

North Cumbria Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

Question	Agree	Response
1 – Geology	No	<p>The information is slanted and biased towards your obsession with volunteerism. Volunteering to have a repository in Cumbria does not make the geology safe.</p> <p>The Partnership says “further investigation” is needed. West Cumbria is one of the most investigated geological areas in the country with a long history of mining. Mines were abandoned not because they were mined out, but because of the energy needed to dewater them. Areas of “high rainfall, permeable rocks and hills and mountains to drive the water flow” would guarantee leakage to the surface (1999 Government sponsored video – Pangea) Universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow for example have made studies of the area over the past 15 years but you have not allowed Professor David Smythe to give his measured judgement(although you took days to visit France - completely another geology) nor listened to Professor Stuart Haszeldine.</p>
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>This Government aims to put “first wastes into the repository by 2029.” In 1997 the Nirex Public Inquiry and Appeal agreed with Cumbria County Council’s argument and the findings of experts that the risk was too great for geological disposal of intermediate level wastes. I should like you to let me know how many of the Partnership have read the conclusion of this report?</p> <p>Today’s plan includes high level wastes – a world first.</p>
3 – Impacts	No	<p>A nuclear dump would blight both agriculture and tourism - Cumbria’s largest industries. Even before the emplacement of wastes, the mining operation would rival the biggest mines in the world adding to the earthquake risk and disrupting West Cumbria’s water table.</p>
4 – Community benefits	No	<p>West Cumbria should be assured of essential infrastructure such as schools, roads and hospitals without being bribed.</p> <p>What measures have you in mind in the case of a nuclear accident.</p>
5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>The Partnership says that “ A facility will not be built unless it will be safe during its operations and for future generations.” Their own advice contradicts this: “Geological disposal safety plans do not assume that total containment by engineered barrier systems for ever is possible.” Dr Adrian Bath</p> <p>You have no designs nor any engineering plans as you do not define the waste you are planning to deposit in this repository.</p> <p>Thoughts you do have are flawed as gasses from reactions of the fissile materials will escape upwards to ground level and water will become contaminated too and rise to the surface. It is considered likely that this may take place in a matter of decades from the repository being loaded. Cumbria is geologically unsuitable for this repository.</p>

6 – Inventory	No	You have made no inventory. You say you have one but where is it? Professor Stuart Haszeldine keeps asking too and he found your reply depressingly wanting. The inventory you talk of as your inventory is meaningless as this plan includes existing wastes (which are already outside of the scope of any inventory) and new build wastes from untried “high burn” nuclear power plants.
7 – Siting process	No	<p>Longlands Farm and the surrounding area was ruled out by the Nirex Inquiry. New criteria have been written to rule Longlands Farm back in.</p> <p>You are choosing this area because it is remote and has few inhabitants. The people who live here are desperate for income. You are exploiting their situation. This is not a robust nor flexible approach to the siting problems. You are using volunteerism. Volunteerism does not make Cumbria geologically safe.</p>
8 – Overall views on participation		<p>This is a cunning plan to keep the process and the nuclear agenda on track. The government are sinking tax payer £millions into a timetabled ‘process’ “too big to fail.”</p> <p>There would be a geological nuclear dump NOW in the Eskdale area if CCC had not opposed the plan 15 years ago.</p> <p>North Cumbria CND is shocked and deeply unhappy at this process you are running. It is unethical being a complete waste of money and a dangerous approach to the problem of nuclear waste. The whole nation desperately needs to address this problem with intelligence through the democratic process, not just push it onto and under poor Cumbria.</p>
9 – Additional comments		<p>Cumbria is geologically unsuitable for such a repository. It is dangerous and downright unethical to continue this process.</p> <p>North Cumbria CND says NO to the geological dumping of nuclear wastes in Cumbria.</p>