

User ID	Question	Agree	Response
1101	1 – Geology	No	I believe that West Cumbria is geologically unsuitable.
1101	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	As I do not agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on geology, it follows that I do not agree with its initial opinions on safety and security. A history of radioactive leaks and incidents related to falsified records at Sellafield, reminds us of the dangers. The plans and systems described in the document amount to statements of intent. Whilst it is encouraging that the agencies plan to communicate with each other and to carry out R&D to identify and deal with site specific issues that are as yet unidentified, this establishes only that "we'll do our best when we find out what we are facing".
1101	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	I agree that West Cumbria can be described as "nuclear dependant" (or, as a "peripheral community" that seeks jobs and investment by hosting a facility that no other community would contemplate hosting). The document focuses very little on the most important negative impact - radiation. It is the "elephant in the room". I am not sure whether the word "radiation" is even used in this section.
1101	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I agree that the package (or Faustian pact) is yet to be developed. At present, it remains a wish list.
1101	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	The design concepts are so preliminary as to make this question and answer meaningless.
1101	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	I think that there is too much uncertainty about any inventory to make a reasonable judgement about going ahead. The government seems not to commit to what will be placed in the repository, even at stage 5. There is mention of a consultation process for any changes, but only a weak commitment to taking pre-agreed principles into account. Furthermore, statements made on page 93 (step 3e) and page 94 (step 4 i) seem to mean that a local community's wishes (not to host a repository) can be ignored. This runs counter to the principle of voluntarism. As others appear to be, I am also sceptical about the right of withdrawal at the end of stage 5 when hundreds of millions of pounds will have been spent.
1101	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	Your own opinion is tentative and partial.
1101	8 – Overall views on participation		I think they should withdraw from the process now.
1101	9 – Additional comments		I think that is is wrong to endanger people and the environment by burying toxic, highly radioactive materials

			that will cause problems for generations. Previous investigations have found that the area is geologically unsuitable. Investment in West Cumbria does not have to come with such a price tag.
1102	Letter		<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 World 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>As a neighbour of Cumbria, a frequent visitor, a user of services, lakes, and hills, I am most disturbed that this proposal could even be put forward, let alone seriously considered.</p> <p>I ask the decision making bodies responsible not to make a 'decision to participate' to go forward to the stage</p>

			<p>of siting a nuclear dump in West Cumbria</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.</p>
1103	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>There can be absolutely no question that Copeland should take part in the search for "somewhere" to site a repository, without any commitment to have it.</p> <p>This is a pressing issue for the nation and the most pressing issue for Copeland.</p> <p>I hope that a positive decision to participate is reached and that this helps to accelerate an already overdue process.</p> <p>I will make this case in detail in the House of Commons.</p> <p>There are a series of negative, potentially irreversible consequences that will be brought about by prolonged delay; for Copeland, for West Cumbria, for the nation and for the nuclear industry. Conversely, a decision to participate will be hugely beneficial for all concerned from a number of perspectives.</p>
1105	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I agree that you can't rule out the remaining 75% of the area just now. There may be a view that progress is likely to be made, but there is insufficient evidence in the documentation for me to form any opinion. There must be a lot of information that could have been released before this consultation, regarding the geology of West Cumbria.</p> <p>I would also have expected some explanation of the sort of geology that was needed, the potential 'best' areas, and how the waste would be kept away from mankind.</p>
1105	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Safety Cases are routinely produced in the nuclear industry, and I agree that the organisations involved have the expertise to construct such a case. As yet, we don't know if the technology, geology, etc will allow this case to be made.</p> <p>A tremendous amount of Research and Development remains to be undertaken. No programme has been shown; not any fall back responses in case of unfavourable results.</p>
1105	3 – Impacts	Yes	<p>The chapter gives a comprehensive list of impacts, and acknowledges the areas requiring more attention.</p>

			<p>The chapter should say more about the environmental impacts of the rock removal process and the impact on the whole area.</p> <p>Although the area a a whole might be impacted, it is important to recognise and to have a mechanism to deal with individuals who feel the consequences.</p>
1105	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The principles are good as far as they go, but leave a lot of scope for interpretation. Understandably, they tend to look to the future to try to improve the well being of the area.</p> <p>However, there is little about the immediate recompense for the people who have been disadvantaged. Four areas are of particlar concern-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * the right of withdrawal seems to get progressively more difficult, so that Government might refuse to accept it * the "host community" should be a village or small town within about 5 miles of the site(s). Whilst a wider area may be impacted to some extent, it would be grossly unfair if the people who suffered the real impact were not properly compensated, whilst 'hangers on' did benefit. * Negotiation of the details benefits package might occur only after agreement to proceed. Whilst the true 'host community' will only be known at a later date, (and hence the appropriate compensation) there could be indicators of the scale of what is being considered; both for this community, and for the rest of West Cumbria. At one extreme, it could be pointed out to Government that it might cost (say) £30billion to buy up almost all of the area- a figure less than the bank bail out!! * other developments are also being considered for the area, particularly a new nuclear station at Moorside. To what extent does the Localism Act limit the benefits that might be received? <p>Satisfactory resolution of these 4 issues would be essential before any agreement to proceed, even at this early stage.</p>
1105	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>This chapter is almost without any content. It could, at least, have discussed the anticipated arrangements for dealing with water flows, gases, explosion hazard, critically, etc</p> <p>The 'ideal' design could have been spelled out more, particularly the anticipated flow of water and radionuclides that would be tolerable. Then, the arrangements for responding to unexpected events. E.g. what if a future ground movement opened up new pathways back to the surface?</p> <p>There is no discussion of the form of the waste, particularly what leakage is expected or tolerable from the containers.</p>

			There is no indication of the extent of monitoring that is foreseen, nor of the period during which the waste could be retrieved.
1105	6 – Inventory	No	<p>The 6 principles represent a reasonable way forward.</p> <p>You also recognise the various potential types of waste, including uranium and plutonium.</p> <p>The quantity range is as good as you could expect at the moment, although you do not give much explanation of the spoil that would have to be extracted, together with the methods, space and location for handling it.</p> <p>Some surface buildings may need to incorporate treatment facilities to ensure that the waste is acceptable to the repository. This aspect has not been explored.</p> <p>In view of discussions on Scottish Independence, there is no acknowledgement of the origin of a significant part of the inventory, and the resulting consequences- financially or politically. It is a Government condition that waste is returned to the country of origin.</p> <p>However, the main difficulty comes from the fact that the detail of the inventory leaves a lot to be desired. Some of it is recorded as "sludge" or "beta-gamma waste". You will need to know the actual radionuclides, the associated chemicals (and hence the mobility, acidity, solubility, fire or explosion characteristics, etc), future intended chemical treatments, encapsulation or packaging, etc.</p> <p>There is then the associated set of questions relating to the repository itself, such as the tendency of radionuclides to stick to the particular rock walls, etc.</p>
1105	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>The document recognises the need to change the representation on the Partnership to reflect the evolving situation.</p> <p>However, it is hard to see how the Decision Making Body represents the host community, when it comes from such a large area; and many members will be from areas that have already been excluded!! It would allow some areas to jump on to a 'gravity train', regardless of the area really impacted. It is difficult to see how such a body has a democratic mandate in these circumstances, and much more 'say' should be given to truly local residents.</p> <p>The 7 principles set out are reasonable, but they are very vague, and their interpretation could be questioned</p> <p>1. How are you going to show that there is "confidence and ownership on the part of the (local) host</p>

		<p>community"? (Principle 1))</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Just how is the host community to be "empowered"? (P2) 3. You have not spelled out how the "representatives of the host communities will be effectively involved" (P3) 4. How will the outcome be shown to be "consensual"? (P4) 5. There is no indication of what is meant by "equitable outcome" in Principle 6. 6. What is the test of "credible local support" required in principle 7? <p>The areas where the vast majority of the population of West Cumbria lives have already been ruled out. I suspect that much of the National Park will become "off limits", so just a fairly small part of Copeland/Allerdale should receive particular attention:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Sellafield area •Millom area •An area north of Cockermouth •An area around Silloth <p>There is a perception that Silloth may well have the best geology, so how will the decision to locate be made, as there will then be a trade-off against the convenience of access at Sellafield?</p>
1105	8 – Overall views on participation	<p>The project should not proceed, based on the information presented.</p> <p>The reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the language is truly ambiguous, so that it could be interpreted as suggesting a good way ahead; it could also be interpreted otherwise. It should be more specific before any progress can be made. • The local host community should be within (say) 5 miles of the site(s). There is no acknowledgement of this: indeed, the process seems to be designed to undermine it, so that distant communities could have undue influence and benefit. Just how this real host Community is to be involved, and give its approval in a consensual manner needs to be spelled out. • There is no mention of UK devolution issues. Perhaps 30% of the waste arose originally from Scottish operations, so how will this be equitably resolved? At some point, the Scottish administration will need to be reconciled. • There is no acknowledgement that full compensation will be available for individuals who may be impacted; as well as to communities in a more general sense; or what the process might be, so as to avoid expensive litigation. • Satisfactory answers are needed for the issues in question 4. • The process is at a very early stage, and a lot of information is not available. Whilst this is understandable for some aspects (detail repository design, actual location, production of safety case, etc), the information that could and should have been declared by now includes:-

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How the DMB is going to be constituted in the future to prevent the repository being forced on the local host community by other areas that are hardly involved 2. How the host community will have a proper democratic 'say' in the affair. Local support needs to be demonstrated. 3. How the R&D is going to be programmed; and what are the processes envisaged for waste treatment. This has been underestimated in the past. 4. What kind of geology is really wanted, and what would rule out progress? What would be the response to future ground movements? 5. The principles to ensure safety- regarding gases, explosion, criticality, water flows, etc.
1105	9 – Additional comments		<p>I understand the need for a National Repository.</p> <p>However, the process described is unfair, particularly towards the eventual (small) host community. It seems to seek to draw that community into the process, with minimal 'say' in the matter; and a benefits package to be 'negotiated' only after agreement to host! The local population would not be adequately involved in the decisions. Whilst the document talks of 'equity', the process does not seem likely to provide it.</p>
1108	Letter		<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. As a frequent visitor to the Lake District, currently living close to Hunterston B nuclear power station, I am writing to express my concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - 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. - 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>- 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 be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World 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>While it may be that technology and our understanding of how to deal with nuclear waste has moved on since the enquiry into the Nirex "Rock Characterisation Facility" came to its conclusion in 1997, it is inconceivable that the geology of the region will have improved in the last 15 years. I am very concerned that, having shown the region's geology to be unsuitable to dispose of nuclear waste, similar proposals should now be back on the table.</p> <p>I therefore 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> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this letter</p>
1109	<p>Emailed letter – see Appendix A for full submission</p>	<p><i>[For the full submission, which also contains graphics and pictures, please see Appendix A. The non-technical summary is provided below. The respondent has given permission for his personal details to be included in his submission.]</i></p> <p>Response to West Cumbria MRWS consultation:</p> <p>Why a deep nuclear waste repository should not be sited in West Cumbria</p> <p>NON-TECHNICAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> <p>The Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) process uses the unique concept of a 'volunteer approach' to siting a deep geological nuclear waste repository. There a suspicion of predetermination because the only district that has come forward is West Cumbria.</p>

		<p>A national site search based on geological criteria was carried out in the 1980s. The site finally selected was Longlands Farm, near Sellafield, but this was very different, geologically, from the 'Sellafield' in the original list of 437 potential sites. Criteria were manipulated and the site location moved twice, to ensure that a near-Sellafield location was chosen. But the Inspector at the Public Planning Inquiry of 1995-96, held to determine whether Nirex could go ahead at Longlands Farm, rejected Nirex's proposals. He said that the underground laboratory was the precursor to a full underground repository, that the site had been chosen on manipulated criteria, that the geology and hydrogeology were unsuitable, and that some of the 'more promising' sites elsewhere in England should be investigated instead.</p> <p>National and international guidance on how best to select potential sites for deep geological nuclear waste disposal is being ignored. Among the desirable criteria cited the same themes emerge; of geological simplicity and slow, predictable groundwater flow, because the final and most important barrier to escaping radioactivity is always the natural geology. Defra has misled the public in implying that 'voluntarism' abroad has taken precedence over geological search criteria, whereas in all other countries the geological search came first. Topography is the driving force for groundwater flow, and in Cumbria it is extreme compared to chosen repository sites in Finland, Sweden, the Wash/Norfolk region (a potentially suitable area for search), and even to Switzerland. Thus the Cumbrian topography alone is a sufficient ground to exclude the whole region. Cumbria is geologically very well understood, so we already know enough to be able to make decisions about its suitability. Every possible district and rock formation is reviewed. The location of the geologically complex original Longlands Farm site is highly constrained, and there is no possibility of relocating it to a better position. It is the 'least unsuitable' site in the district.</p> <p>Northern Allerdale should have been excluded from further consideration, both on its hydrocarbon potential and on current groundwater use; nevertheless the rocks there are unsuitable. The Eskdale granite is a highly fractured body of rock next to a major fault line, and therefore unsuitable. Limestones around the fringes of the national park are similarly too faulted and complex. The offshore zones up to 5 km from the coast do not have any suitable rock bodies, and in any case, a site offshore would contravene international conventions. In summary, there are no districts, localities, or suitable rock types which could host a repository, irrespective of the extreme topography.</p> <p>The current MRWS process depends upon the assent of an undefined 'community'. It is now claimed that Longlands Farm is, after all, potentially suitable; in so arguing the Inquiry Inspector is misquoted, and non-existent BGS support is cited. Analysis of Nirex's modelling used in this argument shows that if realistic assumptions are made about the faulting, the flow will be upwards, straight to the surface, in 5000 years. The site is demonstrably unsafe.</p> <p>There are no criteria for finding suitable host rocks in MRWS Stage 4. There are no measures, nor funding, to</p>
--	--	---

			enable truly independent, critical assessment, in contrast to Sweden and Canada. To return to West Cumbria would be scientifically irrational. <i>[See appendix for full submission]</i>
1110	1 – Geology	No	I have very grave doubts that the geology of the area is suitable for this type of development, with water courses, faults and geological movements all apparent in the rock strata. This is the very baseline for any application of this kind. The area is not suitable and therefore we should pull out now.
1110	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	This project will have to endure for 1 million years. WHO is to say what the situation will be like in 50, let alone 1 million years time. This will be an environmental and security catastrophe.
1110	3 – Impacts	No	I once met an old friend and told him I'd moved to Cumbria. He jumped back and said, "Oh radioactive, keep away". This dump will only make it worse. It beggars belief that an area with the most beautiful environment in ENgland is thinking of spoiling it all on this project. Moreover, the jobs will be low-skilled - glorified security guards. This is not a future for west Cumbria. Just a bone thrown by the government to a sappy old lapdog who eagerly takes it up. I'm impressed that our local leaders can only think of a nuclear dump as a future for the area. We may as well all pack up and leave. If it is good enough for West Cumbria and Cumbria COunty COuncil are involved then it is good enough for Ambleside!
1110	4 – Community benefits	No	Any community benefits will not outweigh the devastating impact caused by the building of this thing and the impact on tourism and other industries. Who will eat Cumbria meat, knowing that the ground is full of nuclear waste? We'll have a workforce more reliant on the nuclear industry and its bribes.
1110	5 – Design and engineering	No	You don't express any opinions on design, just put it off until later. The dump will have to have retrievability so that the stuff can be made safe if the technology improves. This is the option being pursued elsewhere.
1110	6 – Inventory	No	WHAT!?! Again no opinions set out. Just some waffle about the community being asked about changes to the inventory. I don't know if we should put high level waste, very high level waste, or super-high level waste in. What could be the difference? Come 100 years when we come across something which isn't on the inventory and it needs to be stored, do you think we shall have a big consultation on whether it should go in or not? This is all fantasy policy making.
1110	7 – Siting process	No	This concept of voluntarism is a fabrication. We have a leadership with too many links to the nuclear industry who are pushing for this. I wasn't asked if we should put our area forward, I'm just being asked if we should withdraw. The initial groundwork should have been done to see if the area is suitable (which geologically it

			isn't), before we went ahead and put this area forward. The further down the road the area goes, with decisions put off, the less likely the government will accept a withdrawal and the more money will be wasted. We need to pull out now.
1110	8 – Overall views on participation		We should pull out now before any firm commitments are made. The "without commitment" idea is a fallacy. The area is being bribed by the "benefits". It will destroy the tourist, agriculture and other industries in the area, for the sake of a few very poorly skilled jobs. The whole thing is a disaster waiting to happen.
1110	9 – Additional comments		300,000 years ago this area was under glaciers. This dump will have to survive for 1 million years. I cannot see how anyone can conceive of this being a good idea for the area.
1112	1 – Geology	No	<p>I do not agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on Geology. My opinion is based on this extract taken from the following document. APP/H0900/A/94/247019 Appendix 1 to Inspector's Report, Cumbria County Council Appeal by United Kingdom Nirex Limited, Assessor's Report, Assessor C V Knipe BSc CEng CGeol MIMinE MIMM FGS. Based on the statement made by this eminent geologist I do not believe the MRWS process should be focusing again on West Cumbria and the surrounding districts with its known volcanic rock and fault lines. Nor do I accept the preliminary exclusion of areas by the BGS which was so restrictive in criteria, it hardly seemed worthy of doing. Have we really so much tax payers' money available we can ignore Lessons Learned?</p> <p>Extract G.52: (from the Inspector's report) 'The voluminous technical evidence submitted to the inquiry within my field of interest has led me to conclude that the setting of the Sellafield site is geologically and hydrogeologically much less simple and more complex than would be expected of a choice based principally on scientific and technical grounds, and does not match any of the theoretically favoured types. It therefore suffers from the disadvantages which led to its not being generically chosen in the first place. As a consequence it and the surrounding district are proving difficult to explore and characterise. In particular the actual basement rock chosen is exceptionally difficult to characterise due to the nature of its eruptive volcanic origins. This and the frequency of significant faulting means that potential repository sites within this area will be severely constrained and may require compromise on layout and orientation. The geosphere uncertainties have increased the importance of engineered barriers so that there is high reliance on an artificial containment concept which is itself complex and untried.'</p>
1112	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Extract from 'NWAA ISSUES REGISTER' Outstanding Scientific and Technical Issues Relating to the Production of a Robust Safety Case for the Deep Geological Disposal of Radioactive Waste. Context: In October 2009 at a meeting between representatives of the Environment Agency and members of a small

			<p>number of NGOs, the technical, scientific and ethical hurdles to the development a deep geological facility for the disposal of radioactive wastes were discussed.</p> <p>The NGO representatives reported that the „intensified R and D programme? called for by CoRWM (i) in its July 2006 report does not appear to have been progressed to any significant degree. Very little research data has been put into the public domain, which is of particular concern due to the imperative of adopting a wide ranging and inclusive scrutiny and evaluation of the proposed nuclear waste disposal programme: issues that are potential „show stoppers? are of special concern and it is essential that these are appraised against an effective and meaningful back drop of public involvement.’</p> <p>I do not understand the scientific significance of the Yucca Mountain standards shown below, but I do see a short clear and reassuring set of guidelines. Would The Royal Society set these standards in the UK, or have we adopted these International standards? There is little information on International standards versus National standards within the consultation document.</p> <p>The Yucca Mountain standards for the environment are in line with approaches used in the international radioactive waste management community. The final standards will: Retain the dose limit of 15 milirem per year for the first 10,000 years after disposal; Establish a dose limit of 100 millirem annual exposure per year between 10,000 years and 1 million years; Require the Department of Energy (DoE) to consider the effects of climate change, earthquakes, volcanoes, and corrosion of the waste packages to safely contain the waste during the 1 million-year period; Be consistent with the recommendations of the NAS by establishing a radiological protection standard for this facility at the time of peak dose up to 1 million years after disposal. Human exposure to radiation varies from natural sources, such as radon and ultraviolet radiation from the sun, and other sources, such as medical X-rays. The average annual radiation exposure from both naturally occurring and manmade sources for a person living in the United States has been estimated to be 360 millirem per year.’</p> <p>Based on the above I do NOT agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on Safety, security, environment and planning.</p>
1112	3 – Impacts	No	<p>I do not agree with the Partnership’s initial opinions on the impacts, both positive and negative, of a repository in West Cumbria due to the Impacts to direct, long-term and economic sustainability based on the following picture drawn through facts available through documents NDA/RWMD/048 Generic Disposal Facility Designs Dec 2010, NDA/RWMD/046 Generic Transport System designs, Dec 2010, NDA Disposability Assessment for Wastes & Spent Fuel arising from Operation of the EPR Part 1 Main Report Jan 2010, NXA/10747397, Geological disposal Inventory presentation to West Cumbria MRWS Partnership July 2010, Highway Agency web site.</p>

		<p>In the 2020s on the fells around Allerdale and Copeland the views will be dominated by an above ground repository service facility. Aerial views seen by fell walkers, runners, climbers, cyclists and bird watchers will see an industrial estate with a perimeter enclosure containing: a stockpile of excavated rock; a buffer material handling plant; construction offices, workshops, stores & marshalling area, fire and rescue station, an explosive store, waste emplacement facility, ventilation & effluent treatment plant, management and transport centres, drift transport vehicle maintenance facilities, shunting engine & main line wagon maintenance facilities, laboratories and laundry centre, mechanical and electrical workshops and stores, administration and reception areas. (Surely in addition a medical centre, an emergency helipad, resting and eating facilities, and car and transport parking). This is not the original picture painted by the Partnership as potentially similar to farm buildings in appearance.</p> <p>Throughout the day there will be a constant sound of heavy machinery, building, maintaining and upgrading the new trunk road network, and road-routes to and from the repository. The road-works include the A66 and A595. In addition the traffic along the A66 is virtually at a standstill as an STGO with a gross vehicle weight (GVW) in excess of 150000kgs trundles along at a maximum speed of 12 mile/h. However there will be some relief as road traffic, and mechanical equipment and train shunting from the repository, dies down between 10pm – 6am on weekdays, and 6pm – 6am Saturdays.</p> <p>As the surface facilities near completion the noise & vibration level multiplies as gigantic lifting cranes and heavy machinery are brought along the roads to the repository. Loading trucks and excavating machinery will continue to multiply in number as excavation work begins. Furthermore new tunnelling equipment will take the noise and vibration levels still higher as tunnelling and drilling begins to shape the underground repository, and the transfer of extracted waste is moved to holding bays where it is crushed and loaded onto train-trucks and HGV for off-site removal. Train-shunting around track sidings, within the above ground facility, will likewise be filled with extraction rock.</p> <p>An approximate total of extracted rock is 5 million cubic metres but this is way below the extraction volumes proposed. A further 500,000 cubic metre needs to be extracted for the cylinder shafts alone. If HGV alone were used to carry the excavated waste this would require as a very minimum 350,000 lorry loads at 15 cubic metres per load. Train-trucks are more likely to take the majority of extracted rock (but loads per train-truck do not appear to be readily available).</p> <p>A decade later this scenario continues, as the Government is considering expansion of the repository to take waste from new nuclear plants as well as current UK plants and other waste generating sources. This will double the original size of the repository footprint and will extend the development (and impacts) well into the second half of 21st century.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>Once the underground repository development completes to the point of EIA safety assessment completion and certification, the transportation of the initial baseline inventory of radioactive waste will follow using the same roadways and railways onto the repository site. Initially the scale of the waste will be 476,000 cubic metres. The number of transported journeys will depend on the weight and size of the waste containers. Arrival of HGV at the repository is estimated at 1,331 per year (4-5 a day) carrying a total of 87,269 assorted containers. Arrival of trains at the repository is estimated at 1185 per year (3-4 a day) carrying a total of 58,335 assorted containers. It is unclear how many STGO will be arriving. In addition extra transport is required to import the rock salt and other materials used to pack round 13,126 canisters.</p>
1112	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>I do NOT agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on a benefits package as there is a very fine line between a community benefits package and a 'stimulus', 'incentive', 'encouragement', 'carrot', 'enticement', 'bribe', 'lure', 'bait'. Which of these words is ethical?</p>
1112	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>I do NOT agree with the Partnership's initial opinion on design and engineering.</p> <p>Consultation document page 76, section 8.4. 'We understand the generic designs being worked on'. The inventory and geology are the driving factor in size and shape of the repository design and the engineering complexities, and neither is known for sure. To be generic here is to say 'this is roughly what I think the initial design might be, but I can't say for sure'.</p> <p>Therefore how can the Partnership have gained true understanding?</p>
1112	6 – Inventory	No	<p>I do NOT agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on the inventory.</p> <p>Consultation document page 86, Waste from new nuclear power stations. 'The issue of whether waste from new nuclear power stations would go into a repository is of concern to some people'.</p> <p>It should be a concern to the Partnership there is no change management process (for us to read and be assured) that describes how waste is added or removed from the inventory, or the signatory that approves the change. In my opinion it is this inventory failing that is the single most likely showstopper in the completion of a repository.</p> <p>Consultation document page 86, Waste from new nuclear power stations. 'However because it is not yet clear if or when this additional waste would arise, or how much of it there would be, we believe that this is a decision for the future when the implications of this additional waste would be better known. We note that the right of withdrawal would exist whilst these decisions would be taken'.</p>

			<p>This statement on the 'right of withdrawal' cannot be substantiated, as the right of withdrawal is removed at the end of Stage 5 (consultation doc. Page 97 (Box 33) while these decisions are likely to take longer. It is unclear how a planning application could be made in light of so many factual uncertainties.</p>
1112	7 – Siting process	No	<p>I do NOT agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on the process for siting a repository.</p> <p>Consultation document page 90, 1. Principles for Community Involvement. Although the Partnership believe 'it is essential that these principles are followed to ensure there is a voluntary approach during the siting process.' There is no mention of agreement from Cumbria County Council, the District Councils of Allerdale and Copeland, or CALC &/or the parish councils.</p> <p>The decision to participate in the next stage is being made on behalf of both current and future generations by a small number of people using a variety of indicators such as Mori poll, survey, stakeholder feedback, and current showstopper issues. Yet these people are not transparent to the public. Who are they and how do we know they are sufficiently qualified to make such a decision?</p>
1112	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>The Partnership appears confused and uncertain in what they are doing. This is demonstrated by so many vagaries throughout the consultation document in particular, so many repeats, yet so little facts. This is not helped by contradictions used by the various parties such as DECC, NDA/RWMD, BGS. An example of confusion and contradiction is the size of the volume of radioactive waste which is, or is not, in-scope for removal and burial in a repository. Should the programme continue I believe there will be a repeat of June 2007, where the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee called the MRWS Programme proposals "incoherent and opaque".</p> <p>I do NOT believe Allerdale and/or Copeland Borough Councils or Cumbria CC, should take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository, without any commitment to have it. They should withdraw immediately.</p>
1112	9 – Additional comments		<p>Document reference Radioactive waste disposal at Sellafield, UK: site selection, geological and engineering problems edited by R S Haszeldine and D K Smythe. Cumbria County Council and the Nirex Inquiry, John Hetherington, County Offices, Cumbria County Council, Kendal .</p> <p>Extract 2.3 'On December 1994 the full County Council refused the RCF application on planning grounds, questioning the need for the development and highlighted the impact of the surface development in open countryside on the edge of the Lake District National Park.'</p> <p>Why has the current CCC ignored this Lessons Learned.</p>

			The Partnership have failed in meeting the Government Code of Practice on Consultation criterion 3 as the consultation documents are not clear about what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposal due to their insistence in continuing with the MRWS process without ensuring there were a minimum of two separate and geological different locations identified that are known to be geologically suitable.
1113	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
1113	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
1113	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
1113	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
1113	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
1113	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
1113	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
1113	8 – Overall views on participation		THE REPOSITORY SHOULD BE IN COPELAND
1113	9 – Additional comments		AS A RESIDENT OF WEST CUMBRIA I THINK A REPOSITORY WOULD BE GOOD FOR THE ECONOMIC PROSPECTS OF THIS AREA
1114	1 – Geology	No	I do not agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on Geology based on the following document extract. APP/H0900/A/94/247019 Appendix 1 to Inspector's Report, Cumbria County Council Appeal by United Kingdom Nirex Limited, Assessor's Report, Assessor C V Knipe BSc CEng CGeol MIMinE MIMM FGS. The content of this important document is not challenged by subsequent scientific evidence, and is therefore relevant in questioning the Partnership's decision in not consider this document as a baseline for the exclusion of areas such as Longlands Farm.

			<p>Extract G.28 'Taken overall, the site is not an obvious choice for its geological environment. It seems to me to have been selected because of its convenience its proximity to Sellafield Works. The nuclear energy industry had been looking at the possibility of disposing of low and medium level radioactive wastes in the vicinity of UK nuclear sites since at least 1980. The study by the Institute of Geological Sciences [COR/616] of the potential of nuclear installations for DWR siting, shows that there has long been a hope that a site near a nuclear facility might prove suitable. I cannot resist the conclusion that Sellafield is not a natural choice and that its pursuit represents the triumph of hope and optimism over a truly objective exercise of identifying a small number of sites around the UK representing those in a favourable geological setting and, on a relatively simple but confident model, likely to meet regulatory design targets. Nirex started out facing many difficulties. As investigations, research and development of methods have progressed, it has opened up more and more areas of uncertainty and problems to be solved. Its task has become harder.'</p>
1114	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Due to the complexities of this programme in undertaking the development of a repository where the volume of storage is still very much under debate, and the baseline inventory is constantly changing, I believe the submission of a planning application will draw the same conclusion from the current Secretary of State for Environment as was offered by John Gummer (when undertaking the same role) where he rejected the planning application because of "scientific uncertainties and technical deficiencies in the proposals". So after over 15 years of work and an expenditure of around half a billion of taxpayer's money, the search for a lasting solution to the nuclear waste problem was back to square one.</p> <p>Safety and security are inextricably interlinked yet there is no clarity through the documents offered as to who is accountable or responsibility for each part of the process of building the above ground facilities, operating the above ground facilities, building the repository, operating the repository, removal of rock, shipping of backfill, shipping nuclear waste to the repository , building and maintaining roads and rail for passage of nuclear waste, securing the facility, securing the roadways and railways.</p> <p>Lack of this information does not help me to feel confident that all is safe and well.</p> <p>I find it difficult to see the connection between R&D and the issues register as I have seen no evidence the issues are being resolved. This would imply there are insufficient people, or there is insufficient knowledge available, to deal with such complex issues.</p> <p>Based on the above I do NOT agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on Safety, security, environment and planning.</p>
1114	3 – Impacts	No	<p>I do not agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on the impacts, both positive and negative, of a repository in West Cumbria as the following facts taken from a variety of sources indicates heavy traffic and a high level of</p>

		<p>noise over a many years of construction, maintenance and adjustments to supporting infrastructure, plus the continuous transportation of waste to the repository once complete.</p> <p>REPOSITORY FOOTPRINT: These statistics are taken from the following documents and DO NOT include above ground facilities:- NDA/RWMD/048 Generic Disposal Facility Designs Dec 2010, NDA/RWMD/046 Generic Transport System designs, Dec 2010, NDA Disposability Assessment for Wastes & Spent Fuel arising from Operation of the EPR Part 1 Main Report Jan 2010, NXA/10747397, Geological disposal Inventory presentation to West Cumbria MRWS Partnership July 2010</p> <p>UNDERGROUND FACILITIES: A footprint range is calculated using the baseline inventory and High and Low strength rock. Minimum 5.6 square km to Maximum 10.3 square km</p> <p>EXCAVATION: A volume range of excavated rock in building the repository is calculated using the baseline inventory and High and Low strength rock. Blasting, drilling and removal of Min 5,225,000 cubic metres Max 7450000 cubic metres of rock this</p> <p>ROCK REMOVAL: 350,000 and 500,000 lorry loads (based on 15 cubic metres per load and standard packaging by waste type). Note: There appears to be insufficient information on the capacity of a single rail wagon to calculate a train load (12 carriages) of waste.</p> <p>The rock will be crushed above ground initially, then underground to reduce noise and dust. An addition 500,000 cubic metre will need to be extracted for shaft for the cylinders, and removed from site.</p> <p>ROAD DEVELOPMENT: Additional road will need to be built, or the present road system updated to take STGO vehicles. A National motorway and trunk road network plus preferred road-routes to the repository need to be planned and built as necessary. Vehicles carrying the waste should operate in the hours of 06:00 to 22:00 weekdays, 06:00 to 18:00 Saturday. Ref: NDA/RWMD/046 Generic Transport System designs, Dec 2010. STGO vehicles with Special Order (SO) loads with a gross vehicle weight (GVW) in excess of 150000kgs are limited to a speed of 12 mile/h. One of the factors contributing to congestion is the movement of abnormally heavy vehicle loads, specifically heavy Special Order (SO) loads with a gross vehicle weight (GVW) in excess of 150000kgs, are limited to a speed of 12 mile/h. Ref: Highway Agency</p> <p>RAIL DEVELOPMENT: Additional rail tracks will need to be built both to and from the repository, 4 lots of 240 metre length tracks. Arrivals and departures should be scheduled to operate between 06:00 to 22:00 weekdays, 06:00 to 18:00 Saturday. The GDF should preferably be accessible in two directions from one of the national mainline rail routes.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>RADIOACTIVE WASTE to site: Statistics are taken from the Baseline Inventory of 476,000 cubic metres. The number of journeys and transport used depends on the weight and size of the waste container.</p> <p>ROAD TRAFFIC operational: HGV Arrivals at GDF: 1,331 per year (4-5 a day) carrying a total of 87,269 assorted containers. Note: Within the documents referenced STGO journeys per year does not appear to be given.</p> <p>RAIL TRAFFIC operational: Arrivals at GDF: 1185 per year (3-4 a day) carrying a total of 58,335 assorted containers.</p> <p>WASTE CONTAINER PACKAGING operational: Additional transport will be required to import the rock salt and other materials used to pack round a total of 13126 canisters.</p>
1114	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The word ‘future negotiations’ with regards a community benefits package, used in the consultation document page 71, section 7.4 shows even now the current &/ or previous Government are reluctant in participating. Given the repository impacts will affect many communities in the future it is not feasible to imagine there will be longer term benefits from the respective Governments. Any ‘benefits’ or rather ‘compensation’ are more likely to be short term based on the intrusive nature of the undertaking.</p> <p>Therefore I do NOT agree with the Partnership’s initial opinions on a benefits package.</p>
1114	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>I do NOT agree with the Partnership’s initial opinion on design and engineering.</p> <p>Consultation document page 76, section 8.4. ‘We are content that detailed design issues are largely site specific’. The root cause of the ‘101 issues’, 4 of which were presented to the Partnership, are not site specific per sey, rather the site will either reduce or magnify the complexity level of the issue. Looking at the issues register I would suggest only the Partnership is ‘content’ with what they see.</p>
1114	6 – Inventory	No	<p>I do NOT agree with the Partnership’s initial opinions on the inventory.</p> <p>How can the Partnership be ‘satisfied with the proposed inventory to be managed in a facility’ when they admit they ‘do not have a definitive picture of what would go into a repository’ at this time. This implies that they outstanding uncertainties are generated by the lack of Government decision on whether new builds; uranium, plutonium and spent fuel; recycling; submarine & other wastes might be placed in the repository. When in fact the real uncertainty is caused by the faulty change management system applied to the inventory (baseline) which keeps changing. Baseline means ‘clearly defined starting point (point of departure) from where</p>

			implementation begins, or is judged, or comparison is made.' It is fixed, not movable.
1114	7 – Siting process	No	<p>I do NOT agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on the process for siting a repository.</p> <p>Consultation document page 94, Gauging credible local support. 'in the event of the Partnership concluding that the omission of a potential host community would create insurmountable problems for the siting process then it could recommend the inclusion of the community concerned if this was supported by a full justification and explanation.' This statement describing the scenario of one or more community deciding they do not want to go to the next stage immediately negates the previous statement which is 'the presumption should be that they would be left out of the process. This inconsistency in the voluntary process removes any trust I had in the Partnership's MRWS approach.</p>
1114	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>In 2001 the UK Government and devolved administrations initiated the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) programme, with the aim of addressing this problem. The aim was to find a practicable solution for the UK's higher activity wastes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - achieved long-term protection of people and the environment - did this in an open and transparent way that inspired public confidence - was based on sound science, and - ensured the effective use of public monies. <p>I do not believe the MRWS programme supported by the Partnership has achieved these objectives and therefore I have no option but say 'NO' to the areas covered by Allerdale, Copeland and West Cumbria, taking any further part in the search for somewhere to put a repository, without any commitment to have it. I wish for those borough councils and Cumbria CC. to withdraw from the MRWS programme and process immediately before any further money is spent.</p>
1114	9 – Additional comments		<p>The current Government has been embarrassed by a number of press releases since they took office. A further embarrassment would be for a senior member of the PR firm Osprey being found to be a senior member of Cumbria Tourism and advisor to the Treasury. By anyone's account this is a conflict of interest. It would be better this person stood down!!</p> <p>Are women properly represented on the MRWS Partnership? I think not. Yet it is women who hold the responsibility of safely nurturing many hundreds of generations of children in the future.</p> <p>I repeat I wish for Allerdale & Copeland borough councils and Cumbria CC. to withdraw from the MRWS programme and process immediately before any further money is spent.</p>

1115	Letter	<p>I ask you to consider this letter as a formal submission to your consultation.</p> <p>I am writing to record that I am opposed to the Geological Disposal of Radioactive Nuclear Waste in Cumbria in general, and in particular in the Ward of Aspatria which I represent within Allerdale Borough Council. My reasons are fourfold, namely:</p> <p>Democratic Responsibility</p> <p>I am unaware of anyone locally who agrees with the proposal to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste anywhere within the vicinity of Aspatria, and it is my democratic responsibility to represent those views.</p> <p>Technical & Geological</p> <p>I am aware that the overwhelming weight of expert opinion is that Cumbria is one of the inherently least suitable locations within which to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste due to its complex geology, including the behaviour of its water tables and the risk of seismic activity, both naturally caused as well as man-made as evidenced by the recent 'fracking' quake in Lancashire. As shale gas deposits have been identified in the Morecambe Bay area, any fracking' permitted to take place there would be uncomfortably close to the complex geology of Cumbria in which it is proposed to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste.</p> <p>I am also concerned that much of the technology proposed is largely untested and particular at the scale proposed. Risks of failure over an effective lifetime of thousands of years cannot by definition have been assessed with any degree of certainty.</p> <p>The Polluter Should Pay</p> <p>I believe in the principle that 'the polluter should pay' for recycling and disposal. I am concerned that much of the nuclear waste currently stored at Sellafield or Thorp originated from other countries, and I am opposed to Britain in general and Cumbria in particular being used as their 'rubbish bin'.</p> <p>At a domestic level, Cumbria is the second least densely populated county in England, and by that same token will have one of the least intensive profiles for the consumption of electricity, yet it is here where you are considering disposing of radioactive nuclear waste.</p> <p>Political</p>

			<p>There are many other areas of England that consume electrical energy far more intensely than Cumbria and which have far more stable inherent geologies. If underground disposal of radioactive nuclear waste is as safe as claimed, why not dispose of it close to where electrical energy consumption is at its highest – say under London?</p> <p>We both know the answer to that. But if you couldn't sell your proposals on the grounds of need and safety to the 8 million electricity consumers living and working in and around London, why do you imagine that the 500,000 people living in Cumbria would agree in principle to the same proposal?</p>
1116	Email		No Nuclear Dumping in Cumbria!
1120	1 – Geology	No	<p>I don't agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on geology</p> <p>Because the Government has never stated what type of geology or hydro-geological regime they are looking for, and the NDA claim that engineering will overcome geological difficulties, it seems that both are unwilling to tie their own hands by specifying geology and that the West Cumbrian community is therefore at a disadvantage in trying to counter a moving argument.</p> <p>The consultation document refers to the integrity of the BGS screening report. I have little doubt that it did what it was asked to do but I am also in no doubt that the BGS could have been asked to do much more desktop work, which would have resulted in larger areas being screened out.</p> <p>If this "is the only geological assessment required by the Government at this early stage" then we must ask the question why. And the conclusion is that this would have produced the result that there was not sufficient area of land left to consider continuing, and that this may well have been the case wherever communities volunteered.</p> <p>We are required to comment not only on the extent of land area remaining but also the quality. I note that NDA Document 167 giving further information on the geology is fairly unsatisfactory and that although the consultation document cites document 193 to confirm that the Nirex planning inspector did not rule out the whole of West Cumbria, it fails to mention that the same document states that the inspector said "seeking to identify sites with potentially simpler geological settings than Longlands Farm is critical".</p> <p>I am concerned that the second "geology seminar" which I attended is misrepresented in the consultation document, as it implies that there were a number of people qualified to make a geological/hydro-geological</p>

			<p>judgement whereas in reality only Dr Dearlove was a geologist. It was disappointing that so little time was offered to Professor Smythe that it would not have been possible for him to make his argument. It therefore fell to an unfunded group opposed to the repository to organise a public meeting, which was very well attended, in order that Professor Smythe could explain and justify his thesis that the whole of West Cumbria is unsuitable.</p> <p>I know that many (more than the unquantified "some" of the consultation document) members of the public share my concerns that the geology of West Cumbria is unsuitable, specifically that it is no simpler than Longlands Farm, that is subject to the same faulting and hydro-geological forcing.</p>
1120	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>I don't agree with the partnership's initial views on Safety, Security, Environment and Planning</p> <p>My concerns about the changing planning system are outlined in the section on process.</p> <p>To them I would add the concern that the Government has suggested that they would like to speed up the process, and that Copeland MP Jamie Reed has also expressed this desire. I do not share the Partnership's confidence that the industry and the regulators can safely meet an accelerated timeline. I share the public lack of confidence in regulators in general, when they are close to the industry they are to regulate.</p> <p>I am not convinced that all 105 of the technical issues published in the Issues Register by the NWAA will be resolved without creating further problems and safety issues. We have seen this clearly in the work done on repositories abroad, where solving one problem just leads to another. Some of the issues may never be resolved. In particular the issues relating to gas release/radioactivity containment. One cannot say that a problem has been solved just because effort has been made to solve it.</p>
1120	3 – Impacts	No	<p>I don't agree with the partnership's initial views on the impacts</p> <p>Direct impacts</p> <p>I think the impact would be immeasurable - from the very start of the project the blight to the "Cumbria brand" for food industries, farming and for the tourist industry - hotels and attractions, then the impact of such a huge construction project both the engineering works themselves and the transport issues around them. Given that the proposals will probably include a massive central store for spent fuel, a spent fuel encapsulation plant, huge spoil heaps and construction, the surface works would be a blot on the landscape visible from many highspots and viewpoints within the National Park. Many visitors to the Lake District come from countries with sizeable majorities which have rejected nuclear power, and are unlikely to want to spend holidays in a nuclear hotspot. A proposal for a repository and all ancillary works adjacent to, or under the Lake District National Park sits badly with its aspiration to become a World Heritage Site.</p>

		<p>Unfortunately no independent research is available at this time on the negatives impacts of a repository. That research, presented as a preliminary paper to the MRWS in February, is not yet complete and as far as I am aware has not been independently reviewed. The consultation document gives the misleading impression that these issues have been covered and presents a proposal which has more advantages than disadvantages.</p> <p>We are asked to accept that future work will provide "an acceptable process in place to assess any negative impacts and mitigate them," and also "how much offsetting these impacts will cost" I am completely unconvinced that it will be possible to offset impacts by spending money, or that money will be available in the future to do so.</p> <p>I note that the document suggests that the "urban community and business community" seem positive about suggestions, but less so in the rural community, which is where the surface developments will be situated and where it is likely the dump itself would be. In other words, those most likely to be affected are least positive about it.</p> <p>Long-term direction For as long as I can remember development agencies in West Cumbria have talked of reducing dependency on a single industry, and have claimed to be trying to diversify the economy. Some were set up with this as their primary purpose (West Cumbria Development Agency, West Cumbria Tourism initiative). The consultation document quotes the Energy Coast Masterplan as having 4 aspirations (page 62) and the proposal for a nuclear waste dump seems to fit with only one word ("nuclear") amongst the four aspirations. If West Cumbria is serious about reducing its nuclear dependence, and producing a strong and diversified economy, then adding to it possibly widening the area involved and dependent seems very questionable.</p> <p>Economic Sustainability On 'uncertainties and recommendations for future work' it is suggested that a long term visioning exercise is undertaken if a decision to participate is made. This should have already been done, and in any case must be done before a decision to participate is taken.</p> <p>The Partnership seems to have taken a very rosy view of "job creation investments complementary to a repository" which will create sustainable employment. This appears to be without any evidence, and without any assessment of job losses in other industries both within West Cumbria and within the wider area of the County. It may, of course be true, but if so it will not contribute to what I would define as economic sustainability.</p> <p>Far too little information is available on impacts for us to be able to make any meaningful decision to participate.</p>
--	--	---

1120	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>I don't agree with the partnership's initial views on community benefits package</p> <p>I note the 12 principles developed by the Partnership but I also note that the Government has not committed to accepting any of them, only that they would form a basis for negotiation.</p> <p>The Partnership admits that we will not see what benefits package we will be given until we get much further down the line. Yet it seems confident that a package will be negotiated that meets its desires.</p> <p>I do not share that confidence. We are being asked to take on trust something that may not materialise at all, may be far less than we hoped for, and is exceedingly unlikely in any case, to truly compensate for the damage done to our existing economy. A carrot is being dangled in front of us that may never be in reach.</p>
1120	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>I don't agree with the partnership's initial views on design and engineering</p> <p>I note that detailed design work for the caverns are not possible until a site has been found, but the Partnership believes that generic design work done so far is fine.</p> <p>The generic design for surface facilities is very lacking in detail, and gives the impression of quite benign buildings. There is no mention of potential central storage of thousands, or even tens of thousands of tonnes of highly radioactive spent fuel, for decades until encapsulation can take place, or of the length of time the encapsulated waste might have to be stored on the surface until it could be disposed of. Spent fuel encapsulation has never been carried out in this country, it will therefore be a risky process. We know already that other parts of the country where new nuclear reactors are planned are hoping to transport their waste and spent fuel to West Cumbria. We know that the NDA has had talks with the industry over a possible 'interim store' for spent fuel from new build at Sellafield or at the surface site of the repository, but not on taking over spent fuel stores at reactors sites</p> <p>British Energy has estimated the store for all the spent fuel from Sizewell B is expected to be of the order of 50m wide by 110m long by 23 m high. Depending on the scale of any new reactor programme, several stores of the scale proposed at Sizewell might be needed to store spent fuel at the above-ground facilities.</p> <p>The consultation documentation should have at least made the public aware of the possibility of this, and I am sure it has an impact on the statement on page 85 that "No matter how much and what type of waste goes into a repository, the surface facilities are expected to cover an area of around 1km²".</p> <p>I note that the five uncertainties identified in the document are extremely important - they are the five things we</p>

			need to have answers on, before we can even consider making a decision to participate.
1120	6 – Inventory	No	<p>I don't agree with the partnership's initial views on Inventory</p> <p>I note that the Partnership wanted to understand what level of influence the community could have over the inventory, and that they have drawn up principles asking for commitments from Government. I note that the Government (DECC) has agreed to 1 only 2 of these principles.</p> <p>We also know that the Waste Transfer Price document of 8th December 2011 says that the Government "expects" to dispose of spent fuel and intermediate level waste from the new build programme in the same GDF.</p> <p>DECC may have confirmed that this would be "discussed with host communities" (p83) , but they have not said it would be negotiated. In fact negotiations underway now between EDF and the Government on new build wastes and disposal. These are covered in the Funded Decommissioning Programme for new nuclear waste management and disposal which has to be completed prior to new reactor construction. There is also discussion taking place on the Waste Transfer Price agreement on disposal costs. The issue of how and where disposal will take place will form part of these discussions, which are being carried on behind closed doors, but the deals agreed there will decide how, when and where new build nuclear wastes will be dealt with, and will not be published until after they have been reached (and only then if they are not deemed commercially confidential).</p> <p>I am therefore not convinced that the community will have any influence over changes to the inventory, nor that the Partnership has understood this. Given that the amount of radioactivity in spent fuel from new build (assuming 10 new reactors) would be three times that of all the legacy radioactive wastes and nuclear materials accumulated over the past 60 years, this is very serious. It is more serious when one considers that due to its heat-generating properties it has major implications for length of storage, the size of the repository and the amount of spoil.</p> <p>The consultation document makes no specific mention of military nuclear waste but upper inventory volumes suggest that it too could be included.</p> <p>Nowhere in the world is a repository planned which could contain so many different types of waste and spent fuel, and yet the consultation document states "A change in the inventory is not expected to present any new technical challenges for the design and construction of a facility" This is a serious under-estimate of the technical difficulties ahead.</p>

1120	7 – Siting process	No	<p>I don't agree with the partnership's initial views on the process</p> <p>I am very anxious that the UK has gone out on a limb and inverted international good practice by asking for volunteers from anywhere without regard for best geology. This has undermined the credibility of the process, especially as the two areas now being studied have less than satisfactory geology.</p> <p>The validity of the process is further undermined by the fact that the Government has never said what type of geology is needed, nor what type would be a showstopper.</p> <p>I am further concerned that "local community" has never been defined, and this becomes more vital as the narrowing down process takes place. For example the "local criteria" and "local issues" mentioned on p89. Does that mean that we could choose to rule out the National Park for surface facilities, transport routes and any underground works? Could we also rule out those parishes which believe the process should end here? I suspect not, as we know that the Borough and County Councils are the decision making bodies (DMB), and can overrule local objections.</p> <p>I am worried by the fact that on p90 in the description of work in stage 5, it is stated that there would be "fairly large areas" still being considered. This presupposes that we know the results of stages 4a and 4b. As a result, it is easy to assume that the two parts of stage 4 will be managed to ensure that large areas are left in.</p> <p>I consider that principles one and seven of the Partnership's Principles for Community Involvement are already breached. It is clear that the process so far has not inspired confidence, which is why so many parishes have voted to withdraw from the process. Principle seven is clearly not going to be upheld if a parish wants to withdraw but the DMB overrules them.</p> <p>I understand that members of the Partnership are placing great faith in the Right of Withdrawal (RoW). I do not share that faith. Once the next stage is entered DECC still state (from their website faq checked again 20.03.12) that "It is expected that all parties will work positively to seek to avoid the need to exercise the Right of Withdrawal." There is no doubt that pressure will be exerted for partners to remain within the process.</p> <p>Furthermore the 2008 White Paper states: "In the event that at some point in the future, voluntarism and partnership does not look likely to work Government reserves the right to explore other approaches." At times DECC officials have said 'Plan B is to make Plan A work' , at others they have said failure of voluntarism would mean starting again.</p> <p>I note that the consultation document, when talking of the commitment to RoW states that there would have to be "a Government decision" to change it, changing the wording from a previous draft from "a formal</p>
------	--------------------	----	---

			<p>Government process". If the latter were true, this would imply consultation and parliamentary debate, but a Government "decision" is just that, much more easily and quickly taken.</p> <p>The current state of flux of the planning system for major projects means considerable uncertainty for the future of planning as applied to radioactive waste disposal. The Government could decide the GDF is a 'nationally significant infrastructure project' - and that a National Policy Statement (NPS) is needed. The NPS determines 'need' for the repository, as does national interest and the RoW would not remain. Under the new IPC/MIPU system being introduced, the Secretary of State would make the final decision on the repository.</p> <p>This proposal is unique in having a voluntarism and RoW process. It is quite possible that the large costs involved, might cause the Government to change its mind on leaving the RoW so late in the process. I am sure the industry will have concerns about being singled out for special treatment, in this way.</p>
1120	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Overall views</p> <p>In every section we are asked to take on trust that the uncertainties will be solved. In the meanwhile Government wants the process speeded up. We are being asked to take too much on trust, and where there are uncertainties, I believe it is impossible to make a meaningful decision to participate.</p> <p>Furthermore the geology is so unsuitable that I believe we are wasting vast sums of money exploring an area which will never prove suitable. We must stop this gambling from going any further and withdraw from the process now, before we lose the right to withdraw.</p> <p>I trust that our local politicians will be brave enough to call a halt to the process.</p>
1121	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>I feel it would be better to have a repository in West Cumbria (if possible) because:</p> <p>A) I would feel safer if radioactive waste was deep underground rather than on the surface. B) If the UK has to have repository, then the closer it is to Sellafield where the vast majority of the UK's radioactive waste is currently held, then the less risk there will be when transporting the waste. C) I feel the area could do with the economic benefits.</p>
1122	Email		<p>I would like to register my horror at the thought of a nuclear dump being sited in or near the English Lake District.</p>

			Please take this letter as my heartfelt opposition to such a move.
1124	Email		<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>Il 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - 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. - 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. - 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. - 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>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> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.</p>

1127	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>As the Secretary of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG) and a resident of West Mersea which lies directly opposite Bradwell, I have an interest in what will happen to the nuclear wastes from proposed new build.</p> <p>I personally believe that there are too many uncertainties for the process to proceed in West Cumbria or anywhere else at this time. I understand that the Partnership may wish to proceed. I would, however, urge it not to recommend entering the next stage of the siting process unless it is absolutely clear that a repository in West Cumbria would be dealing solely with legacy wastes as the volume of these is already known.</p> <p>It is clear that the potential existence of a national repository would be used by the Government to justify new nuclear development. However, there is as yet no policy for the long-term management of any wastes from new build. Nor does anyone know what their volume and radioactivity will be. Therefore, the Partnership needs to ensure that the people of West Cumbria understand exactly what it would be proposed to store or dispose of in their area.</p> <p>In my view, should the Government persist with a new build programme, it will be necessary to undertake a completely separate policy process and consultation on the long-term management of the wastes produced. It cannot simply be assumed that they will be managed on each site or sent to a repository in West Cumbria.</p> <p>Please note that this response is a personal one from me and separate from that of BANNG.</p>
1128	1 – Geology	Yes	While some areas have been assessed and found unsuitable there remain other areas yet to be assessed
1128	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
1128	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
1128	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
1128	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
1128	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made

1128	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
1128	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes, they should participate without commitment until they are satisfied that they are doing the right thing by either siting a repository there or not, as they adjudicate.
1129	1 – Geology	No	I disagree that 'further investigation' is needed. Every school child in this country who studies geography knows that Cumbria has about the most fractured and convoluted geology in the entire country, coupled with steep slopes, high rainfall and lots of underground water movement. Nothing has changed since the Nirex enquiry deemed the area unsuitable. From what I understand the geology should be simple, stable rocks with gentle gradients and little underground water movement. Exactly the opposite of what we have in Cumbria. Stop now.
1129	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The previous enquiry decided that the risks were too great for intermediate level wastes and now the highest level wastes are being considered. We cannot afford to take on trust that safety problems will be solved in the future. This is unbelievably irresponsible-not just for humans, but we have a duty to the rest of nature to get this right first time and to minimise all risks first time. We have no right to be arrogant about this or to look for an easy short term solution for us, now, when we have to make sure it is safe for all life, not just us. The rest of nature can't do anything about us messing-up, but we can. I do not trust the regulatory structure one inch-it is too hand-in-glove and I wonder whether there is enough clout and brainpower on the regulatory side to have any serious effects.
1129	3 – Impacts	No	A dump would impact most horribly on the landscape, on tourism, on agriculture and on the artisan foods for which Cumbria has become famous. I suspect many small food producers would be put out of business. Yes, people who get to work on a project of this size get paid well, but what about everyone else? I also believe that many people who have taken part in this consultation have no idea how large the works will be. I did not notice any scale mock-ups of the proposals presented in a way that people could understand and appreciate the true scale of what is being proposed. Most people cannot read a plan. I also don't believe that many people taking part understand that it is the very highest level wastes which are under consideration.
1129	4 – Community benefits	No	This is pathetic and laughable-buying off the community with beads and mirrors. Firstly we should have all essential infrastructure as citizens of this country. No amount of bribes could make up for what we lose in terms of landscape and losses of income as described above and nothing at all would compensate for radioactive contamination. What is being proposed is large scale destruction. There is no compensation. Just because we are remote, dispersed and have a malleable population already attached to the nuclear industry gives you no

			right to see us a soft target.
1129	5 – Design and engineering	No	I quote: 'a facility will not be built unless it will be safe during its operations and for future generations'. I agree and as I said before we have a duty to all of nature for this to be true, not simply for humans. This is incredibly onerous and it is simply not sufficient to leave technical and engineering matters to the NDA to solve 'sometime in the future'. This has to be solved now and not just by the NDA who, from what little I have seen of their activities seem to be a bunch of overpaid numpties, too frightened to do much, hidebound by regulations, overstaffed and who shout 'safety' in order to get the government (us) to cough up more money to cover up what are often their mistakes or inactivity. Do I trust the NDA? Not on your life. Those settling ponds of wastes for example, how much have they cost so far and what progress has been made?
1129	6 – Inventory	No	As far as I can see the inventory is meaningless-it could include anything and everything and probably will. Nobody else lumps all their different wastes together in one facility: existing wastes, wastes from new build, high level medium level, military etc etc. Since you cannot design the facility until you know the inventory, if you do not know the inventory then you cannot take a risk on a design which may then not be suitable for future types of waste. Too risky.
1129	7 – Siting process	No	This is all too scary. I do not believe that this 'right of withdrawal' is all sunny and positive. My chief concern is that the borough or county councils will become enslaved to the idea of all the money coming into the area, rather than ensuring that conditions are absolutely right and suitable. Each step down the track makes withdrawal less and less likely, whatever is said. So much money will have been spent that it will be 'too big to fail' and even if there are severe reservations it will go ahead. This would be the very worst scenario as it would go ahead for the most wrong of wrong reasons. Nobody but nobody can have the right or the arrogance to let this happen. All the parts of the scenario have to be completely right otherwise it should not go ahead. Dumping on us because you can is so irresponsible it does not bear thinking about.
1129	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I believe they should not take part any further. I think this is all a horrible ruse. I don't think most people have thought seriously about what all this means and I think the government is banking on that. Since it was decided 15 years ago that this area was unsuitable how can it have suddenly become suitable? Isn't it very suspicious that no other local authorities put themselves forward as potential areas of search, even if they have more suitable geology? Why is this one must ask? Two answers spring to mind: one is that West Cumbria was a 'done deal' so that there was no point in anywhere else putting themselves forward or, conversely, West Cumbria is the area most likely to give in whereas other areas with denser populations and richer economies, even if more suitable geologically, just would not stand for it.</p> <p>Why was an initial search for suitable geology not the first activity to be carried out, followed by an invitation to communities in suitable areas to express an interest? Surely the whole thing has been done the wrong way</p>

		<p>round-further grounds for suspicion of a 'done deal'. It is utterly irresponsible given what is at stake. Stop the process. Pull out now.</p>
<p>1129</p>	<p>9 – Additional comments</p>	<p>I wish to reiterate that EVERY condition has to be right. If any are slightly wrong or unknown then a decision to go ahead is immoral, irresponsible and wrong, not just for humans but for the rest of nature, which has as much right to be here as we do. I have a horrible feeling that government, the NDA etc will try to push this for the wrong reasons: economic, soft touch etc. I think the 'right of withdrawal' is a sham. I trust nobody involved in promoting this process.</p> <p>[Additional postcard]</p> <p>Side one</p> <div data-bbox="684 641 1640 1307" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Side two [name and address removed]</p>

			<p>To Cumbria County Council, Allerdale and Copeland Borough Councils,</p> <p>You are running a consultation to see if Cumbria should proceed along 'steps towards geological disposal of nuclear wastes.'</p> <p>Enough is known about Cumbria's geology to know that this area of "high rainfall and hills and mountains to drive the water flow" is NOT SUITABLE FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION.</p> <p>I do not support any further "steps" and ask that "no decision to participate" is taken by the 3 councils and decision making bodies.</p> <p>Please ensure that Cumbria has a viable future and STOP the STEPS TOWARDS GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL</p> <p>yours sincerely,</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Address:</p> <p>Postcode:</p>	
1130	Email		<p>Although I do not live in Cumbria I value the area as a very important part of Britain.</p> <p>I do live just 30 miles from Hinkley Point and so have immediate concerns about a proposal to build new reactors there.</p> <p>If this goes ahead the radioactive waste they produce will need to be stored on site for 60 years, meaning that material will be there from the date the reactor starts until 160 years after it closes, some 220 years or more from now. From about 2075 very active waste would need to be transferred elsewhere.</p> <p>Over the past 67 years it has been known that radioactive waste would need long term storage, but no proper measures have been taken to secure this.</p>	

			<p>CORWM was set up to attempt to find a solution. It concluded that a deep geologically safe repository was needed but recognised that few communities would welcome such a thing in their area.</p> <p>It was felt that people in the Windscale area, many of whom benefited economically from nuclear power, might provide the “willing community” but unfortunately investigation of the local geology showed the area to be unsuitable.</p> <p>Hopes and promises cannot change the geology. It remains unsuitable. If attempts to force a deep repository were made it would inevitably result in very long term destruction of that local environment and effects further afield. Health costs as well as financial costs would fall on Cumbrian children and others elsewhere for generations to come.</p> <p>Is this what you want? Please face the facts.</p>
1131	3 – Impacts	No	<p>Criterion A</p> <p>I find it difficult to believe that any strategy can be developed that will protect the brand and reputation of the area from the negative impact of the development. The development would be incompatible with the Lake District brand.</p> <p>I disagree with the assumption that much or all of the spoil will be able to be kept on site. The volume generated will make this highly unlikely.</p> <p>Criterion C</p> <p>I don't think that accepting a repository will be economically advantageous, in respect of local jobs. It is possible that more local jobs will be lost in tourism than are gained by the development.</p>
1131	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I think the opinion statement is reasonable, but I doubt that the benefits package would match the expectations of local people.</p>
1131	6 – Inventory	No	<p>I don't believe that enough guarantees are in place over the content of the inventory, and I disagree that an acceptable process for how the inventory could be changed is in place.</p> <p>I feel that under no circumstances should waste generated by overseas power production be stored in this country.</p>

			<p>The government policy of 'a presumption that only UK radioactive waste should be stored in this country' (p80 of consultation doc) is not a guarantee.</p> <p>A guarantee (binding on this and future governments) to exclude overseas waste should be in place as a condition of any decision to participate in the siting process.</p> <p>At this stage the community is being asked to give a very open ended commitment because there are no details, but it will be much harder to influence the inventory during the later stages when money has been invested in the process. In particular the question of whether waste from new power stations would go in is important, and needs addressing at this stage. I think the answer should be no. How can we be sure that a decision on proceeding with new power stations would be taken before the right of withdrawal ends?</p> <p>If the repository goes ahead, I feel there will be an assumption that the facility will expand to meet any future build, and by that stage it will be difficult to prevent it.</p>
1131	7 – Siting process	No	<p>I am extremely sceptical that the right to withdraw will have any real meaning, as the criteria for establishing support from the community are so vague and open to alteration.</p> <p>Even at this early stage, I think the right to have a referendum is an additional commitment that could realistically be expected. Therefore I disagree with the Partnership's opinion that there are no additional reassurances that could be expected.</p>
1131	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I do not think either council should take part in the search.</p>
1132	Email		<p>I ask you to consider this letter as a formal submission to your consultation.</p> <p>I am writing to record that I am opposed to the Geological Disposal of Radioactive Nuclear Waste in Cumbria in general, and in particular in the Ward of Dalton which I represent within Allerdale Borough Council. My reasons are fourfold, namely:</p> <p>Democratic Responsibility</p> <p>I am unaware of anyone locally who agrees with the proposal to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste anywhere within the vicinity of Dalton Ward, and it is my democratic responsibility to represent those views. However</p>

		<p>these are my views and no vote has taken place, as yet, in my ward.</p> <p>Technical & Geological</p> <p>I am aware that the overwhelming weight of expert opinion is that Cumbria is one of the inherently least suitable locations within which to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste due to its complex geology, including the behaviour of its water tables and the risk of seismic activity, both naturally caused as well as man-made as evidenced by the recent 'fracking' quake in Lancashire. As shale gas deposits have been identified in the Morecambe Bay area, any fracking' permitted to take place there would be uncomfortably close to the complex geology of Cumbria in which it is proposed to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste.</p> <p>I am also concerned that much of the technology proposed is largely untested and in particular at the scale proposed. Risks of failure over an effective lifetime of thousands of years cannot by definition have been assessed with any degree of certainty.</p> <p>The Polluter Should Pay</p> <p>I believe in the principle that 'the polluter should pay' for recycling and disposal. I am concerned that much of the nuclear waste currently stored at Sellafield or Thorp originated from other countries, and I am opposed to Britain in general and Cumbria in particular being used as their 'rubbish bin'.</p> <p>At a domestic level, Cumbria is the second least densely populated county in England, and by that same token will have one of the least intensive profiles for the consumption of electricity, yet it is here where you are considering disposing of the nation's radioactive nuclear waste.</p> <p>Political</p> <p>There are many other areas of England that consume electrical energy far more intensely than Cumbria and which have far more stable inherent geologies. If underground disposal of radioactive nuclear waste is as safe as claimed, why not dispose of it close to where electrical energy consumption is at its highest – say under London or the Home Counties?</p> <p>We both know the answer to that. But if you couldn't sell your proposals on the grounds of need and safety to the 8 million electricity consumers living and working in and around London, why do you imagine that the 500,000 people living in Cumbria would agree in principle to the same proposal?</p>

1133	1 – Geology	Yes	I agree that the evidence so far indicates that there may be suitable sites and that further evaluation is necessary to establish suitability. Therefore it is appropriate to continue in the siting process. Ultimately it will be the sum of the protective functions of the geology and the protective functions of the repository system that will ensure safety for future generations. It will be important that the characteristics required of the geology are clearly articulated in future safety cases and that these are used in defining suitable areas. I suspect that this will be an iterative process, where the areas of suitable land may change as details of the design and characterisation are developed.
1133	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	There is a good international basis for development of an appropriate safety case. The work to date is well grounded and is seeking to establish requirements and fill in knowledge gaps through R&D. There is sufficient evidence to give confidence that a safety case could be made and that any such case will only be (a) presented and (b) accepted if the assessments are robust and based on good evidence.
1133	3 – Impacts	Yes	The needs of multiple communities within West Cumbria need to be reconciled and there needs to be clarity about the extent of benefits and detriments that may arise from a repository in West Cumbria. Further work is required on this and is underway. To me the importance of nuclear sector is and is likely to remain significant for many years and is a major source of high technology work and development. The long term viability of the sector requires that a repository site is found, therefore West Cumbria stands to gain in the event of a successful siting. There are no other current candidates for a site is a significant factor in deciding to proceed in the process, but it cannot be the only consideration and as further information is available the balance of benefits and detriments will have to be examined and tested to ensure that the final decision is based on real as opposed to apparent consequences.
1133	4 – Community benefits	Yes	There is evidence of engagement from government on providing an appropriate package for the area. This is likely to be a source of intense negotiation but progress to date is sufficiently encouraging to support proceeding, particularly as there is always the option to step out of the process at a later stage if undertakings appear to be reneged upon.
1133	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	The basis of the approach appears well founded on international experience. Local siting will be important for the final design. In the absence of significant evidence of major challenges to the basis of design further engagement in the process is appropriate.
1133	6 – Inventory	Yes	As a national repository it will be important that it provides a robust means of dealing with current legacies and future waste arisings. Flexibility over the agreed inventory is therefore desirable provided always that it can be shown that the safety of the repository and of future generations is not significantly impaired by any changes. It is important that principles for dealing with this are agreed in the forthcoming stage to provide support to

			assessments of the benefits arising from the repository siting as well as many other aspects of the proposal.
1133	7 – Siting process	Yes	Assurances on the basis of the siting process are important. The current approach appears fair and balanced. Over time care will need to be taken to ensure that neither proponents nor detractors can manipulate the process and that local determination is not unduly influenced people outside the affected areas. Within the process as defined there are appropriate means for others to engage in the overall policy and national debate, which is also important and proper, however this should not undermine the intent of the process.
1133	8 – Overall views on participation		I think that it is important for both areas to continue to engage in the process. The industry as a whole has brought benefits to the area, notwithstanding that there have also been some detriments as well. A successful repository site will help to retain related high skill industries in this area. Having a site may help provide further high skill and long term employment especially if siting/repository/disposal related R&D and support activities can also be brought to the areas a part of the overall development.
1133	9 – Additional comments		Given the potential opportunities and with the assurances on the ability to withdraw later in the process, it appears sensible to continue to engage in the siting process whilst retaining a sound oversight of the development work and potential implications.
1134	Letter		<p>To whom it may concern. That includes the Cumbria County Council, Copeland Borough Council, Millom Town Council, Jamie Read MP, Security Services and Police Chief Constable, the WCMRAWSP.</p> <p>It is impossible to overstate the destructive effects of this, your latest 'plan' for us, the Public, or the effects that your development will have, and Nuclear has had on what, except for you, would be a thriving, wonderful Lakeland area. Your whole industry is founded on a lie. Germany, which has a rap ore with its people, has given up nuclear, it is solvent. France has 50+ nuclear plants; it is broke.</p> <p>Out of your alleged Energy Shortage Pan and into the Nuclear Fire. Nuclear is not cheap nor will it reduce CO2. It will do, and has done, the opposite. So the Government, who know nothing about nuclear, says to Local Gov., who know nothing about nuclear, get together a few locals, who know nothing about nuclear, to put the issues to the populous, who know nothing..... The issues.....between 2.5 and 9.5miles square! Which? What? Who's waste, Japan's? Where? Why? The US needs two 1.3 GW 'coal fired' power stations to enrich nuclear material for their bombs!</p> <p>Does MOX work? Is Japan still sending its waste by sea? If MOX is a failure where will their waste go? If we keep it will they have to pay compensation? Did we keep the defective MOX fuel that Japan rejected? Or was</p>

		<p>that the fuel that was leaked i.e., mixed oxides, emitted in their melt down! Will that be Gov. or Companies reimburse? When? Who, private/ Gov? Companies and Country of origin? Insurance; yes/no; provider? Insurance for existing and new npower stations? If none, say none and explain why?</p> <p>Are you, the n-industry blocking the development and introduction of Thorium as a safer fuel alternative? Or do the multi nationals want to get rid of their out dated failed technology here? Why has Germany cancelled? What effect has that had on German npower suppliers/companies? Are they looking for a new base here; have they already got one here?</p> <p>Pink bit on your map shows Windscale/Sellafield as possible site. The radioactive pond(s)? at W/S (“no-one knows what’s in there” W/S worker quote) leaking water for decades; where is the radio active water now? Why did they leak? If sitting under W/S wouldn’t this rule out W/S as a Tip Site. Also as a site for the new npower W/S Station?</p> <p>Where are you going to put the Tip spoil, Active or Otherwise? What happens to the birds that land on these Ponds, their eggs?</p> <p>The Gov. wants to dump the issue onto the Local Gov. It does not want Public Enquiries because the public can get together expertise and match the might of Gov. and Multi-Nationals combination. We’ll have tea and biscuits for the Public and Corporate hospitality for Local Authorities, instead!</p> <p>All the nastys emanating from nuclear took place when we had Public Enquiries! Why? I’ve been to four, re. Hodbarrow, and the public won three of them.</p> <p>Public v CBC + Developer. One of these wins the Rt Hon Tom King reversed the Inspectors decision!</p> <p>Was it 1100 drums of high level waste dumped on ‘low level’ Drigg Tip? Have you moved them back, or where are they now? Why the mistake?</p> <p>Iso-statics</p> <p>10 000 years ago this area was covered in ice, it has been as much as 2 000 ft thick. It pushed the land down. There is no ice now so the land is coming up again. Duddon to Solway is a 1 000 foot geological fault. Nirex drilled and found fissures in the rock. They said that this shows the rock stresses are relieved. They would! If the stresses are gone, why do we have earth quakes? Nirex was asked; “if you found rock with no cracks, would you use that site”? No reply. Where else in the Country have you prospected? Place names and dates?</p>
--	--	---

		<p>I presume the mining of coal rules out some of the bits marked pink. What was the death toll of miners at the Whitehaven Mine? Won't methane gas be present in the other areas? Will you pump water from this Tip? Where will that go to? Aren't there lots of workings in your proposed areas? CBC had to stop pumping water from Millom tip because it had contaminated the ground, but the work force is still exposed to the gasses! Were they fined? If CBC moved the tip skips 100metres the staff risk would be reduced. I mention it so you know what CBC is capable of.</p> <p>Has the PM just done a deal with the Scott's to build a railway to remove 400+ tons of nuclear pollution from Dounreay to W/S? Shouldn't you have built the railway years ago? And figured out what to do with the lethal waste before you got Planning Permission? (CBC "Sustainable development".) We have to! So have you a special relationship with the planners and EA? If yes what is it? Is there any more waste to come? How much is there now?</p> <p>How long will this Tip be in use? Will we have another ice age in its life time? How high will sea levels rise? 12 000 years ago the sea level rose 300feet very quickly didn't it? How will this affect the Tip? Will it be under sea level at 600feet minimum depth? Note; CBC are allowing buildings/development well below the high water mark. Indeed, much of Millom is built on reclaimed mud flats. You will have to rebuild the whole transport network throughout the Lakes. When are we to be told about that? E.g. South Copeland serviced by one bridge. It's a two arch stone bridge. Its ends are poorly supported and moving out. Look at the up-stream side of the bridge. Bridges stood over two hundred years old have been damaged/destroyed recently by floods. So will you build a road across the Duddon Estuary, link to the Ulverston road and drive everyone out or insane with the increased traffic. And/or; build a Harbour at Whitehaven, another one! This will all be done using diesel oil; tons of CO2?</p> <p>I recently wrote to the Chief Constable hoping to show how vulnerable and unsafe W/S is to head off problems. I didn't make a Twin Towers film about it. This demonstrates how reluctant we are to get involved with CBC, the Environment Agency etc. A World threat that no-one dare talk about! The fire Brigade don't know what to do if W/S 'goes up'! Ask them. I know that W/S has its own fire services, why? See Japan's nfires. The Japanese are good engineers, but their reactors 'failed dangerous' in a known earthquake zone.</p> <p>Fail safe design is a simple idea. Lorry air brakes; if the air pressure fails the brakes are applied by a spring and the lorry stops. However, jumbo jets have outward opening doors; these will and have failed catastrophically.</p> <p>You can't walk away from a reactor and expect it to shut down by its-self, humans are involved. Humans are always the weakest link in a chain of disaster and this is a big chain.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The bull bars on 4wds, 'designed in danger'. Designed to kill kids; their height. (Because they increase the pressure and acceleration. The two killers.) Car safety has improved for the occupants but not for others having to use the roads and visibility out of new cars is poor. That should tell you something about the human animal. If it does not, boot up Union Carbide, India or the Windscale Fire, or atmospheric A tests! Will all these other Countries use this Tip? A bit like sending our ships to be scrapped in Pakistan, by their kids. Oil pollution in Nigeria; is that BP?</p> <p>What has happened to the Scottish (?) Fast Breeder reactor? How much to take that to bits? Three billion? Are these 'bits' to stay in the Scottish Nation, or use the 'new' railway?</p> <p>Was it at Dounreay that the n-industry threw its active rubbish down a disused well which chemically reacted and blew the concrete lid off? Have you sorted that out yet, with the locals?</p> <p>No-one has tried underground storage with different fuels; so if it's a German firm would it be possible for them to practice it over there? I know J Reed MP went to have a look at a tip. What happened? Who did our MP report back to? His constituents or W/S?</p> <p>On attending 'our' Kirksanton RWE chat over tea & biscuits re. proposed nstation no-one dare speak as the RWE rep. was there. Was this a real application to build a reactor on top of the HM Prison or just a distracter so that we would all breathe a sigh of relief when you put it in W/S!</p> <p>I keep saying "You". By "you" I mean anyone that stands to make money out of this misery.</p> <p>I note that 'hydraulic fracturing' gas extraction; Blackpool earthquakes, produces naturally radioactive rock which is higher than the Environment Agency will allow. Will 'your' (I mean 'ours' but you know what I mean.) rock be radioactive? Half life? Will it be stored in the tip?! I note also that the EA has not been to check Blackpool rock; it's the same here, unlicensed tips all over the place. I had thirty tons of intimidation Garage waste dumped on me. Took a decade to get it remove! CBC, EA kept having meetings! You can see 'my tip' from space!</p> <p>I also had a large hole dug close by, too close; in the concrete Garage floor with a 20 ton Caterpillar 360. The purpose of which is obscure but it could be part of a breaking of a deal I did with the developer having given up on CBC, CC, Environment Agency , Police, Ombudsman, Fire Service,.....</p> <p>The deal or part of it was to drain the 1500m2 site (Which is really only 1078m2. More houses on 1500m2! CBC/Developer does it all the time.) into the Public drains. The hole brayed through the concrete with the 360 bucket, apart from shaking this house to its foundations, cracking the ceilings, and ensuring a new roof; it</p>
--	--	--

		<p>means that the drainage is now via my house, and all the others down the Street. Double whammy? Is that a “shut up or else”. The Garage, in use for 80-90 years, a condition was put on the Plan. A “Desk Top Study” for pollutants was required. My solicitor asks; “has it been done”? “Is the whole of this area now polluted”? Obviously the deal was not done. Can we eat the produce from our gardens? Shall I send CBC, EA my apples pears goose gobs strawberries damsons? I think we should be told.</p> <p>At Estuary Close Millom a pollution search was only done after people were living in their houses! For arsenic. CBC Planning forgot. They forgot here...again. There are another 42 houses to go on Estuary Close 2, land now for sale? Buyer beware? Hundreds to go up in Millom and Haverigg. It is surprising what you developers can do; what we would be put in jail for. Perhaps the next time I see the developer he will hit me with his iron bar! Next time he came he brought a shovel, that’s when the demolished their party wall into my garden, accidentally, but this time there were two police there. I had phoned 999. The first time they came was better; they only kicked my path door in.</p> <p>We, the average members of the public are expected to have at our finger tips, all this information on npower and its effects, this to counter your glossy publications with its pretty misinformation. If we don’t come up with sound arguments or don’t object; then you put that down as a yes to this monstrosity. (It’s the same tactic used with our local permissions) You don’t know the arguments and you have access to the information! We will have to wait 30 years for ours. Just like the lunatic with a shot gun that wantonly destroys life, human and other animals, you turn your back on the issues surrounding npower and put the whole of humanity (And fellow creatures) at risk, for money!</p> <p>I was once threatened with a shotgun, “come here and I’ll knee cap you”, while fell running, by the local postman. He threatened my kids later while walking his dog. I’ve been threatened with men with shot guns on several occasions, and again by the post man! Blue Anchor had 12 strong arm men and 12 Alsatian dogs at Hodbarrow, numerous assaults. Their Planning Permission failed at the County Council only to be handed back by Copeland Borough Council at a closed meeting. I had to go to London for a solicitor, Wright Webb Syrett & Sons. Various Council Officials left CBC employment including their solicitor and Chief Planning Officer.</p> <p>The Garage Plan I took to Judicial Review and it was rescinded. CBC reinstated it in spite of all is obvious inaccuracies. I had difficulty getting to the meeting because I had no wheels on my car. I had to go to Sheffield for a solicitor, Erwin Mitchell.</p> <p>We had 32 car tyres slashed on two occasions in Holborn Hill.</p> <p>‘My’ MP Jamie Reed states, BBC explaining the shootings at Seascale, “this is a close nit society” (Copeland): Tell that to the developer that caused thousands of pounds worth of damage to my house while demolishing a</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Copeland Borough Council 'Conserved' building which I tried to argue is similar to, (CBC must have agreed with the Conservation because they took my work and conserved this whole area!) is historically similar and associated with, but pre- dates Lord Leaverhumes Port Sunlight. They said "now the developer will need Planning Permission to demolish! (See above) There were considerable earth tremors when the 360 pulled the two story concrete wall onto the fuel tanks, they didn't close the main street, just stood an old bod across the road to watch.</p> <p>Tell it to the thugs that terrorised this area, Millom, for thirty years. I tried to tell Mr Reed once; I took the Garage writ; after trying for ages to get an appointment with his agents; I was more or less thrown out of the Labour Party building.</p> <p>Is Mr Reed a 'driver' in this mega tip + Lakeland concreting? Should he not state an interest in this and not take part in these proceedings. I note his npower questions in the House. What committees is he or his agent on?</p> <p>Tell it to the developer that should have been controlled by Copeland Borough Council that harassed Mr H Northcote of Steel Green Terrace, Millom who subsequently died.</p> <p>The press, NWEM etc. has all the News Sheets, Free sheets, Carlisle to Grange. In writing a complaint to the Advertiser, not the NWEM, (Now under new management) my letter, in reply to their glowing report on Hodbarrow, was not published but taken to the developer Blue Anchor Cumbria Leisure by the then editor. They had me sued. I was so incensed by the harassment Mr H & S Northcote and others had received that I took the developers on. At first by myself, then, with the help of Private Eye. I have to thank Private Eye and the BBC for their rescue.</p> <p>This is not a close nit society; there are lots of ways to shut people up or to destroy their perfectly reasonable arguments, and lives. Intimidation 1984 stile is rife. W/S is so dangerous that people are vetted routinely, every day freedoms are lost and CBC gives our Amenities to the developers.</p> <p>Politics Power Intimidation. Your simple message, jobs with; what you describe as the spin off benefits. Every delusionist needs a simple message. For the fundamentalist it can be as basic as, kill the opposition, and you go to heaven. Your nuclear strategy of sweeping it all under the carpet; or chucking it over next doors wall stinks.</p> <p>Note The British state of the art stealth sub sitting high and dry while the Iranians walk around it with their mobiles. So who is watching you?</p> <p>You spent 100s of billions pounds in nuclear projects that have failed, spread radiation world wide, and, all this</p>
--	--	--

		<p>while the energy going into Windscale/Sellafield far exceeds its usable energy produced. It's so bad it's got its own gas supply; for Barrow terminal. How much did that cost? "Electricity cheaper than water" you said. But we had to wait thirty years to find the truth that Windcale was a very leaky bomb factory that had an npower station tacked onto the end of it as an after thought. A dangerous bomb factory whose reactor was not up to the job, you knowingly went outside its design limits (Fail Dangerous, the rods went in horizontally!) and very nearly blew us all to kingdom come. In short you lied to the public and they suffered for your lie. Our Council, Copeland Council could have saved us but did not; it took the nuclear, developer line, amenity to the developers.</p> <p>I recently sued Copeland Council because they lied. Come to Millom and witness the social devastation they have caused, I'll give you a guided tour. I recently asked the Police Chief Constable and Copeland to witness the damage done to this house, the Police ignored the offer; CBC came but not to see me, but with the developer to further their harassment and blame me! I haven't got a 360.</p> <p>When Mr Northcote died the Police Assistant Chief Constable stated "I have made a full enquiry into your harassment allegation". He had not, so I complained. (I was sure that no inquiry had been made because the Police had not spoken to Mr Northcotes brother. Both had lived at Hodbarrow all their lives before being harassed out of their home by Blue Anchor Cumbria Leisure Ltd and their agents. The Police had not spoken to his sister, his near neighbours or friends or Councillors, indeed, no-one.</p> <p>In the larger scheme of things, Blue Anchor is small beer, big enough to drag me through the Royal Courts but tiny in comparison to the people you intend to unleash on us. So what do you expect folk to say about your latest scam? Will you apologise if it all goes wrong.</p> <p>I note in your publication you allow your associates to print an attack on the considered opinion of an objector. This is harassment. They have not brought the World to the point of extinction, you have.</p> <p>How many countries do the potential developer companies come from? US? France? Germany? Spain? Finland? Who runs W/S? And what's their interest in making our UK</p> <p>Tip. (Minus Scotland, that don't want you their!) I note 'our' MP went to Finland! Why? Where, or more to the point, if; a nuclear tip is built, it should be a UK decision, not Cumbria decision, shouldn't it? Won't it affect us all?</p> <p>For thirty years I (And others) have been battle ling with the 'Authorities' to ensure our safety and a reasonable quality of life. We have been assaulted, two have died, been bur galled, our property stolen our cars and vehicles destroyed and damaged, windows smashed, thugs at all levels allowed to operate, encouraged,</p>
--	--	---

		<p>unrestrained, employment/pension threatened, house and business buying gazumped; we even have to suffer at the petty level; of bins (not) emptied, or into the street, access to the local tip stopped and drains not cleared, (or your drains hijacked, blocked and used by the developer as tips!) Or it may be that my five npower questions, put to the 'experts' at public 'Meeting', are not answered! Or the District Authority, responsible, doesn't turn up to the meeting; indeed they have joined forces with the developers and covered up.</p> <p>When complaints were made to the Police, they passed on our personal details to the Local Authority and, we, the Messengers were dealt with, perhaps by informing the developers. My tyres slashed twice, car damaged, gate stolen, yard door kicked in, spouse's car written off. Party wall demolished. As a result few complain and those with the resources remove the advancing crime wave. Those that remain fortify their houses; as I was told to do by the Police. Social responsibility stops now at the back yard wall.</p> <p>I cannot complain to my MP because He and His Agent(s) are, or were (And probably will be again) employed by the 'nuclear industry'. This so, they should declare and take no further part in this latest imposition.</p> <p>As an example of the level of Political ineptitude I recently sent two letters, these copied to the National Press and Chief Constable for our own safety. These relate to the asset strip of our Local Theatre, attached Park, Job Centre, and School. The latter school housed, or did, the Youth Club and CAB. Here, a small unelected Committee has decided to bypass the Town Council and join forces with the District Council and Property Developer to grab the entire above amenity, public and private, and give it, "unencumbered", to the spec developers!</p> <p>One of this committee has demolished the Harriett Trust Handicapped Centre and built a private house on the site.</p> <p>Try and find a tree in Millom? CBC has employed a tree man! Much cheaper to buy a chin saw. Having lost some of the above assets to Millom folk CBC snuck back and chain sawed the trees. CBC usual apology given.</p> <p>Security is assured?</p> <p>There is a commercial air corridor over flying all of your three Cumbria sites. If Lockerby had happened 20 minutes earlier the debris would have landed on Sellafield. You cannot shoot debris down, just whole aircraft and of cause the people in them!</p> <p>The cooling water to Sellafield from Wast Water is vulnerable to attack, so is electricity and gas, I pointed this out to 'our' local councillor; he has appeared to have blocked further emails. The same council had its fact finding lunch after deciding to accept, on our behalf, the nstation at Kirksanton!</p>
--	--	--

		<p>(Note there is no sizable fresh water source to Kirksanton other than by creating massive ecological (Including human) damage.)</p> <p>Fuel rod supply to any sites, say from "Politically Stable Australia", (RWE quote!)</p> <p>24 000+ mile round trip by sea; nuclear driven? The present ones are diesel. Remember you cannot prevent hijackings by pirates with Kalashnikov technology, and boats sink, look at the Chart for the Irish Sea.</p> <p>Perhaps from Rumania where massive ecological damage due npower mining already!</p> <p>I had a drink of brandy with a Rumanian gold miner shortly before his house was flooded with irradiated water. The town school was half submerged. They got their stability by shooting the President. And his wife. The Australians say they want their waste back! So that means 4 000 miles across land to their 'safe' store.</p> <p>It is rumoured that n waste is to safe store inside Black Combe, it riven with geological faults, huge glacial land slips and dripping with water. It is at least above present sea level which the equally geologically faulted Sellafield Repository site is not (Nor will Kirksanton or Beckermitt be,)! As storage is to run for many 1 000s of years (See Periodic Table or are you to ban that as subversive literature.) and the last Ice Age was 10 000 years ago, how will the deep freeze Repository work?</p> <p>"We will store our waste on site on surface". (Is that out now?) RWE quote. Most of the communities of Millom and Haverigg are threatened by the sea inundation. The RWE stated, intended houses of its 1000 workforce; more work for your diesel JCBs.</p> <p>There is also to be "permitted leaks to the environment". RWE quote. That's on top of the permitted and not permitted ones past and present. Chernobyl contaminated 'Welsh Hills', not Sellafield? Free after 26 years! Remember the news, it won't come here.</p> <p>Proposed for Kirksanton (And other Irish Sea Reactors)</p> <p>115 cubic meters of cooling sea water per second will enter Kirksanton. So if the pipe is one meter square, sea water will be whizzing up the pipe at 230 miles per hour! And so will anything that gets into the pipe! Like a bomb or a fisherman or his boat or the ecology of the Irish Sea. Other nations live around and about the Irish Sea and the water moves! It will egress another pipe 15 degrees hotter, presumably irradiated, and along with the part cooked chemistry of what went in. That's 750 000 tons of water/day. So you can forget your terns, sand eels, basking sharks and natterjacks and their protective Law.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>At Hodbarrow CBC allowed the developer to exterminate 10s of 1000s natterjacks.</p> <p>This is not my idea it's yours, i.e. collecting all the necessary ingredients for disaster into one place!</p> <p>The coast line will of cause be closed as will the sea to three miles out. Look at the Irish Sea Chart. It is so shallow that stealth subs have great difficulty getting under it.</p> <p>600 000 casualties at Chernobyl, more than two days to evacuate area, volunteer troops lead to their death, kids on life long medication. How many deaths at the Sellafield Bomb Factory and from its atmospheric and underground tests, American and British; the fall out?</p> <p>How do you separate a natural cancer from a fall out cancer?</p> <p>We appear to have supplied America with weapons grade material in contravention of Treaties with our Russian 'allies'! These people too, were quite sane. RWE say the French have lots of npower stations. Is our Government to sanely sink the objector's vessels in nuclear neutral harbours/countries as the French Government did?</p> <p>At Kirksanton, how long to evacuate? And for those 200yards away, how long? Good of you to tell the Prison 600 and 300 staff. And all that very rush hour traffic down that tiny road and through the envisaged (By the junior school kids; lets give them the radar gun and power to use it. The power to protect their own lives!) 20 limit! Poor kids still haven't got their "Twenties Plenty". How many have died in the energy rush to work ("jobs") and how many will die travelling to and from this 'plant'? Few workers live near. There is a standing joke here and that is to send the entire Sellafield workers home on full pay and leave nature to decommission.....</p> <p>Security; do you mean as in the Middle East where the Israeli's may bomb the Iranian npower station, as they did in Iraq. If Iran, then Egypt, Syria? Then the whole of the Middle East. For jobs.</p> <p>But you've got one why shouldn't we. What happens if Iran retaliates or gives Palestine the means too? Security as in the USSR's old nuclear arsenal, spread rotting all over its former states, the bodies of their sailors recovered by the Norwegian Navy. Security as in India and/or Pakistan and as in the Far East China and Korea? They all want to be in the Nuclear Club that you created, because with membership comes power, they think.</p> <p>Russia is to build 15 npower stations for India. China, Korea, how many more? Where is the fuel to come from? In India, a girl lost her baby and died for want of a blood transfusion.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>The infrastructure, are we to have trunk road ways and all the stress, and all its appended problems replacing the existing lanes. If so you will kill the Tourist Industry and with will go all the jobs you say will accrue from the nstation. The Prison will close and 300 jobs will go. If you don't rebuild the roads then people will die, they will die in the initial build because you will have to use the existing communications. Those most at risk will be poor the young and the elderly, as always with speculative development. As an example of this regarding roads, the small quarry here; there has been two fatal accidents and a spate of accidents caused through mixing 42 ton trucks with one ton cars. Nether of the two fatal accidents were the truck drivers fault but the car occupants are just as dead.</p> <p>RWE quote, "the railway line is not to be rerouted to the proposed nuclear site, Kirksanton, and it's not needed". This information was offered up as a reason for the waste not being removed to Sellafield and thus necessitating storage on the Kirksanton site. Of cause RWE is a private company and would have to pay for waste removal. It also has to compete with other nuclear companies so it could be more profitable not to compete but to get a bigger plot to store its waste on?</p> <p>Your so called public consultation is a sham. So stop wasting our time and lives.</p>
1135	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>Currently the geological interpretation of the West coast of Cumbria contains a number of assumptions and interpolations, as do all geological summaries. These are generally valid when discussing geological history and large scale features. However, when addressing particular points there is a need for higher resolution - more intrusive - data to be acquired. Again, assumptions will still need to be made between the sampling points (ie boreholes, rock outcrops) but the error levels in the interpretation will be reduced. It will not be possible to take samples everywhere and at all depths (which would be needed for a full understanding of the geology and hydrogeology) but having a well designed and fit for purpose survey performed to answer the specific geological questions in relation to the siting of a repository would increase the validity of the model.</p> <p>Until there is wide spread consensus within the scientific community regarding the geological interpretation it can be considered that there is not enough information. This is not to say that investigations should continue until all views are aligned - just the overwhelming majority.</p> <p>Given the importance of this process and the consequences of an inaccurate geological and hydrological model it is much more prudent to spend more time and effort at this stage than to back track later down the line. Having more then enough information and data is a much better position to be in than having just enough.</p>
1135	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	<p>Given the early stage we are at in the process there is much that may change before a final decision has to be made on whether or not to site the repository in West Cumbria. The process should be conducted in an open</p>

			<p>and democratic way and be shown to meet (or even exceed) the current best practice for planning and design. Further details should be released as further information becomes available.</p> <p>As for security, currently 36 site house high level nuclear waste all above ground. Having a single store should make monitoring and maintaining the inventory easier and more secure. Housing the waste underground will also increase security and limit the effects of any airborne contaminants if there were to be an accident.</p> <p>Given a fit for purpose geological and hydro-geological model a suitable repository can be designed and constructed. This would limit any environmental impact.</p>
1135	3 – Impacts	Yes	<p>The impacts would need to be assessed and discussed when further information becomes available, and mitigation measures need to be put in place for any negative impacts. This needs to be continually reviewed and updated so as not to become stagnant.</p> <p>West Cumbria needs investment and development and could benefit a great deal from this project - if it is done with the participation and the open consultation of the local population. There is currently a skilled nuclear work force in the local area and a great number of related jobs. This resources should be made use of and should not be allowed to slowly disappear.</p> <p>Sellafield and Drigg are both located in Cumbria and there is still a thriving tourist trade in the Lake District and Cumbria as a whole. The limited surface expression of the repository is not likely to have any more of an effect than the other nuclear sites in the area. The Sellafield visitor centre was a visitor attraction.</p> <p>But at this early stage where there is no commitment to have the repository the process should continue. When more information is available and the impacts are known with more certainty then a discussion and decision should be made.</p>
1135	4 – Community benefits	Yes	<p>The benefits package needs to be agreed prior to the final decision and needs to be binding. Tangible investment needs to be visible, such as schools or hospital investment and is also needed for the lifetime of the project - not just during the construction phase. There also needs to be benefits felt by every member of the community - such as a rebate on council tax or something similar so that every house hold directly benefits. In addition, those households closer to the disruption during the construction should also have addition benefits during the construction phase.</p>
1135	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	<p>At such an early stage it is not possible to define the final design, this is agreed.</p> <p>The design should make use of best practice and should be open to wider scrutiny - without compromising</p>

			<p>security. The open and honest discussion should continue.</p> <p>There should be several levels of fail-safe build in to the design - in essence it should be over engineered for the task. Given that this is a very long term project it should be flexible enough to allow for any unforeseen eventuality.</p>
1135	6 – Inventory	Yes	<p>The design of the repository should be flexible enough to take into account changes in the inventory.</p> <p>Given that it should be designed to accommodate the highest level waste conceivable then anything the UK has or produces in the future should be suitable for the repository - another reason for over engineering the repository in the first place.</p>
1135	7 – Siting process	Yes	<p>The process should be open and honest and should take into account the views of all sectors of the community - not just the vocal minority.</p> <p>As long as the areas interested in housing the repository have the three further stages at which they can withdraw from the process without prejudice the process can be considered suitable.</p> <p>If this right to withdraw were to be removed and commitments were required before the full investigation and consultation were to be completed then the process would not be fit for purpose.</p> <p>The process needs to continue to be open and democratic and needs to be seen to be such.</p>
1135	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Given that no commitment is required at this stage the council has nothing to loose at this stage. All stake holders in the area should take an active role in discussing the proposal and the councils should be a part of this.</p> <p>Allerdale and/or Copeland Borough Councils should continue to take part.</p>
1135	9 – Additional comments		<p>I feel that the siting of the repository would bring much needed investment to the area. The negative effects would be out weighed by the positives. During the construction phase it would bring a large number of much needed jobs to the area, making use of the skilled workforce in the area. During the operation phase the number of jobs would be less but it would still be a long term employer in the area.</p> <p>Have all of the waste housed in one place has to be more secure than 36 sites around the country.</p> <p>Underground storage is also the preferred option as long as the repository is designed so that - in the future -</p>

			the waste could be removed if need be. Environmental security should also be improved with a well designed underground storage facility.
1136	1 – Geology	No	<p>The Nirex Inquiry and David Smythe's report indicate that the geology of most if not all of West Cumbria is unsuitable for safe underground storage of nuclear waste.</p> <p>It seems a very strange coincidence that the area around Sellafield is deemed to be geologically suitable.</p>
1136	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>We have regulatory bodies at present but that doesn't stop radioactive leaks from Sellafield and a legacy of a radioactive Irish Sea.</p> <p>If local planning decisions are replaced by the IPC or MIPU by the time of any planning application, local input to the planning process would be reduced.</p> <p>I'm sure that Japan had safety systems in place but that didn't stop the disaster at Fukushima.</p> <p>I see no consideration of the environment in this section.</p>
1136	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The further development of a nuclear industry in West Cumbria would blight the whole of the county. It cannot be justifiable to risk the tourist economy of Cumbria through the continued development of nuclear power in the county. No amount of 'brand protection' will convince the public otherwise. We only need the slightest hint of a safety issue for the whole of the county to lose its income - just as happened during the foot and mouth outbreak but for far longer.</p> <p>We should be moving away from nuclear, not tying ourselves further in with it. We should be forward looking and develop industry based on renewable non-nuclear energy.</p> <p>There would be too many losers to justify going ahead with this.</p> <p>There might be a nuclear aspiration within part of the west Cumbrian urban community who currently rely on it for jobs in the absence of much else, but this does not extend to the rural community, and the impacts go far beyond the immediate communities through nuclear blight and the effects of transport to the site.</p> <p>There would also be the significant risk to the water supplies to the west coast through any contamination of groundwater.</p>

			<p>The construction and operation of a repository would lead to unacceptable traffic impacts; the location of the area, on the far side of mountains, makes it remote from the rest of the UK. Road improvements would be highly damaging, and I really cannot see the railway line being upgraded sufficiently to take the strain. Transport of nuclear waste would be hazardous whatever route is taken.</p> <p>A repository is just too hazardous to the environment and all of those who derive no direct benefit through employment to be worth considering further.</p> <p>The number of jobs likely to be created looks very small given the massive negative impacts.</p>
1136	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Where is the line between compensating a community for hosting a facility for the benefit of the nation and bribery?</p> <p>What use are community benefits compared with the risks to health and safety?</p> <p>Community benefits are highly dubious, as they distort the consideration of the impacts of the proposal.</p>
1136	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Retrievability is essential.</p>
1136	6 – Inventory	No	<p>I fundamentally disagree with the concept of burying nuclear waste (on the 'out of sight, out of mind' principle).</p> <p>It should be possible for the Government to know what it wants to bury and where it will come from.</p> <p>It is good that only UK waste is being considered.</p>
1136	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Looks reasonable, but I cannot believe that the withdrawal would really be possible once money had been spent on investigations in the area. Like so many consultations, I suspect that the Government's desired outcome would come about whatever the results of public consultation along the way.</p> <p>There should be a referendum at each withdrawal point, not just an opinion poll. This is far too serious an issue to be decided in any other way. A referendum should be across the whole of Cumbria as it affects far more than just the local community.</p>
1136	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I strongly believe that the areas covered by Allerdale and/or Copeland Borough Councils should NOT take part in a search for somewhere to put a repository.</p> <p>The risk to the tourist economy of the rest of Cumbria is too great and it would continue to tie west Cumbria into</p>

		<p>the nuclear industry, to the detriment of the county.</p> <p>It is not worth sacrificing the whole of Cumbria's economy through 'nuclear blight' for the sake of a relatively small number of jobs in west Cumbria.</p> <p>West Cumbria is too remote from the rest of the UK to be suitable for a repository as the transport issues would be highly damaging.</p> <p>The geology of the area has been found to be unsuitable following previous investigations.</p> <p>The construction and use of a repository would have an unacceptable environmental impact.</p> <p>A small fraction of the cost of the proposed investigation could secure worthwhile jobs in west Cumbria which would remove the tendency for support for nuclear power in the area in the absence of any other employment.</p> <p>The recent Fukushima disaster should have made it clear that we should be moving away from nuclear power towards a real push for reduced use of power and less wastage and the use of renewables such as wind, hydro and solar power. If a fraction of the money put into nuclear, including work of a repository, were to be put into research and development of renewable energy and into incentives for using less power then we could be heading for a truly sustainable future.</p>
1136	9 – Additional comments	<p>Do not blight Cumbria through further development of nuclear power; work towards the end of nuclear power in Cumbria.</p> <p>One hint of a radiation leak and Cumbria's tourism industry has gone. Cumbria and the Lake District have special qualities which support the tourist industry. Cumbria's industrial west coast needs good jobs but these do not need to be nuclear.</p> <p>Do not bury nuclear waste, 'out of sight, out of mind'.</p> <p>If burial is so safe, put it somewhere central in the country, or perhaps near to London. To suggest that only west Cumbria is suitable, near to an existing nuclear facility, beggars belief.</p> <p>The cost of work on a repository should be put into the development of safe renewable energy (eg. wind, wave, hydro and solar) and into the reduction of use of power. Cumbria's west coast could be at the forefront of these technologies with no risk to the other aspects of Cumbria's economy.</p>

1137	1 – Geology	No	Cumbria is geologically unsuitable. Previous studies showed that Cumbria as a whole is not suitable. Climate change, erosion and flooding, especially of coastal areas is of great concern. The likely contamination of groundwater and bacteria which could eventually enter the water cycle and food chains over a period of time are of concern
1137	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	A proper impact assessment has not yet been carried out. What has been carried out is couched in terms relating to a PR opportunity. The impact assessment must include the implications of the continued existence of current nuclear power generation, the proposed building of new nuclear reactors as well as the underground storage / disposal facility. All three must be considered jointly in terms of their potential negative impact on public health; the environment and threat to existing and future employment in the farming, food, heritage and tourism industries which jointly provide more jobs than the nuclear industry. How many jobs will be lost? Cumbria already suffers from nuclear blight and these proposals are likely to make the situation worse.
1137	3 – Impacts	No	The impacts on the whole of Cumbria, Northern England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland, Isle of Man and beyond need to be considered.
1137	4 – Community benefits	No	No community benefits package would be sufficient to overcome the potential damage to the entire county. The package is likely to be restricted to West Cumbria but the negative impact will be felt throughout Cumbria and beyond.
1137	5 – Design and engineering	No	There seems to be deliberate confusion over whether it is for storage or disposal.
1137	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
1137	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
1137	8 – Overall views on participation		The borough councils should not take part. The whole process makes no sense until there is a firm commitment to abandon the building of more nuclear reactors and to close / decommission the existing ones.
1137	9 – Additional comments		The nuclear industry is not safe, not sustainable, not financially viable and is not wanted in Cumbria. I do not want to have an underground storage / disposal facility.

1138	1 – Geology	No	We object to the fact that only West Cumbrian authorities have said they are interested and that the proposal to accept this as sufficient evidence of agreement is not anywhere near good enough. We suspect that their agreement is heavily based on maintaining West Cumbria as good area for employment for the foreseeable future and any contamination that may occur later is not their current worry. It is no wonder that other authorities don't want to get involved while there are any "stupid enough" to say yes.
1138	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	There is no guarantee that somehow "terrorists" could blow up the site.
1138	3 – Impacts	No	See answer to previous question.
1138	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	But this would not adequately overcome the security question.
1138	5 – Design and engineering	No	Nothing can be sufficiently secure to be guaranteed to remain "perfect" for thousands of years without possible damage to future residents.
1138	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	We cannot understand what this covers.
1138	7 – Siting process	No	It all comes back to or answers to 1 and 2
1138	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes but provided many other authorities also do so.
1138	9 – Additional comments		Enough said.
1139	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
1139	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
1139	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made

1140	Emailed letter	<p>I ask you to consider this letter as a formal submission to your consultation.</p> <p>I am writing to record that I am opposed to the Geological Disposal of Radioactive Nuclear Waste in Cumbria in general, and in particular in the Ward of Broughton St Bridget's, near Cockermouth which I represent within Allerdale Borough Council. My reasons are fourfold, namely:</p> <p>Democratic Responsibility</p> <p>I am unaware of anyone locally who agrees with the proposal to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste anywhere within the vicinity of Broughton St Bridget's Ward, and it is my democratic responsibility to represent those views.</p> <p>Technical & Geological</p> <p>I am aware that the overwhelming weight of expert opinion is that Cumbria is one of the inherently least suitable locations within which to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste due to its complex geology, including the behaviour of its water tables and the risk of seismic activity, both naturally caused as well as man-made as evidenced by the recent 'fracking' quake in Lancashire. As shale gas deposits have been identified in the Morecambe Bay area, any fracking' permitted to take place there would be uncomfortably close to the complex geology of Cumbria in which it is proposed to dispose of radioactive nuclear waste.</p> <p>I am also concerned that much of the technology proposed is largely untested and in particular at the scale proposed. Risks of failure over an effective lifetime of thousands of years cannot by definition have been assessed with any degree of certainty.</p> <p>If you couldn't sell your proposals on the grounds of need and safety to the 8 million electricity consumers living and working in and around London, why do you imagine that the 500,000 people living in Cumbria would agree.</p>
1141	8 – Overall views on participation	I think these areas should stop taking part in the search, and should opt out of this process ASAP.
1143	Email	I have also left a message on your voicemail. I know this is the last day of consultation and I am sorry this is so

		<p>last minute but having read the consultation document I wanted to make my opposition to the storage of high level waste underground in Cumbria clear.</p> <p>The summary part of the document says that despite the findings of NIREX in the 1990s "...that there is not enough information to show that the whole area is unsuitable" this of course means that there is not enough evidence to show that it is likely to be suitable either. Or that Cumbria is particularly more geologically suitable than other parts of the UK.</p> <p>It may seem reasonable to do more drilling and explore the possibility further but I am afraid, knowing a bit about the way large organisations work, once further exploration has started, exploration which as far as I am aware will not be taking place anywhere else in the UK, the project is unlikely to be abandoned. In other words if we agree to the exploration we are likely to get the repository, regardless of whether another location would actually be much safer.</p> <p>Hence I remain strongly opposed to the proposal of further geological exploration of the possibility of a high level underground nuclear waste repository in Cumbria.</p>
1144	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. · 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. · 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. · If a dump were to be constructed in West Cumbria, it would ruin the beautiful western landscape of the

		<p>Lake District National Park and possibly deter visitors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. · 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>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> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this letter</p>
1146	Emailed letter	<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. I grew up in the area and still visit regularly throughout the year.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. As someone who was growing up in the area at the time, I remember how long the process was - was all the time and effort to find out the scientific facts wasted? 2. 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. 3. 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>4. 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>5. 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 District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>6. 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 waste 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> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this letter</p>
1147	Emailed letter	<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>Although now retired I have considerable experience in the uses of radioactivity and ionising radiation. I carried out my PhD on the biological affects of radiation on bone marrow function, worked in Radiotherapy Physics and lectured in Medical Physics for over 20 years. Watching the film 'Into Eternity' a couple of years ago also brought home to me the responsibility we all have to the Future when we take irreversible decisions concerning the long term storage of radioactive waste, particularly high-level waste</p> <p>The present proposal is of concern not only to those of us who live in Cumbria but also to those who visit the region or have other connections with it. This not an issue only for those who live in West Cumbria.</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>- Continuing this process will either involve wasting millions on geological testing only to come to the same conclusions as was found in the past or run the risk of making an unsafe decision because those responsible feel unable to back out.</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>- This is not a decision affecting those living in Cumbria now and our children. The decision reached will affect the area for 200,000 years or more. This equals the timespan that our species has already been in existence. Any storage facility needs to 'fail safe'; can we guarantee this given Cumbria's geology?</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>- As a Director of Keswick Tourism Association and a Mountain Leader taking visitors for walks on the Fells I am particularly concerned about the effect of this project on the perceptions and opinions of visitors to the Lake District. Tourism is the basis for a majority of employment in Keswick and the surrounding area. This project puts this at risk and for the Lake District as a whole the numbers benefiting from Tourism far exceed the additional jobs created by building a nuclear waste depository</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 District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World 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>
1150	1 – Geology	No	The known characteristics of the geology of the Lake District and West Cumbria with its heavily faulted structures make it singularly unsuitable for the geological disposal of radioactive material
1150	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	With the past history of the nuclear industry in West Cumbria, one can have little confidence in the competence of decision making bodies to resist developments which can and have adversely affected the environment under pressure from the so called National Interest

1150	3 – Impacts	No	The Partnership's opinions that the scheme has overall positive benefits is self evidently flawed when it admits prospective benefit in jobs is minimal and cannot be dedicated to local employment.
1150	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	There is no consideration of the community benefits package from not hosting the potential facility and being able to live sustainably without this monstrous scheme blighting every aspect of life
1150	5 – Design and engineering	No	It must be quite straightforward to present a likely design scenario for the public to judge its impacts on particular sample areas in the locality
1150	8 – Overall views on participation		They should not take part in the search after the last survey was so signally against any repository
1151	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
1151	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	Opinions too legalistic and long-winded.
1151	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
1151	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
1151	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Need to know a lot more about the specific site before cash do this.
1152	1 – Geology	Yes	I think the explanation of how you have arrived at your conclusion seems entirely plausible and reasonable.
1152	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	I don't like to sit on the fence and I appreciate the efforts in your literature to be clear, but I feel do not feel able to make a sensible and worthy judgment on the Partnership's initial opinions.
1152	3 – Impacts	No	It seems to me that the level of uncertainty regarding the impacts, is too high at this stage. I think the Partnership should be seeking greater confidence.
1152	4 – Community benefits	No	This bit really worries me because there are no firm commitments. On the other hand, it would be very early to expect them. I just would want some government commitment of the mechanism. It really all pales into insignificance though against the importance of the geological issues.

1152	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	I just cannot answer this. Not qualified to make a worthy judgement. Sorry.
1152	6 – Inventory	Yes	I am happy to accept your judgment on this matter.
1152	7 – Siting process	No	I am amazed with the right to opt out at any time and actually I find it hard to believe that this right can hold. Consequently I find I cannot agree. Not because it is a 'bad deal' but in a sense because I believe it is such a good deal that it cannot be true. Kind of perverse logic in there.
1152	8 – Overall views on participation		I am not against taking part in such a search but I do so with a huge degree of anxiety. I feel totally unqualified to understand the geological issues, I feel very nervous that notwithstanding the pull out options that this may become on a roll and almost that the open ended pull out option is too good to hold. Most of all I feel very anxious that this massive decision will ultimately be taken by politicians who necessarily only have a window of maybe 4 years or at most 8 too look forward whilst this is a decision that impacts over many decades if not centuries. Now the trouble is that I can think of no satisfactory solution to that conundrum of democracy.
1152	9 – Additional comments		I really give you credit on your consultation. Nobody can say with any legitimacy that they don't know about this process and consultation.
1153	1 – Geology	Yes	It is important that the Geology continues to be properly investigated by people with an open mind, and I note that the partnership's opinions show that they are continuing to consult a range of experts, which is as it should be. Those who argue that the whole of West Cumbria is unsuitable appear to be putting forward what they want to believe rather than what is supported by the evidence.
1153	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I have read chapter 5 of the report and believe the arguments and conclusions to be reasonable and logical.
1153	3 – Impacts	Yes	The development of a long term repository appears to me to be preferable to the status quo, and has the potential to bring significant economic benefits to West Cumbria. It is, however, absolutely essential that necessary improvements in infrastructure, particularly transport infrastructure but also housing, medical services, and education are designed, approved, and implemented on

			a phased basis which ensures they are delivered in time to ensure that the local economy can cope with the work which would be needed to build a repository.
1153	4 – Community benefits	Yes	For the reasons given in my response to Chapter Six, a community benefits package is essential because there will be an adverse impact unless significant improvements in infrastructure are made. Clearly the exact nature of this package will need to be the subject of wide consultation when detailed proposals are made
1153	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	It is too early to say very much about design or engineering at this stage. But I find the partnership comments logical. My only other comment is that it would also be quite difficult for the design of an underground repository not to look better than the present storage arrangements !
1153	6 – Inventory	Not answered	I don't have a comment on this because the initial opinions in the document are extremely general.
1153	7 – Siting process	Yes	I am broadly in agreement with what is written. As someone who thinks it is likely that I will support a repository I nevertheless consider that to be absolutely certain that the local community is carried with the project, there should be a plebiscite in the borough area or areas containing the proposed repository as part of the consultation process.
1153	8 – Overall views on participation		I consider that it would be irresponsible not to continue with the process. We already have the nuclear waste here, and it is not going away unless we find somewhere else to put it. Too many objectors to the process talk as if the waste would magically disappear if the MRWS process were abandoned. We owe it to future generations to continue the investigation into the best solution for the country and for West Cumbria.
1155	Letter		PROPOSED NUCLEAR DUMP IN WEST CUMBRIA I am deeply concerned about the above which is entirely unsuitable for the following reasons:- 1. The Nirex Inquiry which cost £400m appears to be over-riden. This was an evidence based research that found the geology unsuitable. There are also problems with the hydrogeology. Think of Japan.

		<p>2. The scale of the proposed project is staggering. It would be enormous. It would create vast amounts of waste 'spoil' from digging out tunnels and vaults. The radioactive waste involved includes thousands of tonnes of highly radioactive spent fuel and is of key concern.</p> <p>3. The plans, if carried out, present a significant risk to the environment and economic well-being of the Lake District National Park and possibly deter visitors. Tourism is your greatest industry. The numbers of jobs that could be lost to tourism far outweighs the number gained by creation of the dump. Farming could also be affected detrimentally. It could also prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>4. Nowhere in the world is there an operating repository for the kind of waste proposed in West Cumbria. The project is unique in its intention to bury high-level radio-active waste, spent nuclear fuel and intermediate-level waste from all past, present and future activities.</p> <p>5. There is significant risk in moving this highly dangerous waste around the country.</p> <p>6. Yorkshire is your next door neighbour and could be affected if there were an accident.</p> <p>I hope that the National Park will say NO to Geological Disposal in West Cumbria. I am a regular visitor to the Park. It is one of my favourite places and it should be preserved for future generations.</p>
1161	Email	<p>I firmly believe the 3 Councils to move to the next stage in the process. Without a definitive answer to the geology of West Cumbria no one can make a logical, reasoned judgement whether to accept a repository or not. In my opinion not to allow the Councils to take part in the search may be denying future generations a prosperous future and leave them with an unenviable legacy.</p> <p>The Sellafield workforce have created, packaged, managed and stored nuclear waste for nearly 60 years, the workforce better than anyone understand the need for safety, security, and the possible consequences of not treating the materials with the respect they deserve. I see the workforce and their representatives as being one of the major stakeholders in the what ever decision is made, and should continue to be involved.</p> <p>I say YES the Councils should take part in the search.</p>
1164	Letter	<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</p>

		<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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>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>
1165	Emailed letter	<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>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1166	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1167	Email	<p>I have just this evening seen the advertisement about this consultation, on a phone box in Keswick.</p> <p>I have just attempted to wade through all the information on the 120+ pages of this consultation document and even though I have a chemistry degree and taught chemistry for a number of years, I find this so complicated that the non science specialist will not have a clue what it is all about.</p> <p>In addition I cannot find the pages where I am supposed to give my answers to the questions indicated in the document. It also seems that the design of the questions makes an straightforward answer virtually impossible.</p> <p>Therefore I feel I must simply say that myself and my wife are against the depositing of any nuclear waste in West Cumbria, or indeed anywhere in Cumbria.</p>

1168	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1169	Email	<p>Lets get building a repository and more nuclear power stations and get rid of those terrible blights on our landscape which only fill the pockets of overseas companies and have a 29% efficiency. WIND TURBINES</p>

1170	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1171	Emailed letter	<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</p>

		<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1172	Emailed letter	<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>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1173	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1174	Emailed letter	<p>Please take this email 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1175	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1176	Emailed letter	<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 waste facility - 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would to

		<p>be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>I ask the decision making bodies responsible not to make a 'decision to participate' to go forward to the stage of siting a nuclear waste facility in West Cumbria</p>
1177	Emailed letter	<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 is not an issue only for those who live in West Cumbria. This is why I am writing to express my concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *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. *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. *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. *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. *I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. *Nowhere in the world is there an operating repository for the kind of waste proposed in West Cumbria. This

		<p>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>
1179	9 – Additional comments	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>I ask the decision making bodies responsible not to make a 'decision to participate' to go forward to the stage</p>

			of siting a nuclear dump in West Cumbria
1180	Emailed letter		<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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 Wold Heritage Site. • 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>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>

1181	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1182	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • over 150 years. • 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. • 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. • 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 District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1183	Emailed letter	<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>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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. Leave all the nuclear waste where it is, above ground at Sellafield where it can be monitored and shielded like Chernobyl. <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>
1184	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 &

		<p>hydrogeology of W Cumbria and it has been concluded it is not a suitable region for a nuclear dump.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1185	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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

		<p>spent fuel - is of key concern. The operations may continue for over 150 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1186	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1187	Emailed letter	<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 District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World 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>
1188	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 tons of highly radioactive spent fuel - is of key concern. The operations may continue for over 150 years. • 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. • 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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 radio waste from all past, present and future nuclear activities. <p>I ask the decision making bodies responsible not to make a 'decision to participate' to go forward to the stage of sighting a nuclear dump in West Cumbria</p>
1189	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>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>
1190	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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> <p>In addition to the above comments I would wish to raise the issue of a lack of governance at national and local political level re all the consultations about energy policy, new build nuclear power stations and the proposal to dump toxic nuclear waste in West Cumbria. I suggest that the information being used by local and national politicians on which to base their decisions is compromised and ask that clear unambiguous information is provided to the public to show how such decisions are being made, in a form that is understandable.</p>
1191	Emailed letter	<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, but for those of who live in the North West. This is why I am writing to express my concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. Many of my German friends already are resistant to the idea of holidaying in the Lake District because of Sellafield. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>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>
1192	Emailed letter	<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 where I plan to visit in the near future as a tourist.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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.

			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
1193	Emailed letter		<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>

1194	Emailed letter	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1195	Emailed letter	<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</p>

		<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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>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>
1196	Emailed letter	<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>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • 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. • I support the view that the combined impact of the above and below-ground operations of this dump would be likely to have significant negative impacts on the Lake District National Park and could prevent the Park becoming a World Heritage Site. • 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>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>
1197	Emailed letter	<p>Please accept this document as my response to the MRWS Partnership's Initial Opinions Public Consultation document Nov 2011 to Mar 2012.</p> <p>Regrettably, I do not agree with any of them.</p> <p>It is noticeable that the Partnership is made up of individuals and bodies dependant on the Nuclear Industry for their jobs or commercial activities and are therefore pro-nuclear. The only two Cumbrian Councils wanting the dump have most representatives and also have a second bite of the cherry by being the only two Councils represented by the Cumbrian Association of Local Councils, (CALC).</p>

		<p>The MRWS Partnership exists to advise the 3 Councils expressing an interest, ie. Allerdale, Copeland and Cumbria County Council. This means they are advising themselves and as such the outcome is a foregone conclusion.</p> <p>It is of particular concern to me that the opinions of the majority of the residents of Cumbria are of no account and are to be ignored.</p> <p>The Partnership is using three indicators to move forward to the next stage of the siting process. This will be done by means of an opinion poll conducted by telephone calls to a thousand people in Allerdale, a thousand people in Copeland and a thousand people in the rest of Cumbria. If this loading in West Cumbria's favour is not enough, the opinions of the majority of people, which is the rest of Cumbria, are to be ignored when it comes to indicator 3, page 108. This is the only indicator which is taken into consideration when deciding to move forward to the next stage of site selection and it says "this indicator will only apply to West Cumbria and the views of people living in the rest of Cumbria will only be taken into account on indicators 1 and 2.</p> <p>This should ensure a net support for continuing, as only the survey of people in Copeland and/or Allerdale, who mostly have connections to the Nuclear Industry, will be considered.</p> <p>It is things like this that make the whole MRWS Consultation worthless. It has not even been considered, that under the proposed new boundary changes parts of Cumbria such as Windermere, Grasmere etc., who have no interest in being host to a nuclear dump, may find they have had no control over the issue if they are amalgamated, as proposed, with Copland.</p> <p>To conclude I would ask Cumbria County Council to remember that they represent the whole of Cumbria, which relies on tourism and farming for its economy, which will be blighted by the imposition of a nuclear waste dump.</p> <p>The MRWS Partnership is a PR exercise for the Nuclear Industry in West Cumbria.</p>
1198	Letter	<p>This letter is to express the opinion of this household relating to the proposed nuclear waste repository in West Cumbria.</p> <p>Our opinion is that the search should NOT include West Cumbria.</p> <p>Reasons include: the widespread and total disintegration of the environment as it is now, and as we chose to spend our working life and retirement years in.</p>

			<p>From a safety aspect, if the construction did go ahead and was brought into use, nobody can rule out the possibility of a natural disaster or human error, (examples exist). We are as vulnerable here as anywhere in the world.</p> <p>From a moral aspect, we believe our generation should not create this problem that is at present unsolvable, for future generations.</p> <p>From a personal aspect, experience of the previous exploratory work in this area proved that even hole boring is far from silent and causes vibration. We were subjected to this 24/7 for many months and it caused considerable distress. A repeat of that followed by construction of the project would render probably the rest of our lives intolerable.</p>
1199	Letter		<p>I am extremely concerned about the proposal to site a massive nuclear dump in W. Cumbria. In the 1990s the Secretary of State for the Environment - and many experts since - have emphasised that Cumbria's geology is not suitable for such a repository.</p> <p>I am also appalled at the prospect of new power stations being built in the area and what the consequences of that might be.</p> <p>Please reconsider.</p>
1200	Letter		<p>I would like to right and object to the proposal for increasing the nuclear deposit in our area. After reading the data produced all round, the rock structure and economics of the area I think this would be a very bad idea and destroy our history and heritage, for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>I have voted labour in the past, I am not a political person, but because of the political situation at the moment I feel I cannot support this proposal, even for more jobs locally!</p> <p>If this is deemed to go ahead by the local council, I will withdraw my support to the labour movement and hopefully move away!</p>

Appendix A: ID 1109 – Full response (see separate document)