

Whicham Parish Council

Question	Agree	Response
1 – Geology	No	<p>The consultation document states that there is no significant public or stakeholder criticism of the study's integrity. It therefore follows that there is some criticism and this is not described in the main part of the document</p> <p>Varying opinions amongst geologists and the evidence of previous investigations lead us to doubt that any of West Cumbria (not already screened out) is suitable for a repository</p>
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>The conclusion on page 51 is very conditional, e.g., "will have", "will be in place". This does not inspire confidence, neither does the fact that safety is enclosed in inverted comma on that page.</p> <p>We are not confident of the impartiality of the NDA.</p> <p>The White Paper on which this consultation is based states that the aim of a GDF is to "ensure no harmful quantities of radio activity ever reach the surface" There is no such thing as a safe level of radiation - if there is to be even slight leakage, then a GDP can not be considered to be a safe, permanent way of disposal of high level nuclear waste</p>
3 – Impacts	No	<p>We question the integrity of the impacts study. 377 people were questioned, all bar 0.8% in towns. This is not a representative sample. And almost half of these people questioned were in Workington and Whitehaven - these areas have already been ruled out by the initial screening process. This means the "evidence" is skewed, by questioning people who will not have the repository in their immediate vicinity. There is an implication that rural areas do not favour a repository, but there are no figures given.. As a rural area we feel that our views are not represented in the study</p> <p>The study on impacts was carried out prior to the Japanese disaster and it is likely that this event has coloured people's perception and it could be argued that the impact study is no longer valid</p> <p>The main impacts of a repository have been defined as physical, social, environmental and economic. Of these categories the only one that may be a benefit is economic with jobs created during the construction. This benefit would be outweighed by the loss of jobs in the tourist and farming industries.</p> <p>The research into protecting the brand and reputation of the area was not complete when the consultation document was published. This was completed and reported in the MRWS bulletin no 17, point 7. The recommendation was "putting in place a phased communications campaign to emphasise the area's strong points" It is difficult to see how this extra advertising will mitigate the negative perceptions that would arise from siting a nuclear waste repository in West Cumbria</p> <p>The full report will not be available on the web site until the end of the month. This is after the end of the consultation period, so respondents have to take on trust the precis published in the bulletin. It could be the case that the findings were that it would be very difficult to protect the area's reputation, should a repository be sited in West Cumbria. This is another example</p>

		<p>of the flawed nature of this consultation</p> <p>We do not agree that an "acceptable process can be put in place during the next stage of the MRWS process to assess and mitigate any negative impacts" as some of the impacts, e.g. visual and disturbance will be impossible to mitigate.</p>
4 – Community benefits	No	<p>There are, and can be, no firm proposals. "We cannot be certain what specific package the Government might agree to this far in advance", so there are no guarantees</p> <p>Impact mitigation is discussed - in our opinion there can be no mitigation for the impact of a repository in terms of visual impact and effect upon tourism and farming. In other words community benefits on offer would not address the disbenefits.</p> <p>There is also the point that the Community Benefits package is in the gift of the Government. In the life time of this process it is likely that there will be at least one change of government.</p>
5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>We agree that waste should be retrievable</p> <p>We agree that it is too early to consider specifics</p>
6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	It is too early in the process to be considering the detail
7 – Siting process	No	<p>The Decision Making Body is remote from Whicham, more than 30 miles away and in this context is not accountable to our residents.</p> <p>We are concerned that if there is progression to the next stage it appears that the wishes of the host community can be over ruled "If omission of a potential host community would cause insurmountable problems for the siting process" the Partnership could recommend inclusion of the community concerned. In other words, we find the Right of Withdrawal suspect, especially as it would be exercised by Copeland Borough Council.</p>
8 – Overall views on participation		Whicham Parish Council do not wish to host a repository or over ground facilities. If the decision is taken to proceed to the next stage we would like our parish to be taken out of the areas being investigated as being suitable.