

Minutes of The South Copeland GDF Community Partnership

Drigg & Carleton Village Hall 22nd Feb 2024 at 6.30pm

Present:

Ged McGrath	Chair
David Billing	Millom Town Council
Kelly Anderson	Nuclear Waste Services (NWS)
Maggie Cumming	Whicham Parish Council
John Sutton	Sustainable Duddon
Chris Gigg	Drigg & Carleton Parish Council
Carl Carrington	Millom Without Parish Council via Teams
Kate Willshaw	Friends of the Lake District

Supporting Attendees:

Lucy Clarke	NWS Communications Lead
Helen Conway	Grants Manager
Charlie Rollason	Yonder Research
Anne Broome	Operations Manager

Apologies

Bill Amos	Business Sector
Cllr Bob Kelly	Cumberland Council

Agenda

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date:	22nd Feb 2024	Time:	18:30 – 20:30
Meeting Type:	Phone Call	Virtual/Conference	In Person x
Location:	Drigg & Carleton Village Hall		
Additional Material enclosed? <i>If so, list here</i>			
Agenda			
Item No.	Time	Description	Lead
1	18:30 - 18:35	Welcome & Introductions. Declaration of Interest.	Chair
2	18:35 - 18:40	Approval of minutes/Action Log	Chair
3	18:40 - 18:55	Chairs Update to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Working Group update BGS Visit Geology Events 	Chair

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Forum • Yonder Survey (CP) • Chairs Meeting 11th April 	
4	18:55 - 19:20	Yonder Survey Results	Yonder
5	19:20 - 19:40	CIF Report	HC
6	19:40 - 19:55	Communications Update	LC
7	19:55 - 20:10	Feedback from Subgroups	Subgroup Chairs
8	20:10 - 20:25	Questions from the public.	ALL
9	20:25 - 20:30	AOB and Close	Chair

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed Partnership Members and supporting attendees to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Bill Amos from the Business Sector and Cllr Bob Kelly, Cumberland Council Rep.

2. Approval of Minutes and Review of Action Log

A query about the minutes had been sent in in advance by John Sutton. This was discussed by Partnership members and the minutes were subsequently amended with the addition of:

- *Q. The diagrams confirm that there are faults off the South Copeland coast. What is the potential impact of these on the likelihood of finding geology suitable for hosting a GDF.*
- *A. Faults have been interpreted in the inshore areas. It is possible that any accessways, required to connect a potential surface site to the GDF, may need to cross faulted areas. NWS geologists are describing these faulted areas as part of the ongoing geological evaluation. These fault descriptions will be used in further feasibility studies, to understand the impact on any potential footprint and accessway.*

and then deemed as an accurate record of the meeting.

Action Reference:	Description:	Assigned to:
08.11.23 1	Send out updated calendar invite for December CP workshop - 5pm – 8pm	Operations Manager Complete
08.11.23 2	Invite Chris to a future Community Partnership meeting to further discuss the Allerdale exit.	Community Engagement Manager Complete
08.11.23 3	Report on the Allerdale exit to be shared with members once it is available.	Community Engagement Manager Complete

Action Reference:	Description:	Assigned to:
08.11.23 4	Kelly Anderson, Fiona & Jason to discuss recording a video of the seismic presentation.	Community Engagement Manager + Geo team Ongoing
08.11.23 5	Anne Broome to liaise with Fiona to arrange a trip to the British Geological Society.	Operations Manager Complete
08.11.23 6	Kelly Anderson to arrange a meeting for Carl Carrington and Kate Willshaw with NWS colleagues.	Community Engagement Manager Complete
11.10.23 7	John Sutton to draft a letter to CoRWM.	John Sutton Complete

It was mentioned in Action 08.11.23 4 that Kelly Anderson follow up to see when the video would be ready and to ensure there would be a transcript and subtitles to go alongside it.

Action: CEM to confirm when the geology video will be ready for publication and ensure it contains a transcript and subtitles.

3. Chair's Update

The Chair provided an update on the following items:

- **Working Group update**

A new Working Group had been launched in South Holderness on 25th January 2024, however on 21st February the local council in South Holderness voted to withdraw from the recently formed Working Group following a vote by East Riding of Yorkshire Council members.

- **BGS Visit**

All arrangements for the British Geological Survey visit are now in place. Everyone should have received an email regarding pick up times etc.

- **Geology Events**

The Geology events recently held in Millom and Drigg had been well attended and it was felt they had gone well. It was agreed that hosting more topical events were a good way forward for the CP.

- **Community Forum**

The next Community Forum is scheduled to take place on 14th March in Drigg Village Hall. The registration site for the event is due to go live on Monday 26th February. The Chair asked for a show of hands regarding members attending the forum KW, JS, MC, KA & the Chair all indicated their intention to attend.

- **Yonder Survey (CP)**

The Chair thanked Charlie Rollason from Yonder for attending the CP meeting and confirmed that the CP had commissioned three surveys per year. After each survey, Yonder usually come along to share the results with members. Given that meetings have now moved to bi-monthly, the Chair asked the members if they still felt there was a requirement for Yonder to present the findings every time or whether the information could be shared by email.

It was agreed that unless there were any issues, the slides and background information from Yonder could be shared via email followed by an agenda item for discussion at the CP meeting. Yonder would only need to attend once a year to present at a Community Partnership meeting.

- **Chairs Meeting 11th April**

The Chair mentioned there was a joint Chairs meeting at Pelham House on 11th April. Items to be discussed included:

- If new Community Partnerships enter the process, how do they play catch up?
- The site evaluation roadmap/journey
- Development Consent Orders

He also mentioned that the Developer was trying to arrange a visit to the Chiltern Tunnel for CP members. There was a short discussion around the value of meeting the community around the tunnel.

Members were asked to feedback anything else that they would like the Chair to raise at the meeting.

Action: Members to feedback to the Chair anything they would like him to raise at the joint Chairs meeting

- **FOI requests**

The Chair mentioned that there had been some FOI requests submitted asking for details of the Chairs remuneration and expense claims. He clarified that he receives no remuneration for being Chair of the South Copeland GDF Community Partnership and neither do any of the members. It is also stated in the Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) that any Chair of the Partnership would be unable to claim any remuneration for the role.

Expenses claims for the South Copeland Community Partnership to date totalled approximately £700.

- **Feedback from Community Partnership Workshop**

The Chair gave a brief update on the decisions made at the Community Partnerships Look Ahead Workshop which took place in December and the planning for the Year ahead which included:

- Writing an introductory letter from the Community Partnership to neighbouring communities/parishes to ask how they would like to be engaged going forward
- The need to move to bi-monthly Community Partnership meetings due to the introduction of more subgroups with workstreams
- One CP meeting to be live broadcast as a pilot later in the year
- Review of subgroup membership
- Public Fora / topical Community Events to continue
- The need for large level engagement events to be replicated in both Millom & Drigg.
- Membership of the CP to grow organically rather than develop a proactive recruitment campaign

4. Yonder Survey Results

The Chair introduced Charlie Rollason who gave an update on the November 2023 Yonder survey results. He mentioned there had been 203 participants within the wards of Millom & Millom Without with the method and approach being consistent with the previous two surveys. Quotas were employed to ensure the resident sample was representative of the relative populations of the two wards. Weighting was then employed to ensure the sample was representative in terms of the age and sex profile of the population in question.

He went through the presentation discussing:

- The recall of people seeing, reading, or hearing something in the past year where 60% attributed their awareness to a leaflet or newsletter.
- Awareness of the Community Partnership and the South Copeland Search Area
- The UK's current storage method for its higher-activity radioactive waste
- The respondent's ability to accurately describe a GDF
- The measure that half of the respondents supported a GDF in the Search Area, whilst only 15% opposed it. One-in-three remained neutral. NET support stood at +35%
- What kind of information the respondents would like to receive regarding geological disposal and the siting process going forward.

Q. Do the participants get asked if they have already taken part in a previous survey?

A. It is not a question we currently ask so there is no accurate number on this.

The CP asked if they could see male/female comparisons, and particularly breakdowns by location given the recent enquiries. Charlie has advised that he'd suggest only breaking down to Millom/Millom Without (due to the base sizes in question).

The CP members discussed how they would like to see information by Parish Area now and going forward. Yonder were asked to see if they could provide a breakdown by parish in future reports. They would like to see where people are responding and if there is a need to pick up/target engagement in different ways.

The CP members also asked if the sample size could be increased Charlie mentioned that this would need to be discussed with NWS.

The CP members felt that it was always important to have questions around Information / Communication so the surveys can be comparable.

The members were interested in what happens with the information. It was explained that it is used to address information and communication needs, and for targeting certain demographics etc.

There was a discussion around next steps following the three surveys that have been committed to. Part of this was a suggestion of a co-hort study following the same people over time – young people and women (two of the demographics known to be harder to read); and also focusing on the Parishes.

5. Community Investment Funding Report

The Chair introduced Helen Conway, NWS Grants Manager who gave an update on the number and amount of grants to date showing a comparison of grants in Years 1 &2 and the grant expenditure to date in Year 3 which is 7 grants awarded totalling £348,604. This includes two multi year awards made in the previous year.

Helen mentioned that the Community Investment Funding (CIF) pipeline - continues to be “healthy” with a number of funding enquiries continuing to be received by the team. There have also been some Expressions of Interest of significant financial scope. To help ensure the healthy pipeline continues, there is an intention for the CIF team to attend some Cumbria CVS hosted events to promote CIF.

Helen also mentioned that following consideration by the CIF Panel and requests from Community Members there was a proposal to increase the number of Community Partnership members having a seat on the CIF panel. A Community Investment Panel Member Role description and appointment process has been drafted and is with CP members for comment.

There was further discussion around the application process for CIF and the fact that the CIF panel had to make sure that requests were appropriate and sustainable.

Finally, the Chair made an offer to any member of the Community Partnership to come and sit in on a CIF panel meeting to see how the process worked and the level of scrutiny that applications went through.

The Community Partnership requested a full report of the spend to date including clarity on the multi-year awards.

Q. We were going to have an article in the next newsletter about the Millom Development Officer role. Is this still happening?

A. The Comms Lead stated that it was still the plan to get an interview with the Development Officer but that she was currently struggling to make contact despite leaving various messages.

Q. The appointment of the Development Officer was for 3 years. Are we getting value for money?

A. The Grants Manager stated that CVS sent monitoring reports into NWS on a quarterly basis and all was in order, but it was also noted that the individual had been in post less than a year.

Q. What actions are being taken to attract smaller grants and is there a cutoff point?

A. The Grants Manager explained that small grants were anything up to £10,000 and had a different application form compared to applications for funding over £10,000 but it was acknowledged that the CP would like very small grants to have an easier process.

Action: CIF updates to continue on a quarterly basis

6. Communications Report

The Chair introduced Lucy Clarke, Communications Manager. Lucy took the CP through her presentation which covered the period from November to February. Her report included, but was not limited to:

- **An overview of communications activities October 2023 – February 2024**
- **Social media and website analytics October 2023 – February 2024**
- **Enquiries and social media responses October 2023 – February 2024**
- **Upcoming communications activities**

The Community Partnership agreed that going forward that all social media posts that included a question should be responded to even if this was just a thank you.

Q. Can we monitor repeat visitors to the website

A. I assume so. I will look into this and feedback to the CP.

Lucy asked if members wanted to receive the communications stats via email quarterly and this was agreed, but they should also be presented at the Comms & Engagement Sub-group in the first instance.

The weekly update email for members should continue, and an in person presentation was requested at the end of the year.

Action: Comms Lead to give quarterly comms update at C&E meeting

Action: Comms Lead to continue to send weekly comms update

Action: Comms Lead to present in person end of year report in December

Action: Comms Lead to provide a response on repeat visitors to the website query

7. Feedback from Subgroups.

- **Communications and Engagement Subgroup**

The communications and engagement subgroup met on 5th Feb 2024 and discussed the following agenda items:

- **Community Impact Report**

Carl Carrington updated the Community Partnership on the Community Impact Report. A meeting had taken place between Carl, Kate Willshaw, Ged McGrath with representatives from NWS. This had been followed up with an email from NWS and the 2 parties have now agreed to move forward with the initial desktop studies. Another meeting is to be scheduled where the group will discuss the next steps.

- **Geology Events**

This was covered in the Chairs report but the positive feedback about the events was reiterated.

- **Drigg Community Forum.**

This was covered in the Chairs Report.

- **Website update (Kate Willshaw)**

Kate requested that all 4 items that John Sutton had requested in November 2024 be added to the website. This followed a discussion in the C&E Sub Group in which the majority of the voting members expressed this wish.

- **Website update (Lucy)**

A Task and Finish group had been set up as a subset of the Communications & Engagement Subgroup. Bill Amos, John Sutton and Lucy Clarke are working with an external company, DXW, and NWS, to look at the redevelopment of the Community Partnership website. Up to five Community Partnership volunteers (including John and Bill) can volunteer to participate in the user research stage.

In November-December 2023 a Communications & Engagement Sub-group member, John Sutton, requested that three articles collated and written by him, and a video by Claire Corkhill (CoRWM), were uploaded to the Community Partnership website. As no consensus was reached, this was added to the agenda of the next Sub-group meeting, and it was agreed that John's website proposals would be shared by Lucy with Sub-group members by email for their comments.

There was also an action to develop a procedure for members to request changes/additions to the website, and an action to investigate whether it would be possible to give CP members access to the website Content Management System (Wordpress) to upload content going

forward. In February John had provided a draft process based on majority voting as outlined in the Community Partnership Agreement, but Lucy stated that she felt consensus was required.

It was explained that at the point of the Community Partnership meeting, these conversations and investigations were ongoing, and opinions on the website proposals were split between Sub-group members. NWS were considering the requests and the views of other members, before making comments as the technical lead on GDF.

John expressed his dissatisfaction and felt he was being censored, and Carl Carrington and Kate Willshaw questioned the time taken. John stated that it was a breach of the Community Partnership Agreement for NWS to veto the request.

NWS explained that procedures must be in place to ensure all Sub-group members can review website proposals, and to ensure suggested uploads are factually accurate to protect the reputation of both the Community Partnership and NWS.

Members were reminded that the Sub-group update provides output from the Sub- group meeting and as this matter is ongoing the Sub-Group will provide an update at the next Community Partnership meeting.

- **Annual report**

Lucy confirmed that the CPs Annual Report was being drafted and would be circulated shortly.

Action: Circulate the draft Annual Report

- **Operations Subgroup**

The operations subgroup met on 7th Feb 2024 and discussed the following agenda items:

- **Chair of the subgroup**

John Sutton was elected as the new Chair of the subgroup with review after one year.

- **Operations / Membership panel proposal to merge**

It was agreed there was overlap between the Operations Subgroup and the Membership panel. The ToR of the Operations subgroup state that that group should be responsible for membership. It was therefore proposed that the membership panel and the Operations Subgroup merge and operate as one group. This was agreed by the CP members.

Terms of Reference were also discussed and it was agreed that an updated draft should be circulated and agreed via email.

Action update and circulate ToR

- **Annual review of Community Partnership Agreement & Declarations of Interest**

The Operations subgroup are in the process reviewing the CPA and would be feeding in their individual comments to the subgroup.

- **CIF panel proposal to recruit new members**

It was proposed that up to 2 new members from within the Community partnership should be added to the CIF panel. This was agreed by CP members.

A CIP members role document had been circulated to CP members and it was agreed that a paragraph should be added confirming that once a member is selected by the panel, approval will be sought from the full Community Partnership before the offer is made to the candidate.

Action: Add paragraph to the CIP members role document re full CP membership approval of CIP panel members.

8. Public Forum

15 minutes is allocated on each Partnership meeting agenda for a Public Forum, to enable members of the public to ask questions directly of Community Partnership members.

Eight questions were submitted in advance of the meeting via the website/contact centre and these were read out and answered before opening the discussion to those in attendance.

The questions and answers were as follows:

1. At previous meetings and events the public have been informed that the site is to be 1km squared and this is still stated on the partnership website however the NWS engineer stated it would be larger than that particularly in the initial 20 year phase. Will you amend the website and inform the public on the true site size at all the development stages?

It was stated that the Community Partnership is not able to answer technical questions. This is a technical question and should be sent to the NWS contact centre.

The Partnership and Community Engagement support team always endeavour to pass the latest information on to the community. We will continue to update information as we learn more.

2. The Social anthropologist “independent expert” incorrectly stated that the community partnership could instigate a right of withdrawal this was corrected by a partnership member. Could the partnership clarify to the public the procedure/process to initiate a right to withdraw. She also stated that we had as a community volunteered to take part in the process and seemed unaware that a single person had initiated the communities involvement. Could the independent expert be contacted to inform her of the misunderstanding?

We have fed this back to the person in question.

3. Did the CoRWM “independent expert” appear in one of the NWS films? Do the partnership feel this could be construed as jeopardising independence?

Yes, the CoRWM expert appeared in one of the films. This was a film independently made by CoRWM to set the context for Government policy and the need for a solution. It was not an NWS film. NWS purchased the rights to use this film.

4. Previous information from the partnership stated spoil would be used to backfill the dump sealing the waste. This being less of an impact to transport movement or onsite storage. The NWS engineer explained that it will be in fact be Bentonite. Can the partnership clarify this error to the public? With the disclosure that Bentonite is to be used how does this impact the transport movements with respect to removal of spoil and importation of Bentonite? What is the expected amount of spoil to be removed?

It was stated that the Community Partnership is not able to answer technical questions. This is a technical question and should be sent to the NWS contact centre.

5. At previous meetings / presentations the partnership have given the figure of approximately 20 years for the construction of the dump followed then by the transportation of the nuclear waste. NWS disclosed the dump will be a 150 year construction site with continuous tunnelling required and removal of spoil and importation of Bentonite. Will the partnership clarify this misunderstanding to the public?

The Partnership and Community Engagement support team always endeavour to pass the latest information on to the community. We will continue to update information as we learn more.

6. The developer was unable to clarify if the figures given to Cumbria Council by the developer of initially 800 jobs on site reducing to 600 once nuclear waste begins to be accepted then down to 200 then obviously 0 as still valid. Can you clarify if this information to the County Council is still valid?

It was stated that the Community Partnership is not able to answer technical questions. This is a technical question and should be sent to the NWS contact centre.

The NWS 2022 estimate of the workforce and skills can be found here: www.gov.uk/government/publications/gdf-creating-jobs-skills-a-first-look

7. The NWS representative stated all areas through which the waste is transported, including areas of the Lake District National Park, need to be considered in impact assessment to explain why the location of the dump in our community at either White Rock to Millom Embankment or Layriggs Lane to Haverigg Sea Wall can not be identified as a potential location. Does this mean all the transport routes from all the areas of the UK from where Nuclear waste is imported into our community will need to be assessed before NWS divulge if the White Rock to Millom pier or Layriggs Lane to Haverigg are suitable locations?

It was stated that the Community Partnership is not able to answer technical questions. This is a technical question and should be sent to the NWS contact centre.

8. Could the CP explain why prior registration is required in order to attend the community forum events? How is this information used? Several participants at the first event had not registered but

were still allowed to take part so why insist on registration?

Could these questions be answered by the CP at the Drigg meeting on 22/2/24 please?

The Community Forum is a facilitated workshop involving roundtable discussions. To ensure we have sufficient facilitators and notetakers, we need an idea of how many people intend to participate. We will however always endeavour to accommodate people who turn up without registering, as we did in Millom.

Members felt that although these questions should have been sent to the Contact Centre, because they had been submitted before Christmas we should endeavor to get a developer response to the questions that aren't for the Partnership. The CEM agreed to get answers that would be sent back to the requestor on this occasion. In future all requests for technical information should be directed or redirected to the Contact Centre and this should be made clear to the requestor.

Action: CEM to get responses to the technical questions submitted to the public forum.

Questions asked by attendees in the room were as follows:

Q. How do the CP members feel about the £88.00 paid per survey by the taxpayer to Yonder.

Do you feel the Yonder survey should be postal in the future and sent to every household? As a resident I feel that 200 participants is pathetic I don't accept those results as not enough people have been surveyed.

A. It would be difficult to carry out a postal survey as this would be self selection. Potentially you could have a situation where you had 1000 respondents but they were all male over 50 or all working age females. We have to reach certain quotas as described in the Yonder presentation so that the survey sample is representative in terms of the age and sex profile of the population in.

Thank you for your question though, we will discuss this in our subgroups when we consider our future approach to surveys. The next three surveys do have to be carried out on the same basis as the three previous so we can look at trends etc.

Q. Can you give me the timeline for publication of the Property Value Protection documentation and when the scheme will go live.

A. If you give us your contact details we will get back to you on that.

9. AOB

There was no other business discussed.

New Actions

Action Reference:	Description:	Assigned to:
22.02.24. 1	CEM to confirm when the geology video will be ready for publication and ensure it contains a transcript and subtitles.	Community Engagement Manager
22.02.24. 2	Members to feedback to the Chair anything they would like him to raise at the joint Chairs meeting.	All
22.02.24. 3	CIF updates to continue on a quarterly basis.	Grants Manager
22.02.24. 4	Comms Lead to give quarterly Comms update at C&E meeting	Comms Lead
22.02.24. 5	Comms Lead to continue to send via email weekly comms update	Comms Lead
22.02.24. 6	Comms Lead to present in person end of year report in December	Comms Lead
22.02.24 7	Action: Comms Lead to provide a response on repeat visitors to the website query	Comms Lead
22.02.24. 8	Circulate the draft Annual Report	Comms Lead
22.02.24. 9	Action update and circulate ToR	CET
22.02.24.10	Add paragraph to the CIP members role document re full CP membership approval of CIP panel members.	CET
22.02.24. 11	CEM to get responses to the technical questions submitted to the public forum.	CEM

Next Meeting

Wednesday 17th April 2024

The Lighthouse Centre, Haverigg 18.30 – 20.20