

User ID	Question	Agree	Response
201	1 – Geology	Yes	I agree with the article as it has only given an initial assessment, verified by independant specialists, it confirms that further analysis would be required and appears accurate in its assessment.
201	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Understand the demand for future build but believe this is within the appropriate controls of the various regulatory bodies.
201	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
205	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
205	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
205	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
205	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
205	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
205	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
205	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
207	Email		most of cumbria is on green belt land and burying nuclear waste under it will only result in protests. likley to be violent, knowing what green peace are like. DUMP IT UNDER LONDON INSTEAD
208	1 – Geology	Yes	The study work carried out sets out how much land is not suitable for repository and points out that the land

			remaining is adequate for the range of estimates. The study is balanced and the use of 2 independent professionals gives confidence that the process is not biased or prejudiced.
208	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The programme is being exceptionally open about the whole process including mature acceptance that at this stage there is little knowledge about the exact R&D required.
208	3 – Impacts	Yes	The socio-economic impacts and acceptability to generations of nuclear workers make West Cumbria a suitable recipient for the repository provided the geology is right. Most families in the area understand radiation and the context of natural and man made radiation. Knowledge overcomes irrational fear which may be present in other communities.
208	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Yes at this early stage it is unrealistic to have the detail on the table and the consultation recognises future negotiation as a key point of detail to move forward.
208	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	I would like to see "Retrievability" as a mandatory requirement with the option to backfill later. Your proposal seems to set this as an option which makes me worried that it becomes a cost benefit argument. The science and uncertainty of waste behaviours should drive the issue. Your diagram shows large area for high level wastes and smaller areas for ILW. I would have thought ILW will take a larger proportion hence the proposal seemed misleading.
208	6 – Inventory	Yes	I am pleased the study is working with ranges of materials and has decision points to agree whether future types of waste would be accepted. This is a key step.
208	7 – Siting process	Yes	Although the process does recognise that the voluntary nature of the process makes for a difficult decision making process.
208	8 – Overall views on participation		The area should definitely be included as the workforce and local population have a mature understanding of nuclear safety and radiation. Therefore the local population is less likely to react to scare stories. The retrievability of waste should be made a mandatory feature until it can be proven otherwise.
208	9 – Additional comments		No further comment.
209	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made

209	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
209	3 – Impacts	Yes	I believe that West Cumbria is the center of Nuclear expertise in the UK and is an ideal location for long-term storage. The UK owes it to West Cumbria to keep work local too.
209	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
209	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
209	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
209	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
209	8 – Overall views on participation		Both councils should be fully involved with the intention of their wanting to pick up this important and beneficial work.
210	1 – Geology	Yes	Evidence provided means Cumbria is suitable. Transportation of radioactive materials is reduced also if kept within our boundaries
210	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Cumbria is used to transporting Radioactive materials, and we have the best security available (CNC)
210	3 – Impacts	Yes	Great detail has gone into this study, time now to make a move on getting it done.
210	4 – Community benefits	Yes	gree but i still think more could be done for local villages that will be nearer.
210	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	There the experts in this field.
210	6 – Inventory	Yes	Better underground stored correctly then above and open to all sorts of interferences

210	7 – Siting process	Yes	People from this area accept Nuclear industry and benefits and implications.
210	8 – Overall views on participation		Why waste time , effort and money when this has already been done
210	9 – Additional comments		get it built , it benefits Cumbria as a whole. but the road network is something that could be possibly upgraded.
211	1 – Geology	Yes	From the report the geology appears stable. The most important part is the construction of the repository boundaries which must ensure the criteria for safe storage is retained for the lifetime of the facility
211	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Following the principles is important. these security arrangements already in place on the local sellafeld site are effective. similar arrangements on the new facility should be included. Safety of the west cumbrian population means safety of the UK. operational arrangements must be clarified to understand the safety arrangements for the facility. the principles of protecting the population through appropriate assessment of risk coupled with protection controls is normal business for the current nuclear industries. Remember it is usually human error which causes disasters.
211	3 – Impacts	Yes	The nuclear industry is reliant on the current west cumbrian resources to retain safety of material. the industry experts currently make up a significant portion of the current population. Continued investment in this workforce will mean the impact is no larger than it is now.
211	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	Why try to buy the location ?. the benefits of nuclear power generation are seen by all on a day to day basis. Obviously improvements in infrastructure will be needed to support the transport of material to the repository. This should not be the reason for the most appropriate siting. Safety must be number 1 consideration. I have lived in West cumbria all my life..... without the nuclear industry i wouldnt have my current lifestyle. trying to buy a community is morally wrong.
211	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	We must ensure we learn from those who are already ahead of the UK in this game. Taking the positives and repeating but learning from issues. dont try to make bespoke arrangements just because we are british. We have suffered from this in the past. Take the learning and steal with pride.
211	6 – Inventory	Yes	I agree with the storage of HLW and ILW, I would like to take the opportunity to flag here that a decision on

			storage of spent fuel needs carefull consideration. The value of U and Pu chnages.....natural resources are not infinite..... reprocessing of spent fuel should be the option of choice due to the economic recovery of U coupled with the reduction in volume of waste which then needs to be stored. Investment in reprocessing now would significantly reduce the cost of repository build in the future.....we are curently being very short sighted in my view..... Time to make the right decision for the UK is now wit the current view that the reprocessing capability of the UK will cease in 2018....this will leave 67 years of spent fuel to go to store..... considering the UK nuclear power generation is only reaching that age now.....what volume of spent fuel will be made in the next 67 years ? THORP alone will have reprocessed somewhere around 7000 te U when it closes. That a lot of storage space needed
211	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	As said earlier safety of the UK has to be the overriding priority.location/design and management of safety within the facility have to be assessed before the true location can be decided.
211	8 – Overall views on participation		Cost has to be assessed. Why spend money if the answer is going to be no. Start with the population..The true population !!!!!..seek their views..... but dont waste time and effort where not required.
211	9 – Additional comments		Please dont try to buy a community..build this in the right place for the right reasons For most of us this doesnt matter....use the people it really matters to to help make the decision... anyone over 35 probably wont be around..... talk to the guy'sin their 20's. Its really their opinions that count... this is one decision that really needs to be focussed.
212	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
212	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
212	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
212	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
212	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
212	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made

212	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
214	1 – Geology	No	There are too many unknowns, is the facility going to be 200 metres or 1000 metres. Is the rock formation suitable?
214	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
216	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
216	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
216	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
216	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
216	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
216	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
216	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
218	1 – Geology	Yes	I am happy that some areas have obviously been excluded and believe that until further investigations have been completed, it is not possible to exclude the whole of West Cumbria. No one at this stage has sufficient information to either exclude or include the remaining area of West Cumbria, and so we must remain open minded.
218	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I am however concerned that the Lake District National Park Authority will - irrespective of the evidence and local support for the repository - vote against any such repository because of NIMBYs and fear on the potential impact on tourism. Tourism doesn't provide jobs and financial security for West Cumbria, but the nuclear industry does, but the Authority do not care about jobs for local people, they want Cumbria to be kept as an outdoor museum.

218	3 – Impacts	Yes	The nuclear industry has for many decades brought prosperity to the areas. We cannot 'undo' the past, we are too reliant on this industry, therefore we need embrace nuclear, to expand it and become a centre of excellence where industry is confident to invest and to provide additional jobs.
218	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I agree with the principles but I'm not convinced that the community will receive a 'sufficient' benefits package and think that the package should be outlined sooner rather than later. People need to see that benefits will be brought to the area at an early stage.
218	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Local infrastructure needs to be sorted out first unlike when Thorp was being built and the Hensingham and Egremont bypasses were built later rather than in time for the main construction traffic.
218	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	Physically there is no reason why plutonium should not go into the repository, however ethically I believe plutonium should be recycled into new MOX or fast reactor fuel. Plutonium is energy rich and this energy should not be discarded by placing it underground.
218	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	I agree on the principle of seeking opinions on the siting, however it all seems a very long winded process that looks like it will take for ever! I think the process needs to be more timely and therefore hopefully save a little money and get to a point where we might actually get down to making a decision on this repository otherwise all the people you initially consulted on will be dead and buried and it will be their children's views you will have to go back on and consult a second time !!!
218	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes they should take part in the process to seek a site for a repository. The waste is here, the expertise is here and the nuclear industry support is here. If its not going to be here it will never be built, so lets press on with the process and try not to waste too much money in the process.
218	9 – Additional comments		I think that the process over is very thorough but I'm extremely concerned that it is far too long and that we'll never get to a decision. I agree that people need to be consulted but to be honest do they need all the detail, most people are just too busy or disinterested.
219	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
222	1 – Geology	Yes	Seems well researched

222	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
222	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
222	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
222	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
222	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
222	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
222	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes - they should take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository
224	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
224	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
224	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
224	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
224	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
224	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
224	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
224	8 – Overall views on participation		Right thing to do

227	1 – Geology	Yes	The survey carried out by the BGS and independently reviewed by two experts being used as the foundation for the report, taking on board the comments from stakeholders and the fact that they are promoting further surveys of the remaining land that could possibly be investigated.
227	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The correct levels of interaction with the regulatory bodies and R&D.
227	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	Not to sure about what are the negative effects of the repository.
227	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I do believe that we have to manage the process with central government, trust is also my issue.
227	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	To many uncertainties until the location of the site is known.
227	6 – Inventory	Yes	Yes I think we know enough about what will go into the store.
227	7 – Siting process	Yes	The ability to withdraw from the process is already available if needed.
227	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes we should continue to look into this, I think that the underground approach is still the safest solution for final disposal.
227	9 – Additional comments		I have trust issues with the government regarding the benefits package, given the current financial state if this were to be repeated whilst the store was being developed where would this leave us? As part of the West Coast Energy, why can't investment take place during the 15 year planning process?
228	1 – Geology	Yes	A detailed study has been undertaken; it is good that suitable and unsuitable areas have been identified.
228	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	IT seems suitably robust plans have been put in place - that will demonstrate if the job can be done safely
228	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	It seems there would be great financial benefits to the community, some of which are covered in this information. No doubt there would be further reaching impacts; probably more positive than detailed here.
228	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/	More details would be beneficial; but I dare say what ever is agreed on would be huge benefit to the

		Partly	communities
228	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	Again more detail would be needed to form a full view - however no doubt a safe design and engineered facility would be put up.
228	6 – Inventory	Yes	Seems a reasonable assessment, and covers contingency of scenarios etc
228	7 – Siting process	Yes	Seems a reasonable approach for all involved
228	8 – Overall views on participation		I think the local communities should embrace the opportunity and look to investigate the feasibility of having the facility here
229	1 – Geology	Yes	The initial investigation was a limited one and therefore should only be used as an indication of suitability. As the initial investigation concluded that there is not enough information to discount the whole of West Cumbria, it is logical to progress to the next stage and do a more in-depth study of the area's suitability.
229	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Regulatory input is large within the Nuclear industry, the ONR and EA are praised as being strict and independent, they wield the necessary power to enforce regulations and legislation (Ask anyone who has the pleasure of working with them). Because of this I do not believe it would be possible to build a repository if the ONR/EA did not deem it acceptably safe (an example of their rigor is the current new build design acceptance process).
229	3 – Impacts	Yes	I believe that the overall impact of the repository would be positive. As stated a lot of the economy is based upon the nuclear industry, recently it was claimed that Sellafield directly employs 8% of the local population, and that then directly impacts other businesses (e.g. suppliers, supermarkets). As the Sellafield life time plan shows both reprocessing plants with closed by the end of the decade, it makes sense to take on projects such as the repository as it matches the skill sets of the area.
229	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
229	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	It is obviously too soon for any sort of detailed design, and good that the Partnership realises this.
229	6 – Inventory	Yes	Most of the existing waste that would go into the repository is already held in West Cumbria, at Sellafield and Drigg. So there really isn't much of a difference.

229	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
229	8 – Overall views on participation		I believe that the councils should take part in the search for a suitable site for the repository, it has the potential to have a large positive impact on the area, and as there is not commitment to host it, what is there to lose?
230	1 – Geology	Yes	There currently is not enough information to form an opinion on regarding the suitability of west cumbria as a potential repository. Clearly more detailed investigation needs to be undertaken and the findings reviewed by persons with non biased opinions.
236	1 – Geology	Yes	I strongly agree it is essential that the radioactive inventory is appropriately contained behind both engineered and geological barriers. West Cumbria has the nuclear expertise best placed to provide the engineered solution. I also believe the rock formations within the area are ideally suited geologically and are local to where the waste is currently stored thus reducing the hazards associated with high level nuclear waste transportation.
236	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I am in total agreement, with regard to the hazardous nature of the waste it is essential that all stakeholders are engaged from the start especially Regulatory and planning bodies thus ensuring a robust Safety Case is developed and adhered to.
236	3 – Impacts	Yes	I agree with all three statements. It is very important that all direct impacts the repository will have on the local community and environment are assessed and the risks prioritised, then appropriate processes can be developed to start mitigating against the high level negative impacts.
236	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I believe it is very important to gather stakeholder opinion when considering the benefits a waste repository could bring to the local community, however these additional benefits must not be at the expence of the necessary 'business as usual' funding.
236	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	I agree entirely, the initial design concept must not rule out the option to retrieve the waste from storage at a later date. Future engineering technology may be developed that would allow for the waste to be reprocessed to a point where the hazard is removed or at least reduced.
236	6 – Inventory	Yes	I agree, it is important for the community to know what the basics of the inventory and are kept informend of any major changes to the initial commitment. I woul like to presume a Regulatory body would be in place to authorise any change methodology.

236	7 – Siting process	Yes	I agree with this in principle, however gaining community opinion through say a poll could prove difficult to gauge and enter the world of NIMBYism
236	8 – Overall views on participation		I believe some firm degree of commitment should be gained as early as practicable, if not this process could again end up a costly waste of time and tax payers money which could have been better spent on other necessary areas within the Cumbria community.
236	9 – Additional comments		I strongly believe West Cumbria is the most practicable place in the UK to site the repository, the positives far outweigh the negatives here, As previously mentioned it is a well known fact that the Nuclear Engineering expertise has its base in West Cumbria and where not surprisingly the majority of the high level waste is currently stored. It would seem appropriate to site a new repository as near as practicable to the old to reduce the hazards with respect to transportation and security. Its basically I think about balance of risk here, and where else in the UK is more suited than the area being discussed here, none I think ! Benefits
237	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
237	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
237	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
237	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
237	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
237	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
237	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
237	8 – Overall views on participation		They Should take part

238	1 – Geology	No	There are uncertainties about the suitability of West Cumbria's geology and the prospects of finding a site for a repository that meets regulatory requirements. Aren't there places where the geology is suitable which should therefore be considered first?
238	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	A GDF must have a negative impact on the Lake District and its "brand".
238	3 – Impacts	No	<p>Compensation for property blight must be provided. Under BP's programme, residents in the offsite area could sell their home to BP for 100 percent of its appraised value and receive a moving allowance. In addition, BP offered home improvement grants for those who chose not to sell their property</p> <p>As an example average property is likely to drop 20-25% where the property is within 100 metres of a telecommunication installation, or of a high powered cable network installation.</p> <p>Often the threat of a development will have a more significant impact than the presence of one. The Zone thus contains a number of 'potentially affected neighbourhoods' due to excavation of spoil, transport activities and disposal in the designated facilities.</p> <p>In the case of the MRWS process, Stage 4 only involves non-intrusive examination of a number of potential candidate sites. This means that it will be necessary to include the whole of West Cumbria within an initial PVP 'zone of influence', apart from those areas excluded by the BGS screening exercise. It will therefore be necessary to agree at an early point the form of the potential impact upon property prices etc. that might be included in any proposed Stage 4 PVP, as this is likely to include planning blight and concerns amongst those considering purchasing or renting properties within the whole of the potential siting area. Only when and if a final site is selected will it be possible to agree a more focussed AVP Zone.</p>
238	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The research and strategy to protect the brand and reputation of the area is not yet complete so how can we comment on this potential non-benefit?</p> <p>Box 20: Examples of community benefits in other countries - is misleading when "...we cannot be certain what specific package the Government might agree to this far in advance and, therefore, whether the amount and type of these benefits would match the expectations of local people". There may be no community benefits.</p> <p>No other communities have volunteered, suggesting that they consider whatever the benefits they are outweighed by the disadvantages.</p>
238	5 – Design and engineering	No	Doesn't appear to be much design and engineering described to form any meaningful opinion.

			How will the decay heat be removed?
238	6 – Inventory	No	The 2010 estimates are based on spent fuel arisings based upon 10GW from 4 x AP1000 and 4 x EPR operating for 60 years. I believe that this estimate has now nearly doubled in less than 2 years.
238	7 – Siting process	No	<p>The Decision-Making Body will be responsible for exercising the RoW, based on advice and recommendations from the local Community Siting Partnership. The term "partnership", based on current experience, refers to a group of people with a vested interest in progressing the project. There will be no credible challenge. People will need to understand the role and objectives of the "partnership" especially if it doesn't include a balance of opinions.</p> <p>In the case of the MRWS process, Stage 4 only involves non-intrusive examination of a number of potential candidate sites. This means that it will be necessary to include the whole of West Cumbria (assuming all three Local Authorities agree to participate) within an initial PVP 'zone of influence', apart from those areas excluded by the BGS screening exercise. It will therefore be necessary to agree at an early point the form of the potential impact upon property prices etc. that might be included in any proposed Stage 4 PVP, as unlike the Canadian examples, where a specific site already existed, this is likely to include planning blight and concerns amongst those considering purchasing or renting properties within the whole of the potential siting area.</p>
238	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>There should be a commitment NOT to have a repository UNTIL the design, location, safety, geology etc issues have been addressed.</p> <p>There should be hold-points to break the momentum and allow people to take stock.</p>
238	9 – Additional comments		<p>I believe that a GDF will solve the problem of waste disposal.</p> <p>How can the process be described as a "search" when it is limited to West Cumbria? It is a national problem that should have a national search. Most of the waste is likely to come from the new-build reactors e.g. Sizewell, Hinkley Point, Wylfa, Oldbury etc.</p>
239	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
239	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made

239	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
239	5 – Design and engineering	No	I feel that there is still much to do here. The devil will be in the detail.
239	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
239	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
239	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes, they should take part.
239	9 – Additional comments		It is my view that nuclear workers recognise the importance of finding a solution for long term disposal of nuclear waste as being key to the future at Sellafield and for new build. West Cumbria is the centre for nuclear expertise in the UK today and we need to keep it that way and take forward discussions about being the host community for safe, retrievable storage. Not only will this be a key enabler for new nuclear and provide a safe, long term solution for waste, but it will bring hundreds of new jobs and many millions of pounds of additional investment to West Cumbria.
242	1 – Geology	Yes	Having worked on the Nirex project in the 1990's as a site chemist for the contractor that analysed the borehole samples I am aware of the large amount of information already gathered - particularly around the Longlands Farm area but also the fact that we need to build on this and seek out the best place for the future. What has been done in the report seems a sensible no biased approach.
242	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The repository will be a sensitive issue and it is important that all the correct procedures are shown to have been followed. Something that appeared to be missing in the arrogant approach of Nirex in the 1990's.
242	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
242	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	This section did not tell me much.
242	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
242	6 – Inventory	Yes	Clear document.

242	7 – Siting process	Yes	I understood the process after this.
242	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>West Cumbria is unique in the UK due to its heavy involvement in the nuclear industry. Thousands of jobs depend on this industry and a large amount of goodwill is present because of these jobs, partly because the residents understand how safe this industry is.</p> <p>The Sellafield site contains the vast proportion of the nuclear waste present in the UK. It would seem eminently sensible that this waste be deposited as close as possible to where it is currently stored. Of course this would depend on several factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The local geology is suitable. -The majority of the local residents are supportive (all of the local area not just Gosforth). -And given that the local infrastructure is already strained and there is proposed new nuclear build which will also add to the pressure, then investment in road and rail must be committed to by national government before this can go ahead. <p>Finally permanently depositing the waste underground has to be better than storing it above ground in buildings.</p>
250	1 – Geology	Yes	I agree we should look further into a Cumbrian repository. Cumbria holds a great deal of waste which is difficult to store but more importantly difficult to transport. Transportation of any form will involve risk to the public and will invite terrorist interest.
250	2.1 & 2.2 – Safety, security, environment and plannin	Yes	Whatever form a store will take it is only temporary. The waste held at Sellafield will be hazardous for thousands of years. No one can hope to create a store that is guaranteed to last that long
250	3 – Impacts	Yes	The impact of transporting the waste to another site seems to have been overlooked. The road network is poor.
250	4 – Community benefits	Not answered	The Cumbrian workforce has dwindled over the years with the rundown of Sellafield. The new Nuclear build will be a huge benefit to the community as will the repository if successful.
250	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	none
250	6 – Inventory	Not answered	It's better to store the waste underground rather than on the surface

250	7 – Siting process	No	none
250	8 – Overall views on participation		Answered previously
250	9 – Additional comments		None
252	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
252	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Howeverr no where in the report does it out line any benifits the we as West Cumbrias would gain from having the repository
252	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	Again what are we West Cumbrians going to gain from this better infra structur, world class hospital
252	4 – Community benefits	No	You do not say what it is how much money would be available to us West Cumbrias, this must be decide, agreed and set in stone. As we have seen in recent years with the ConDem Government cutting 10 million from the West Cumberland hospital project. We have been the second class citizens for too long and we must gain something from the repository being in our back yard
252	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
252	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	As DECC do not give any assurance only presumption I can not give a yes or no
252	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
252	8 – Overall views on participation		They shuold take part in the process but they must insist on a benifits package for the whole of west cumbria, any monies identified must be ring fenced and only used for projects that are goingto benefit the Whole of west Cumbria

254	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
254	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
254	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
254	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
254	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
254	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
254	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
255	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>There has been independant review of the integrity of the report by independant reviewers following several rounds of comments and ammendments.</p> <p>Initial focus of reviews to date have been to highlight which areas could not be used and that these have taken into account not just the geological aspects of the rock but also that they contain facilities or other resources that may be required in the future.</p>
257	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
257	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
257	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
257	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
257	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made

257	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
257	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
259	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>First opinion of the waste management of nuclear waste deposits. At ground level and underground. For long term storage of 50 years or so said to be radio-active. The initial site of Keekle Head opposite to my own Local area and community. And concerns for running water in this particular area. Hydrology to be taken into consideration. Obviously a worry without, discussing the underground construction of the Nuclear Bunker and the multi-barrier approach for higher level waste.</p> <p>To the proposed plans for the underground tunnels and channels of the Bunker. So has to make the nuclear waste fully secure and protected and safe to all environmental issues and of course health.</p>
259	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Planned for this particular area of the country of Cumbria. BNFL and the Nuclear business of de-commissioning and nuclear management. The standard of this development, protection and the transportation of the waste. The Nuclear Rules and Regulations to All. Regulators capability to protect everything and everyone on the environmental issues For the monitoring of the independent review with respect for the siting surface facilities within the National Park.
259	3 – Impacts	Yes	Suitably placed outer Town of Whitehaven, Workington and Carlisle of the county. Approximately one to four times the size of Sellafield site. Of the assessed construction tunnels and shafts the potential housing of the decommissioning authority and implementing safety of it. Administration and responsibility to it.
259	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Not too close to local communities and areas but still of great concerns to surrounding areas stated environmental, safety, secure and of course health issues of the future. Maybe of the construction of it. It would be said to be of an attraction to the local area and of interest to the nuclear Eava of Heritage. At eye level.
259	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	<p>From the articture look and the infrastructural look. A high tec construction look to it. From the image of the facilities to it. Of some beauty perhaps. And greenery and foliage planned to the development. At surface level.</p> <p>Tunnels, shafts, buffers, containers, and the main repository of the construction some what an engineering distinction of building of high level indeed. Unique design to the civil engineering.</p>
259	6 – Inventory	Yes	The inventory types of amounts of radioactive waste. Advanced and satisfactory progress for intermediate level

			waste. And the principles and agreements of the Government. To stand together with the community and the nuclear power stations of our futures.
259	7 – Siting process	Yes	This present day issue of nuclear waste management. The old Calder Hall works of some age to itself i.e. the Chimneys which were demolished and put to the enw BNFL Sellafield business. Old reactors of great concern and worry to all local residents to Whitehaven and surrounding areas. MOX and other constructions perhaps of a new age of nuclear way and term.
259	8 – Overall views on participation		Obviously a great debate of the social sciences to the security of the future of this very important issue. Not only the area appointed, the construction proposed by it. To pack it, to store it, transportation of everything else that has been taken into consideration by the doctorate.
259	9 – Additional comments		<p>The only comment further of personal opinion is the worry of running water to this particular area. Reported from NW Water and utilities on water situations - water/waste water.</p> <p>An important issue on their agenda at present. Seemingly to Ennerdale, something missing. An old well maybe not being picked up and ajoining the water system to Ennerdale and the Lakes programme.</p> <p>To make progress from our Georgian heritage.</p> <p>[Addition from letter]</p> <p>[Part 1]</p> <p>Councillors Business Itinerary 23/3/2012 Agenda:- Nuclear Bunker Proposal for Nuclear Waste & Management</p> <p>In reply to the Report & Document received by The Partnership (MRWS). Wishing to return it in good order & faith for your Appointed Business of Geological disposal of Radioactive Waste in West Cumbria.</p> <p>A very important title indeed I do feel for the Town Copeland Workington & Carlisle & the County of Cumbria.</p> <p>For & on Behalf of Your Council Business, The Planners & Specialist Teams Appointed by The Doctorates, Scientists & The Professor of His Business. Thanking you for handling this Affiar on His Behalf. With great</p>

		<p>Care, Loyalty & Respect. And thanking you for this chance of Readins his Scientific Report & Paper Documentations All in order I do believe.</p> <p>[Part 2]</p> <p>Geological disposal of radioactive waste in West Cumbria</p> <p>BNFL- Sellafield Old Calder Works:</p> <p>In respect of the de-commissioning programme and prospectus for our future within the nuclear business and proposed plans for a nuclear bunker for nuclear waste and waste management of it. On welfare reform of all welfare issues connected to this report and documentation all affairs of nuclear, scientific and adjoining doctorates, councillors and select committees. To all agreements of each or legislations within the laws of all the investigations carried out at bore holes, testing and monitoring of this business.</p> <p>For the safety, security of the future of this particular nuclear issue within the Geography of the National Park and Lake District area. The geology, germology, hydrology within the adjoining councils at the country planning officer's agenda. All taken into consideration this day welfare reform decommissioning our resources, reservoirs and renewable energies for the regeneration of 2000. Hydrology most apparent reports of concerns for running water in this particular area planned for the nuclear bunker. Concerns from the utilities NW Water of real concern and of great worry. Indeed. Especially after the flooding in and around Cockermouth at Keswick. Areas to the City Council connected to this business. Old Quaker wells not incorporated into the water system to Ennerdale (26). Of the concern to the older outlying maps of Cumbria and older style of gas and electricity land lines. Maybe of the same nature for attention maybe from the Council from say:</p> <p>1400 Quaker age 1800 Georgian age 1959 Nuclear heritage</p> <p>Accountability of it respectively to each Calais (30)</p> <p>A personal feeling obviously of health issues first and foremost the older style of nuclear now lapsed but very much with us all this day March 2012. The year of my birth 1959. A very important date within the nuclear field. Radioactive leakage at Sellafield and of great fear and worry to all. The scientists, doctors, famous and all of the surrounding area to Calder works. All cattle destroyed, milk poured away and the grazing land contaminated to the surrounding area of the old Sellafield works.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Of our age today and health too! With respect and loyalty for the doctorate, this proposed site at Keel Head found approximately for this particular infrastructural construction of demand for and on behalf of BNFL Ltd. But a feeling of the older style of things in need of investigation i.e. gas, waves and electricity maybe of an advantage to the country planning prospectus. Obviously this situation of running water a worry to it unaccounted for wells of such for future investigations, monitoring and testings carried out "OFTEN" by the scientists and doctorates appointed. "Fungi" I do think of the chemistry and science of its feeling of hydrology.</p> <p>This public consultation document now seems somewhat out of date many reports saved from 2008, 2010, 2011. The scientific welfare team and professor's papers for the Government recognition to its status.</p> <p>Mentioning of worries of the pressures respectively of the generating boards. A concern to each this day from our Quaker heritage and Georgian styling to the population of Whitehaven, Workington and Carlisle, the County of West Cumbria on the highways and Byways of your council businesses.</p> <p>Design of Engineering of the same to Europe at the European Laws at parliament, said Paris, Sweden alike. An experienced construction of this nature.</p> <p>Inventory: acceptable to all. The town, city, communities and connected doctorates appointed by (the Professor). To the volume and capacity of his doctorate and appointed scientists to operate this operation on father's behalf.</p> <p>The Government definition of acceptable process of this very important issue today, indeed.</p> <p>Process of repository: Experimentation I do feel. Still at this stage (1950-2012) under total safety by experienced scientists within the partnership of apprenticeships. All the further investigations monitoring of testing from now on.</p> <p>For and against: obviously a slight worry or concern at the first impression to it but well presented to us all. With respect and great loyalty I do feel this plan today should be appointed very shortly by the Mayor of the Councillors Committee as soon as possible for our nuclear well being, loyalty and out welfare together.</p> <p>(NDA) – Authority</p> <p>(ONR) – Management/Waste</p> <p>SVEC</p>
--	--	---

			<p>The Commissioning (MRWS Partnership)</p> <p>The Accountability, Approach, Approval The Apparent to the documentation of Report The Clarification of the Professor. Of course</p> <p>A personal response: Geology: - underground safety to the structural. Feeling from the scientists preferences to Rock. Feel but then "to the new era of MOX" For all views, evidence, opinions at professional geological term Positive/negative of the disposal repository Safety, Security Health Environment/Planning: Most specific to each by all doctorates on behalf of the council. Great to be taken from the bunker chambers being constructed to house this waste or to take care of it. The construction on the whole from the civil engineering chartered team.</p> <p>The basis of believe of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority appointed for the Government business of IT of confidence I do feel. More than one more has been considered within Europe and Africa. Positive depository. This our business today from our heritage 1950. The new age now of nuclear community welfare – another of a similar nature just over on the national grid at Drigg managed by BNF Ltd.</p>
260	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
260	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
260	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	The impact on the landscape of the waste (= to that produced in building the channel tunnel) and its removal in an area of inferior infrastructure.
260	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Experience at the parish level of hosting the countries LLWR has involved restrictions. The reduction of council tax or even the precept is excluded. The parish has to show it has tried to get money from elsewhere before using the money allocated.</p> <p>The money allocated to the 'host' community should bear a relationship to the scale and cost of the project. So far Liberia has benefitted more than West Cumbria from Government money.</p>

260	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
260	6 – Inventory	Yes	UK waste only
260	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	If a HLWR and new nuclear build are both to go ahead, then a commitment to improving the roads is essential. An accident on the A959 blocking the road for hours means in some circumstances a detour around the Cumbrian mountains via Keswick or Penrith.
260	8 – Overall views on participation		We should take part and view the results when they are available.
261	1 – Geology	No	<p>I know a limited amount about geology. However, I do know that I can see the Cumbrian fells from my garden. The question is - "the government says a repository will only be put in an area where people are willing to have it" so are we willing to have it? NO</p> <p>Putting this hot material underground is not a good idea. Any problems and you cannot get near it. Above ground, you have options. Below ground anything can go wrong - a fire, flood or seismic event. Above ground you can deal with all of those at once. Below ground any one of those is a BIG problem. would YOU go down to deal with one of those??</p>
261	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>No matter what argument is put forward, nuclear waste or anything to do with nuclear fuel or power has safety problems. Put it underground and problems will multiply. The question is - are we willing to have this nuclear repository? NO</p> <p>No amount of planning will avoid the inevitable. There will be a serious problem, if not in the first few years, certainly in the 1st century or so. This stuff - 6 or 11 times the volume of the Albert Hall, will be there and volatile for 1,000's of years. We don't want it here!!</p>
261	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The best "impact" for Cumbria is to leave it exactly as it is. The main industries here are tourism and farming. A nuclear waste facility does not fit with those. No-one who lives and works hwere wants this repository.</p> <p>Make sure you listen to us all please.</p> <p>No - we are not willing to have this nuclear repository.</p>

			<p>When the inevitable leak happens, who will compensate the whole of the farming and tourism industries?</p> <p>Our nuclear waste appears to be handled safely at present. If it isn't broke - don't fix it! We don't want or need a repository here.</p>
261	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>No doubt, benefits put forward will include additional Government funding for Cumbria, more jobs, better infrastructure etc etc. None of those so called benefits make sense:- Governments change regularly What is agreed today, will be reduced by cuts later when Government changes and cuts are necessary. Yes, jobs will be created and wealth of the county will increase, with probably the better paid jobs being filled by non-Cumbrian residents - from outside the existing community. More roads and rails are not necessarily welcome</p> <p>The question again is:- Do we want this nuclear repository? No it is not a benefit. We cannot be bribed into being "willing to have it". By being offered a few jobs, some roads and rail improvements or any amount of Government funding.</p>
261	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>Wherever you put radioactive waste equivalent to the volume of "between 6 and 11 times the size of the Royal Albert Hall", and that is just for starters, there is going to be an accident at some point.</p> <p>Chuck in thousands of years of this stuff being extremely dangerous, and no amount of design and engineering can make it safe. We don't live on a fault line here in the UK but we do have seismic events.</p> <p>Also, heat is a problem at depth, as is water access down a shaft or shafts is asking for trouble. Can anyone really design and engineer their way around a few thousand years of those kind of problems? I don't think so.</p> <p>We do not volunteer to have those kind of problems in Cumbria, now or in a few hundred years' time.</p>
261	6 – Inventory	No	<p>OVERSEAS WASTE I believe that waste from other countries is already imported and processed in England.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is that going to stop? 2. Is there zero waste left after processing? <p>It is very naive for the Government or anyone else to "presume" that only UK radioactive waste would be "disposed of" in this country.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. "Disposed of" is not a term that can be used in respect of nuclear waste is it? Radioactive decay takes

			<p>thousands of years. Burying it is not a way of "disposing" of it. Wherever it is buried, it will be there forever. Do we volunteer to have it in Cumbria? No</p>
261	7 – Siting process	No	<p>If a nuclear repository "will only be put in an area where people are willing to have it" surely the first part of the siting process should be to find those volunteers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You haven't done that yet. 2. I don't expect that any community will voluntarily accept a repository. 3. You will go ahead anyway and put it where you like. 4. No people will be willing to have it other than those who stand to gain a substantial amount of money from the project. 5. You won't like No 3/4 but that is what will happen.
261	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Don't even start searching. I have yet to find a single person living here who is willing to have anything nuclear sited in this part of England. We already have Sellafield. That is more than enough.</p> <p>If it is such a good idea, put it near London.</p> <p>Do we as a family volunteer to have a nuclear repository anywhere near here or in Cumbria? NO</p>
261	9 – Additional comments		<p>People are being paid to push this nuclear repository through - it is their job. If it wasn't their job and it was to be sited in their backyard, they would oppose it vigorously. Wherever this repository is built, will ultimately depend on bribery and corruption.</p> <p>"Back-handers" will be paid - we all know that money will decide where it will live, not geology, not a community of people who "volunteer" to have it.</p> <p>The decision to "volunteer" will be made by governing bodies, not volunteering people. You already know that. Cumbria is not volunteering!!</p> <p>[Additional comments slip]</p> <p>"The Government says a repository will only be put somewhere the geology is suitable and THERE IS A COMMUNITY THAT HAS VOLUNTEERED TO HAVE IT"</p> <p>OK let's have a vote in the Community.</p>

			Put me down for a VERY BIG NO!!
262	Comments slip		How can you 'reduce' or 'compensate' for future impact on health when you can't possibly know what the effects will be?? Increase in e.g. thyroid cancer and leukemia caused by radiation how will this be compensated for? Making Cumbria into a dumping ground, Yes? Who thought that would not effect the tourist industry so NO is my answer. There are no 'benefits'
263	Comments slip		The English Lake District is one of the gems of Britain, if not the world. It has already been polluted by the various nuclear works on the west coast. It could now seem madness to bury nuclear waste here, when it is already a repository for low level waste. Further more underground disposal of waste is unsatisfactory, as it requires regular inspection and easy access. The only way this is possible is to have above ground containers. Technology is sufficiently advanced to allow this. It would also help to remind future generations of our folly.
264	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
265	Comments slip		<p>The process is back to front because it is undemocratic. It is undemocratic because it starts with local councils volunteering their areas for a repository. Unfortunately local councils are not democratically representative bodies.</p> <p>Council - Election - Turnout Cumbria - 2009 - 36.6% Copeland - 2011 - 41% Allerdale - 2011 - 46%</p> <p>Most people do not even take part in local council elections. Independent scientific experts have confirmed that Cumbria is geologically unsuitable for a nuclear waste repository. The most suitable area is SE England including East Anglia. The correct procedure would be to identify the most suitable localities on geological grounds and then try to canvass majority support in those localities. Costs could be reduced by 'piggy backing' the repository onto existing or planned construction projects. e.g. the London Crossrail link or the proposed new airport in the Thames estuary. However, the democratic reality is likely to be majority popular opposition to a nuclear repository in all part of England, perhaps as much because of property blight as because of concern about radiation. I certainly don't want to see such a repository in my area. In the end, the most realistic location may be an uninhabited UK territory such as South Georgia.</p>
266	Comments slip		I am not in favour of a repository in the area you outline. We have one of the most beautiful parts of the country

			<p>here. It has a tourist trade which draws people from all over the world. People would not come if we sited a repository here.</p> <p>Also something completely unexpected happened in Japan and something could happen here which no-one foresaw with disastrous effect. We are a small island and need to safeguard our wonderful countryside which once lost can never be replaced.</p>
267	Comments slip		Yes if suitable sites can be found. The advantages outweigh the disadvantages. We are already producing a lot of waste, so we should dispose of it too!
268	Comments slip		I feel we could proceed to the next stage provided we have undertakings from the Govt that property prices will be underpinned and infrastructure would go in before any repository commenced. Also local acceptance necessary over the inventory of material to be stored.
269	Comments slip		<p>Sir, surely, the first question should be, "Do we want a depository if our area is geologically suitable?"</p> <p>To spend a large amount of time, energy and money investigating the suitability or otherwise of an area for the repository, finding that it is suitable, and then finding that the councils (and the people?) refuse to have it anyway, seems to me potentially a terrible waste of money, and a classic case of putting the cart before the horse.</p> <p>I would accept a repository if Cumbria is suitable – the waste has to go somewhere.</p>
270	1 – Geology	Yes	This is a stable region, we dont suffer from earth movements and areas that my be a water sources have been excluded
270	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	safer and better buried underground
270	3 – Impacts	Yes	Would bring much needed employment to the area, this would more than offset any other disadvantages. We already have a storage facility at sellafild. It makes sense to keep it in this area.
270	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Anything that benefits the local communities in this area is good thing.
270	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Wont be a 'blot' on the landscape and would fit in with the existing Sellafild complex if this is the area that is

			chosen
270	6 – Inventory	Yes	Our waste, our problem. waste from other countries should be shipped back, or they pay for the storage here
270	7 – Siting process	Yes	Seems a fair method for the planning the possible siting. Given the we already have Sellafield in the area, it wouldnt be unreasonable to site the repository here also.
270	8 – Overall views on participation		Of course they should take part without commitment.
270	9 – Additional comments		would be a good thing to have the repository in West Cumbria, given the social & economic benefits it would bring
272	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
272	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
272	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
272	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
272	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
272	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
272	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
272	8 – Overall views on participation		Absolutely imperative to be at the table.
273	1 – Geology	Yes	The inital investgation has shown that there is still 75% of usable land within Allerdale/ Copeland. These results are encourigng becuase they have taken into account certain aquifers which could be used as water supplies in the future.

274	1 – Geology	Yes	Was peer reviewed by independent consultants. Some uncertainty about the area north of Egremont not being suitable but area south is ok. Looks like a convenient solution to make Sellafield acceptable.
274	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The industry is well regulated and engineers diligent.
274	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
274	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	The benefits of the facility should be enough. Employment and benefits to local business.
274	5 – Design and engineering	No	I would like the waste to be retrievable.
274	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
274	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
274	8 – Overall views on participation		They should take part. It is an opportunity to benefit the area.
277	1 – Geology	Yes	I feel able to agree because the document sets out very clearly how the BGS report was reviewed by two independent experts and thus accepted. The discussion on the suitability of the geology is an interesting one that does not come to a firm conclusion and admittedly the arguments put by Professor Smythe about the conclusions of Nirex are powerful, however I would concur with Dearlove when he says that Prof. Smythe is offering a personal opinion and perhaps wants to believe rather than prove the area unsuitable, so on balance I would agree that there is not enough data to draw a firm conclusion and further analysis is warranted.
277	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The partnership has presented a good overview of the regulatory scrutiny and planning process to be applied. It was particularly pertinent to read that the regulators were all aligned on this.
277	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	There is a lot of uncertainty associated with any likely impact that I do not believe allows any firm opinions to be drawn. I would dispute whether or not the repository fits with West Cumbria strategy element with regard to

			diversifying the range of industry.
277	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I would agree that this would need to be carefully considered at a future stage as it is difficult to see how an 'agreed' community benefits package would be assured and guaranteed especially with the whims of government cutting back when required to, this would be one of the first things to go.
277	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	I agree that it is probably too early to come up with a clear design.
278	1 – Geology	Yes	I agree with all of it.
279	1 – Geology	Yes	We need to store out radiological waste in a manner that it safe not only now but for generations to come. In need to be stored in a manner that it can be retrieved if any issues arise with it in order to keep it safe.
280	9 – Additional comments		I think they should. Because we have most of the waste. We have to find an answer. It has to be thought of long term - especially safety.
281	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
281	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
281	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
281	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
281	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
281	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made

281	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
281	8 – Overall views on participation		Agree to statement but fear financial influences that might lead to incompetent decisions.
281	9 – Additional comments		I would like to see a more holistic approach where the development of alternative energy supplies is related to the need for, and size of, a repository.
282	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
282	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
282	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
282	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
282	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
282	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
282	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
283	1 – Geology	Yes	It is essential that a really thorough geology study is taken with nothing taken for granted.
283	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I have faith in the partnership ability to make a repository as safe as possible.
283	3 – Impacts	Yes	I am sure only an area suitable will be taken into consideration. I hope any repository will give something back to the community of Cumbria.
283	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Cumbria needs investment and this gives us an opportunity to get something back for the locals.

283	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	On the disc display the repository looked very safe.
283	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
283	7 – Siting process	Yes	Only the best site should be used and I hope the partnership will be honest about this.
283	8 – Overall views on participation		No area should be overlooked only if it impacts on the National Park.
283	9 – Additional comments		I am for a repository as long as it is in the right place.
284	1 – Geology	No	<p>Guaranteed safe disposal is essential and the decision must be based upon solid reliable data, it is not acceptable to base any decisions on any uncertainty. This report seeks to hide the evidence within confusion just to achieve the required outcome. The suitability of Cumbria's geology is not only highly questionable but so complex as to be not fully understood, and is why over twenty different minerals were commercially extracted in Cumbria, more than any other area in the UK. If the leading authority on British geology has any reservations at all then that must be accepted as a no, the BGS has stated that there is no suitable locations within Cumbria, mainly due to the high permeability of the rocks and high water flow from the mountainous regions, then you have the complex fissures, faults and rock types that are the result of past volcanic action, the Sellafield site sits on the Borrowdale volcanics. You then have areas of limestone that are not suitable, the old haematite mines, coal mines and the shallow mud formations in the north of the county so where else is there to look?</p> <p>A more sensible approach would have been to look at the UK as a whole, find suitable sites and then see if they are willing to volunteer.</p>
284	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>If you proceed on uncertainty then how can it be classed as safe, it will have a negative impact on the environment. The planning is not following international guidelines and is trying to run roughshod over Cumbria. This whole process appears to be driven from the top without local consultation, and if they hear something that does not support it then you just ignore it, rephrase it or apply statistics to make your point. It has been said that it is a desperate measure to find somewhere to dump the waste in order to help justify the new nuclear builds, when everyone else but the Chinese and Indians are backtracking on new nuclear programs. It is wholly wrong for local councils to put their hands up and say you can bury it here without going to the people for referendum, so have one and save the tax payers a fortune.</p>

			Why are the Cumbrian councils the only volunteers in the UK ? It is not a case of when it goes wrong it will only effect Cumbria, it will be a global catastrophe, so I suspect it is a case of short term gain knowing they will not be around to suffer the long term pain, but what about future generations who will suffer?
284	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The government is desperate to resolve this issue of nuclear waste and as a result are liable to act in haste, believing they can hide the truth amongst a mass of documents, surveys and consultations. If this repository was being built in the home counties would they have followed the same process and would they have so eagerly ignored expert advice ?</p> <p>This report would have been more credible if it had followed international guidelines, sort out the location first, not ask for volunteers and then waste 400 million in drilling bore holes in an unsuitable location, before ignoring the expensive evidence that you asked for.</p> <p>I believe that the government looked at west Cumbria as being nuclear acceptable and easily mislead, they knew they would not put up a fight because it is a deprived area in urgent need of investment and so they think they can just railroad this project through.</p> <p>The future is nuclear decommissioning; give future generations a chance not nuclear waste.</p>
284	4 – Community benefits	No	This is just legal bribery on the part of the government, they know the area is in urgent need of investment and rejuvenation but will not spend the money as they see the area as being of little value to the country as a whole. So they offer a token gesture in return for dumping their waste in somebody else's garden, and Cumbrian gardens come much cheaper than ones down south even though sites in Norfolk are much more geologically suitable.
284	5 – Design and engineering	No	How can we design something with a lifespan that exceeds the radioactive timeframe of this waste. Unless you have the building materials that can last this length of time then the design is of no value and do we have any sound knowledge of materials based over thousands of years in uncertain conditions. So in reality there is no engineering solution and we are back to the geology, rocks have been around a long time but even they change with time. Placing the repository in suitable ground conditions will minimise the risk and will be the final line of defence after the steel and concrete has gone.
284	6 – Inventory	No	Out of sight and out of mind is not a solution to nuclear waste. If you are willing to produce it then budget into the equation the cost of nursing it forever and this will be the true cost of nuclear power. High level waste should never be buried and should be accounted for at all times and monitored. The only safe solution is to get this waste off the planet, not hiding it. Why not just fire it into the Sun, it would not even notice these amounts.

284	7 – Siting process	No	<p>The process was and is flawed. You need to find a suitable location that meets the criteria first as was the case in Sweden and Finland.</p> <p>Having been told that the geology is not suitable how can the process have passed stage 2 unless either the evidence was ignored or the process is just a case of going through the motions. There is no point in finding a willing area if the location is unsuitable or are the Cumbrian councils now regarded as nuclear experts? The government waste enough money on so called experts and consultants only to dismiss their findings, yet having gone through this process before and failed, for some strange reason they are willing to do it again to waste even more tax payers money, the geology will not have changed that much in the last few years.</p>
284	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>The councils should not take part in any search until they have the overwhelming support of their tax payers, i.e. hold a referendum and the people should be informed that if they support this, then if the surveys and research supports a repository then their council will be committed to having it constructed, this saves spending money unnecessarily for no outcome.</p> <p>Having now been informed that Cumbria is not a suitable site for a repository there is no point in preceding any further no mater how desperate any council is in reaping any rewards. The end result is going to be the same, the geology is unpredictable and complex with high water flows, spending millions more will not alter this fact.</p>
284	9 – Additional comments		<p>Just think of the future, hundreds of years from now: do you want be remembered as someone involved in burying the nuclear waste that led to a massive environmental catastrophe just because you ignored the evidence presented and did not do the right thing.</p>
285	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>The need for a geological barrier in the design of the GDF is fully explained. Since the majority of higher level waste is presently held at Sellafield its transport to a GDF in the vicinity would obviously be beneficial, The case for further geological investigation is overwhelming</p>
285	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	<p>I do not think you should want to be satisfied that suitable regulatory and planning processes are in place. You should know which processes exist (5,5a). You have indicated that you do, and are aware there could possibly be change</p> <p>As a former nuclear plant manager I sat on the Design Committee of the new plant which I was to manage. Approval of the Design Safety Report by the NII was essential before construction could start. I then chaired the same Committee and produced the Commissioning and Operating Instructions When they had been approved by the NII, commissioning could begin. Not until the Commissioning Report was approved did we</p>

			obtain the Site Licence to operate. This seems to me to be the most important part of the regulatory process.
285	3 – Impacts	Yes	You have recognised that there could be adverse effects arising from the transport of spoil and subsequently the transport of nuclear waste. In Japan, all nuclear sites are coastal. Prior to the start of construction of the facility each site was provided with a small port through which heavy items of equipment were delivered. The ports have been used to transport spent fuel for reprocessing. If the geology permits the GDF to be built under coast or sea, a small port or use of existing ports could reduce the impact of GDF spoil and nuclear waste transportation.
285	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I think it appropriate that the Government should offer community benefits to those prepared to accept a repository. Referring to Japan again, it was no easy task for the Government and industry to persuade people with their experience of the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to accept peaceful nuclear energy. The Japanese fishing industry is always given some percentage of the cost of a nuclear power station, and benefits and legal controls are obtainable by the prefecture in which a nuclear facility is sited.
285	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Too early to comment
285	6 – Inventory	Not answered	The Government position relating to overseas waste is defined by Treaty and within commercial contracts. My recollection is that only high level waste must be returned. Presumably plutonium is included, not as waste, but for safer underground storage, and it would be retrievable. Presumably too, without reprocessing, spent fuel elements with cladding would have to be treated as high level waste.
285	7 – Siting process	Yes	The stages in the process for siting a repository are well illustrated in the diagram on page 87. The excellent Public Consultation Document indicates how much thought has gone into the project so far. The need to maintain supportive public opinion is fully recognised. The Partnership has played an important part so far but is to be stood down. Are there professional public relations experts available to advise and take actions to counter the objectors as we move towards potential site areas and beyond?
285	8 – Overall views on participation		Both should be involved and support the selected site.
285	9 – Additional comments		I look forward to hearing that the Document has been submitted to the Councils and later that approval has been granted by the DECC to enable the next stage to begin

288	1 – Geology	Yes	Proper geology study must be made and local people kept inform of the final study.
288	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I think they've got it spot on, has long on as it kept reviewed over the process.
288	3 – Impacts	Yes	I think its ok what they have said has long they kept local people informed.
288	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Packages will be good for the area.
288	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Yes they've seemed to know what they want.
288	6 – Inventory	Yes	Yes of course.
288	7 – Siting process	Yes	Yes I think the need sitting a repository hopefully local.
288	8 – Overall views on participation		I fully support both councils looking for a repository.
289	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	The Nirex project said the geology was not suitable. How will you now convince people otherwise.
289	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
289	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
289	4 – Community benefits	Yes	We have been promised road improvements on A595 south of Sellafield with every major development at Sellafield. They have never happened.
289	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
289	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made

289	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
289	8 – Overall views on participation		Agree they should.
290	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
290	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
290	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
290	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
290	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
290	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
290	8 – Overall views on participation		This seems a wise choice to not rule out future investment in this area.
290	9 – Additional comments		I feel there is a very vocal minority of people who are anti-nuclear power and also anti-repository no matter how strong the safety, investment and infrastructure options are. Please be aware that there are many local people who work at Sellafield who feel content about a GDF in this area.
291	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	Don't like the statement that storage can be safe forever. We can't predict safety over a potentially infinite time. I still think we can accept what is safe for foreseeable future.
291	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made

291	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
291	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
291	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Ability to recover waste in future is important.
291	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
291	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
291	8 – Overall views on participation		Should take part. Less likely to be anti-nuclear than other areas.
292	1 – Geology	Not answered	Has there been any study on sand? This area is built on sand and our building are still standing.
292	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	Can't be sure safety & security is in place until things get going.
292	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	After living with Sellafield since the beginning found our local workers were happy with conditions but tourists were wary about coming here.
292	4 – Community benefits	Not answered	We shouldn't go ahead in our area with a repository until firm promises are made for better roads and a hospital.
292	5 – Design and engineering	Not answered	Don't understand anything about engineering but would hope the experts do.
292	7 – Siting process	Yes	We've had a nuclear plant here for 60 years so its bound to be an obvious site.
292	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes I do think Copeland should go ahead for a repository without any commitment.

293	1 – Geology	Yes	The BGS is a reputable body but it was sensible to get other expert opinions. I do not rate earthquakes as a serious risk. Groundwater is probably the one to watch. Judging by the map plenty of land to be investigated.
293	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not answered	Good that they are taking their time and trying to consider all possibilities.
293	3 – Impacts	Not answered	If Cumbria is already associated with nuclear in the public's mind. It seems unlikely that the impact will worsen especially if the improvement in security etc is emphasised.
293	4 – Community benefits	Not answered	It is important that infrastructure precedes construction given the lack of dual carriageways in W Cumbria. We certainly need to look at the effect on future generations v carefully. Info from other counties should be helpful, especially if they are further along the process.
293	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	I think retrievability is desirable.
293	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	Will need to read full report to form a view on this.
293	7 – Siting process	Yes	Look ok but we will need to see how this is handled.
293	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes we should. Our future is bound up with the nuclear industry whether we like it or not. The work at Sellafield has been safely contained so far.
293	9 – Additional comments		I will not be there to see this built but we need to come to a decision.
294	1 – Geology	Yes	It appears that a large amount of research has gone into the suitability of any proposed sites. Chapter 4 has all the details I need.
294	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The regulating bodies need to have the support of the community who in the main are quite parochial. Therefore to make them acceptable they should have as many local members as possible. "Safety and Security" should be the key to any community involvement and this be progressed from a 'local' base. The last thing any local wants is to be dictated to by an 'outsider'.
294	4 – Community benefits	Yes	This seems fair and well thought out. It should not become a bail out option for the ineptitude of the local council.

294	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	As a lay man I have to take most of these points on face value.
294	6 – Inventory	Yes	I accept what I have read on the poster however I may have more comments when I read Chapter 9 fully. Overseas waste must be included if the project is to become financially worthwhile.
294	7 – Siting process	Yes	There has been a vast amount of work done in this area: we need now as a local community to support the move to the next phase.
294	8 – Overall views on participation		100% behind both councils taking part if they can get their act together.
295	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>How can one have an opinion on a "it may or may not be" suitable? In so far as it goes, its OK. The problem with this questionnaire is that nowhere does it ask if the respondent agrees or disagrees with the idea of the repository here or even having a repository at all anywhere.</p> <p>I am reluctant to put yes in any of the categories in case it is taken as support. This is a national park, an area of outstanding beauty, geologically highly complex with many springs, aquifers and other underground water sources.</p>
295	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>It is difficult to have an opinion on any of this - it is not easy reading and a considered opinion would take hours of research. Given that I disagree with the concept of a centralised nuclear waste facility anywhere in the country, the answer to all these sections has to "NO".</p> <p>There is nothing in this to change my mind - everything is qualified "at this stage" "as far as possible" etc. What I would like to see is a definitive list of criteria that have to be met for any storage system to be safe.</p>
295	3 – Impacts	No	I disagree with the starting point - see previously. 550 jobs in 140 years, even with additional indirect employment, does not compensate for the potential loss of tourism etc.
295	4 – Community benefits	No	Sounds like bribery however you dress it up. Also there is the danger (for us) that if we withdraw, we will not only loose the "benefits" we would have had if we had gone ahead with the scheme but we could also loose out in "benefits" we would not have had in any case. I know the Government say that the benefits should be over and above those we would normally receive but since these have not been defined, the Government are free to interpret/re-interpret the benefits.

295	5 – Design and engineering	No	Retrievability should be included now not in the future - whatever storage system is used.
295	6 – Inventory	No	It is clear that a large number of important issues have not been decided and that we are being asked to support a proposal where there are few hard facts.
295	7 – Siting process	No	I do not agree with the concept of a single depository for the whole of the UK.
295	8 – Overall views on participation		I do not agree with the proposal. I believe that each nuclear power station should look after its own waste and should not send it to a centralised point. The money this is costing would be better spent on agreeing the criteria for safe disposal and ensuring that each nuclear power station is storing its waste securely. I would urge all councils to withdraw from this proposal now.
295	9 – Additional comments		It is nonsense for the local and county council to have expressed an interest in this proposal. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty dependent on tourism and in the process of applying for World Heritage status. We have only one trunk road (A66) which already has a high accident rate. The coastal railway line is liable to flooding and needs major upgrading to take freight.
297	Comments slip		I strongly oppose any radioactive waste being deposited in Cumbria. We are becoming the dumping ground for this country and other countries waste. Haven't the people of this county already allowed too much with the ever growing Sellafield and now more new plants. Go somewhere else!
298	Comments slip		This should be fully investigated and has my full support. Nuclear power is the only way forward for this world and if that is so then we need to store it's by product. So why not here?
299	Comments slip		NO
300	Comments slip		The recent earthquake, which shook houses where we live, many miles from the epicentre, is yet another reason for the unsuitability of this whole area. For that and other well documented reasons, my family, friends and I will always be opposed to any proposal even to consider a nuclear waste repository.