

Minutes of The South Copeland GDF Community Partnership

The Lighthouse Centre, Haverigg

Wednesday 20th November 2024 at 6.30pm

Present:

Ged McGrath Chair

Kelly Anderson Nuclear Waste Services (NWS)
Maggie Cumming Whicham Parish Council

John Sutton Sustainable Duddon

Dave Savage Millom Without Parish Council Kate Willshaw Friends of the Lake District

Bill Amos Business Lead

Andy Pratt CALC

Karen Warmoth Drigg & Carleton Parish Council

Simone Falkner Millom Town Council

Ben Daniels Individual

Supporting Attendees:

Jonathan Cook Cumberland Council

Jodie Dougherty

Lynne Purbrick

Anna Todd

Amy Shelton

Community Partnership Assistant

Community Engagement Co-ordinator

Community Engagement Co-ordinator

Principal Community Engagement Manager

Owen Thomas Yonder

Apologies

Apologies were received from Bob Kelly, Carl Carrington and Dave Billing. All had sent deputies to the meeting.

Meeting Date:		20 th No	vember 2024	Time:	18.30 - 20.30		
Meeting Type:		Phone	Call	Virtual/Conference In Person		In Person	
Location: T		The Lighthouse Centre; Atkinson Street, Haverigg.; LA18 4HA					
Additional Material enclosed?							
Agenda							
Item No.	Time		Description				Lead
1	18.30 - 18	.35	Welcome & Intro	ductions. Dec	claration of Inter	est.	Chair



2	18.35 - 18.40	Approval of minutes/Action Log	Chair
3	18.40 – 19.10	Chairs Update Vienna RSO conference Ulpha drop in Visioning meeting with Canadians Visioning questionnaires New CIF panel applicant Website response	Chair
4	19.10 - 19.40	Latest opinion survey results	Yonder
5	19.40 -19.55	Voting Rights	Chair/BA
6	19.55 – 20.10	Update from subgroups	KW / JS / CG
7	20.10 – 20.25	Questions from the public: Opportunity for Public attending to ask questions	Chair
8	20.25 - 20.30	AOB Date of next meeting	Chair
9	20.30	Close	Chair

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

There were apologies from Bob Kelly, Carl Carrington and Dave Billing. No Declarations of Interest were recorded.

2. Approval of Minutes and Review of Action Log

There was a long discussion about the minutes of the previous meeting. John Sutton had a number of changes which he talked the attendees through. These specifically related to action points 3 and 10 and these are covered in the action log below.



Actions from the previous meeting

Action Reference:	Description:	Assigned to:
16.10.2024 01	CP Assistant to recirculate August and September minutes. Complete	Jodie Dougherty
16.10.2024 02	Circulate agenda for Vienna and find out possibilities of people joining online. Complete	Kelly Anderson
16.10.2024 03	Consider plans for a future DESNZ visit to South Copeland. Cancelled	Amy Shelton
	Agreed not an action just a general point to remember if they attend the area in future.	
16.10.2024 04	Chris Keenan to provide data on volume of PVP applications to other <i>schemes such as HS2</i> . Ongoing – Chasing HS2 for data.	Chris Keenan
16.10.2024 05	Share PVP information with parish councils and put info in the Newsletter. Complete	Jodie Dougherty
16.10.2024 07	CoRWM to send some dates in the New Year for a closed meeting with partnership. Complete – Attending 9 th January 2025	Kate Willshaw
16.10.2024 08	Ops subgroup to look at Chair job description. Complete	Ops Subgroup
16.10.2024 09	Update website about pre-election period. Ongoing – Lucy on annual leave.	Lucy Clarke
16.10.2024 10	MC speak to TK (Member of public) to offer a meeting with chair and AP.	Maggie Cumming



Action Reference:	Description:	Assigned to:
	Agreed to change wording of action – Andy Pratt to meet with TK (a member of the public who had walked out of the previous meeting due to frustration at the answers given to his questions). Maggie Cumming to facilitate arranging the meeting.	

3. Chair's Update

The Chair provided an update on the following items:

• Welcome to new Partnership member

The chair welcomed Ben Daniels as he joined us for his first meeting.

• Vienna

The chair explained that he and Bill Amos, along with members from other community partnerships travelled to Vienna in October for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Technical Meeting on Strengthening Local Stakeholder Engagement. There was a long conversation about the different aspects of the meeting and a number of questions about what had been covered.

RSO Conference

The chair explained that there is an NWS Research Support Office (RSO) Annual Conference in Bristol on 15th and 16th January 2025, with an opportunity for a member of our partnership to attend. The chair described the conference as an opportunity for academics working on geological disposal, from waste to geology to social science to showcase their work.

Partnership members showed an interest in the opportunity to attend but asked for further details. A place was reserved for someone to attend.

Action: Provide more information on the RSO Conference.

Ulpha Drop in

There was a drop-in event held at The Browfoot Room in Ulpha on the 12th of November 2024. This event was advertised through our social media channels, on the SCCP website as well as being shared to the local Ulpha WhatsApp group by The Browfoot Room Secretary. It was held between 2pm and 6pm and was manned by Kelly and Lynne, supported by Ged. Three people attended and three good quality conversations were had. Overall, the sentiment was positive.

Visioning Meeting with Canadians



The Chair had met up with delegates from Canada during his trip to Vienna and they had offered to speak to members of the visioning subgroup to give advice and share learning on visioning.

Chris Gigg joined the meeting along with the Chair and Anne Broome. He explained it was a really useful meeting. They have shared links to lots of documents which will help us in the future and Chris agreed to send these links to the wider CP. He shared that the most important thing was to be able to understand peoples core values and have the knowledge of what's important to them before trying to do anything.

The Canadians whole visioning documentation was written up by a third party and the process was fully transparent. Chris gave lots of positive feedback and informed us they are happy to continue to help us.

Action: Chris Gigg to send links to Canadian visioning documents to members.

• Visioning Questionnaire

The chair informed the partnership that the Visioning Questionnaire had been sent to all households in the Search Area. It included a freepost envelope so people could send back their responses and also a QR code for those who wanted to complete it online. We have currently received 40 online responses and approximately 300 hard copies. This is a fantastic response rate and we expect to receive more in the coming weeks.

Corhyn Parr

The chair informed the partnership members that the NWS CEO, Corhyn Parr is stepping down in March 2025.

New CIF Panel Applicant

The chair explained that Bill Amos formally expressed an interest in joining the CIF panel.

Partnership members agreed that Bill would be a good addition and approved his application.

Andy Pratt had also been taking up a seat on behalf of CALC following David Savages resignation from the CIF panel.

Andy's position on the CIF panel was agreed by the members.

Website Response from NWS

The chair explained to the partnership that he had received a response to the website proposal from Simon Hughes at NWS. This had been circulated to members and although it was not what everyone would have wanted, a response had been received and we now needed to move on with improving the website we do have.



John Sutton mentioned that there was an issue with the wording in the letter from Simon which meant that the letter wasn't accurate. This related to an extract from policy where only the first sentence of the policy extract was used and the second was omitted. There was a discussion about whether this meant the letter was inaccurate or not. Eventually the NWS representatives agreed to ask Simon to add the second sentence in to the letter and republish it on the website.

Action: Reissue Simon Hughes letter to ensure the full policy wording is included and republish on the website.

4. Latest Opinion Survey Results

The chair welcomed Owen Thomas, Yonder Representative to give a presentation on the latest opinion survey results.

Between 8 September and 2 October 2024, Yonder oversaw a survey of 200 adult residents who were interviewed in person across the wards of Millom and Millom Without. Quotas and weights were employed to ensure the random sample was representative in terms of the relative populations of the two wards and the age and sex profiles of the area in question. With a sample of 200 and a 95% confidence interval, a margin of error of +/-7% is expected.

Findings from the latest survey demonstrate that residents across the electoral wards of Millom and Millom Without remained engaged with the subject matter. 61% of respondents were able to recall seeing or reading or hearing something about nuclear waste or geological disposal over the past year. Nearly a third (28%) attributed their awareness to a leaflet or newsletter in the post.

There remained a level of uncertainty in relation to the management of nuclear waste with just 32% aware of the UK's current storage method for its most hazardous radioactive waste. A greater proportion of respondents (45%) were uncertain of the current approach, and 23% incorrectly assumed the most hazardous radioactive waste was already held in multibarrier vaults deep underground.

To ensure the representativeness of the surveying, Yonder utilises random probability sampling. Random probability sampling guards against sample bias. In addition, Yonder uses the latest ONS and Census population data to ensure the sample is representative of the local area's population (in terms of geographic balance, age and gender). With this information, quotas are employed to ensure the resident sample is representative of the relative populations of the two Search Area wards. Following fieldwork, Yonder then reviews the interview sample, examines any differences between quotas and the achieved interviews and corrects any differences by weighting up under-represented groups and weighting down over-represented groups. This ensures the resident samples which inferences are based are representative in terms of the age and sex profile of the population in question. Utilising this approach permits justifiable inferences to be drawn from the sample to the population, at quantified levels of precision.

Question: Where did the surveys take place?

Answer: In person, face to face with people in the streets across South Copeland.



Question: Is there any breakdown by age?

Answer: There is a breakdown which covers 16-25, working age and 50+

Question: What was the percentage of the total population interviewed?

Answer: Don't know exactly but it is certainly higher than a normal national poll. 200 people equates

to around 2%.

Question: When people asked why here? Did you get a sense of who they are asking? Answer: We have asked previously a question about who they want to hear from and we're pretty sure people are usually referring to Cumberland Council.

Question: Over the course of doing this, I'd like to be confident we are reaching different people in each survey. Is there a question to try and find out if they have answered these questions before as this will make a huge difference to us?

Answer: We don't ask the question, because there are lots of research surveys going on so we wouldn't know if they had done it through us or through another company. We don't store names or details either. Beyond that, it is face to face, so we are more confident we are reaching a fresh group of people every time as interviewers are pulling random people in random places at random times.

Question: This partnership has challenged in the past, for some analysis or breakdown of results by Parish.

Answer: We have investigated this and in terms of Parishes, some are very small and so participant numbers are lower which means you have less confidence in the results. But, if you go back to the middle of 2023, we have now conducted 4 surveys which comes to 791 interviews in total. If we group this combined data into Parish groupings rather than individual parishes we could get some useful data.

Members looked at the proposed groupings and were happy with 4 groups but requested that Ulpha was moved to be included with Millom Without.

Question: Now we are happy with the groups, how long will it take to get the data?

Answer: Before Christmas.

5. Voting Rights

Bill Amos explained he had been with the Partnership for 12 months now, but didn't feel very included in the partnership as everyone has voting rights except for him and this has often been used against him to imply that his voice isn't as important as others. Whilst having conversations



with the Mid Copeland chair he realised that it appears that its only South Copeland who have this rule about only certain members having voting rights, others allow all members to vote. Bill explained he represents the business community, to be part of this process and have a voice he believes he should have voting rights.

Members of the partnership explained the history and reasoning behind the original decision. Members who represented others had a mandate from those they represented and should therefore have a vote. Those not representing a constituted body were seen as individuals voting on behalf of themselves and therefore wouldn't have a vote.

Amy Shelton stated that she understands how it was formed originally but that members of the partnership should be reflective of the community rather than necessarily representing their community. From an NWS perspective, we would be happy for all members to have their voices heard and vote. It is very rare that there has been a need to vote but the process works well in Mid.

This topic of conversation led to members stating how the partnership members don't work well together and how meetings can be uncomfortable and difficult to participate in. A previous CP member who was attending as a deputy said that that nothing had moved on since he left the Partnership 18 months previously.

Kelly Anderson added that the Partnership was not fulfilling its duties as outlined in policy and were instead fixated on small matters such as minutes. She felt members should be pushing for more engagement with the community and questioning how we respond to opinion survey results. Instead they seemed to be trying to actively stop progress.

There was a short discussion about how these problems could be solved and it was agreed to arrange an in person discussion in the New year for people to air their concerns and see how things could be improved.

Action: Arrange an in person meeting in the New Year to think about how we work better together.

6. Update from Subgroups

Unfortunately the team from NWS and representatives from Drigg had to leave at this point as the meeting had overran and they needed to get through the convoy system at Ravenglass before the road closed at 10pm.

The meeting continued but no further notes were taken.