

## SAFEGROUNDS with SD:SPUR Conference – 12/13 March 2007

### Workshop A – Deciding site end-states with local stakeholders Additional delegate comments

Due to the limited time available and the number of delegates attending this workshop, it was anticipated that it would not be possible to hear the views of all the delegates. Forms were given to delegates to record any additional comments. Below is a transcription of all the comments that were submitted, in no particular order.

- 
- *Local stakeholders care most about the economy and local jobs. They wish to see a near term positive vision.*
  - *How do we engage people in very long term thinking – several generations ahead?*
  - *Who knows what future technology changes will bring? We should assume a big technology revolution.*
  - *The Government could aid the debate by*
    1. *Deciding on waste repositories*
    2. *Deciding now and start new nuclear build*

- 
- *Clear objective about the process of consultation and whether it is one of public or stakeholder consultation.*
  - *Management of expectation of the weight or result of their contribution to debate, and clarity up-front of how the preferences are to be resolved.*
  - *Care not to canvas only the views of the interested, pro-nuclear, informed and vested-interest community.*

- 
- *Local authorities (with elected members) need to be in the foreground. Where are they in all of this?*
  - *SSG attendee are pro-site/pro-nuclear or NGOs with anti-nuclear positions. These exercises are not democratic or representative (Not public engagement)*
  - *Are we seeing stakeholder burn-out – getting weary of consultations?*
  - *What is the degree of influence of SSG? Need to manage expectations – planning acceptability (LA); affordability (NDA); environmental acceptability (Regs).*

- 
- *How do local stakeholder groups deal with diverse end-states proposed? Who decides the agreed outcome? NDA? Site Management Company?*

---

#### *Long timescales*

*Are stakeholders being asked to wrong question?*

*How do we gain a greater level of involvement?*

*Cost needs to be a consideration*

- *Statistically representative sample population*  
*Don't want just the vocal view*

- 
1. *Form and function of SSG's a real problem – issue of representative legitimacy and trust*  
*SSG's need to be reconfigured - otherwise stakeholder involvement a "forlorn hope"*
  2. *Issue of end-state level of remediation*  
*→ need to address other non-ICRP-based risk models*

3. Question of stakeholder resource, and issue of consultation – recent judicial review of Energy Debate suggests problems.
4. Issue of decision making-sharing - See Aarhus convention (EU) and recent EU (2005) decision on community participation in decision making for environmental risks.

---

*Should we consult stakeholders?*

*If we already know the end-state is consultation just a waste of money?*

*Why not make a decision, inform the public and defend the decision taken?*

*What is the value from the entire consultation?*

*We don't preach appropriate public/school education on scientific issues in society.*

---

- *"We can't have any influence" is complaint. Therefore show /illustrate where they have had an influence.*
  - *Go to them "Tesco's" Hold consultation on new Tesco's at Wyfla?*
  - *Who is "affected" by what?*
  - *Avoid despotism of vocal minority*
  - *What counts as a measured*
  - *Websites (Wyfla) had 200 end use consultation comment via website*
  - *It's is a moving target*
  - *It's a stupid question → we shouldn't bother!!*
  - *Ask Kate Moss?*
- 

- *Unclear how NDA will reconcile the site end state process into any new or revised National Strategy, and how National consideration on new build (nuclear) will be taken into account.*
  - *How does NII delicensing criterion relate to choices/decisions on end-state?*
- 

- *Long timescales. Hence making decisions on activities that will not happen in our lifetime.*
  - *'Involvement will make no difference' Hence, people don't respond to stakeholder process.*
  - *Go out to stakeholders. Example given from Wyfla; local show was where stakeholders engaged.*
  - *Very low level of response. How is this taken into account in evaluating responses?*
- 

- *Importance of links with on-going regional development agendas*
  - *Interfaces with development organisations*
  - *Communicate appropriately – don't patronise but be understandable*
  - *What do you want – the interested or a statistically valid view*
- 

*It depends on the local economic benefits to the stakeholder group.*

*Stakeholders are interested in short term gains i.e. years, not what's going to happen with 100's of years.*

*General public believe they have little input into decisions relating to the site end-state programme.*

---

*Consideration should be given to such consideration being carried out by market research companies funded by the NDA, Not by SLC's otherwise many stakeholder would lack trust in the process.*

*The consideration should emphatically not be web dominated – you need to talk to people, not at them.*

*The lower the number of respondents, the greater the risk of statistical bias in the results, with dominance by vocal minorities.*

*How can you expect anyone, the general public in particular, to make an informed decision on what an area should be like in 150 years time?*

*How do you rank the responses? Regardless of wishes, a 7 year old child does not, and cannot, have the ability to make an informed response as an adult. By all means educate and inform but do not place too much weight.*

*At the most basic level, people care where their next pay cheque comes from.*

---

- Stakeholders – go to their home ground
  - Venues ~ choice
    - not library
    - shopping centres - yes
    - 'family outing' venues
  - Why are new build sites not part of decommissioning?
  - Present 'idea prompting' choices – have masterplan
  - Options presented must include costs, as to omit these will lead to view that delivery will not happen.
  - Risk based end-condition – public mistrust.
- 

*What is the learning about the minimum requirements for NDA frameworks or guidance for future SSG consultations? [to cultivate consistency across the UK]*

*Examples might include:*

- Which stakeholder organisations to consult (e.g local authorities with development plan/control responsibilities)
- What to publish when (e.g large variation in quality of material on SSG websites about end state processes)
- Which engagement methods to use (better to go out to stakeholder groups than expect them to come to you – limitations of opinion polls)
- How to use exercise to build foundations for future engagements.
- What capacity building may be necessary ( a. in SSGs, b/ in key stakeholder groups e.g. local authorities)

*Fred Barker*

---

*The gulf in understanding between the industry and the public. People who do not go to meetings are not necessarily uninterested. There is widespread concern. Many people feel disempowered by years of secrecy and exclusion from technical knowledge. Go to the WI, the schools Wildlife Trusts etc. where people are comfortable.*

*Stakeholder methods and involvements are patchy. Help is needed so that there is a national strategy and national pool of ideas these SGs and others can refer to.*

*Many SSGs feel unsupported*

*Throw money at it – the reward will be great!*

*Get people like me (Val) to talk to the WI etc!!*

---

1. *It is not possible to release any site on the basis of characterisation by bulk activity or through predicted exposures in mSV. This entirely misses risk through inhalation or ingestion of (a) particles or (b) specific isotopes. It would be possible to determine levels*

*of (a) and (b) using various techniques e.g. CR39 plastic sheets to characterise particulate density in terms of total particles and their activity per cu metre.*

*This is the main concern of stakeholders who will be using the released sites.*

2. *Risk cannot be determined from models employing the methods of ICRP since these are dependant upon external acute irradiation epidemiology.*
3. *Maybe stakeholders don't believe that what they say will make any difference to what has already been decided.*
4. *Remediation of activity levels compatible with surrounding areas, not mean levels in the contaminated area of Harwell SSG.*

**CIRIA, 15 March 07**