENDA 7:
WORKSTREAM 3 OBJECTIVES SUMMARY REPORT**

Rob Ward gave a summary of the section of the Working Group Objectives Summary report covering the activities of the Working Group in relation to the objective, *to identify prospective members of a Community Partnership*. This summary covered:

- Identification of members and the member selection process
- Chair selection process
- The development of a Community Partnership Agreement and Terms of Reference
- Other activities undertaken by the Working Group to support the establishment of up to 2 Community Partnerships

The Working Group confirmed that we have met the objective of Workstream 3 and this is formally recorded in the minutes

No further questions.

**AGENDA 8:
DECISION DECK UPDATE**

This has been covered in other parts of the meeting.

**AGENDA 9:
RECOMMENDATION TO FORM COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP**

Chairs closing remarks

The Chair summed up that he had concluded that the Working Group has met the three objectives. The Chair's recommendation to the group is reflective of the previously discussed exclusion areas of the National Park and its proposed extension as well as coal mining areas. An RWM policy advisor was invited to join the meeting to ensure that the recommendation was policy compliant. It was also confirmed that proposed communications will include the areas of exclusion.

BREAK

Genr8 North delegate joined the meeting.

The proposed wording of the recommendation was discussed with the Working Group and there was input and constructive challenge from various Working Group members, particularly around the coal mines and their current and future exclusion. Policy advisors from RWM attended the meeting to clarify the policy position regarding areas of known resources, which is addressed explicitly in RWM's published Site Evaluation approach.

Agreed recommendation from the Working Group today, 27/09/21



- The Working Group has met its objectives and identified two Search Areas – ‘Mid Copeland Search Area’ and ‘South Copeland Search Area’ - that could have the potential to host a Geological Disposal Facility. Based on the community engagement activities undertaken, and the work done to identify prospective members for a Community Partnership, the Working Group now recommends to RWM and the relevant Principal Local Authorities that two Community Partnerships are formed, one for each Search Area.
- The identified ‘Mid Copeland Search Area’ and ‘South Copeland Search Area’ should be considered further on the basis that the:
 - inshore area adjacent to Copeland Borough is considered by RWM as its initial focus
 - the area within the Lake District National Park and its proposed extension are excluded from consideration to host a GDF above or below ground
 - the current and future coal mining areas are excluded from consideration to host a GDF

A vote was taken to agree to form two Community Partnerships and the votes were counted and were unanimous, although one Working Group member wanted it noted that he had concerns over wording in the recommendation in relation to coal mining areas.

The Working Group voted and formally agreed to recommend the formation of two Community Partnerships.

AGENDA 10:

AOB

The timeline was discussed with the Working Group and the comms will be shared with the Working Group. The media will be prepared for an announcement at 12noon Wednesday 29th September.

An offline conversation was agreed to address the point raised by a Working Group member at Agenda point 3.

AGENDA 11:

DATE OF NEXT MEETING 21st October 2021

Ref	MEETING DECISION LOG	
270921		
CWG005	The Working Group agreed that Workstream 1 had met its objectives	ALL
CWG006	The Working Group agreed that Workstream 2 had met its objectives	ALL
CWG007	The Working Group agreed that Workstream 3 had met its objectives	ALL
CWG008	The Working Group agreed to recommend formation of 2 x Community Partnerships	ALL
CWG006	The Working Group agreed to the designated Search Areas	ALL