

Bradwell for Renewable Energy

Question	Agree	Response
1 – Geology	No	There is uncertainty amongst experts over the suitability of the geology, starting with the initial screening in 1997 which cast doubt. Over and above local problems, there is an emergent perception of unknowns in geological behaviour due to climate change. These could be sudden or gradual. There should be an exploration into this. In fact, the suitability of Cumbrian geology to support high level nuclear waste is so contentious, there should be a national exploration of this issue, involving all opinions. The Lake District is of great importance in our national heritage, and the heart of any such project should be protection of this national asset.
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	The prospect of security into the far future is based on optimism that future generations will indeed take on the role. Has the Partnership any specific idea of who would actual do the security? How far into the future would this extend?
3 – Impacts	No	West Cumbria is a sitting duck, because so much of the waste is in situ. So, to avoid such waste being moved, there is the danger of bending over backwards, and falling over, to make the project "acceptable" in many technical and social ways. Furthermore, there should be a separate project of research and consultation regarding new build wastes, which are of a different order. These do not necessarily have to be hosted in Cumbria. It would be interesting to see local views on this.
5 – Design and engineering	No	As the geology is not 100% suitable, safety is largely reliant upon engineered barriers. This is a vulnerability. How far has this aspect been explored by the Partnership, and how are they going to assure the people whom they represent?
7 – Siting process	No	This community group was involved in the initial CoRWM nationwide consultation. We only signed up to the document on moving towards a repository provided that there was a programme of r&d that could give the public something to go on in their evaluation. This has not happened, and there is a lack of trust. This trust has since been eroded due to the programme of new build which seeks to sneak in new build waste. This should be a separate issue and a separate consultation.
8 – Overall views on participation		These local councils have the burden of Sellafield to deal with, and have been given tremendous responsibility without adequate process and information. They should not give an opinion on any other possible site.
9 – Additional comments		It is dismayed that all roads lead to a repository, when the CoRWM recommendations were more equivocal. Given the geographical and geological conditions of the UK, there should be serious attempts at dealing with alternatives. The general public gudgingly went for a repository in the belief there would be the possibility of retrieval. This will be impossible in future generations. This should be borne in mind.