

User ID	Question	Agree	Response
1001	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
1001	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
1001	3 – Impacts	Yes	West Cumbria is and will remain associated with the UK's nuclear industry irrespective of whether the repository is sited there. That said and because of that long standing association it is appropriate that West Cumbria gains the long-term financial benefit from the repository along with the environmental benefits of moving nuclear waste from the Sellafield site.
1001	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	There is a lack of clarity in the potential community benefits. A clear statement of what the scheme would look like should be made as soon as possible.
1001	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	The design is good, but the strategy is wrong. Maintaining options for retrievability beyond the operational phase of the repository is not helpful and is leading to unnecessary costs and over design of packages. A philosophy of early opening and early closure (ie backfilling) should be adopted.
1001	6 – Inventory	Yes	An extra principle should be added that the repository will only accept radioactive wastes arising from nuclear operations undertaken within the UK, and that foreign waste will not be accepted.
1001	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
1001	8 – Overall views on participation		It is a sensible and pragmatic way forward, both councils have longstanding relationship/experience with the nuclear industry and the benefits and disadvantages that arise from that association. The sooner specific locations are identified the sooner local residents and can properly assess the effects.
1002	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
1002	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The minimum depth for the chambers seems very shallow. There seems to be insufficient evidence that these chambers will be as physically stable as will be required. Any rock movement could cause a failure of the casings designed to line the tunnels.

1002	3 – Impacts	No	Although the creation of local jobs would be very welcome, there are too many unknowns regarding the long-term viability of such a storage facility.
1002	4 – Community benefits	No	You cannot get around the issues of long term viability by offering people short-term (by comparison to the legacy of nuclear waste) benefits. Jobs and industry are badly needed in this area but not at the potential price of radioactive contamination - even if the theoretical risk is small.
1002	5 – Design and engineering	No	There seems to be no mention of ground movement - we do occasionally suffer from minor aftershock to earthquakes. If the climate is to change as much as is feared then surely this is an issue in a project with such a long timescale.
1002	6 – Inventory	No	Having Sellafield on the doorstep of one of the nations biggest tourist area and region of such environmental importance seems more than enough risk and damage. There is not enough evidence to prove that this is safe.
1002	7 – Siting process	No	No matter what the geology, this is an area of outstanding national beauty and should not be considered.
1002	8 – Overall views on participation		It should not be considered under any circumstance. The technology is emerging and not proved and this is an area of too much importance to risk.
1004	1 – Geology	No	Do to the comments of your independent reviewer in Document 194: Review of the NDA's information on geology by Dr Dearlove, May 2011
1004	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	It is impossible for anyone to ensure the safety, security or environment over the period for which the waste is dangerous. We can not conceive of how to communicate the danger to humans 100,000 years in the future, just as our ancestors 100,000 years ago could not have conceived how to communicate with us. None of your planning can be effective over this period. If safety is a priority and you're not convinced by the argument above, build the thing in the most safe place. My understanding is that the rock near London is the most stable in the country.
1004	3 – Impacts	No	None of the work done in chapter 6 uses appropriate times scales. Try answering: * Whether the Partnership is confident that appropriate possibilities exist to assess and manage environmental, social and economic impacts appropriately if they occur at any point over the duration of the

			<p>sites existence, circa the year 100,2012AD.</p> <p>* Whether the Partnership is confident that the possibility of a repository fits appropriately with the overall direction of the relevant community/ies over the duration of the sites existence, circa the year 100,2012AD..</p> <p>* Whether the Partnership is confident that accepting a repository at some point in the future, and committing the host area to a nuclear future for many generations to come, is economically advantageous and will contribute to economic sustainability over the duration of the sites existence, circa the year 100,2012AD..</p>
1004	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Only the current generation can be bribed with a benefits package.</p> <p>The question should be whether the Partnership can appropriately compensate local communities for the next 100,000 years?</p> <p>My opinion is that future generations would rather not have a nuclear waste dump. We can not consult them to find out but what rational mind could disagree?</p>
1004	5 – Design and engineering	Not answered	You say you don't know anything yet. I would agree.
1004	7 – Siting process	No	Another leading question. Whether any of the Partnerships processes (siting or otherwise) meet THEIR needs is up to them. The question should be whether the Partnerships processes are sufficiently robust to meet the needs of anyone now or in the future (until the waste is safe) who could potentially be affected by the site.
1004	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Any 'solution' to nuclear waste that can not make waste harmless within the lifetime of those choosing to create the waste condemns future generations to inherit their problem.</p> <p>Legitimising the idea of passing the waste on to future generations will lead to an escalation in production of waste.</p> <p>Considering such a 'solution' is wrong in principle. If you are unable to see that, hold a baby in your arms and look into its eyes. Consider the word legacy.</p>
1004	9 – Additional comments		<p>[Additional email]</p> <p>Please take this letter as a formal response to the consultation on whether local authorities in Cumbria should make a decision to go forward to the next stage of siting a nuclear dump - near to or under the Lake District National Park - in West Cumbria.</p>

			<p>This proposal is of concern to those who visit the region or have other connections with it. This not an issue only for those who live in West Cumbria. This is why I am writing to express my concerns.</p> <p>I understand there are significant issues surrounding the geological suitability of West Cumbria as a region to dispose of nuclear waste. Detailed examination has highlighted significant problems with the geology & hydrogeology of W Cumbria and it has been concluded it is not a suitable region for a nuclear dump.</p> <p>The scale of this proposed project is staggering. It will create vast amounts of waste 'spoil' from digging out the tunnels and vaults. The radioactive waste involved - including thousands of tonnes of highly radioactive spent fuel - is of key concern. The operations may continue for over 150 years.</p> <p>The plans, if carried out, present a significant risk to the environmental and economic well-being of the Lake District National Park and surrounding regions.</p> <p>If a dump were to be constructed in West Cumbria, it would ruin the beautiful western landscape of the Lake District National Park and possibly deter visitors.</p> <p>I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would to be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake Distrct National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a Wolrd Heritage Site.</p> <p>Nowhere in the world is there an operating repository for the kind of waste proposed in West Cumbria. This project is unique in its intention to bury high-level wastes, spent nuclear fuel and intermediate-level radwaste from all past, present and future nuclear activities.</p> <p>I ask the decision making bodies responsible not to make a 'decision to participate' to go forward to the stage of siting a nuclear dump in West Cumbria</p>
1007	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
1007	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made

1011	1 – Geology	No	<p>I believe the general geology and body of water contained in the lake district and in this area in particular , make it unsuitable as the host site for a waste repository.</p> <p>The amount of rainfall experienced in this part of the country must also play a part in the decision making, as it would seem to me that it was necessary to have as dry an environment as possible to store waste safely underground. Another leak recently at Sellafield highlights the fact that you cannot guarantee total safety and that there would be safer environments than this to place a repository. If waste leaked into the environment through our underground water course, it would be disastrous.</p>
1011	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
1012	9 – Additional comments		<p>I endorse and agree with the submission made to this consultation by Millom Without Parish Council. In particular:</p> <p>It is in the national interest that the proposed site should be determined by an examination of all suitable areas and that the final selection should be made of the site which best satisfies scientific and geological requirements.</p> <p>This may not be in Cumbria; it has been argued (geologically), that one of the best possible places would be in the salt mines of Cheshire.</p> <p>However, I believe that in the proper meaning of “safe”, ultimately there is no safe place to dispose of long lived radio nuclides. MRWS is a contradiction in terms.</p>
1015	1 – Geology	No	Although 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)
1015	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	A Public Inquiry and Appeal agreed with Cumbria County Council’s view 15 years ago that the risk was too great for geological disposal of intermediate level wastes. Today’s plan includes high level wastes – a world first.

1015	3 – Impacts	No	A nuclear dump would have disastrous effects both on 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 the disruption of West Cumbria's water table.
1015	4 – Community benefits	No	The proposed 'benefits package' is essentially bribery. West Cumbria should be assured of essential infrastructure such as schools, roads and hospitals without having to be bribed. The fact that this so-called benefits package is even necessary is yet another indication that the plans are so clearly controversial and will be unpopular with the public as a result.
1015	5 – Design and engineering	No	The Partnership said " A facility will not be built unless it will be safe during its operations and for future generations." But their own advice even contradicts this: "Geological disposal safety plans do not assume that total containment by engineered barrier systems for ever is possible." Dr Adrian Bath
1015	6 – Inventory	No	The inventory is irrelevant. 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.
1015	7 – Siting process	No	Longlands Farm and the surrounding area was ruled out by the Nirex Inquiry. Yet new criteria have now been written in order to rule Longlands Farm back in.
1015	8 – Overall views on participation		This is a highly reckless and cunning plan to keep the process and the nuclear agenda on track. The government are sinking millions of pounds of tax payers' money into a timetabled process deemed "too big to fail." There would be a geological nuclear dump in the Eskdale area already if Cumbria County Council had not opposed the plan 15 years ago.
1025	Comments slip		* I agree with this statement. [* refers to the question on the comments slip]
1029	9 – Additional comments		The views made by Millom Without Parish Council should be considered seriously. Not just because they make good common sense but they are representative of the people living in that part of Cumbria: "2. In view of the above the Council is of the opinion that it is the duty of the government and the nuclear industry is to seek a location for this repository which gives principal weight to criteria based upon geological considerations in the most rigorous sense. The search for a site should not to be confined to the areas of

			<p>those principal councils which have, at present, expressed an interest. It is in the national interest that the proposed site should be determined by an examination of all suitable areas and that the final selection should be made of the site which best satisfies scientific and geological requirements.”</p> <p>Indeed it IS the government’s duty: central government should not be allowed to try to dilute its responsibility for radio active waste with regional consultations like the Cumbrian MRWS exercise.</p>
1031	1 – Geology	No	This is just a new set of geologists disagreeing and rubbishing their predecessors reports. (NIREX 1989)
1031	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Safety - There have been past incidents of unexpected overheating of surface stored waste. These have been generally kept from the knowledge of the public.</p> <p>Security - I have no faith in security.</p> <p>Environment and Planning - Yet to be determined.</p>
1031	3 – Impacts	No	<p>Again - Yet to be determined.</p> <p>Too much emphasis on short term gains of jobs and Community Benefits Packages.</p>
1031	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Community benefits are BRIBES in the short term.</p> <p>This will never overcome the detrimental effects a repository would have on Cumbrian long term safety and security.</p>
1031	5 – Design and engineering	No	Too many unanswered questions to consider at this stage.
1031	6 – Inventory	Yes	Too early for a decision and more consultation needed to completely answer the points raised in the consultation pack.
1031	7 – Siting process	No	The process is the wrong way round. The Government should have made a survey of potentially safe sites and then deciding the best site in the National interest.
1031	8 – Overall views on participation		See Question 7.2

1031	9 – Additional comments		[Additional comments slip] As a Cumbrian, born and bred from the bottom of my Cumbrian heart I request the Councils of Cumbria to please withdraw totally from any further discussions with the Government on having a repository in Cumbria.
1032	1 – Geology	Yes	Multi-barrier approaches have been the method used for the storage of Low Level waste for years and seems to be a logical way of protecting the environment and local population from the effects of ILW.
1032	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	If the safety case can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the regulators and security is increased by placing the ILW underground it would seem logical to allow the facility to be built.
1032	3 – Impacts	Yes	My preference would be for building the ILW in the south Copland area. The reasons for this are, this part of Cumbria has a lower population than the Cumbrian northwest coast, has fewer tourists, lower employment and would benefit greatly from improved road access. Sellafield traffic causes almost grid lock conditions on the A595 twice daily, the rail timetable does not allow for an alternative to road travel. The same rail network is ideally positioned to deliver the waste from around the UK, as a large proportion of the waste that does not originate at Sellafield already passes this part of Cumbria. A road bridge across the river Duddon from Askham to Millom would allow much of the construction traffic to access this part of the region without impacting on the national park or tourist hot spots.
1032	4 – Community benefits	Yes	It is only right that the area responsible for hosting the only ILW repository in the UK be granted benefits of this, in the same way London has benefited greatly with sporting facilities for housing the Olympics.
1032	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Design and engineering are the most critical aspects of ensuring the safety and security of the ILW.
1032	6 – Inventory	Yes	The definition for ILW is clearly laid out by the regulator, the fact the Sellafield has accumulated huge stocks of plutonium and spent fuel over the years, and has not reprocessed this stock would indicate that it is already waste. As almost all of the users of reprocessed fuel belong to the private sector and as such are clients of Sellafield, this stock pile should have been used to supply them already.
1032	7 – Siting process	Yes	This seems to be a logical way to address the repository siting process.
1032	8 – Overall views on participation		Copeland should defiantly take part in this process. And if a suitable site is found commit to the building of the repository if suitable benefits for the local community are forthcoming.

1035	Comments slip		<p>I strongly disagree with any move to designate West Cumbria as a potential site for an underground nuclear waste repository. Such a structure must be guaranteed to be safe for the hundreds of thousands of years that the waste will remain toxic.</p> <p>That guarantee cannot be given for a repository buried in this terrain.</p> <p>Finland looked at over 30 possible locations to find the one most suitable for its own repository. Our government is looking at just one, and that one is possibly the least suitable and the most unsafe of any site in England.</p> <p>It is unsuitable and unsafe because of the rock in and under which the repository would be built - it is riddled with fractures and faultlines - and because of the mountains which tower over and beside it, down which constant and often fierce flows of water cascade, permeating the ground and creating a constant threat of seepage.</p> <p>We who live in West Cumbria did not volunteer our area for such a fate. The three councils who did so are betraying not just us and not just the millions across Britain and the world who treasure its beauty, but more important still, future generations whose safety such a repository would threaten for thousands of years.</p>
1045	Comments slip		<p>I object most strongly to the proposed repository - this area is unsuitable for such a project and will result in the 'spoiling' of a beautiful countryside as well as leading to many other difficulties - as yet unforeseen. And is it not true that we in Cumbria have only got the repository because no one else wants it!!</p>
1048	Comments slip		<p>Please take part in a search for a repository.</p>
1049	Comments slip		<p>Please take part in a search for a repository.</p>
1050	Emailed letter		<p>I have followed the debate regarding the MRWS process for coming to a decision regarding whether or not to agree to proceed to stage 4 with increasing concern. Initially I was in favour of trying to find a site in Cumbria for some obvious strategic reasons. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The majority of the existing waste is already in Cumbria and shipping elsewhere has its own risks.

		<p>2. Deep geological disposal seems to be the preferred route internationally.</p> <p>3. Cumbria has long accepted the presence of the risks of a nuclear installation.</p> <p>4. It is safer to place the waste in long term underground storage than to leave it on the surface where any form of storage is time-limited and inherently therefore less safe. In effect we cannot leave it where it is for much longer.</p> <p>Unfortunately I have come to believe that the MRWS process is deeply flawed.</p> <p>At the end of stage 3 the decision-making bodies are not even the elected bodies of the different councils but sub-sets of them weighted towards particular areas. The public consultation process is a sham involving a deep consultation with whomever shows up to listen followed by a randomly selected telephone poll. The chance that more than a handful of people selected at random have actually been involved in the consultation is minimal. This makes a mockery of the consultation process itself.</p> <p>The decision makers are asked to say whether it has been shown that it is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. possible to find a site in Cumbria for disposal 2. that a research programme has been mapped out which can show that any chosen site would be safe. <p>Following this decision the power to refuse to proceed at a later stage becomes progressively more difficult with a requirement that good grounds are required for refusal. What good grounds might mean has not been defined and is presumably at the judgment of central government – hardly a local issue now.</p> <p>In fact, what has been shown by the MRWS process Stage 3 is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not impossible to find a site in Cumbria 2. All the questions that need to be answered in a research programme have been stated. <p>On the first point: they have not shown that it is probable that we can find a site in Cumbria, they have not shown that the chance of finding a site is as much as 2%, they have simply stated that as they have done no research over a reasonably sized part of the county they cannot say that it is impossible to find a suitable site there.</p> <p>In fact the various consultation exercises have clearly shown that it is not probable that a site will be found in Cumbria that is reasonably safe for over 100,000 years (although it is highly probably that a site will be found that is safe for about 5,000 years). Of course, this shorter time frame would take any consequences of failure well out of reach of any possible censure to the present government when a failure occurs.</p> <p>On the second point: the NDA has provided a series of questions (between 100 and 200) which will need to be</p>
--	--	---

		<p>answered by a research programme. This is a very expensive research programme if all questions are to be answered properly for any prospective site.</p> <p>No indication is given as to in what order the questions would need to be answered.</p> <p>No indication is given as which questions would be used for initial screening of a site.</p> <p>No indication is given as to likely time frames neither for the research on any prospective site, nor as to the cost of such research.</p> <p>This paper is actually laughable in its imprecision and lack of useful information.</p> <p>Once stage 4 is reached the chance of any further objections to any prospective site being raised by parties other than the official bodies is negligible. There is already no right to challenge the research findings as to whether they do or do not guarantee safety for 1,000,000 years which is the target time.</p> <p>The risks which this region will be accepting if this project goes ahead will be unlikely to affect any of the existing population, nor indeed any of the next 200 generations, but then there could be an unknown risk. It is unlikely that documentation will survive that long into the future and consequences of failure of containment could be serious. But hey, 200 generations is nearly forever so why are we worrying? After all if we do not do something soon about lowering our carbon emissions we will not last another 10 generations!</p> <p>Of course, councillors might well believe that there will be some community benefits. Any promises to that effect have so far been so vague as to be useless. Vote no at this stage and see what happens. Central government does not appear to have a Plan B.</p>
1051	Comments slip	I am FULLY IN SUPPORT of further investigations to determine whether West Cumbria is a suitable area for the disposal of radioactive waste.
1053	Comments slip	Continue with investigations for the repository.
1055	Comments slip	<p>I agree we should continue to take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository, without any commitment to have it.</p> <p>Any site should be accessible for monitoring and retrieval.</p>

			Any selected site should only proceed following local approval - not just from local Parish Councils but by a local referendum.
1056	Comments slip		I support this consultation and agree it is vital to investigate further whether West Cumbria is a suitable for the disposal of radioactive waste
1058	Email		<p>Thank you for your phone call.</p> <p>As I expressed, I am disturbed that telephoned objections in response to your leaflet regarding the proposed radio-active waste disposal are "not valid" & have serious doubts about the validity of this consultation exercise as a result.</p> <p>I wish to formally express my objection to the proposal of radio-active waste in West Cumbria since I believe it does not meet adequate safety criteria, particularly in an area with a recorded (& recent) geological instability. I think we owe it to future generations to avoid putting them to risk. Long-term adverse biological consequences to both animals & humans cannot, by definition, be predicted with 100% accuracy over such a long time scale but risks rise with prolonged exposure to even "small" risks.</p> <p>Councillors must surely consider our legacy to future generations and err heavily on the side of caution.</p>
1059	Comments slip		Evidence already exists that Cumbria is not suitable for a repository and that other areas in England are. These areas should be looked at first. It is illogical to look at unsuitable areas just because they are the only ones to have 'volunteered'. We should go no further in looking for a site in Cumbria. We should not go to stage 4.
1060	Comments slip		Evidence already exists, although not in this document, that Cumbria is unsuitable for a Repository, and that other areas in England are. These areas should be looked at first - it is illogical to look at unsuitable areas just because they are the only ones to have volunteered. We should go no further in looking for a site in Cumbria. We should not go to Stage 4.
1066	Email		A radioactive waste dump should NOT be put in Cumbria. The 1997 Public Inquiry into the Rock Characterisation Facility found no suitable geology available, that there was too much water which would move radionuclides out of any containment and the containers themselves have rather short half lives in that sort of

			<p>environment. The current state of knowledge - or lack of it - does not justify such a long term project being established in an unsuitable area leaving yet more problems to be dealt with by future generations which did not "benefit" from the use of the energy produced at the time.</p> <p>For full exploration see Uncertainty Underground edited by Allison Macfarlane, and Rodney C. Ewing - 2006. While it is about yucca Mountain, a project which was cancelled by President Obama, it asked all top scientists in the range of issues involved with radioactive waste management:</p> <p>What do we know What do we not know How long will it take to find out.....and sub question cost</p> <p>Until that exercise has been done in a transparent fashion in the UK and a clear method for people to follow the advances which are and will be made in the associated research the answer is NO.</p>
1067	1 – Geology	No	<p>The position is one of uncertainty, after much of the area has been ruled out.</p> <p>A national repository is a matter in the national interest. Better candidate areas can be readily identified at present, such as areas of Oxfordshire which have been favoured in the past and where exploratory work has commenced.</p> <p>Rather than exploring areas of West Cumbria which have other disadvantages, it would be better in the national interest to explore superior sites at the outset.</p> <p>The potentially suitable areas include low lying coastal areas which make these obviously unsuitable in times of fluctuating and rising sea level for a hazardous repository with such a long term risk.</p>
1067	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>The current regulation of the nuclear industry and its waste has been conspicuous in not preventing accidents and serious leaks of radioactivity to the environment.</p> <p>The proposed repository is an unknown technique and the expertise of the regulators is accordingly of limited value. In the event of a serious incident in an operating repository, effectively nothing could be done to regulate or correct the problem.</p> <p>The planning decisions will not be taken locally but by ministers and the IPC.</p>

			The construction of the facility will be hazardous in itself and will cause harm to the environment and landscape of a very high quality.
1067	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>The nuclear industry is an enduring blight on the area which is wholly inconsistent with its landscape quality, agriculture, tourism and long-standing culture. The landscape quality and rural attributes are at odds with industrial or major infrastructure development.</p> <p>The development will do little to ease unemployment in the area as the long-term unemployed are unlikely to be found work in such a project.</p>
1067	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>A benefits package is essentially a bribe to overcome objection to a manifestly objectionable proposal. Probity in the planning system is undermined by such tactics.</p> <p>It would not be acceptable to send hazardous waste to a third world country and give some financial sweetener to ensure that it is accepted. Identifying an economically poor area within UK is just as objectionable.</p>
1067	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>Retrievability in any meaningful sense cannot be achieved for the enormous lifespan of the project.</p> <p>It is clear that whatever engineering techniques are used or design settled upon that there will be immense disbenefits in terms of landscape, environmental quality, transport disruption and quality of life.</p>
1067	6 – Inventory	No	Once a repository has been agreed then there will be no effective control over inventory and so it must be assumed from the outset that the widest range of wastes will be accommodated. If the government or industry changes the inventory then it is unrealistic to pretend that any local concern will prevent it.
1067	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Local preference should take a minor role compared with suitability in the national interest. This is a national problem and the best site nationally, not just the most accepting population nationally should determine the decision.</p> <p>The consideration at this stage of benefits packages shows that the whole process is unsatisfactory.</p>
1067	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>The approach is quite astonishing. Certainly there are links to the nuclear industry. However, this is no reason to encourage pariah industries with serious health and environmental disbenefits to the area. It is notable that there are no suitable areas near Whitehaven or Workington, but only to the areas furthest away with little connection to the administrative centres of the councils.</p> <p>The repository will work against regeneration by blighting the area as does the nuclear industry as a whole.</p>

		<p>Egremont is located closest to the main nuclear industry and despite its character and history is as deprived and run down as any location in West Cumbria. That is the due to the regenerative effect of the nuclear industry.</p> <p>The whole approach is cynical. Hoping to find a location for radioactive waste because the industry can do nothing better than bury the extremely toxic waste it has created in producing over-priced energy. West Cumbria has suffered from the blight of the industry. It should not suffer again from the blight of its waste.</p>
1067	9 – Additional comments	<p>I strongly OBJECT to the location of a waste repository in West Cumbria. Because the location is manifestly unsuitable, I object to further needless research being conducted.</p> <p>I wish I had the opportunity to object to the Scottish Waste being brought to Cumbria but as with the repository, I doubt that I or the Councils could have any real input.</p>
1069	Email	<p>Please don't put our beautiful countryside and wildlife at risk. I grew up here and would be so sad to have to move away again. I want to raise a family here. This decision will affect generations...</p> <p>Please don't risk it. Please don't risk us.</p>
1070	Comments slip	<p>When NIREX carried out their geological survey they found the area of Longlands, Gosforth, West Cumbria totally unsuitable for an underground high level waste nuclear repository on the grounds of unsuitable rock formations and doubts regarding hydrology. They therefore abandoned this location and stated that it would never be considered again for these reasons. They could not prove a safety case which could guarantee that high levels of radioactivity would not appear in groundwater run-off, resulting in the need to create human exclusion zones. Are we to believe that this geological fact has now altered? And are we seriously expected to believe that it is sheer coincidence that Sellafield just happens to be in the proposed new exploration area? So what has changed? The answer to this question is that the British Government has become desperate as no other area in Britain has indicated its willingness to host such a repository - so West Cumbria is now being worked on remorselessly by means of the 'dripping tap'/ inducement technique- jobs, prosperity, better roads, sponsorship etc in the guise of the 'Energy Coast'. No mention is made of the effect of this on West Cumbria's Tourist Industry or the impact on our renowned landscape - the Lake District national Park included. West Cumbria will be shunned by visitors - as happened before in the 1970s. Allerdale and Copeland are selling our souls for a pound of SHORT-TERM flesh. We vehemently oppose this proposal.</p>

1071	Letter attached to comments slip	<p>When NIREX carried out their geological survey they found the area of Longlands, Gosforth, West Cumbria totally unsuitable for an underground high level waste nuclear repository on the grounds of unsuitable rock formations and doubts regarding hydrology. They therefore abandoned this location and stated that it would never be considered again for these reasons. They could not prove a safety case which could guarantee that high levels of radioactivity would not appear in groundwater run-off, resulting in the need to create human exclusion zones. Are we to believe that this geological fact has now altered? And are we seriously expected to believe that it is sheer coincidence that Sellafield just happens to be in the proposed new exploration area? So what has changed? The answer to this question is that the British Government has become desperate as no other area in Britain has indicated its willingness to host such a repository - so West Cumbria is now being worked on remorselessly by means of the 'dripping tap'/ inducement technique- jobs, prosperity, better roads, sponsorship etc in the guise of the 'Energy Coast'. No mention is made of the effect of this on West Cumbria's Tourist Industry or the impact on our renowned landscape - the Lake District national Park included. West Cumbria will be shunned by visitors - as happened before in the 1970s. Allerdale and Copeland are selling our souls for a pound of SHORT-TERM flesh. We vehemently oppose this proposal.</p>
1072	Letter	<p>I am a retired doctor and unfortunately was not able to attend the meeting in Kendall Hall where I had hoped to ask the Partnership some questions, so I am taking the liberty of writing down a few of my observations concerning nuclear waste disposal.</p> <p>Firstly, I would suggest that the Government is completely wrong to even consider building 10 new nuclear plants. When the actual cost of decommissioning the outdated ones and finally dealing with the created high level nuclear waste is added to the construction and maintenance of new build, surely the cost is going to be astronomical. Even now, the policy could be aborted and the money diverted to a serious boost to the production of real renewable and sustainable electricity. The UK with its enviable supply of natural resources for such projects could be self-sufficient in electricity relatively quickly and with the added advantage of the provision of many more jobs for UK people nationwide.</p> <p>Nuclear radiation is far more hazardous than the industry admits, and even low levels may remain in the human body until death e.g. strontium 90 migrates to bones where it remains and causes cancer, but some radiation attacks the gametes resulting in childhood deformities.</p> <p>For a full account of the history of the Nuclear Industry, which after all was first developed to produce bombs, the production of electricity being merely a bi-product at first, I would earnestly recommend the reading of the book by Rosalie Bertell called "No Immediate Danger: Prognosis for a Radioactive Earth". I wish to include one small quotation from the book – "The purpose of a nuclear waste depository is to prevent the solid fission waste, especially strontium 90, caesium 137, cobalt 60, carbon 14 and the Trans-uranium elements like plutonium, from contaminating the environment. The repository must be stable for a million years". Even the</p>

			<p>half life of plutonium is 240,000 years.</p> <p>Do we know how much waste is to be disposed of in Cumbria yet? A 4 foot tube of fission waste requires about 10,000 times its actual size in order to prevent the development of a critical mass which would explode. However could such a depository of necessary size be monitored for so long? How dare we even consider leaving such a legacy to our descendants? It is not just human beings of being in danger but all living creatures too.</p> <p>The Nuclear Industry has a long history of laxity concerning leaks of radioactive material - mostly accidental, but some even intentional such as the waste pipe from Sellafield to the Irish Sea. The radiation is far more damaging than is portrayed, the real danger being that effects may be small at first and even unrecognised, but as more and more of the DNA in sperm and ??? ???? [illegible] place more obvious abnormalities are likely to occur and become multiplied in generation after generation.</p> <p>Please find copies of an article in the Guardian this week, and also one an account of the above book by Polly Toynbee.</p> <p>I am sorry not to have a more constructive contribution to make.</p> <p>[Two newspaper articles were attached – see appendix below]</p>
1074	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
1074	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
1074	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
1074	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
1074	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
1074	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
1074	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made

1074	8 – Overall views on participation		Both councils should be involved
1075	Letter		<p>In my opinion it would be foolish for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The geology- based on granite which develops cracks, has already been judged to be unsafe. Radioactivity could enter ground water and make the whole area a “no go” place. We have had an earthquake here recently. Do we know the effect? 2. It would not provide many permanent jobs: nothing in the way of “bribes” could compensate. 3. It would prevent diversification because non-nuclear businesses would prefer to go elsewhere. 4. The infrastructure is inadequate. 5. We could say goodbye to any tourist industry. <p>PS Since the country seems to need better sources of energy, at present I am in favour of the development of nuclear power stations. Destroying our beautiful countryside with inefficient and expensive wind turbines doesn't make sense.</p>
1076	Letter		<p>With the so called consultation process about a Cumbrian Nuclear repository moving its way to a conclusion current events may be worth noting.</p> <p>An article in the Cumbrian News & Star 28/02/12 reported that the energy firm Centrica after spending millions of pounds abandoned plans to make a storage facility off the coast of Barrow in Cumbria for storing gas. Apparently the physical integrity of the area was unsuitable. Just say it “The rock's rotten”. This facility 20 Billion cubic feet was more than likely a repository.</p> <p>After all in the Kirkgate Centre Cockermonth Alun Evans the Nuclear spokesman confused the two commenting on NIREX in 1989. Finally the BBC main news showed Japan's problems since their disaster which nearly cost them the use of Tokyo. It will take at least 40 years to get anywhere near right. Assuming that nature behaves. NO CHANCE. The Japanese are in trouble. Time for Cumbrian Councils,</p>

			nuclear industry and the public to WAKE UP AND SMELL THE COFFEE. Cumbrian Repository Rock out of condition Project out of scale Plans, out of order Place out of bounds
1078	1 – Geology	No	Nirex ruled out W Cumbria years ago - we should respect that. Recent earthquakes/tremors show the whole region is not stable in the long term.
1078	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No confidence in the Regulators long-term; there have been too many failures of regulation in the past. As to planning, the new NPPF due to come into force soon defaults to the 'developer' view and makes local objectors face a high hurdle to carry their case. Local planners in Cumbria and the District councils are not used to this level of major projects, and will rely on 'experts'; local residents will have less of a say. Tourists/visitors' interests will be ignored.
1078	3 – Impacts	No	Long term environmental impacts are impossible to predict for centuries ahead. Future generations will not thank us for loading them with the burden of long-term maintenance and upkeep of this kind of facility. Considerations of job creation must be short term in the context of several centuries of operation, no-one knows what the population of W Cumbria will be or what they may want in terms of employment opportunities.
1078	4 – Community benefits	No	Whatever benefits there are on the table for W Cumbria will be irrelevant in a hundred years time. Future generations will not be impressed by the idea that this decision was influenced by a benefits package delivered around the time the facility was constructed. It will also be of little use to future tourists and Lake District visitors. How will the Hotel/B&B/hospitality businesses be compensated for the loss of tourist trade?
1078	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	It must be essential to be able to monitor the state/condition of waste containers to avoid pressure build-up and possible rupture and release to the local environment. Retrieval as you call it seems essential if future generations decide there are alternative, better methods of disposal.
1078	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	We (the UK) don't appear to know exactly how many Nuclear Power Stations we need or will build over the next decades, so I don't see how we can have any confidence in inventory estimates.

1078	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>It seems strange to rely on 'voluntarism' to decide the siting issue, over the next fifteen years there will be several changes in County and District councils, then maybe the project will go through several 'off-again/on-again' phases, adding to the expense. However I applaud the idea of allowing the local communities a voice in the various stages of deciding where and what to build.</p> <p>I think other areas in Cumbria should have a more prominent role in this decision, not just Copland and Allerdale (speaking as an Eden resident).</p>
1078	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>As above, I think the wider Cumbrian community (eg in Eden) should have as large a say as Copeland/Allerdale. The Winscale disaster in the 1950s affected the whole of NW England, not just Sellafield.</p> <p>On balance I think this proposal to invite the installation of a repository should be rejected.</p>
1078	9 – Additional comments		-none-
1080	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
1080	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
1080	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
1080	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
1080	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
1080	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
1080	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
1082	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>It has been said in previous public meetings that there are more suitable areas in the UK for a possible site. There was no mention of this on the notice boards in the meetings.</p> <p>Copeland Council seem determined to go ahead with turning Cumbria into a nuclear dump, their attitude is</p>

			"not enough evidence to rule out West Cumbria" what sort of an argument is that! It doesnt sound a positive endorsement for an ideal place.
1082	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	There is an inadequate infrastructure. The council seem to be bulldozing their proposals - perhaps there should be a referendum?
1082	3 – Impacts	No	Safety and disposal techniques and the dealing with radioactive waste changes over time as scientists discover better ways to treat the waste and also realise more about this hazardous waste. The waste will be active for 1,000's yrs and we cannot guarantee the safety, we cannot trust or rely on commercial enterprises to deal correctly with the waste. In the post-op phase of operations companies conveniently for them disappear and dont fulfil their legal and responsible duties. Take for example the open cast mine at Keekle - the agreement to mine - was also dependant on the clean up operation - the council is still waiting. I could say the council is niave but I suspect other motives to do with financial gain.
1082	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	From personal experience, people in business will tell you exactly what they think you want to hear. Promises are made and are rarely met in full.
1082	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	I have been to public and partnership meetings and get the impression the council has worked hard to sell this to the public. However, taken as a broader picture I am not convinced that what is accepted as 'safe' now, will be in say 100yrs time.
1082	6 – Inventory	No	I moved to Cumbria as my husband got a job in nuclear decommissioning at Sellafield. Now after four years the industry is actively seeking to build more reactors!
1082	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	I feel that Copeland Council is determined to find a site regardless of its suitability, that is the way it comes across at meetings. I was said that other areas in England were more suitable, but obviously their councils had more sense.
1082	8 – Overall views on participation		I dont believe the people of either area want a repository, perhaps we should ask them first before the council speaks for us.

1086	Letter		<p>I write as a retired member of the teaching profession, having been attracted to Cumbria from the south of England, and latterly from Derbyshire, to take up a post at the then secondary Technical College in Workington, as head of Geography, and on its closure to Dissington Secondary school until my retirement.</p> <p>During my stay at the Technical College much time was given to leading parties of boys to view the prospects open to them at Sellafield, where many then found employment.</p> <p>During this time also I was a member of the Cumbria Geological Society, and on the basis of personal knowledge gained led frequent groups of pupils on expeditions at weekends and school holidays into the Lake District to study the Geology of the surrounding area, as well as rock climbing, and the exploration of mineral deposits an activity which was always found to be of absorbing interest.</p> <p>They were all familiar with the high rainfall figures for the area and the complexity of subtle streams which percolate through and between the fractured nature of porous and impervious rocks which abound in the region, a former volcanic region of great complexity.</p> <p>I am concerned that it would be virtually impossible to constantly monitor the safety of the water supply to be free-from contamination by leakages and the nuclear contamination, with the devastating effects that these would probably cause to future generations.</p> <p>Should the repository be placed underground, we could no longer trust the humble kitchen tap to deliver the purity of water we now receive.</p>
1087	Letter		<p>I write in response to the question "Should West Cumbria take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository?"</p> <p>I fully support the repository being put in either Copeland or Allerdale area. I have a concern that over the 60 years of the Nuclear Industry being in our area, I feel that some of our towns and villages have not been fully supported by the Industry.</p> <p>There has been a lot of money spent outside our County in the supply chain. If we have the right structure and investment in local companies to support the Nuclear Industry, we can improve our communities and thus can improve their standard of living. I believe we have the skills locally to help build a repository. We just need support from Government to do this.</p>

1088	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
1088	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
1088	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
1088	4 – Community benefits	No	No comment was made
1088	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made
1088	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
1088	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
1088	8 – Overall views on participation		The geology should have been investigated first
1088	9 – Additional comments		The MRWS process is flawed. Deep geological disposal is unsafe and unacceptable
1089	Letter		<p>This letter is a formal response to the Consultation Document re. the siting of a nuclear dump in West Cumbria.</p> <p>I am against the siting of a nuclear dump in West Cumbria because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The only credible information I have heard is that the whole area of West Cumbria is geologically unsuitable. 2. The adverse impact on the area, its residents and future generations cannot possibly be foreseen either in the short term or many years hence. 3. There may be jobs created but not necessarily for local people. 4. No credible information has been forthcoming from the MRWS Partnership. I have attended two meetings and read the Consultation document and I have concluded that this whole process has been a PR exercise.

		<p>The real facts have not been divulged to those who will be most affected.</p> <p>5. There are known to be more geologically suitable areas in the UK for this site.</p> <p>Now I read in the press (03/03/20 12) that support for nuclear energy throughout Europe, Japan and the USA is at crisis point and only the UK is determined to proceed with the planned programme of nuclear development. Is this yet another ill-considered, massively expensive project that is being pushed along by our leaders?</p> <p>In conclusion I ask that all our representatives recommend withdrawal from the process at this stage.</p>
<p>1090</p>	<p>Emailed letter</p>	<p>This letter is a response to the consultation on whether local authorities in Cumbria should decide to go to the next stage in the process of siting a nuclear dump under west Cumbria.</p> <p>Given the vast amount of work that has already gone into determining the geology of the area, it is amazing that it is even still being considered as being a potential site. The total absence of any other expressions of interest nationally is surely indicative of the extreme nature of the risks inherent in the proposals?</p> <p>The question arises as to who owns the county and therefore has the rights to excavate such holes in it; to create such an orifice and then fill it with highly toxic waste merely because no safe method of dealing with the material is highly irresponsible. There is also the question of what will happen if a huge hole is actually commenced, thereby changing forever the underground structure with unknown consequences. At the very least there will be a dramatic change in ground-water flow.</p> <p>As owners of property on the Cumbrian coast, we have been appalled at what is being proposed in terms of development, which we consider to be wholly inappropriate for the area. We note the involvement of a large number of ex-Sellafield personnel in the process pushing for the development. The possibility that the placement of these people is non-accidental concerns us greatly. In the past we have noted that there has been corruption of many of the county's institutions - confirmed by the 96 findings of the Redfern Inquiry into Tissue Sampling and Body Part Removal by Sellafield and the industry. It seems that this situation arose with the complicity of national government. We consider it a scandal that there has been no investigation by Cumbria Police into those findings - and consider the lack of interest by that organisation to be further confirmation that the county has been corrupted by the nuclear industry. It seems to us that there may be a deliberate policy of inserting pro-nuclear personnel into positions of influence and power and would welcome some investigation as to whether this is a viable interpretation of the situation. We note, too, the allegations printed in the local press from time to time, that the nuclear industry is bribing the local residents with promises of things to come - but only if they agree to the proposed expansion.</p>

		<p>The selection of people such as the expert chosen to brief the public, for example Dr. Dearlove, in preference to, say, Professor D. Smythe - an acknowledged expert whose advice was, we understand, accepted at the Nirex Enquiry and whose knowledge of the area's geology must be second-to-none, amazes us. The banal suggestion of the doctor that granite is "very solid", demonstrated by a lump of the material, is an insult. If Cumbria were founded on solid, unbroken granite, then at least its geology might lend itself to the proposed scheme. As it is not, and the doctor should have acknowledged the fact in the interests of honesty and integrity, his suggestion is ludicrous and misleading. There is an obvious potential for the inference that the gentleman was employed because of his nuclear-supportive views, whereas Professor Smythe has the knowledge that proves the area is entirely unsuitable. Where were his views made apparent in the informative sessions?</p> <p>We note that one of the prime protagonists has already commissioned an international company – presumably at great expense - to assess the future transport requirements of the area. Surely this is premature if the process of consultation is genuine and meaningful, rather than, as we suspect, prejudged? What we perceive to be an inherent bias in every one of the consultations has been registered throughout all the various exercises that have been undertaken over the last four years; not just by us, but by all those non-industry respondents with whom we have come into contact.</p> <p>We note, too, the employment of Mr. E. Robson's company, Osprey Communications, to ascertain whether locating the dump in west Cumbria would have any adverse effect on tourism. What a further waste of money.</p> <p>Why anyone should think that a nuclear dump will be an acceptable part of the holiday or recreational scene is beyond us. The £5 million that has been put forward for the company to come up with the answer would have been far better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>So, the government and nuclear lobbyists in Cumbria propose the area should, for at least the next 150 years, be utterly spoiled and its future into eternity jeopardised to facilitate the waste disposal? We have suggested in the past that the plans supported by the various pro-nuclear factions will eventually entail the whole of the Cumbrian coast, from Maryport down to Barrow and beyond, becoming a vast industrial estate, as this could be the thin end of a very large wedge. Is that what we should be leaving to our successors? Over more than 100 years members of my family have played on the beaches, enjoyed the countryside, the sea and the seascapes.</p> <p>All the various proposals will put an end to these pastimes and render the area as industrial as those from the worst excesses of the Victorian era, but more toxic. We are supposed to have learned our lessons. Not content with pouring toxic materials into the Irish Sea, and spreading it around the countryside and fells around Sellafield, the industry now want to risk unproven technology merely because they cannot find an alternative answer. No other human artefact has lasted as long as the half-life of the waste. Why should we</p>
--	--	--

		<p>believe that this method will endure any better - merely because Sellafield and other vested interests try to persuade us it is so? Their past record is hardly conducive to that required level of trust. What happens if the containment fails? How will it become known? Surely by the time the alarm is raised it will already be too late? Somewhat akin to the genie getting out of the bottle, but with far graver consequences.</p> <p>Dr. Weightman, in his post-Fukushima assessment of the various facilities in the U.K., somewhat absurdly suggested that the country is not very prone to earthquakes. Obviously low-level quakes that the region has experienced could be provided for, but we would note that there have been more than 30 serious nuclear incidents, only one of those has been the result of an earthquake and tsunami. The rest have been down to equipment failure and human error. It is our belief that these risks cannot be countered.</p> <p>As well as misleading the public about the facts of the proposed dump in sessions allegedly supplying independent information as part of the consultation exercise, we note that even the logistical effects are being omitted from the public's information. Noise? Dust? Vibration? To accommodate the transport requirements to facilitate the disposal of the enormous quantities of spoil which would result from the proposed dump, there would have to be development of roads and rail systems. It is patently obvious that the current road system cannot cope with the increased burden that it would have to carry. Presumably the rail network would also have to be expanded and improved, too. Obviously the proposed new reactors to be sited at Sellafield will require connection to the national grid, and the method and route is yet to be announced. Nevertheless, this change to the infrastructure will have its own additional impact on the existing amenity of the area. We know of no other private company that could command such extensive plans for expansion. The more so when its history of contamination of the environment and effect on human health is taken into consideration. How can any of this be accomplished without utterly destroying the amenity left in the area? The presence of hundreds of 40 tonne lorries on the roads of the county, on a daily basis, is hardly going to improve the amenity.</p> <p>We are not sure whether we are being unduly suspicious, but it does seem to us that, once the scheme has been approved, then the commercial opportunity for burial of high-level nuclear waste from around the world will be too tempting for further expansion to be declined. In the absence of any alternative disposal plans, it seems certain that the dump would become the ultimate destination of waste from around the whole of the U.K. We do not believe that this is solely about the disposal of legacy waste currently stored in a dangerous condition at Sellafield. We appreciate that there is a need for this material to be disposed of, but the idea of permitting, let alone encouraging, the industry to carry on producing material that cannot be safely disposed of is surely wrong. What limit will be imposed on the size of the dump?</p> <p>The area will then truly become the nuclear dustbin of the world. That the process is not being carried out anywhere else is surely indicative that it is not a viable one. Even without that, there is no guarantee that RWE will not resurrect its plans to build further reactors at Braystones - even though, for the time being, its site there has been dismissed as unsuitable. Given that the same thing happened to the proposed dump site back in the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>1990s, we can surely expect similar miraculous changes to make Braystones a viable site in a few years time.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the proposed dump should be rendered unnecessary;2. if permitted, it will only serve to encourage the nuclear industry with the attendant increased risks of incident and the whole project will escalate to deal with dangerous material from a very wide area, not just in this country, but world-wide - with all the attendant risks;3. the topography and the transport systems extant in Cumbria are totally unsuitable for the proposed development;4. the risk associated with subterranean disposal are too great - dangers being exacerbated by ground water - problems which are relevant throughout the whole region;5. to allow the development to go ahead will seal the fate of the area for ever - locking it into dependency on the nuclear industry and leaving it without alternative. We believe that government policy prohibits the promotion of a monopoly industry in any area;6. the need for nuclear expansion is based on flawed and biased evidence presented to, and by, officials (including DECC) and government ministers, by those with the same vested interests that have prevailed in Cumbria for decades;7. the much-vaunted employment opportunities will surely only apply, in the main, to those from outside the area - even in the short term; with teams of specialist construction workers not associated with, and having no particular interest in, Cumbria. The main components of the development will no doubt be bought in from places like France and few full time jobs will result;8. when completed, the unemployment situation will be worse than ever and the reduction in commerce in the area resulting from the decline will severely hurt the area;9. in the event of an incident the area would then become a dead zone, any advantage in terms of the creation of jobs will be balanced by the short-term nature of them, the fact that the majority of them will be granted to external applicants who will only temporarily be resident and will be disposed of when the project has been commissioned;10. if the idea were in any way attractive, practical, or rewarding, there would be many more expressions of interest from around the country. There are not, therefore commonsense should tell you that it is too dangerous and too costly - whether considered in terms of damage and risk to the environment, or purely financial terms;11. it must also be obvious that the cost of the proposal is such that if only a small percentage of it was to be spent on developing the area along more sustainable lines, there would be absolutely no need to even consider the matter further. <p>In view of the foregoing arguments, we say that the whole project should be abandoned - if it is at all possible. We note that the expenditure thus far may preclude the option of withdrawing, despite the earlier government promises. The further the process is allowed to continue, the more difficult it will be to opt out. It only requires</p>
--	--	--

			<p>the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Pickles, to dictate that the national interest is greater than the local one and any further arguments will be futile. We have absolutely no faith in the concept either of “localism” or the “Big Society”. Once again, it is our opinion that this consultation, like all the others, has been pre-judged and the plans are afoot. It would be extremely nice to be proved wrong.</p> <p>Having experienced difficulties in communications in the past, we would be grateful for an acknowledgement of this document.</p>
1092	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I do not believe that either of the West Cumbrian boroughs should continue to co-operate in any search for a repository site . The information offered on the scientific suitability of the area concerned is totally inadequate , and the representatives of Cumbrian voters should not allow themselves to be pressurised by current external interests into embracing a policy which could well prove a disaster for future populations of the regions they purport to represent .</p>
1092	9 – Additional comments		<p>As you will appreciate from the above comments , my family and I are entirely opposed to any further investigation into the development of a Repository in West Cumbria . The proposal we believe is scientifically suspect , socially a betrayal , and economically likely to prove so unviable that the project could never be completed with anything like the security to which the regional (and indeed national) populations are entitled for generations to come .</p>
1094	Letter		<p>I write in response to the consultation on whether local authorities in Cumbria should agree that a national nuclear waste dump could be sited in West Cumbria. I am addressing the letter to you because I feel that the Park Authority, as a planning authority in its own right, should take the lead in making this decision.</p> <p>Any industrial development on this scale is bound to have an adverse impact on the Park, regardless of whether it is sited within or adjacent to it. I am sure you will agree that protecting the setting of the park and the control of HGV movements through its narrow and congested road network are essential objectives for its conservation and enhancement. I look to you to lead the authority in insisting that there is an overriding presumption against large-scale industrial development in our national parks, or at any adjacent site likely to impose adverse environmental impacts upon them. The coalition government has recognised this presumption both in the Coalition Agreement and in its emerging National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>If this inviolability of our national parks is not fiercely defended by those charged with their safe keeping, they cease to be the national resource envisaged at their inception in the immediate post-war years. I live in</p>

		<p>Hampshire but the Lake District is my park as much as anyone else's. I have loved it since long before I first saw a single lake or fell. I knew it first through reading Wordsworth, later through Norman Nicholson. Now it comes to my mind's eye in my own memories, photographs and drawings. I hear oars breaking the surface of a lake at dusk, wind whistling through the broken teeth of a dry-stone wall. I want all this to be there for my children and their children, down all the years.</p> <p>I live next to the New Forest National Park. Beneath it lie oil and gas and an abundance of sand and gravel. The ancient oaks could be worth a fortune. None of these things are for sale. They are out of bounds to commerce; the potential profit from them cannot shrink my council tax or enhance my pension. So it must be with whatever jobs or economic growth might be dangled before the decision-makers of the NPA and adjacent authorities.</p> <p>You will no doubt be told that the national interest demands your acquiescence in progressing towards acceptance of a nuclear waste dump in West Cumbria. I would remind you that this questionable imperative will have to be tested against the strict tests of the European Habitats Directive, the Birds Directive and the directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment. If this enormous project were to be so much as contemplated by a planning authority the likely adverse impacts on the SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites of the Lake District would have to be assessed. The judgments of the European Court of Justice suggest that the national 'need' for a place to dump nuclear waste over the next 150 years might not actually be compelling enough to pass the test of 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' specified in European Law.</p> <p>No fast-track planning procedures promised (or threatened) by any Infrastructure Planning Commission can bypass the tests of scientific certainty laid down in the ECJ's 'Waddenzee' ruling. Are 'we' sure beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the unsuitable geology beneath West Cumbria will contain radioactive and toxic leachate and heated groundwater for the foreseeable future? How can 'we' be confident of that when no repository of this kind has ever been built before? Do we know that decades of mining and spoil disposal will not lead to pollution of watercourses, causing harm to European priority species and to the Natura 2000 sites created for their conservation?</p> <p>The choice facing West Cumbria and the Lakes is between two kinds of future. Does the area want to brand itself as a new pioneering nuclear science park, at the cutting edge of a new technology promising prosperity to its people? This did not work for Windscale. Or does it want to be known for the national resource for which it is already famous - its unparalleled wealth of landscape and wildlife?</p> <p>The people of a much more impoverished region of Europe faced that choice in 2003. When the Italian government proposed dumping nuclear waste in salt mines beneath the region of Basilicata the residents of Scanzano Jonico and surrounding communities resisted. They refused an annual payment of £17m. They</p>
--	--	---

		<p>blocked roads and railways in a 12-day campaign that culminated in a march by 150,000 people. The government withdrew the plan. This poor region preferred its own ideas for economic revival, based on the fertility and unspoiled beauty of its landscape, to the prospect of becoming a place that no-one would want to visit.</p> <p>I urge the Park Authority and the other planning authorities involved to recognise that our planning laws and the biodiversity directives of the European Union already impose on them a clear duty to resist any proposal for locating a deep-mined nuclear waste repository in the national park or at any place where such a development could adversely affect the integrity of the park and the European species and designated habitats that depend on the prevention of pollution and disturbance.</p> <p>Please recognise the overriding force of these planning constraints now, before taking any further steps in a process clearly designed to clear the way for a presumption in favour of planning permission.</p> <p>I look forward to a considered reply to the points I have made and trust you will keep me informed on the results of this consultation and any formal planning processes that may follow. In the event of a planning application being submitted please register me as an objector.</p>
1095	<p>Letter (signed by 12 people)</p>	<p>The consultation period on geological disposal of radioactive waste in West Cumbria is due to end on 23 March. We and many other West Cumbrian residents are gravely concerned that decisions may be taken in the current context of research which prove to be totally inadequate, and that the process once started may prove irreversible.</p> <p>Our concern does not spring from opposition to nuclear energy as such, which may be indispensable to our future energy requirements. We certainly do not wish to export the responsibility of waste disposal to other countries, and we believe that it is right to seek a British solution if one is available. But we fear that the current process of consultation organised by the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership (MRWS) could be flawed in a number of important ways.</p> <p>One is methodology: the “voluntarism” approach. Only two UK boroughs, both in West Cumbria where there is already a substantial nuclear industry, have volunteered as candidates to host the proposed repository. But this in no way exempts central government from its inescapable responsibility to examine the suitability of all potential sites in the country and to determine which is geologically the most suitable. Indeed this surely should have been the first step. To secure the right location for a facility whose lethal dangers stretch into the unimaginably distant future must be more important than identifying a currently willing community.</p>

		<p>However great the temptations of inevitably short-term economic benefits for the period of labour-intensive construction, what is of fundamental and critical importance is enduring safety. Large quantities of waste may have to be held for considerable periods of time above ground before entering the underground facility. Both the very substantial long-term underground repository and the above-ground areas demand the best possible guarantee of freedom from physical damage.</p> <p>No case has yet been made to demonstrate that West Cumbria is especially suitable in this respect. Indeed, strong arguments have been put forward to indicate that it is not. For a facility of this kind to be centred in a region with acknowledged geological faults, with mountains producing high pressures to drive underground water flows in the area, is at least highly questionable. One of the documents circulated by MRWS asserts that there is currently insufficient evidence to rule out West Cumbria on geological grounds. This seems to us to indicate a highly misguided and negative approach. What the country requires is a site about which there is well-researched and convincing evidence for its geological suitability as the most convincing place to have a repository. At the moment there is an assumption in favour of Cumbria without any evidence to establish its pre-eminence.</p> <p>There are additional factors. Changing climate patterns such as greater rainfall in north-western areas of the UK could deepen the problems of the local geology. A period of greater seismic activity, prophesied by some, could invalidate present calculations of risk.</p> <p>It is therefore imperative that, without further delay, central government and parliament face up to their responsibilities for a decision. It would be highly irresponsible in effect to delegate this decision to the people of Cumbria alone. The present generation of Britain will be bequeathing to countless future generations a physical danger of immense proportions. Only the very best solution is acceptable.</p>
1098	Email	<p>I ask you to take this letter as a formal response in the consultation on whether local authorities in Cumbria should decide to go forward to the next stage in the siting of a nuclear repository in West Cumbria.</p> <p>As a regular visitor to the Lake District and wider Cumbria region, I am highly concerned about plans for a final repository for radioactive waste in that region.</p> <p>The geological situation of West Cumbria brings forward large concerns for suitability for hosting a radioactive waste repository that needs to be stable for extremely long times as well as provide a suitable chemical and biochemical basis for such a repository.</p> <p>Also the construction work of the project will severely impact the region I so much love to visit.</p>

			<p>From my experience with the final repository programmes in Finland, Sweden and France, I know that the technology for any deep geological disposal is still far out of reach - putting Cumbria forward for such an experiment is simply a mistake. The speed with which this project is pushed forward by the UK authorities seems more to be linked to their wish to develop new nuclear power than by serious concern for risk-reduction of radioactive waste.</p> <p>I therefore as the responsible decision making bodies not to make a "decision to participate" in the siting procedures for a nuclear repository.</p> <p>Please, acknowledge receipt of this letter</p>
1099	1 – Geology	No	I think you should listen to Professor David Smythe and the Nirex report. There is also a geological fault in the land around Kirksanton and should therefore always be ruled out.
1099	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I don't think you are listening to anyone, just so intent in getting money regardless
1099	3 – Impacts	No	<p>This would have a negative impact on Tourism and we already have a negative impact with windfarms all around. It is supposed to be an area of outstanding beauty.</p> <p>There is no positive impacts.</p>
1099	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>It would never benefit the whole community whatever it was. Some people are always left out of any community package. It always targets the minority.</p> <p>It could also turn out to be blood money!</p>
1099	5 – Design and engineering	No	I think this is a terrible blight on the landscape and nothing you would do would take that away.
1099	7 – Siting process	No	No, because you are not listening to anyone
1099	8 – Overall views on		I think that Allerdale and Copeland are without vision to even want to site a repository in Cumbria. Why are you

	participation		<p>the only councils to apply for this? Do you have no regard for the people living in this area, we have had everything thrown at us, the dumping ground for anything to make money.</p> <p>Apparently other councils have more regard for their community!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p>
1099	9 – Additional comments		<p>The impact on wildlife and the lake district national park is unprecedented to say nothing of the lives put at risk for 100s of years. Why take such a risk on the Cumbrian community.</p>
1100	Email		<p>Nuclear waste dumping: don't do it. You will only have to get it out again at a later date. respect the countryside.</p> <p>please have sense for the future.</p>

Appendix – Newspaper articles attached to response from ID 1072

The Guardian 1. 2. 2012

Evidence for nuclear power was 'distorted' by ministers

1. 2. 2012

Fiona Harvey
Environment correspondent

Ministers misled parliament over the need to build a fresh generation of nuclear power stations, distorting evidence and presenting to MPs a false summary of the analysis they had commissioned, a group of MPs and experts allege in a report published yesterday.

If MPs had been presented with an accurate picture of the evidence for and against new reactors, the government's plan might have been challenged, says the report.

Both the previous Labour government and David Cameron's coalition overstated the evidence that such nuclear power was needed, the report alleges. And some of the findings were misrepresented when relayed by ministers.

Rather than assess the requirement for stations and then work out how many were needed, the government commissioned research that began with the assumption that 10 reactors would be built. It then presented its research as evidence of the need for 10 reactors, it is claimed.

The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) said: "We are confident that the energy national policy statements

10

Number of reactors the government researchers were asked to assume as a starting point for their evidence, claim campaigners

[which set out the government's stance] are robust documents which took account of all relevant factors."

The report suggests that the government's repeated assertion that electricity demand was likely to double was based on some of the highest estimates from its research rather than the average.

The author, Ron Bailey, who has opposed nuclear power, also accused ministers of ignoring findings of the research they commissioned, including that which showed how Britain could cope without new nuclear investment.

A spokesman for the DECC said: "We need a range of new energy infrastructure to keep the lights on and reduce our carbon emissions in a secure and affordable way. The UK has everything to gain from becoming a leading destination to invest in new nuclear power. This will come alongside investment in other technologies such as renewables, clean coal and gas, and improved energy efficiency."

The report, *A Corruption of Governance?*, was written by the pressure group Unlock Democracy and the Association for the Conservation of Energy.

Caroline Lucas, Britain's only Green party MP, said: "Given what we know about the strength of nuclear industry lobbying, there needs to be far greater transparency around the decisions that will determine where our electricity comes from in 10 or 20 years' time."

Peter Facey, director of Unlock Democracy, said his organisation did not have a position on nuclear energy but wanted to "ensure that the information on which ministers based their decisions is as impartial and robust as possible". The MPs endorsing the report included, besides Lucas, the Tory MP Mike Weatherley, the Labour MPs Joan Walley and Alan Whitehead, and the Liberal Democrats Tessa Munt and Martin Horwood.

PHOTO: K



BEHIND THE LINES

Polly Toynbee

ONE of the two women to receive this year's Alternative Nobel Prize — worth \$25,000 — was Dr Rosalie Bertell. She is a scientist and a nun, who has devoted the last 13 years to alerting the world to the dangers of low level radiation in the atmosphere. She believes that even without a nuclear war — or more Chernobyl-like disasters, we are about to annihilate the human race over several generations through slow poisoning from increasing doses of radiation.

The trouble with an issue like this is that the layman has little chance of assessing the facts and figures presented by the two warring groups of scientists — the pro and anti-nuclear lobbies. By now, especially since Chernobyl, most people have become sceptical of the nuclear industry's bland reassurances. We all saw how our own Government was so quick to tell us there was no risk whatever to us from Chernobyl, even when they knew parts of Britain had been contaminated. Could we



Dr Rosalie Bertell — picture by Martin Argles

'By the fifth generation of children born into the

She notes that male sterility rates, which she believes are caused by mutation due to radiation are greatly increasing. She quotes a study in Florida which has continued since the 1930s, when one man in 25 was sterile and this has now risen to a startling one in five. "There is nothing I know of in Florida that is special, it simply happens to be where this study of male sterility has been conducted."

She believes that it is the military interest in nuclear technology that has prevented governments from monitoring the true effects of radiation. She sees it as a quite deliberate conspiracy. But she thinks people are becoming more aware. The governor of Utah is now bringing a suit against the US Government for damage from the nuclear weapons testing site in Nevada. "They have found a doubling in cancer rates and four times more cancers in children. Breathing and intestinal disorders have greatly increased," she says.

She has been to the Marshall Islands to monitor the effects of weapons testing there, and she has been watching the effects of the Three Mile Island disaster. She came to Britain to give evidence at the Sizewell inquiry and now she is also campaigning against the use of irradiated food. (The food itself does not become radioactive, she says, but the process creates carcinogens in the food.)

She has already prevented the building of ten new nuclear power plants in America, including two in Tulsa, Oklahoma, that would have been the world's largest. She denounces the international "safety" level that power stations work to —

And yet how are we to assess the other view presented by scientists like Dr Bertell? It is one of those areas in political life where most of us, out of inevitable ignorance, are forced to make up our minds. Those who tend to trust authority believe that on the whole governments are broadly well-intentioned and would surely act if the threat were real or imminent. Those whose natural instinct is to fight authority are more likely to be influenced by Dr Bertell's conspiracy view of the power of the military to prevent us being told the truth about the real dangers of current radiation levels.

But wherever you stand, Dr Bertell's huge book on the subject — *No Immediate Danger — Prognosis For A Radio-Active Earth* — makes a terrifying read and no one who reads it will ever be complacent again about any level of radioactivity being "safe."

She began her work by accident, in 1973. She was working on a nine-year study into the effects of medical X-rays at a cancer hospital in Canada. It was part of a study of 16 million people which investigated the possible causes of leukaemia. She found that one cause could be shown to be ordinary diagnostic medical X-rays. "I knew nothing whatever then about nuclear power stations. I assumed that they emitted no radiation."

While working there, she received a call from a local citizens' group, wanting someone from the cancer hospital to talk at a public meeting about the effects of radiation on the human body. They didn't know who to ask for but by chance it was Rosalie Bertell who answered the telephone that day. The citizens' group was concerned

post nuclear age the damage will be very clear indeed'

Low level radiation, Dr Rosalie Bertell warns, can do terrible things to us

about plans to build a nuclear power station in Niagra County.

"That was my first public meeting of many. It was also my first experience of how well the nuclear industry manipulates such meetings," she says. "I knew nothing whatever about nuclear power, but I could tell them quite a lot about the effects of even very low dosages of radiation on the human body. I only discovered at that meeting that power stations do emit radioactivity into the atmosphere."

The nuclear industry experts made the mistake in their statements to the meeting of announcing that the local people and the workers at the plant would receive no more radiation than the equivalent of a few medical X-rays a year. "They always think medical X-rays sound reassuring, because the doctor orders them. But since I'd just spent nine years researching the fact that even these low dosages were not safe, I was able to explain that to the meeting," she says.

She also discovered that the plant was to be built right next to Cornucopia Farms, where Gerbers grow their baby food. The nuclear industry experts were not aware of this, as they had chosen the site purely for its access to Lake Ontario's cold water

supply. "I was one of three women who spoke for the citizens' group against five men from the industry. We must have spoken eloquently, because the very next day Niagra County legislature voted against allowing the plant being built."

Evidence she heard given at that meeting set her thinking. "I wondered who had set these 'permissible' levels of radiation, and on the basis of what kind of data. It didn't tally at all with the medical research I had been working on." From then on her life changed direction. The more she discovered about how 'permissible' levels were arrived at, the more she was drawn into campaigning against the use of any process that emits radiation in earth's atmosphere.

Dr Bertell is a Grey Nun of the Sacred Heart — a fact only to be detected from a small crucifix of the order attached to her lapel. Otherwise only a certain austerity in her manner and a quality of unshakable certitude in her statements might indicate her vocation. She entered a Carmelite convent, an enclosed order, after taking her first physics degree in Washington DC. There she spent six years doing heavy manual labour, until she suffered a heart attack. She transferred

to the Grey Nuns, an open teaching and nursing order. Later she took a PhD and then began her medical research into causes of leukaemia. Her order is so open that quite a number of Grey Nuns work outside it altogether. Does it help or hinder her in her work? "Sometimes it makes people think you must be naive," she says. "But usually it is a plus."

After her remarkable success at Niagra County, her name spread fast on the anti-nuclear circuit, and suddenly she was being asked to come and give evidence at all kinds of hearings. "I became more indignant the more I found out. Who told the nuclear industry it was safe to make these emissions? They were right to claim they were within legal limits, but that still isn't safe." She began to spend more and more time speaking and travelling.

She sees herself now as a Noah, warning a deaf world of the dangers about to engulf us. The picture she paints of the future is grim indeed. She says researchers only ask about the number of cancers that may be caused by radiation. She talks of how radiation prematurely ages everyone, which means they get the diseases they might have had in old age at a much younger age — including cancers. They get arthritis, dia-

betes and serious allergies in their fifties now instead of later old age.

At the same time, children are now being born weakened by radioactivity, prone to enzyme disorders, allergies and asthma directly caused by cell mutations. She talks of a weakened new generation less able to cope with an ever increasing dose of radiation in the environment. "By the fifth generation of children born into the post nuclear age the damage to the entire gene pool will be very clear indeed."

She says scientists justify radiation levels in terms of the "natural" background levels of radiation. But, she says, the "natural" levels have increased from an exposure of 80 millirem a year in 1940 to 100 in the fifties and sixties to 200 millirems in the 80s — mainly due to weapons testing. (Other scientists dispute these figures.)

"Ever since radium and uranium were first mined, the levels have risen steadily," she claims, "but the effects across the whole population with increases in a wide variety of illnesses has not been monitored. Cancer rates have risen steadily and are in the United States moving now from one in four of the population to one in three and people are getting cancers younger."

equivalent to 100 chest X-rays, and I know the effects of that.

"If you expose one million people to that for just two years you will greatly accelerate ageing, as the radiation affects DNA and you accelerate the hereditary cancers people might not have developed until later in life. Out of those million you would get between 115 and 870 radiation-induced cancers. No one studies the general health of plant workers, to find how greatly increased are their problems with arthritis, allergies, enzyme disorders, diabetes, and workers tend to hide ailments from employers."

The longer she talks, the longer grows the catalogue of horrors caused by low level radiation. Above all, there is the threat to the gene pool itself — a threat she fears will not be acknowledged until too late.

Few scientists would argue now with her contention that no level of radiation is safe. But those on the pro-nuclear side contest that the risks compare favourably with many other risks in daily life. They like to conduct public demonstrations, passing a geiger-counter over familiar objects to show how a jar of instant coffee gives off natural radiation about which we can do nothing.

But what is the citizen to make of the conflicting sets of data and the even more conflicting interpretations made of them? For as long as the nuclear power industry propagandises so relentlessly, it is just as well that there are those like Dr Bertell to challenge their complacency, and demand a more honest appraisal of the radiation risks to us all.

No Immediate Danger — Prognosis For A Radioactive Earth, by Rosalie Bertell, (The Women's Press, £5.95).