

**British Society for Social Responsibility in Science**

Question	Agree	Response
<b>1 – Geology</b>	No	<p>There are rigorous governmental guidelines set out exactly for public consultations. The partnership approach has quite deliberately sought to evade their purpose.</p> <p>This question for example is about opinion, not fact. It is clear the partnership opinion was NOT informed by geological expertise. When it was offered them they refused to hear it. The partnership Attitude to geology is:- 'whatever's down there, it's all we've got and we'll have to make the best of it' (and the worst won't happen for a good few generations yet).</p>
<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	No	<p>This question seeks to circumvent government guidelines on public consultation. There is no way a partnership 'opinion' can wish away the fact that a public enquiry ruled out the possibility of a safety case for burial of intermediate level radwaste. The UK is already in contravention of Nuclear Safety Directive. It is only a matter of time before Neighbouring EU govts take action to enforce the precautionary principle - something the partnership was expressly conceived to evade - which is why they now include high level waste as well.....</p>
<b>3 – Impacts</b>	No	<p>The partnership does not seem to have allowed itself an opinion on the scale of the excavation work its proposals entail. Nor does DECC nor the NDA. It is however, impossible to conceal the fact that an equivalent quantity of spoil to the channel tunnel would be brought to the surface and given a destination of some kind. Nowhere has this impact been properly assessed. Nor have the true impacts on Cumbrian agriculture or tourism. The partnership needs to form an opinion - preferably in the light of real factual evaluations 0 before they ask the population for their criticism.</p>
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	No	<p>The current dismantling of public services which local authorities are pursuing in W. Cumbria under the austerity regime of the present Govt. are irrevocable. Once schools and libraries are closed and the buildings sold these community assets are irretrievable. There is not way that W. Cumbrians can have confidence that the priorities shown by their local Government in 'partnership' with a Central government determined to 'dispose' of the Nuclear wastes problem will have anything but a deleterious effect and unmitigated hardship for the population.</p>
<b>5 – Design and engineering</b>	No	<p>Without candidate sites you are unable to answer any design questions that are site-specific. Without nominating a host rock formation you cannot specify how you will 'tailor' your design to last hundreds of millennia. It is the same hubris as that shown by Nuclear Industry in the years before it was banned from tipping Nuclear Waste at sea (in concrete-lined barrels which are now beginning to contaminate the bay of Biscay). You have no clear-cut approach to the chemical transformations that radioactive decay will occasion. It is NOT a positive waste.</p>
<b>6 – Inventory</b>	No	<p>This is one of the areas where the most tortured obtuse of language is deployed. The misrepresentation of the various stockpiles that accumulate from fuel cycle operations started with the 'separation' of civil and military fissile materials. The obfuscation never ceases... it is deliberately misleading to give 'in terms of volume' any estimate of existing or prospective burials because the capacity of the excavation to house it will have to be scores of times bigger.</p>

		The 'inventory' word is intended to give an idea of a fixity of physical properties - false - the heat-generating wastes will undergo continuous change; and chemical inertness - also false their chemical nature will also evolve.
<b>7 – Siting process</b>	No	<p>As the proverbial Irishman says "If I were going to Dublin, I wouldn't start from here" of the many thousands mineshafts and adits that have now all been abandoned, all but one, Goldscope, are flooded (Goldscope was an uphill drive which is therefore a perpetual watercourse itself). No matter how deep a geological repository is situated in W. Cumbria, the dynamics of groundwater circulation will defy predictability.</p> <p>A mathematician was found on hands and knees, hunting around in the street. He was asked 'what are you looking for?' - my keys - 'where did you drop them?' - down the street - 'so why are you looking for them here?' - because, here there is a street light and I can see....</p>
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		Borough councils are not competent to promulgate sustainable and integrated minerals and wastes plans. The current waste plan core strategy comes up for review this year. There can be no question of Allerdale or Copeland proceeding unilaterally without legal challenge. The relevant law reflects EU and Euratom directives which it is no part of a local authorities' capability to seek to overturn. Of course wasting money on a lavish scale is well within their competence.
<b>9 – Additional comments</b>		Your questions have been constructed so that a level of ignorance in their formulation can be exploited in the way people answer. That is deliberate predetermination of the outcome and overtly contradicts the governments criteria for making consultation an element in policy formation. Asking for public responses to questions devoid of any of the serious factual background (or mention of the previous history) is called "manufactured" consent. It bears NO relation to the real meaning of 'voluntarism'.