

| User ID | Question | Agree | Response |
|---------|---------------|-------|---|
| 501 | Comments slip | | <p>We do not agree that these areas should take part in the search for a repository because:-</p> <p>a) to do so is the first step to agreeing to site it here</p> <p>b) the area is geologically unsound for such an installation</p> <p>c) despite the assurance of Nuclear Decommissioning Authority we do not believe enough is known about potential hazards to ensure safety</p> <p>d) the “sweeteners” of increased employment and ‘community benefits package’ (value unknown) can in no sense make up for blighting the area and presenting an unknown and unknowable risk for the future.</p> |
| 502 | Comments slip | | <p>I agree that we need Nuclear energy. I therefore accept that the waste has to be stored somewhere safe. Allerdale should take part in the search and move to the next stage in the process.</p> |
| 503 | Comments slip | | <p>Given the need for safe, secure, long term storage it would seem that West Cumbria is the best option nationally. The local economic benefits are obvious. I strongly support the proposal.</p> |
| 504 | Comments slip | | <p>I am in no way convinced with that the geology is suitable – it won’t affect me (I’m over 80) but what about the future.</p> |
| 505 | Comments slip | | <p>I believe that the area is unsafe for storage of radioactive waste because of the geology of the area. Due to the mountains, water will rise to the surface within an unknown time span dissolving some of this waste. The complex geology makes it one of the most unsuitable areas in the country.</p> |
| 506 | Comments slip | | <p>Opposed to moving forward any further as mountainous geology of West Cumbria precludes this as a sensible possibility.</p> <p>Also the 1997 Nirex enquiry has provided strong evidence against siting a GDF in the area.</p> |
| 507 | Comments slip | | <p>I am not in favour of Allerdale or Copeland Borough Councils participating in a nuclear waste repository in Cumbria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no other council is participating in this process - the opinion of independent geologists is that sites in Cumbria are unsuitable; the geology in Cumbria is too complicated, and sites should be located a long way from high mountains to reduce the head of water (as in Switzerland and Norway). |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| 508 | Comments slip | | There is no reason for Allerdale and/or Copeland Borough Councils to go forward with the storage/dumping of nuclear waste in the LDNP. Obviously the lessons of Chyenoble and Japan have not been learned. Besides safety concerns tourism, property values will suffer. And, as United Utilities and the Environment Dept were unable to keep sewage out of local properties, why trust anyone with nuclear waste? Total insanity!! |
| 509 | 1 – Geology | Yes | It appears to be a professional study |
| 509 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | West Cumbria residents are familiar with Nuclear sites and the safety and security that goes with it. However a new site would give the opportunity to make all these issues even stronger! |
| 509 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | I can only see advantages for my grandchildren with a new nuclear facility |
| 509 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | Not in total agreement with any benefits |
| 509 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | There is now a lot of experience with nuclear issues both in UK and elsewhere. I am convinced the correct decisions will be made. |
| 509 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | Would agree with low or intermediate level nuclear waste but not with high level. I think more experience needs to be obtained from this first repository before thinking about high level. I DO NOT agree with bringing other peoples waste and initially it should only be local waste until the local community gets to terms with it as a local facility. |
| 509 | 7 – Siting process | Not Sure/ Partly | What ever happens it must be a transparent process . |
| 509 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Agree that Copeland and Allerdale MUST look to getting new nuclear business as this is the only way forward for this areas economy. |
| 509 | 9 – Additional comments | | Hope you make the correct decisions for the right reasons that will benefit Copeland & Allerdale. as both these councils would benefit as well as the local communities. Sorry if i may have not answered the issues fully but tried to do it quickly- however i am a ex 40years + employee of the nuclear industry and feel the local community should and must get more benefits from nuclear cleanup. |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| 512 | 1 – Geology | Yes | No comment was made |
| 512 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No comment was made |
| 512 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | No comment was made |
| 512 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | No comment was made |
| 512 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | No comment was made |
| 512 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 512 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | No comment was made |
| 512 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Enter siting process.Oponents have made up their minds before reading your document They have not scientific background,and are unskilled in assessing risk. |
| 512 | 9 – Additional comments | | I can see the necessity of obtaining backing from the public,but we have here scientific and engineering problems.A referendum gives equal weight to a nuclear engineer and to a Friend of the Earth who has not bothered to read your consultation document.But why should he?His response is like a religious response.He knows the answer already. |
| | | | |
| 514 | 1 – Geology | No | There is not sufficient information being made available to members of the public to enable a reasoned decision to be made on if to continue to take the MRWS process to stage 4. It is clear from Proffesor Smythe that he believes based on a large amount of work that there is no where suitable in cumbria due to its mountainous terrain and in turn large amounts of water movement through the geological structures, leading to a potentially catastrophic contamination issue. At no point has it been detailed what is suitable geology for an underground repository and if in deed such geology exists in Cumbria. The whole process is being run back to front, it should have started with looking at where had suitable geology & then working with the community to convince them it was safe. I feel that we are being rail roaded into having the repository in Cumbria regardless of if the geology is safe or not as we are the only communities that 'volunteered' (note: the residents of the boroughs were not consulted on if to join the consultation in the first place) |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| 514 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>Again not enough information has been provided to enable a sensible decision to be made on this, all the consultation documents are leading, trying to push people to say yes to take it to the next stage (stage 4). MORE information is required on the safety aspect particularly given the government now want to open the repository 20 years early in 2020 instead of 2040, what effect does this have on the safety?</p> <p>No information has been given on who would make the planning decision, other than it is likely it wouldn't be the LDNPA but may go to the major infrastructure committee, if this is the case will the LDNPA's expertise on the area be considered? Or will the decision purely be taken on the basis that ministers in London want the repository as far away from them as possible?</p> <p>Environment- Where to start, geology i have already mentioned, impacts on the agriculture & tourism businesses in the area have not been considered? More information is needed on the potential impacts? What will be done with the spoil that is excavated to create the repository, as i understand it has to stay on site, this is a similar volume of material that came out of the channel tunnel, this has massive environmental impacts both aesthetically and geographically, what are the impacts of this volume of spoil? potential leaching of minerals from this spoil into ground water supplies, eutrophication, effect on fish stocks, impacts on animals. Again none of this has been addressed, and many of the publics questions are just not being answered.</p> |
| 514 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>Again referring to my previous answers, more detail needed on potential impacts on the local economy, tourism, agriculture, landscape management etc. Whilst the creation of a potential repository may fit with the West Coast Nuclear focus, it most certainly does not fit with the Lake District Priorities, yet this is likely to be where it is to be sited, on the basis that alot of the west coast geology has already been rulled out by the british geological society survey.</p> <p>The right to withdraw is not clear, and appears to become harder to utilise the further down the process we go. At what point do members of the public residing in these areas get a say?</p> |
| 514 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>ALI that has been provided is principles regarding the benefits package, no information on the actual potential tangible things has been given. And it states that the governemnt wont commit at this stage, we are beeing pushed to take this to stage 4 yet you are offering no information on what may be offered as benefits to a host area. My concern is that a benefits package won't be agreed on until the construction has started, at that point the right to withdraw is lost, and as such the communities won't get a sufficient say.</p> |
| 514 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>I don't know enough about this subject to comment, and the full consultation document doesn't offer the overview or simple information that is required for a lay person to make a comment. Yet again the consultation document appears to be pushing us to go to stage 4 and only at this stage might you give us the required information to make a more informed & reasoned decision</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| 514 | 7 – Siting process | No | Right of withdrawal is not clear, appears to become harder to use the further down the process we go. It is not made clear if/when all members of the effected boroughs will get a say via a referendum (i feel this should be done now, before you proceed to stage 4). It appears that this is based on voluntarism, yet the decision making bodies ABC, CBC & CCC will make the decision for the greater good, which implies that a parish locality or group of parishes can't withdraw regardless of their reasoning for it. Yet again the information is not made clear. I am very very concerned that this consultation process is just a paperwork exercise and that this will go ahead in Cumbria regardless, as we are the only area that has volunteered to be involved... though the public wasn't consulted on this volunteering to be involved. |
| 514 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>Allerdale Borough Council should withdraw now the geology is not suitable, and we shouldn't be rail roaded into this decision just because we are the only areas that 'volunteered' to be involved. The process should be reversed, and a suitable geological site should be found and then the communities concerned should be convinced of its safety & the benefits to having it. The benefits to having it in Cumbria are low, the geology is wrong, speeding it up will result in safety corners being cut, the employment created by a potential repository can't be guaranteed to cumbria, it will have a far more detrimental effect on the cumbria tourism & agricultural economy than 500 jobs on this site could make up for. In short we should say NO now before our hands are tied and we have no choice.</p> <p>Also the title of the consultation is misleading- It is not the West Cumbria, this covers nearly half of cumbria, calling it west cumbria means people in key areas that maybe effected e.g. Keswick, and surrounding parishes don't believe it concerns them. The partnership are making no effort to address this issue (I suspect as if people don't think it effects them they don't respond, which means that the decision making bodies will proceed to the next stage, i think this is misleading). Also the consultation documents & the make up of the MRWS partnership are both leading, and biased towards this actually happening. Why is there no representation of green bodies on the partnership?</p> |
| 515 | 1 – Geology | No | Cumbria should not be used as a under ground dumping site for nuclear waste. Cumbria is an area of outstanding natural beauty which brings tourists in from around the world, people may be put off coming here if they know its also a place for companies to dump high levels of nuclear waste. Also there must be some risk to the public while dumping high levels of nuclear waste. Even looking for a site in West Cumbria would cause disruption and put people off coming here. Yes i agree that it will create wanted jobs in the area, but we don't want to ruing Cumbria just to create jobs, if people in Cumbria cared more about finding a job than where they live, they would just move elsewhere. |
| 515 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | No comment was made |

| | | | |
|------------|---|----|--|
| | | | |
| 516 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>The partnership's opinion of the geology of south Copeland between Muncaster and Millom seems very shaky so I'm not inclined to trust your knowledge of it. You don't seem to be aware of the underground lake understood to be beneath Kirksanton by miners in Millom and Haverigg.</p> <p>Nor have you given sufficient attention to the geometric network of sacred sites in the area. They are part of the pattern of sacred sites such as stone circles and standing stones in the Lake District which represent a quarter of the sacred sites in England.</p> <p>I suggest you learn more from those who know about these issues before dismissing them in ignorance.</p> |
| 516 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>I disagree with the Partnership's initial opinions on safety, security, environment and planning because your knowledge and understanding of the fragile nature of the very narrow area of south Copeland under review seems to be woefully inadequate. I see no mention of earth quakes or tremors yet Sellafield is on a geological fault line from around Annan in Dumfriesshire across the Border and into the sea at Seascale in Cumbria.</p> <p>A quake under Coniston Water two years ago was heard clearly around south west Cumbria and shook properties as far away as Millom.</p> <p>Also there isn't the infrastructure to deal with an evacuation if there is a problem up the coast of Cumbria, viz: evacuation of Sellafield due to high winds in January 2005. This led to gridlock when cars from Sellafield met Emergency Response vehicles from Barrow.</p> <p>Some acknowledgement of these issues by the Partnership could enhance your understanding of the area.</p> |
| 516 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>Negative: there simply isn't the space in south Copeland for the size of repository you envisage on the narrow coastal plain south of Muncaster. You can neither reduce nor compensate for this problem.</p> <p>It would annihilate the increasing business in tourism and food production that make up a major source of income for those who look after the land for townies to enjoy.</p> <p>What would happen to the main employer, HMP Haverigg?</p> <p>I'm not aware of any positive impact of your proposals.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| 516 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>You would have to improve the infrastructure of road and rail, as well as rehouse displaced people and put in investment to create jobs anyway.</p> <p>You don't commite yourselves to any particular benefit otherwise.</p> <p>Therefore there's nothing ot agre with.</p> |
| 516 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>Perhaps the "professional geological community" would like to speak to people in south Copeland before being lumbered with an opinion many of them might find hard to defend. The Partnership's initial "opinion" on design and engineering on your PR handout is fluid to the point of vapidty (i.e. emptiness)</p> |
| 516 | 6 – Inventory | No | <p>Not being able to envisage the Royal Albert Hall in terms of volume leaves me unable to agree with any opinion formed on this basis.</p> <p>The aforementioned disadvantages of South Copeland render the inventory irrelevant in this area. These include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)small coastal plain available between sea and fells makes planned repository intrusive, 2)lack of infrastructure makes development unsustainable 3)earth quakes and tremors(e.g. under Coniston Water in 2010) make area unsuitable for disposal of radioactive waaste, 4)lake under area north of Haverigg needs proper investigation before any plan can be advanced, 5)network of sacred sites (part of England's sacred geometry) should not be disturbed. |
| 516 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | <p>The evidence of geography, geology, seismology and the sacred environment should ensure south Copeland is ruled out at Stage 2.</p> |
| 516 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>Reasons why Copeland shouldn't bother to take part in a search for a repository on their patch south of Muncaster and Ravenglass are set out in this response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) area available is too small, 2) there isn't room for the necessary infrastructure as well as a repository 3)the area is subject to seismic activity, 4) geology is unsuitable i.e. presence of underground lake, 5) the sacred sites create an energetic network that would be disrupted with inevitable if unforeseen consequences. <p>The case presented here should rule out our rates being wasted on further research.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| 516 | 9 – Additional comments | | Your PR leaflet is strong on assumptions and weak on knowledge of the area you're dealing with. I hope the information included here helps you re-consider your attitude to south Copeland. |
| 518 | 1 – Geology | Yes | The BGS report gives the facts without bias. The claim that all of West Cumbria is unsuitable for such a repository is clearly not based on fact. |
| 518 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | Particularly that the partnership have in place a 'defence in depth' programme and do not appear to have any bias which would compromise any aspect of this policy. |
| 519 | 1 – Geology | Yes | I am convinced by the fact that the reviewers are expert scientists and are giving unbiased reviews. |
| 519 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | The partnership's survey of safety considerations appears to be suitably comprehensive. The intense heat and gas pressure scenario cited by Greenpiece can be resolved by design. |
| 519 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | The expectations of employment prospects seem reasonable and of course welcome. The pre training of possible workers to help them to succeed in job applications will be of great help. Sensible disposal of waste rock etc is vital. |
| 519 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | I agree with the 12 Principles because without them there could be a significant damage to the area in so far as residents may only see disadvantages in even considering the investigation. Whereas, as set out, the advantages of these detailed stipulations should mitigate most concerns. |
| 519 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | I am convinced that retrievability is very important because if Sods Law dictates that a canister leaks then we need the ability to rectify the problem. Also back filling could cause a heat build up to dangerous proportions. |
| 519 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | I am reassured that only UK waste will be stored. |
| 519 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | I agree because I cannot think of anything else to be considered. |
| 519 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | As there will be no commitment at this stage I cannot see why the councils should not take part in the search. To say no now savopurs of Luddism. |
| 519 | 9 – Additional comments | | As most active waste is held at Sellafield at the moment it would be reasonable to keep it in the area IF |

| | | | |
|------------|---|-----|---|
| | | | POSSIBLE. This would mean less transportation through the Country. When it would be more liable to terrorist threats. |
| 520 | 1 – Geology | No | The Nirex inquiry 95/96 ruled out the areas around Sellafield so why is this not included in the so called unsuitable areas marked on the map. |
| 522 | 1 – Geology | No | I have been convinced by what Professor David Smythe has said. |
| 522 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | Ref Professor David Smythe's report. |
| 522 | 3 – Impacts | No | Ref Professor David Smythe's report. |
| 522 | 4 – Community benefits | No | Ref Professor David Smythe's report. |
| 522 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | Ref Professor David Smythe's report. |
| 522 | 6 – Inventory | No | Ref Professor David Smythe's report. |
| 522 | 7 – Siting process | No | Ref Professor David Smythe's report. I am most grateful for his clear and concise report. |
| 522 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Ref Professor David Smythe. This would be "playing with fire" and in my view a complete waste of time & money which could be spent in other ways to the advantage of the community & further development of this wonderful county of Cumbria. |
| 522 | 9 – Additional comments | | Many people, possibly the majority. will go for what appears to offer substantial financial rewards, without a thought for the legacy left to future generations. I understand that there is enough coal left in this country to keep our homes warm for many years to come & that many people are longing to open up the coal mines in order to offer jobs to the unemployed. Mining accidents, terrible as they are, do not compare with nuclear accidents. |
| 523 | 1 – Geology | Yes | From reading the consultation document. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| 523 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | From reading the consultation document, obviously all responsible authorities have to work together in agreement. |
| 523 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | I would suggest improvement to all ages and gender are improved for mental and physical health, outside exercise apparatus, fruit trees for all etc. |
| 523 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | The community & wider community needs to benefit from roads, housing to recreational provision for ALL ages. |
| 523 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | As far as I can see from the document. Flexibility needs to be in place depending on where the depositary is eventually decided upon. |
| 523 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | I agree with the Inventory principles. |
| 523 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | I agree to the process not necessarily the outcome. |
| 523 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Yes if it's on your patch you should have views and have a major impact on the final decision. |
| 523 | 9 – Additional comments | | I am an unlearned citizen, so my comments obviously are comments but all comments are valuable. |
| | | | |
| 525 | 1 – Geology | No | It would be more appropriate if an in depth study rather than a desk study were undertaken regarding a geological survey to gather public opinion on such an important local issue. |
| 525 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | Nuclear energy production and its disposal provokes in some people vehement objection and in others an acceptance of modern day life. The recent tragedy in Japan, and I am sure all safety procedures were strictly followed, highlights the need for a robust safety regime. My view is that there are no experts available in this field who can correctly forecast what effects burying nuclear waste will have in thousands of years to come. |
| 525 | 3 – Impacts | No | The siting of a nuclear repository in West Cumbria would be detrimental to the tourist industry which plays a big role in the economy of the area. Cumbria also experiences high rainfall which causes flooding. No indication is given as to the full or part time employment that would be available for local people. Traffic chaos could reach intolerable levels while the site was under construction. A negative effect on water supplies, human health, the wonderful landscape, biodiversity and the eco system will all be experienced should this project be given the go ahead. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| 525 | 4 – Community benefits | No | As you have already agreed a set of principles with the government as a basis for future negotiations, why are they not in print for everyone to see, we are supposed to be living in a democracy. Many people see these community benefits as a bribe to get local people on side. In future years, cash strapped governments will accept cash payments from overseas countries to process nuclear waste at this proposed repository. |
| 525 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | There are too many uncertainties around design and engineering. |
| 525 | 6 – Inventory | No | Government states that there is a presumption that only UK radioactive waste should be disposed of in this country. A statement from government that only UK waste should be disposed of in this country would help set minds at ease. There are so many uncertainties surrounding an inventory what could go and what would go into a repository needs to be clarified. |
| 525 | 7 – Siting process | No | The process for siting a repository in West Cumbria should be given to the people of West Cumbria in the form of a vote to every household concerned, not as suggested through an opinion poll. It is an important issue for local communities who must have their voices heard. |
| 525 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I feel very strongly that Allerdale Borough Council should not take part in the search for a site to put a repository. |
| 525 | 9 – Additional comments | | I feel that the public consultation document is too vague in its opinions; there are so many uncertainties involved. The siting of a repository would cover a vast area of what is at the moment beautiful countryside. |
| | | | |
| 526 | 1 – Geology | No | I disagree that, in your initial opinion, there is enough possibly suitable land to make further investigations worthwhile. No other geological surveys would ever consider starting further investigations so near to such a diverse, difficult to map area because the mountainous terrain provides such a 'head' of pressure & rainfall and water table are so evidently unpredictable that the expense of further detailed investigations would be pointless, because you could never prove it safe. For this reason you should not move to Stage 4. (As chair of our local Flood Action Group, I will be happy to provide evidence of unpredicted rainfall and its impact, totally unpredicted). |
| 526 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | You cannot possibly suggest, let alone know, whether we have the capability or knowledge to provide a suitably built repository because you could not understand the diversity of the geology or predict many influencing factors for the full life of the nuclear waste you wish to place inside the repository. Re policies "best guess" is not satisfactory presumption for these issues. Initial policies cannot be proved adequate in a) changing environment, b) eliminate change, c) partners involved, d) advisors & governments throughout future |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|----|---|
| | | | events and centuries to come. It is much safer to contain the waste in an above ground facility to allow for flexible or pro-active reviews as our knowledge & understanding develops in the future. |
| 526 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>Jobs: Disagree: I do not agree that the economic impact will be positive for West Cumbria because the agencies or companies involved will not agree to necessarily resource many skills from the area, but will buy in “expert knowledge “ from outside. The promise of jobs will be much less than they lead us to believe – eg 550 people a year building & operating a repository is a paltry number of people to be employed. Similarly those could be provided with jobs monitoring and building an above ground facility. What will happen to the jobs of those already employed monitoring the current above ground system? Above ground facility will enable us to more readily address any problems identified in the monitoring process & may allow us to make technical improvements as our knowledge improves, further increasing employment opportunities.</p> <p>Agree: (Other impacts may be neutralised satisfactorily ONLY if the Council is strong enough to negotiate such with the nuclear industry)</p> |
| 526 | 4 – Community benefits | No | I do not trust that any future (let alone every) government would be able to honour and abide by a “Community benefits package” agreed now, however attractive it might seem it cannot be guaranteed forever. |
| 526 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | The issue of ‘irretrievability’ is too important to put off the decision whether it is or would be appropriate to a later stage in the discussion, is wrong. How can a design be both appropriate and flexible but depend on being tailored to specific geological structure? If you don’t yet know what is needed, why say you can do it? This opinion is over optimistic and I question the capability in fact, not hope. For this reason you should not proceed to the next stage. Retrieveability must be a condition otherwise the community will not believe that the intention isn’t to ‘bury it and then forget it’. |
| 526 | 6 – Inventory | No | You must know exactly what you intend to deal with in order to deal with it correctly. This facility should dictate what kind of waste it is capable of handling and the nuclear industry should work within these parameters. Every other industry in this country has to abide by waste regulations, starting with avoiding the creation of any waste in the first place. If future ‘types’ of waste may vary and volumes of waste are not known ‘up front’ how can you know if the design & engineering is sound, the community benefits package appropriate, the impacts acceptable, the safety security environment and planning policies effective or the geology conditions suitable? |
| 526 | 7 – Siting process | No | The process for siting the repository should be wholly on suitable geology. The willingness of a community, however, may come into play at the very last – but not be the initial instigation or reason for choosing a site. Voluntarism is not good judgement. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| 526 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I question the council pursuing “without commitment”. This process is far exceeding reasonable response I would deem fit, given the findings of the Nirex report (I have a copy & have read this document (edited by Prof Smythe)) and as far as your opinion that all of West Cumbria should be excluded as unsuitable being not generally accepted within the professional geological community is a lie. Which geologists have told you there is hope of suitable land within West Cumbria? |
| 526 | 9 – Additional comments | | These are very considered opinions, after much discussion & investigation. My 21 year old son is studying Earth & Environmental Science at Lancaster and has explained to me the wider implications of some of the ‘evidence’ – the graphic on the front cover for instance, implying a simple geological picture, and compared this to an actual geological map of Cumbria – I construe as misleading. Your use of double negatives and “do you agree withs....etc” are ambiguous at best, and confusing, and the voting count (where you have to qualify the ‘No’, but is that ‘Yes’ vote given the same scrutiny) is unfair and biased. |
| | | | |
| 527 | 1 – Geology | Yes | I recognise that there remains uncertainty about the geology at this stage but there has sufficient consultation with independent experts to convince me that it is reasonable to proceed further. |
| 527 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | The issues appear to have been investigated thoroughly. I think there is no reason not to proceed to the next step. I do have reservations that the regulators have been optimistic over their ability to respond to all the challenges that the safety case will bring. I am concerned that regulators may not work effectively together as the programme becomes more detailed and more challenging |
| 527 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | <p>I have been reassured that the major issues have been explored as best as can be at this stage. I am satisfied that no major concerns have been neglected.</p> <p>However, I think more work is required on the impacts of a long delay in building the repository or building it elsewhere. The large quantity of radioactive waste held at Sellafield requires management and presents safety concerns that should set the background to the considerations of the impacts of building a repository.</p> <p>I concerned that it may be thought that benefits/disbenefits impact equally on all communities in West Cumbria. Future studies need to address where the negative impacts will occur and how much these will be offset by benefits.</p> |
| 527 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | I fully support the principles that are being proposed. I agree strongly that any additional benefits should mitigate the repository's impact rather than compensate for it. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| 527 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | I am reassured that input is being received from international projects. I think retrievability may be a false hope if it only applies to retrieval before backfilling occurs. Until backfilling and the achieving a steady state with regard to ground water flow, it may not be clear how well the repository is performing. |
| 527 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | I agree with the approach to gain understanding on what the 'baseline' inventory and how to handle/agree changes to it. I think consideration of the inventory in isolation from the impact on safety can be misleading. I expect there will be a small number of critical parameters that determine the safety performance. Probably the bulk of the inventory will not be an issue. I expect there will be low volumes of 'difficult' waste which present a particular challenge to the repository performance. |
| 527 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | I think the approach outlined is reasonable and it is difficult to see what else should be done before the process actually starts. It was not clear how small potential host communities would be and at what point the demands of being involved in a credible way would be overwhelming. I support the comments about the need to ensure that the process is realistically resourced |
| 527 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I think both Copeland and Allerdale should participate in the process to search for a site for a repository. A major reason is that the existing stockpile of radioactive waste in West Cumbria probably presents a greater hazard than disposal in a repository. The only way to progress with a repository is to engage in the process. If West Cumbria proves unsuitable then it places a stronger onus on government to find an acceptable repository site elsewhere. Participation in the process will make a valuable contribution to the necessary task of finding a solution for disposal of radioactive waste. |
| | | | |
| 528 | 1 – Geology | No | I disagree that the partnerships opinions on geology that whole of Cumbria is geologically unsuitable because we just do not know enough about the geology of the area to be 100% sure that it is suitable and without spending huge amounts of money we still wouldn't know. Unless all geologists are of one mind (which they are clearly not) about the suitability of Cumbria we should not go ahead to the next stage. Secondly our area does not comply with the International Standards for a geological disposal facility. Therefore it is my opinion we should not proceed to Stage 4. |
| 528 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | I disagree with all of the partnership opinions because as in question 1:1 we just do not know enough about the suitability of the areas geology to be 100% sure of the environment safety. You cannot say the NDA have 'suitable capability and processes in place to protect local residents' as they do not know where they will place a repository yet or if ever. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| | | | I do not agree with any of the Partnerships opinions. I think the waste should be looked after and monitored above ground and not buried. |
| 528 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | I agree with all the negatives of the partnerships ‘negatives’ and NONE of the positives – the long term employment benefits to the area are minimal and not worth the expense. |
| 528 | 4 – Community benefits | No | I have answered No because you state that the “government might not agree to this” so there isn’t any community benefits. |
| 528 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | The International Standards for placing of GDF is for flat land with low water movement – I suggest you look out of your windows and glance at Cumbria’s mountains. We cannot be sure enough to design a GDF to a specification to last for 1,000s of years. |
| 528 | 6 – Inventory | No | Because agreeing with a current government might not be projected forward by subsequent governments, we just do not know enough! |
| 528 | 7 – Siting process | No | I think that when so much geological evidence is against siting a GDF in Cumbria and the current economic climate of cuts in spending, it would be foolish of the partnership to waste our hard earned money on this project. |
| 528 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I think that any area to be selected for a GDF should be led by geologists and not voluntarism of local councils and spending rate payers money on such an unsuitable area is foolhardy. |
| | | | |
| 529 | 1 – Geology | No | There are uncertainties involved therefore the answer must be NO. Far too many fault lines in Cumbria. Earth tremors (So far up to approx 3.5 in scale) Porous rocks & aquifers in vicinity. |
| 529 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | What expertise have local planners? Planners base decisions on what is on a planning application, not on anything else. Where on a planning application form does one have to sign to say that the truth & only the truth has been written. To make |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|----|--|
| | | | <p>decisions of this nature and then find out the decision was not based on the whole truth is not safe. Therefore the answer must be no.</p> <p>Past safety record is not good. When W. Cumbria nuclear programme first began in the '50s it was only guaranteed safe for 25 years maximum. How long did the government let it go on for? Therefore, the powers that be cannot be trusted. Therefore, answer must be no.</p> <p>P52 "We believe" is not good enough. When "we know" can be said, then we can think again.</p> |
| 529 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>Jobs for Locals is an important issue BUT the 'ends' do not & never should justify the 'means' i.e. Concentration camps provided jobs but were they a good idea? Nuclear depositories will provide jobs, not necessarily for locals – and they too, are not a good idea.</p> <p>Disruption locally will be over a number of years – probably over a quarter – a half a person's life living in the area.</p> <p>Where is all the spoil going to be transported to and by what means?</p> <p>The decision of the people affected must be paramount – not that of the Council.</p> <p>Bribery by the company i.e. providing roads, services etc SHOULD BE TOTALLY DISREGARDED.</p> <p>Therefore the answer is NO.</p> |
| 529 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>If the idea of having an underground depository is a good one, why are ABC & CBC & CCC the ONLY councils who are interested?</p> <p>Handouts (BRIBERY) from the company make one very suspicious of the Councils' motives.</p> |
| 529 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>I do not have any engineering knowledge but "irretrievability" seems necessary from a safety viewpoint - but then the "wrong" people could "retrieve" - just as now, when the waste is above ground.</p> <p>The bottom line to all this is – that we now know, that in the past when we thought we knew all the problems & solutions to the nuclear industry we were wrong. We don't like to admit we made a wrong decision & therefore continue with nuclear programmes. WE DON'T KNOW ENOUGH and should halt before we make any more waste. Put the money into sun & wave & tide power research.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|
| 529 | 6 – Inventory | No | The presumption is “only UK waste” – there is no upper limit specified. What control will the local community have on that? |
| 529 | 7 – Siting process | No | P93 c) “Insurmountable problems for the siting ...” caused by a community not wanting to take part will be over ruled. If a community does not want to take part – then it does not want to take part. The local community view is paramount. It is their lives that will be affected. |
| 529 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | No. What a waste of money. Make West Cumbria the ENERGY RESEARCH capital of the UK. Far safer, far more sustainable, far more jobs, far better jobs. Put money into tide & wave power. From past (lack of) safety, local people are very wary. |
| | | | |
| 530 | 1 – Geology | No | Do not believe the ground to be suitable due to its nature, the possibility of water movement/contamination and possibility of earthquakes/tremors. |
| 530 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | All the planning would be for no use if the site is breached and transport of waste to the site could be affected by terrorists. Any spillage both underground/overground could blight the area for years to come. Just look at the footprint caused by leakage from Sellafield/Chernobyl. |
| 530 | 3 – Impacts | No | Just do not want a repository in West Cumbria, find another area ie under London and see what public reaction would be. |
| 530 | 4 – Community benefits | No | Most labour would be drafted in from outside the area and the large numbers would only be here for the construction process, after that period there would be little benefit to the community. It’s a pity that all the monies from this exercise/planning & consultation could be used to improve the roads and to improve the tourism. |
| 530 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | Any benefits could only be used if the monies are available, if a downturn in the economy money could disappear or be used by Councillors expenses and other none productive bodies. Like this public consultation with all its hangers on. Design of atomic power stations has proved that all opinions are catered for. |
| 530 | 6 – Inventory | No | Political/monitory circumstances could always alter the inventory in the future including taking waste from other |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| | | | countries. |
| 530 | 7 – Siting process | No | Just do not want a repository in Cumbria. |
| 530 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I just believe that it should not be in Cumbria and too much money has already been wasted where it could have been spent on better local things. |
| 530 | 9 – Additional comments | | JUST DO NOT WANT IT. STOP WASTING MONEY ON IT. |
| | | | |
| 531 | 1 – Geology | Yes | Until detailed desk & borehole studies are completed, a final answer cannot be given. The current information is sufficiently encouraging. |
| 531 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No comment was made |
| 531 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | Well thought out. |
| 531 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | - This will have to be handled carefully so as not to appear to be bribing the populace. - This should lead to improved communication with West Cumbria. |
| 531 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | Until boreholes are cut it will be impossible to determine the final design. It is important to keep abreast of developments in similar schemes worldwide. |
| 531 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 531 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | The surface work should be outside the National Park. |
| 531 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | This should be for West Cumbria and not for Allerdale or Copeland as separate councils. It is too big a project for a council. |
| 531 | 9 – Additional comments | | 1. West Cumbria is already a centre for the nuclear industry and its knowledge. 2. HLW exists on the surface of ponds at Sellafield. This is not a solution for the very long term as: - area needed for storage will continue to grow |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cannot risk/commit long term future to manage surface facilities satisfactorily. - Risk of terrorism - The waste will not go away and will therefore continue to be a “problem” <p>3. Deep storage is the only option, and, as 1. above, West Cumbria must take part.</p> <p>4. At present the question is “do we want to be involved?” We must say yes bearing in mind that the ultimate suitability will not be known for a long time.</p> |
| | | | |
| 532 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | There is no detail as to why or why not West Cumbrian geology would be suitable. There is no clear criteria set as to what geology would be suitable, other than the absence of aquifers. If above ground facilities can be a considerable distance from underground, why is all the Nat Park excluded? What rock IS suitable, and why? |
| | | | |
| 533 | 1 – Geology | No | If Cumbria had a major earthquake what would happen to it? |
| 533 | 3 – Impacts | No | Drop in tourism could be more people out of work with more shops closing. |
| | | | |
| 534 | 1 – Geology | Yes | The industry has been honest in the past, beside the fact that geologists and others would have an input. |
| 534 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | Experienced regulators are involved, along with local authorities and parish councils. |
| 534 | 3 – Impacts | Not answered | If we do not proceed what happens to the waste slopping about above ground at Sellafield. |
| 534 | 4 – Community benefits | Not Sure/ Partly | Benefit package might be better if we resisted, and West Cumbria was still chosen not really honest though. |
| 534 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | No comment was made |
| 534 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| 534 | 7 – Siting process | Not answered | It would be silly, not to say hypocritical to oppose the search for a solution to radioactive waste in West Cumbria considering the industry is sited in the area. |
| 534 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I support the initiative |
| | | | |
| 535 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | Stability of the strata. Recent fracking off the Isle of Man resulted in a significant earth tremor at Blackpool so had to be suspended. Not sure how this could be avoided. |
| 535 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Not Sure/ Partly | Where human beings are involved it is difficult to guarantee that, for gain or under pressure, they would not compromise the operation – How can anyone address this concern? |
| 535 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | Your initial opinion on P60 sets out that the impacts are not yet completely understood, so I agree with this. |
| 535 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | A lot of aspects have been considered on implications of a community benefits package and its distribution. |
| 535 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | I agree that detailed design issues cannot be determined until a site (or sites) identified. General design and site must be guaranteed not to flood and not be exposed to earth tremors. Global warming is meant to raise sea levels ... does this raise further implications? |
| 535 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | This depends upon National Government to continue their role in supporting the rules for the inventory & not make 'u' turns esp regarding upper limits & any retrieval requests. |
| 535 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | Voluntarism may be very difficult to maintain – the “right to withdrawal” pledge must be cast iron. |
| 535 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Essential – only those who have to live with the consequences of this plan should have prime say. Must be nowhere near tourist 'honey pot' areas. |
| 535 | 9 – Additional comments | | I feel this is a 'lose lose' situation. We are damned if we do go ahead and damned if we don't. |
| | | | |
| 536 | 1 – Geology | Yes | No adverse comment |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| 536 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No adverse comment |
| 536 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | Do not see any real negatives |
| 536 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | Very subjective point – see Q8 |
| 536 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | Not sufficiently technically minded to disagree |
| 536 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment |
| 536 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | No comment was made |
| 536 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | 1. Stage 3 must proceed and be positive. 2. I see no reason for not moving this project to completion |
| 536 | 9 – Additional comments | | There are a number of issues which are subjective e.g. employment, housing of incoming workers etc. Perhaps some further consideration of these aspects leading to quantification could be useful. |
| | | | |
| 537 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | Don't understand enough about the geology especially in an area of high rainfall. |
| 537 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | No safety is 100% and Cumbria has more than its fair share of nuclear activity. |
| 537 | 3 – Impacts | No | The long-term impact on health, jobs and the local community are not sufficiently accounted for. Job prospects will decrease as tourists stay away. |
| 537 | 4 – Community benefits | No | How can one agree when there are no specifics? |
| 537 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | Far too woolly e.g. “depends on location” “appropriate & flexible” |
| 537 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| 537 | 7 – Siting process | No | Not enough emphasis on the power of local people to veto the proposal – the people whose children’s children will be affected. |
| 537 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Under no circumstances should these councils continue to search for a site. |
| 537 | 9 – Additional comments | | This is a radically flawed process and West Cumbria should be honest & withdraw now. |
| | | | |
| 538 | 1 – Geology | No | The geology of the Lake District is very diverse with many faults. A survey has already been carried out which said the geology was not suitable. The water table is very high & seepage could occur affecting the National Park and the Irish Sea. |
| 538 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>The depository could be located under lakes & high ground water area with a very long tunnel from the coast with possibility of accidents along the way. It could close the tourism of the Lake District & the possibility of World Heritage site.</p> <p>Any seepage could also affect the Irish Sea. Such a siting could be made by ministers in London overruling any opinions of the National Park. West Cumbria is making decisions for the rest of Cumbria – the rest of Cumbria is more diverse & its vote will not count & is more likely to have the detractions rather than any possible benefits. The rubbish under the lakes, the site in West Cumbria & employment benefits in West Cumbria.</p> |
| 538 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>It is likely that jobs apart from labouring would be the only short-term employment for the locals. Most experts being brought in from elsewhere.</p> <p>The impact on the National Park would likely be very negative.</p> <p>We do not know how we could withdraw if we go to the next stage – What would the valid decisions have to be to withdraw if we go on to the next stage - would not future governments put pressure on the Council to agree or override the local opinions, as this is the only area that has volunteered? If we go to the next stage we have to give very valid decision to withdraw - if there is the right geology would extra pressure be given to adopt the burying of the waste in Cumbria. Out of sight & mind of London & the South East.</p> |
| 538 | 4 – Community benefits | No | We do not know what community benefits would be. I have noticed very little government money is being put into West Cumbria at present. More into the North East. Is this to run this area down so they will do anything |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | to get handouts. |
| 538 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | Until we know what the design & engineering is can't decide. Only the size of above ground is noted which will give short-term employment & small long-term employment. |
| 538 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | I do not know what is meant by inventory. Will we have to be a dumping ground for Europe's or other country's waste especially if we continue to make mistakes in reprocessing like the incident with Japan where we had to take the waste back. |
| 538 | 7 – Siting process | No | If the geological case is found for a site (particularly in a remote area) with low population, how could the local population influence the decision which could easily be overruled by the large populations of West Coast Allerdale & Copeland who would receive the benefits of government funds & employment. |
| 538 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | If we go to the next stage it will be very difficult to withdraw without valid (whatever that may mean) reasons. Could be forced to go on to the complete project. As the rest of the country will be glad it's not in their back yard. |
| 538 | 9 – Additional comments | | It has always been a bad idea to situate a nuclear facility so close to the most popular National Park. I do not know how it has become a dumping site above ground without the consent of the locals & planning permission. This could adversely affect the National Park's application of World Heritage Site & future tourism. |
| | | | |
| 539 | 1 – Geology | Yes | Seems thorough and questions about seismic activity answered well. |
| 539 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | Seems to be thought through well. |
| 539 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | Negative effect include environment, tourism, future Positive effect – employment ? appropriate additional benefits |
| 539 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | No comment was made |
| 539 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | Seems well planned |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------|---|
| 539 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | The actual amount going into the repository will be unknown – but will depend on the size of it. |
| 539 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | Seems a well organised process |
| 539 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Seems fair enough |
| | | | |
| 540 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I see no disadvantage to proceeding to the next stage provided the right to withdraw still applies. Further investigation should answer many of the questions raised so far. |
| | | | |
| 541 | 1 – Geology | Yes | No comment was made |
| 541 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No comment was made |
| 541 | 3 – Impacts | Not Sure/ Partly | No comment was made |
| 541 | 4 – Community benefits | Not Sure/ Partly | No comment was made |
| 541 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | No comment was made |
| 541 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 541 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | No comment was made |
| | | | |
| 543 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | I live in the Keswick area I think to put a repository in this area is out of the question the mountains are too high and the valley bottom far too narrow for such development and size of the repository. |
| 543 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Not Sure/ Partly | Safety must be of the utmost importance. I am very concerned the impact of such development would mean to the environment, |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--------------|---|
| 543 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | West Cumbria is where the repository should go but there must be more tests to find a suitable site. It would be less expensive i.e. roads and planning etc, being near to the Sellafield site and also we must consider the new Nuclear Power Station which the area has been earmarked for. |
| 543 | 4 – Community benefits | Not answered | As No 7, page 66 does not give any clear idea of what the benefits are going to be at this stage I feel this question is not applicable. |
| 543 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not answered | I do not feel I am qualified to answer this question. |
| 543 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 543 | 7 – Siting process | Not answered | I feel more investigations should be carried out in West Cumbria, they have a larger land mass for a repository of the size quoted in the consultation document. |
| 543 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I think you will know my views from previous questions answered. |
| 543 | 9 – Additional comments | | <p>The Lake District is one of the most beautiful places in the UK if not the whole world. It has been preserved over many years by previous generations and I feel duty bound to be a part of trying to preserve the area for future generations. The Lake District generates most of its income from tourism and outside the London area it is the most visited place in the UK. It is in the National Park and has a large amount of National Trust land. Given the size of the repository “page 3 of what a repository might look like above ground” the impact on tourism would be catastrophic.</p> <p>No other County in the Country wants a repository so Cumbria is going to be the county where all other communities’ radioactive waste is stored. The repository must be sited where is the least amount of impact on the points I have raised above.</p> |
| | | | |
| 544 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>West Cumbria’s mining (coal/iron) was defeated by geology.</p> <p>NIREX applied extensive studies/boreholes and retired defeated.</p> <p>Unlike Scandinavia – Sweden/Finland – our geology is broken/fractured – even waterlogged.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | Sweden/Finland have storage facilities within their own confined nuclear sites – built on solid granite and do not take waste from elsewhere. It is disingenuous to compare them with West Cumbria. |
| 544 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>Sellafield use the best materials and machines but regrettably have been let down by their management/workforce (or elements therein) over many years.</p> <p>Over the years there have been safety issues/leaks detrimental to local health. Whilst I am pro-nuclear I am not happy with taking the nations waste.</p> <p>Environmental damage – real or perceived will damage tourism to the West Coast/Lake District – an industry that employs thousands.</p> |
| 544 | 3 – Impacts | Not answered | As stated I am pro-nuclear but over the 40 years I have lived in Whitehaven I have seen no great improvement to the infrastructure – lots of “promises” but little action and certainly no local political muscle to get the nuclear industry improve or add to our roads/rail or hospital. The A595 is a disgrace and would fail in the event of any emergency at Sellafield and /or proposed repository. We should only be responsible for our “own (Sellafield) waste and certainly not foreign waste regardless of what “promises/contracts” state. |
| 544 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>Westlakes Science Park is a great example of what can be achieved. The same investment could also benefit the community if the nuclear industry got behind West Cumberland Hospital and created a centre of Health Research & Teaching – Thereby also improving nuclear energy employees lot in the unhappy situation of an “event”</p> <p>As before – the West Cumbrian infrastructure is poor and has driven many non-nuclear industries away from the area. A decent road/rail service would encourage a more balanced working society of equal employment numbers across the region. As you point out – Government cannot/may not agree with any community benefits package you may propose – so why should the community believe anything not set in concrete?</p> |
| 544 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>Mining activities in Cumbria over a couple of centuries have built up a record that suggests our geology is not suitable for what is planned.</p> <p>Recent “fracking” off the north west coast has created problems.</p> <p>There is a distinct difference in Cumbria’s geology to that of Finland (Posiva) – The Finnish photo depicts solid granite in no need of support and certainly looks quite dry. Disingenuous to compare the two different geological structures. Same applies to Sweden’s waste disposal (i.e. they only look after their own waste).</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--------------|---|
| | | | |
| 544 | 6 – Inventory | No | <p>You have offered only guesses as to size and actual inventory along with advice that the government – inventory could be changed. This week (WH News 16 Feb 2012) reports that West Cumbria could be receiving Royal Navy submarine nuclear waste. What else is in the pipeline?</p> <p>If geology proves suitable (doubtful) the proposed repository is too large and will lead to West Cumbria becoming a nuclear dustbin for the nation and probably others who pay enough to government – governments change every five years and the goal posts change accordingly as have been proved over the last few decades.</p> |
| 544 | 7 – Siting process | Not answered | <p>I am unhappy of the close partnership between Copeland/Allerdale council and the nuclear industry. Those councillors are politically motivated rather than accepting projects on merit. Copeland councillors were elected by just 43% of the electorate and have little or no expertise in matters nuclear – they tend to take a short-term view beneficial to their own political beliefs. I would much prefer less councillors and more “civilian” experienced community leaders to be involved in this partnership.</p> |
| 544 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>See 7.1</p> <p>Not one Copeland councillor was in attendance at the Civic Hall Whitehaven meeting, 19 Feb 2012 1400 session. There are 51 councillors and not one was prepared to answer any questions – they sent a fairly junior – unelected – officer.</p> |
| 544 | 9 – Additional comments | | <p>As previously stated – I am not happy with the close working arrangement between nuclear and Copeland BC on this issue.</p> <p>Past experience suggest outcomes that are not beneficial to the entire community.</p> |
| | | | |
| 545 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>Without access to more detailed information and not being a geologist myself, one cannot question that the BGS survey was not done competently, but to a rather narrow terms of reference and to a set of unsuitability criteria that seem to exclude ones that should have been included (eg geological complexity), even at this screening stage. Given that there is no other area in the country that might be going to the next stage, the pressure to find a suitable geology somewhere in our area will be over-whelming if it is decided to proceed.</p> |
| 545 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>Most of this section is not specific to the repository being in West Cumbria, but is generic. I would have concerns that the planning application might be considered not by local planners, but by a national body, where</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| | | | local views might not carry their due weight. |
| 545 | 3 – Impacts | No | If this goes to the next stage and a suitable site from a geological perspective was found, the pressure to find “solutions” to impacts will over-ride everything. Impacts on tourism can only be negative and it is difficult to see how these could be overcome. |
| 545 | 4 – Community benefits | No | This is an irrelevancy at this stage of the process and should not have been included as it diverts attention and focus on much more important issues. |
| 545 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | Without professional independent advice, the Partnership members cannot possibly have the expertise or competence to judge this issue. The fact that they have accepted that “the design concepts being developed are appropriate and flexible enough at this stage.” is an excellent example of the document’s general tone of going along with whatever is being said by official bodies (eg the NDA) and scepticism about views from others. |
| 545 | 6 – Inventory | No | There is no guarantee that non-UK waste will not be deposited in this facility. This is one of the big failings of nuclear power programmes – that plants are built all over the world with no definite idea of how the wastes will be handled over their active lifetime – it is difficult to think of other industries for which this would be allowed. No nuclear power plants should be built until that country has such plans in place. DECC is being disingenuous about what will happen to the waste from new nuclear plants – of course, it will be deposited in the repository (as it should be if this is the best practicable environmental option for such waste). |
| 545 | 7 – Siting process | No | By dint of there being no other area offering itself for this search, the so-called “right of withdrawal” would be very difficult to exercise if a site with suitable geology was found in West Cumbria. Would a negative impact on, for example, tourism be allowed to stand in the way of the economic benefits from construction/operation of such a facility whatever the negative economic impacts on tourism and everything else. |
| 545 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I believe that the voluntarism process is completely the wrong way to start the process of site selection which should begin with identifying areas with suitable geology. Given that this is the procedure, the process should only have gone ahead provided that there were a minimum number (6?) of candidate areas expressing an interest. Therefore, I believe that the Borough Councils should not be taking part in this search. However, I do accept that areas with nuclear power plants should take responsibility for their own wastes, but not necessarily for those from other parts of the country. |
| 545 | 9 – Additional comments | | It is ludicrous to concentrate all this effort into one tiny area of the UK that is known to have certain geological features very likely to be made unsuitable and which are completely different to the geology in other countries where repositories are or are being sited. I have not read the CoWRM documents that resulted in an underground repository being decided as the best way forward for nuclear waste, but I have doubts whether |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | this is inherently better than a surface facility or facilities. I appreciate concerns about security and terrorist attacks, but, given likely the cost of an underground facility, surely an adequate surface facility could be built? |
| 547 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I agree that there is insufficient information available at the present time. - Information on geological activity / location of geological faults / resources (minerals and aquifers) would help me to make up my mind. - There should be no development that impacts on the National Park in any way. |
| 547 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | - If it is truly believed that this type of storage system is safe over the long term for people, the environment and security then the facility should be sited in a developed area, near to the people who will be using the energy, not remote Cumbrian communities. I will not believe that this is a truly safe process unless it can be sited near to a large population centre. |
| 547 | 3 – Impacts | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If it went ahead I believe there would be a large impact on tourism. - The Lake District National Park is already under huge pressure and is becoming surrounded by large-scale infrastructure (off and on-shore wind / new National Grid connections etc). This would be a further large-scale development and further erode the areas special qualities. - I fundamentally disagree with locating potentially dangerous / harmful industries in areas with economic problems where they are likely to be accepted due to the promises of jobs. |
| 547 | 4 – Community benefits | No | - This is bribery and these "packages" never live up to the initial hype once the development has been agreed. |
| 547 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | No comment was made |
| 547 | 6 – Inventory | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is not enough detail on the likely amounts of waste. - There is a danger that the upper limit will be used as the standard for the amount of waste that can be dumped. |
| 547 | 7 – Siting process | Not Sure/ | - Consultations need to be much simpler than this one. It should be possible to comment on the areas that |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--------|--|
| | | Partly | interest each person - not have to go through this massive document and series of questions. Please take in to account for future consultations. |
| 547 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | No - I don't believe that these areas will turn out to be suitable from a geological point of view. Even if they do however I am extremely concerned with the potential impacts on landscape and environment. Although I live in Lancashire I work in Cumbria and love the Lake District. A project like this would help to further erode the special qualities of this part of the UK. If these systems of storage really are safe then please site them below a large city - the impacts should be on those who need the power, not rural communities. |
| 549 | 1 – Geology | Yes | I agree that at this stage the whole of Cumbria has not been ruled out geologically and we should do further testing to see if any sites are suitable. To reject it now would be to do so without the full picture. |
| 550 | 1 – Geology | No | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |
| 550 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |
| 550 | 3 – Impacts | No | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |
| 550 | 4 – Community benefits | No | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |
| 550 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |
| 550 | 6 – Inventory | No | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |
| 550 | 7 – Siting process | No | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |
| 550 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Potential World Heritage Site and nuclear waste repository do not belong in the same sentence. If it is so safe, why not site it in London? |

| | | | |
|------------|---|----|---|
| | | | |
| 551 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>I believe that we know enough already (from previous investigations, e.g. NIREX) that the geology is not at all suitable.</p> <p>The area is obviously complex (even to those without any expertise in geology) and as such is not at all suitable - and not just the rock types and structures, but also the water aquifers, fault lines and movements. To carry out investigations all over the area to try and find a suitable site would simply be a waste of time and money to proceed further.</p> |
| 551 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>Whilst no doubt the actual construction process would be managed in a reasonably safe and secure manner, it is the overall issue of safety of what we are left with that must also be considered, and I do not believe that ultimately this can be achieved.</p> <p>And looking at the consultation document I am highly suspicious that there could be plenty of words that could be used to fudge the issues</p> |
| 551 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>The long term impacts on West Cumbria have to be taken into consideration - and as the geology is unsuitable, then the impact would then become apparent in the long term, when it would be too late.</p> <p>It might be laudable to think of the economic benefits, which could include sweeteners, but this cannot counter the inherent unsuitability of the proposed areas.</p> |
| 551 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>To offer sweeteners to the local communities could well be viewed as bribes.</p> <p>Also, I cannot see how, not matter how well intentioned, any such benefits can ultimately be judged as being additional to existing and planned investments - the natural outcome would be that if benefits are provided by a new body, then pressure on existing bodies would be lessened.</p> |
| 551 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>I cannot see how design and engineering can be seen as being done or viewed as being done properly when the fundamental feasibility of such a scheme is without doubt flawed to the extent of ruling out any area as being suitable.</p> |
| 551 | 6 – Inventory | No | <p>It may be appreciated that it is still early days to say what precisely might stored, but I can well imagine no matter what sort of assurances may be given, the scope would increase as time went on, on a slowly/slowly basis, until imports etc would be coming in.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|
| | | | |
| 551 | 7 – Siting process | No | I cannot agree - what should be done first is to find suitable sites/areas - which would rule out such areas as West Cumbria due to its complex geology - and then to proceed with getting local/regional consensus to development of a repository in such locations. |
| 551 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>I think that we should NOT proceed any further in this process.</p> <p>The geology makes the proposed areas totally unsuitable and the risks are far too great to even consider looking further.</p> <p>To proceed further has been described as "starting to head down a slippery slope" as the further you get into such a scheme, the harder it is to pull out, no matter what assurances are given about being able to opt out at various points - it's just human nature for one thing.</p> |
| 551 | 9 – Additional comments | | <p>The problem of safe disposal of nuclear waste is, of course, a problem, but to proceed further in West Cumbria will delay looking for suitable areas - and given the time scales in carrying out such investigations and processes - the sooner such surveys are carried out the better, rather than wasting time, and a huge sum of money, in carrying on in West Cumbria.</p> <p>I also felt a little concerned that whilst the consultation document is, I believe, supposed to be impartial, I felt that it does tend to lean towards continuing with the process in West Cumbria.</p> <p>I am also concerned that some might opt for the "Not Sure/ Partly" answer as not a full "No" applies; so such responses might be counted out.</p> |
| | | | |
| 552 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I am totally against a repository being constructed in West Cumbria. I am therefore against Allerdale and Copeland Councils putting energy into searching for a site. In my opinion, the idea should be dropped now. |
| 552 | 9 – Additional comments | | I am totally against a repository being built in Cumbria. Any site chosen will create an enormous impact on the environment, wildlife and on not one, but several communities. The facility will be the tip of an enormous iceberg, with new roads and various other links having to be carved into our beautiful landscape to serve the proposed monstrosity. We have to contend with the development of another huge power plant being built on the West Cumbrian Coast. This in itself will have an enormous impact on our countryside and day to day safety of Cumbrians. To invest in the idea of creating more spoil in our beloved county is simply wrong for this generation and the next. Please stop this idea progressing further. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|
| | | | |
| 553 | 1 – Geology | No | I do not believe the geology should be disturbed. It should be left as it is. |
| 553 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | There is no guarantee of safety, including leakage of radioactive material getting into the water system, etc. It also makes Cumbria a sitting target for terrorist attacks. The waste material has to be brought in from elsewhere so there is a vulnerability at point of transfer. |
| 553 | 3 – Impacts | No | There may be jobs created by this repository but I do feel that other jobs could be created. It is not the only job provider. |
| 553 | 4 – Community benefits | No | Community packages are always a carrot to justify what is being done. I do not feel any community package is justified by having the repository. |
| 553 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | An underground repository will disturb the natural environment of Cumbria forever. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty. Hiding the construction underground does not hide the fact that it is a nuclear waste dump. Save Cumbria from such a fate! |
| 553 | 6 – Inventory | No | I don't think anything should be sent for geological disposal in Cumbria. Leave Cumbria's geology as it is. Only nature can design and redesign geology. What would happen if there was an earthquake; tsunami; rising sea levels,etc We are living in a period of climate change and don't know the future impact of these changes. |
| 553 | 7 – Siting process | No | The siting process is not sufficiently robust and flexible to meet its needs. There is not a significant need for a repository. Take away the need and the siting process becomes redundant. |
| 553 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I don't feel a repository is justified and the years of searching will be very costly. The money spent would be better spent on looking at why we think we need repositories and reducing the need for repositories. Lifestyle changes and alternatives may be needed but do need to be considered. |
| 553 | 9 – Additional comments | | Rethink the whole purpose of this exercise and go back to grass roots/ drawing board. Geological repositories are not essential |
| | | | |
| 556 | 1 – Geology | No | Whilst there might be suitable geology in parts of West Cumbria, the search by means of 'voluntarism' has automatically excluded the remainder of the United Kingdom, where more suitable, stable geology, has already been identified by geology experts. The search would gain some credibility if it were a scientific and |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| | | | geologically led process, not a political one. Much of West Cumbria is hydro-geologically unfavourable, due to its exceptionally high rainfall, high mountains, underground aquifers, unstable geology and unpredictable rock fracturing. The voluntarism process has not been preceded and supported by a UK wide geological survey and is therefore fundamentally flawed. |
| 556 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>The regulatory bodies have not always proved effective over the past sixty years, with radioactive substances escaping into our environment, both airborne and water borne. Being 'as confident as possible' is insufficient for burying huge amounts of highly active nuclear waste into our environment for thousands of years, potentially near communities and sources of drinking water. This is a massive undertaking, with no previous proven experience available. I am strongly opposed to committing West Cumbria and its inhabitants to this potentially high risk experiment. The issue of higher volumes of untreated waste from higher burn-up fuels in new reactors has not been adequately addressed in relation to this consultation. Professional experts have raised concerns regarding potential geological disturbance and other phenomena and conditions which could compromise the proposed containment materials over long periods of time. There are issues regarding radionuclides migrating prematurely into the environment via multiple routes due to containment corrosion. The nuclear industry's claim of safe containment is not convincing. The exceptionally high rainfall and unpredictable, fractured geology in West Cumbria could greatly increase the possibility of nuclear environmental contamination. Because West Cumbria has already been exposed to unacceptable amounts of nuclear contamination, I am opposed to a further increase in the amounts of nuclear waste being brought into this area.</p> |
| 556 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>Jobs gained in operating a repository would be negated by jobs lost in other non-nuclear industries adversely affected by the stigma of a nuclear dump.</p> <p>The massive influx of migrant workers during construction stages would bring adverse impacts, including an increase in disease, crime, racial issues and illegitimate births. These impacts would overwhelm the fragile infra-structure and resources in West Cumbria. These 'hidden' costs could easily outweigh any potential economic benefits.</p> <p>Previous experience demonstrates that property prices fall dramatically once an area is identified for nuclear development. Concentrating all UK nuclear waste anywhere near peoples homes would create extreme ongoing stigma and blight. If a repository were built near a community, there must be prior agreement with government, that the affected property owners should be given the option to be bought out at enhanced rates, without having to prove loss of value.</p> <p>Committing West Cumbria to an increased nuclear future, will proportionally diminish our already weak economic diversity to the point of no return and complete nuclear isolation. Attempting to treat West Cumbria</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|----|---|
| | | | as a 'brand' trivialises deep held environmental, recreational and spiritual values in West Cumbria and reflects the current throw-away, consumer society. These values are not exclusive to the Lake District National Park. |
| 556 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>Compared to the 'government billions' given to Carlsbad in New Mexico, for hosting the US Low Level Waste repository for the weapons industry(WIPP), West Cumbria has already been storing Low Level Nuclear Waste for many decades at Drigg. West Cumbria has also provided major national and international nuclear waste services at Sellafield for over fifty years and has received no appropriate community benefits package, let alone adequate infra-structure to provide these unique services. West Cumbria has long been abused by successive governments as a nuclear experimental and dumping zone and already has a massive benefits deficit, without hosting a high level nuclear waste dump.</p> <p>Suitable infra-structure must be in place prior to any further nuclear development and should not be part of a community benefits package.</p> <p>If a repository is sited in West Cumbria, a community benefits package must be identified before agreeing to proceed to the next stage. The requirements of any 'host community' should be prioritised and include up-front funds to buy out owners of adversely affected properties at fair compensation rates. This should include property blight where multiple sites are being considered. BP has a policy of buying affected properties at 100% pre-blight valuation, along with a moving allowance.</p> <p>Facilitating the establishment of non-nuclear related industries to diversify employment is a long-standing aspiration in West Cumbria and should be part of any benefits package.</p> |
| 556 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>Given the highly hazardous content and potential volume and footprint of a repository, it should be located remotely from communities, not only vertically but horizontally. MRWS is complacent in accepting the nuclear industry's engineering claims to withstand the unpredictable hydro-geological forces of West Cumbria, for what amounts to eternity in human terms. High Level Nuclear Waste repositories have not been tried and tested and far too little is known or agreed on by the experts. Concerns have been expressed by professional experts regarding the premature corrosion of proposed containment materials. Repository technology is in its infancy and West Cumbria's hydro-geology is far from ideal. There is insufficient evidence to guarantee that radionuclides will not leak back into our environment through various routes. In the past, the nuclear 'experts' have got things seriously wrong and significant amounts of radioactivity have been released into the West Cumbrian environment on several occasions in as little as sixty years. High Level Nuclear Waste will kill humans and animals very quickly on contact. The serious, long-term nature of a repository is not reflected in the governments politically led, desk based 'voluntarism' approach.</p> |
| 556 | 6 – Inventory | No | The potential volume and inventory of a repository is unclear. What would happen to vitrified reprocessed |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| | | | <p>waste, as this requires special cooling? This material would not seem suitable for deep disposal. WCMRWS and council representatives have confused the public about the size and inventory of a repository in public statements. The argument for siting a national repository in West Cumbria because legacy waste is stored at Sellafield is not compelling. Future reactor spent fuel would be unprocessed and would far outweigh the volume of existing waste at Sellafield by several magnitudes.</p> <p>It is time for all counties in the UK to take full responsibility for using nuclear energy and should retain and store their own nuclear waste. Councils with large cities in particular, should take responsibility for their enormous and frequently unnecessary energy consumption. The dumping of all nuclear waste in a repository 'somewhere in West Cumbria' is irresponsible and morally negligent. I am strongly opposed to West Cumbria being used as a large scale nuclear dump for everyone else's waste.</p> |
| 556 | 7 – Siting process | No | <p>The 'voluntarism' process has effectively excluded a valid scientific, geological search of all of the UK outside West Cumbria. Suitable areas of geology have already been identified in central and Eastern regions of the UK. This has completely been disregarded.</p> <p>The process proposed within West Cumbria effectively allows larger communities (most already excluded from a geological search, thereby incurring non of the adverse impacts) to impose a repository and its extreme stigma, onto a smaller community, by simple means of out-voting. This is an unjust system deliberately designed to give larger communities a financial incentive to benefit at the expense of smaller, vulnerable rural communities. The preponderance of groups within WCMRWS with a vested financial interests in having a repository in West Cumbria, implicates the Partnership as being biased and lacking integrity, validity or independent scrutiny.</p> |
| 556 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>Deep Geological Disposal technology for high level nuclear waste is not tried and tested and is in its infancy. Too little is known or agreed on by the experts. WCMRWS are complacent and negligent in accepting nuclear industry claims to engineer structures impervious to the natural forces of West Cumbrian geology for thousands of years.</p> <p>Regulatory bodies have already failed to prevent several significant radiological releases to the West Cumbria environment in only sixty years. Professional experts have identified safety issues regarding the unknown effects of natural phenomena on proposed repository containment methods and materials that could result in potential releases of radionuclides, via multiple routes to the environment.</p> <p>If Copeland and/or Allerdale Borough Councils decide to take part in the search for a repository in West Cumbria, it will be virtually impossible for West Cumbria to withdraw from. The rest of the UK clearly has no intention of participating in this process, thereby increasing government and national pressure on West</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>Cumbria to find a repository site, regardless of suitable geology.</p> <p>The 'voluntarism' search has focussed on West Cumbria because of its economic vulnerability and existing stranglehold by the nuclear industry, not because of its ideal hydro-geology. It excludes a proper scientific geological search of the whole of the UK, totally disregarding more suitable areas of geology already identified.</p> <p>The process potentially allows a repository to be forced onto an unwilling 'host' community, by means of it being out-voted by larger communities not included in the search area or directly affected by adverse impacts.</p> <p>West Cumbria has already been providing major nuclear waste storage services to the nation for more than fifty years. It has never been provided with adequate infra-structure to provide these services. It has received no appropriate community benefits package in recognition of these major existing services. Successive government promises of nuclear 'jam tomorrow' has worn threadbare, exposing local councils' repeated inability to protect West Cumbrias best interests and allowing it to be persistently abused for large scale nuclear experiment and waste dumping.</p> <p>Government and other counties have already made statements indicating an assumption that all future spent nuclear fuel will go in a repository in West Cumbria. The rest of the UK should take full responsibility for the nuclear energy they consume.</p> |
| 556 | 9 – Additional comments | <p>Future nuclear waste should be stored at the source of the energy consumption, not sent to West Cumbria for convenient disposal. The issue of higher volumes of untreated waste from higher burn-up fuel in new reactors has not been adequately adressed.</p> <p>Adverse impacts beyond mitigation include an increase in disease, crime, illegitimate births and racial issues associated with a massive influx of migrant workers for construction work. Local infra-structure and authorities would be overwhelmed and these hidden costs would never be properly acknowledged or addressed.</p> <p>The diminishing economic diversity due to expanding nuclear domination would increase exponentially with a repository in West Cumbria. Damage to tourism and non-nuclear industries from the extreme stigma of a 'nuclear waste dump' would outweigh economic benefits and is unlikely to ever be mitigated.</p> <p>Property owners adversely affected in communities coerced into hosting a repository, should automatically have the opportunity to sell their properties to the government at fair compensatory rates including a generous relocation allowance.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | <p>Proper infra-structure in West Cumbria should not be used as a government bribe for hosting a repository. It should be provided prior to any further nuclear development.</p> <p>The West Cumbria councils expressing interest in search participation, demonstrate a willingness (without the consent of the people of West Cumbria) to host a repository. I strongly oppose moving to the next stage which would railroad West Cumbria into hosting a repository, regardless of suitable geology. The consultation is without independently funded scrutiny and is therefore fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Dr Helen Wallace (GeneWatch) is justifiably concerned that " - tension between the economic benefits offered to host communities and long-term repository safety, leading to a danger that concerns about safety and impacts on future generations may be sidelined by the prospect of economic incentives, new infrastructure or jobs."</p> <p>There is increasing public demand for West Cumbria to hold an independent referendum on proceeding with a search for a suitable site. The information available is sufficient to justify a referendum. This would avoid the complex, highly structured, restrictive and often rhetorical questions of this consultation and its dubious interpretation by a biased partnership with a preponderance of groups with a financial vested interest in having a repository in West Cumbria.</p> |
| | | | |
| 558 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>Not in a position to comment as not a geologist but concerned that only Cumbria is being investigated as possible site so we cannot know where would be the most suitable site in Britain.</p> <p>Feel that the decision by Allerdale and Copeland councils to volunteer are more political than geological.</p> |
| 558 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>The Government seems to be in a hurry and I am therefore concerned that some aspects of safety, security and environmental protection will be compromised. I fear that there are dangers of gas emissions and water pollution. Exploring only one county (and that being a political choice) makes the whole affair look suspicious. This is a national issue and should be investigated nationally to clear it of the suspicion that political forces will dominate.</p> |
| 558 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>I believe that National Park and its beautiful outlying areas, its tourist industry and agriculture will be adversely affected by the MRWS process. There is nothing about this consultation that will allay these fears because there has been not been enough national public discussion on all the matters relating to this issue.</p> |
| 558 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>Again, not enough information or discussion for anyone to form an opinion on community benefits or on the</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | disadvantages to the community . There isn't even a clear notion of who the community is. Do we mean the present day inhabitants of Cumbria or of Britain? Do we mean future inhabitants who may suffer because decisions were made by governments and councils with short term interests? |
| 558 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | Not well enough informed to comment. |
| 558 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | No comment. |
| 558 | 7 – Siting process | No | At the risk of being/sounding repetitive I have to ask, how can you identify potential site areas if you only look at one county? |
| 558 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Once they take part in the search they're on the road to commitment. Of course commitment is neither implied nor inevitable but its considerably nearer. Withdrawal may be a right but it will be a difficult one to claim. |
| 558 | 9 – Additional comments | | I am concerned that since the search for the siting of possible suitable areas is confined to Cumbria there will be immense pressure to "indentify" such a site here whether there is one or not. The right of withdrawal is being trumpeted but I have no confidence in it. Once the wagon starts moving it will be almost impossible to stop. There won't be just the usual suspects of vested interests. Along with the pressure from government & some councils, "group think" will play its part in keeping the momentum going and avoiding the stigma/what will look like a waste of vast amounts of money and expertise. |
| | | | |
| 560 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>I think safety is the number one priority in the permanent storage of radioactive waste. To maximise the safety we need the best possible site in the UK.</p> <p>This process is not discovering that site. At the meeting I attended the impression I gained was that somehow, somewhere this process would find a site in West Cumbria - it might not be the best, it might not the most suitable - but it would 'do'.</p> <p>That is not good enough. By putting the voluntarism/community considerations before a 'find the best site in the UK' approach, safety is being compromised. The process is completely flawed.</p> <p>My second observation is that we seem in the 1990's to have established a couple of sensible geological principles for the optimum solution viz:</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| | | | <p>'the location should be in a region of low hydraulic gradients so that there should be slow moving and long groundwater paths' and 'the geology and hydrogeology of the site and its district should be sufficiently uncomplicated as to be readily characterisable and predictable.'</p> <p>But nowhere in the documentation does it say that the Decision-Making Bodies and the Regulators will be bound by or commit to follow these guiding principles. It is this sort of thing that creates an overall impression that the geology (and hence safety) will be compromised in favour of the voluntarism/community aspects.</p> |
| 560 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>I have read the Rock Solid and NWAA Issues Register documents as well as most of the documents referred to in the Consultation document (160, 161, 165, 154,159, 146,184). No one reading all these documents would conclude that a safety case has been made. The radioactive waste is too dangerous and too diverse. There are too many unknowns, too much complexity and too many risks. The more you read the less convinced you are that a safe GDF can be built.</p> <p>To say the NDA responses to all of this are 'disappointing' is an understatement. Professor Haszeldine concludes (Document 146) not only that the NDA R&D programme leaves an awful lot to be done (for example, 'at least 52 Areas need to be resolved before any sites can be chosen') but also we do not seem to have any kind of timescales. Thus, we have a date when the GDF is open for to receive waste (2040 – page 13 of the Consultation document) but no dates for the prerequisite R&D. Who does this planning? It does not inspire confidence.</p> <p>So if I were the Decision-Making Bodies I would not go forward unless and until I had a complete road map showing exactly how and when all of the issues raised (in both the NWAA Issues Register and in Professor Haszeldine's Document 146) will be addressed.</p> |
| 560 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>The potential negative impacts are not given sufficient weight. The impacts arise from the real and perceived safety issues. Real because at Fukushima 80,000 people have had to abandon their homes with no prospect of returning and, had the reactors gone into meltdown, Tokyo (140 miles downwind) would have had to be abandoned. Glasgow and Edinburgh are 140 miles downwind of West Cumbria.</p> <p>But perceptions can also have dramatic consequences. As the result of the Fukushima accident, Germany is to close down its nuclear power generation. Thus even the remotest of risks on the other side of the world can, via adverse perception, have real negative impacts and outcomes.</p> <p>Many of these negative impacts can be difficult to see. For example, the LDNP will probably be created a</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | <p>World Heritage Site within the next few years. But, in a couple of decade's time, UNESCO might consider the burying 100 tons of plutonium under a Cumbrian mountain incompatible with World Heritage status and withdraw the recognition. That would be a PR disaster and blight Cumbrian tourism for many years.</p> <p>The problem with the nuclear industry is that minor miscalculations can lead to catastrophic events. Thus the potential for negative impacts far outweigh any positive impacts. If you look at the prime positive impact—employment(P63) and put it into context: the BBC moved as many jobs to Salford and Nissan in Sunderland created 2000 jobs in March 2012. If you had a choice, you wouldn't go for a GDF.</p> |
| 560 | 4 – Community benefits | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>Underlying this question is a question of what is 'community'. The impression I gained from the meeting I attended was that the 'community' to be consulted would shrink as the process proceeded - at this stage Cumbria wide - at the next stage solely West Cumbria and so on. This impression is reinforced by the latest news that the Mori poll is to be conducted in only in West Cumbria.</p> <p>This is wrong. The branding issue alone means that all of Cumbria is involved and so all should have a voice at all stages.</p> <p>Secondly, the focus of the community package must be jobs – and not jobs that are here today and gone tomorrow. It is long term, permanent, high value jobs that will underwrite long term prosperity. (Building community halls or sports centres and the like is an irrelevance.) I would have thought to offset the risks and negative impacts of a GDF, it would need upwards of 10,000 such jobs and if I were the Decision-Making Bodies I would not proceed unless I had a good idea of how it is proposed to make this happen.</p> |
| 560 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>Clearly detailed design issues are site specific and cannot be resolved at this stage but I only see in the neat little diagram (Page 74) and the in the neat little animations on the video a design for a perfect world where nothing goes wrong.</p> <p>One of the most interesting things about the accidents at Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima is, in the hours and days that followed the accidents, just how little was understood about what was going on in the reactor buildings and the reactor containment vessels. This was above ground with good accessibility. Any incident or problem below ground is bound to be much more difficult to sort out.</p> <p>What is required is a 'design for disaster'-that accommodates the inevitable: at some point there is bound to be something that goes wrong.</p> <p>The idea that the storage areas could be up to 10km from the surface facility needs to be looked at much more carefully. Where did this come from? How is it worked out? It may be theoretically possible, but seems</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | <p>completely impractical and unrealistic - that you could take every ton of spoil, every piece of the handling mechanisms, all of the engineering barriers as well as all of the radioactive waste itself more than 5 miles though a single tunnel to the repository site. It not just the cost and productivity issues (it will take so much longer to trundle through 5 miles of tunnel) but the working environment, power and lighting, cooling and ventilation, health and safety and so on.</p> |
| 560 | 6 – Inventory | No | <p>There are a lot of words in the consultation document but some of them seem to obscure the real issues. A good example is on page 80 ‘the Government says that there is a presumption that this repository will only be used for UK waste.’ The real issue is that this cannot be guaranteed. EU law may be changed – in say 40 years time – to allow other EU countries to deposit radioactive waste in Cumbria.</p> <p>I also find it difficult to believe that the Decision-Making Bodies will have any say about what kind of Inventory is stored in a GDF several decades from now. By then the nuclear authorities and regulators will decide these operational issues without reference to local politicians. Once the Decision-Making Bodies say ‘yes’ to a GDF, power and influence slips away to these authorities and what happens at the site is out of your control.</p> <p>If by that stage the Central Government is determined to dump all of the nuclear waste under Cumbria I cannot see what will stop them.</p> |
| 560 | 7 – Siting process | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>If the siting of a repository (Stages 4 and 5) is a 15 year process, then this process is going to create uncertainty and that uncertainty will create risks. There is no assessment of those risks.</p> <p>I also found it strange that the Partnership has not set out an overall action plan going forward. Stages 4 and 5 cover the geology, siting and community benefits - but how is the rest taken forward? Who does the ‘Ongoing Scrutiny’ (page50) of all the other topics – particularly the safety of the GDF?</p> <p>I get an impression from Chapter 5 (Safety, security etc) that this is to be left to the NDA, the Regulators and other bodies. That is wrong. Going forward, the Partnership (or some kind of successor) needs to be deeply and proactively involved in all aspects of the GDF. ‘Experts’ can get it wrong. At Dounreay, for example, they buried radioactive waste, only to have to dig it all up forty years on. It was predicted that the radioactive material that fell on Cumbria as the result of Chernobyl would disappear within weeks –but it is still being monitored today.</p> <p>A future Partnership needs to be able talk to as many experts as it can – including those outside the UK – and then use its common sense and reach its own conclusions. Keep asking: why is it safe? How much to we know? How much of this is leading edge and untested?</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|
| 560 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>I would pull out of this process now, otherwise to continue, may result in long term economic damage to the region. This is because the next stage will probably involve ‘sticks’ as well as ‘carrots’. Nothing overt, but a growing attitude: ‘West Cumbria has had their chance. They did not take it. Why should give them any further help?’</p> <p>I would have thought by now Central Government will regard a GDF in West Cumbria as a ‘done deal’. Find a site, tidy up a few loose ends..... If the process goes forward there will be intense political pressure to make it happen. There is flavour of that on P13 ‘ the Minister stated... the date to be brought forward to 2029.’ At some point, the ‘national good’, the ‘national requirement’ will come to override the local.</p> <p>West Cumbria’s real economic need is to diversify and become less dependant on the Nuclear industry. There has to be a better way forward than this.</p> |
| 560 | 9 – Additional comments | | <p>However, even within a GDF scenario, there is a way forward. The Decision-Making Bodies should go back to the Central Government and say:</p> <p>‘We have had a look at this and we feel there is insufficient understanding and knowledge to commit, at this stage, to a single, permanent ‘all singing, all dancing’ repository. What is needed (and now) is far more practical research – after all we are talking about a storage facility lasting hundreds and thousands of years. It is better to get it right than have another Dounreay. We (the Decision-Making Bodies) think government should set up four mini research repositories – one in Wales, one in Scotland, one in the south of England and one in the north (which could be in Cumbria.) One should be in salt, one in clay, one in sedimentary rock and one in a hard rock such as granite.</p> <p>All of the radioactive material stored in these research repositories should be retrievable (easily) and closely and continually monitored over a period of years – with the results from the monitoring feeding into further computer simulations and modelling. Different kinds of radioactive waste materials should be stored and monitored and different storage technologies tried and evaluated. Engineering barriers should be built and tested e.g. to prevent the build up of gases.</p> <p>The UK should work closely all the other countries involved (France, Sweden, Finland and so on) and set up an international exchange of information, expertise and best practice. All of this should be published and readily accessible to all.’</p> |
| 562 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>I think that it would be dangerous to consider West Cumbria as a site because the BGS report also indicated that an additional volume of rock would need to be excluded because of the presence of aquifers (rocks</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | containing large volumes of water), as these could potentially be used as water sources in the future. Since we don't know enough to say definitively that the geology is suitable or unsuitable then I think West Cumbria should be ruled out. |
| 562 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Not Sure/ Partly | I think that because safety is never 100% the project should not go ahead. |
| 562 | 3 – Impacts | No | I think that the risk of floods, the impact on the landscape in one of the most beautiful areas in the UK and the risk of decreasing the water quality would make the project too risky. |
| 562 | 4 – Community benefits | Not Sure/ Partly | I believe that the Government is trying to "buy" the people of Cumbria and pressure us into this project with an economic offer. The Government has effectively promised nothing as we do not know exactly what this package might be and when it might happen cannot be decided yet. |
| 562 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | I think that West Cumbria cannot accept this project if there is no assurance of what the facilities will look like and because of the relative uncertainty of retrievability. |
| 562 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | I think that the kinds of inventory that are proposed would be dangerous for people's health. |
| 562 | 7 – Siting process | No | I think that despite written assurances from the Government regarding voluntarism and the right of withdrawal, if West Cumbria decided to withdraw the Government would pressure people. |
| 562 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I absolutely disagree with this project. I think that Cumbria is not the right place for a repository due to proven geological facts and the fact that it is one of the most beautiful places in the UK and a large part of the county is a national park. I think that not enough is known about the long term health and safety effects of a repository. I hope that this project does not go ahead. I also mistrust the Government's assurance that they would respect Cumbria's right to withdraw from this project, they have lied to the country on past occasions (such as tuition fees and Lisbon treaty referendum) and I am sure they will not hesitate to lie again. I think that Cumbria should protect its inhabitants and its natural beauty. |
| 562 | 9 – Additional comments | | I am completely opposed to this project. |
| | | | |
| 564 | 1 – Geology | Yes | No comment was made |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | |
| 565 | 1 – Geology | No | I have heard locally that the results from the Nirex bore holes/digging etc showed the local area as unsuitable. I also believe there is an earthquake fault line that comes from the Hardknott area, so how is it safe to store waste underground; when the ground could be unstable and move? We know this is the case as the earthquake we had not too long ago was felt at Seascale. I am sure local people do not want some sort of underground disaster resulting from waste being disturbed. If this happened could it get into the water table? |
| 566 | 1 – Geology | Yes | There has to be a sufficiently large area of suitable geology to fully contain any repository. |
| 566 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | The physical and environmental safety of the site is paramount. If this cannot be guaranteed to the highest standards, then the site cannot be built. |
| 566 | 3 – Impacts | Not Sure/ Partly | A new infrastructure would need to be in place before any excavation can begin. The existing road system is struggling to cope with the normal traffic of the area. The roads both north and south of the area will need rebuilding completely to cope with the influx of machinery and the removal of spoil. A lot of the traffic could go by rail, but again the existing system would need a major rebuild. |
| 566 | 4 – Community benefits | Not Sure/ Partly | The benefits would have to be detailed and ring fenced before any work began. They would also have to be arranged so that every individual felt that they were feeling the effects and the benefits were not aimed at the local politicians. |
| 566 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | I am happy to leave any design to those who know best about these things. |
| 566 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | That material which cannot be safely stored or for which there is no potential future use should be put in the depository. |
| 566 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | If the geology proves suitable, then that is the easy part dealt with. The hard part will be convincing those who will use any stratagem to delay the process. |
| 566 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | We cannot expect any other part of the UK to participate in the search for a suitable site if we have not tried ourselves first. We also have the advantage of having 60 years experience of handling the material. In addition, most of the material involved is already here and will not need to be transported around the UK. |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| 567 | 1 – Geology | Yes | From the documents it would appear a robust assessment has been undertaken, with the necessary independent scrutiny and assurance to support the findings |
| 567 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | Yes broad stakeholder and regulator processes are established |
| 567 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | Good diverse assessment undertaken looking at a broad range of criteria. |
| 567 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | Yes liked the research and comparison to others. Also liked the principles |
| 567 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | Appropriate level of detail provided at this stage |
| 567 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | Liked the concept of Principles to define the scope but with the ability to re-negotiate or change as appropriate |
| 567 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | Very clear process |
| 567 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Me and my family are very supportive of a repository in West Cumbria. We would like to see consideration being given to the area of land south of Ravenglass (around the Bootle and Black Combe) area. We feel it would be ideal with close location to existing rail and roads. |
| | | | |
| 568 | 1 – Geology | Yes | There seems to have been a lot of consultation with professionals who know about geology |
| 568 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No comment was made |
| 568 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | No comment was made |
| 568 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | No comment was made |
| 568 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | No comment was made |
| 568 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 568 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | No comment was made |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | |
| 568 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I think the councils views should be taken into consideration, even if they do not have to make a commitment to site it in their areas, the council is there to protect the interests of the area they represent, so should always be involved in decisions like this. |
| 568 | 9 – Additional comments | | From a safety and security stand point, the bulk of the waste is sited at Sellafield, it therefore makes sense not to transport bulk loads of waste across the country to another repository sited elsewhere, all this would lead to is increased transport and security costs to the UK tax payer and increase the vulnerability of the material being transported. |
| | | | |
| 569 | 1 – Geology | No | There is disagreement amongst professional geologists about the safety of the area as a whole, which suggests there could be doubts about about long term safety. In the Noorth of the region it is said that there could be mineral deposits that could be used in the future, this is also the case in the south of the area. In the south, older geological surveys indicate faults and limestone beds which both suggest the whole area should be ruled out for a repository. |
| 569 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | History of accidents from around the world and including West Cumbria show that that there is no such thing as a safe level of radiation. Parts of the UK are still affected by accidents at nuclear power facilities and a repository would inherently create a safety risk whatever measures were put in place. Can we trust the impartiality of the NDA |
| 569 | 3 – Impacts | No | The negative influences would far outweigh the positive ones. not enough emphasis has been put on the detrimental effects on communities throughout the planning and building programme or the longer lasting effects in the medium as well as the distant future. Short term benefits should not be put before the possible longer term effects for generations to come. |
| 569 | 4 – Community benefits | No | I disagree with the whole principle of benefits package. It should be referred to as a bribe to the community that is to be affected. It is an indication that those trying to impose an unpopular policy realise that they have to try and soften the blow on the people affected. If a project is seen to be beneficial to all, benefit packages should not be required |
| 569 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | My engineering knowledge is minimal, so it is difficult to comment. However I agree that waste should be retrievable |
| 569 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ | Too early in the process to comment, particularly if as I hope, the process goes no further |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--------|---|
| | | Partly | |
| 569 | 7 – Siting process | No | I dont agree that west cumbria should host a nuclear repository so I cannot agree with any siting process. |
| 569 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I believe the process should stop now. Once councils start looking for sites it is almost a forgone conclusion that a repository will be built if a supposedly safe site is found. I think the council was seduced by the idea of possible short term economic benefits without really thinking it through thoroughly. there may be sites elsewhere in UK which would be far safer and more beneficial to the local community than West Cumbria and yet, because other councils did not put their names forward we really do not have that information. West Cumbria has so many other opportunities that could be wasted if the scheme goes ahead and ther are almost certainly safer and more needy areas of the Uk who could host a repository. I request that Copeland withdraws from the process now and asks the government to open up a wider search of the UK for an appropriate site |
| 569 | 9 – Additional comments | | Living in the south of Copeland, in an area of relatively sparse population, I am concerned that the wishes of the people living in the more densely populated north of the council area which has already been designated as an unsafe site for a repository could vote in favour of a site that does not adversely affect them but would be an imposition on those living close to a chosen site situated further to the south.This goes against the principle of local choice where smaller communities would be disadvantaged in this instance. |
| | | | |
| 571 | 1 – Geology | No | Last geological survey deemed the whole of west cumbria unsuitable-this was a very expensive and detailed survey-why the change? coastal area unsuitable-sea level rise? fault lines here-earthquake in dec 2010! Too many unanswered questions. |
| 571 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | Too many unknowns.The video refers to development" in the light of present knowledge"-there is very little knowledge of this type of disposal- no leakage of radioactivity is safe.How do "experts know there will not be an earthquake in 100/1000/10000 years time?? |
| 571 | 3 – Impacts | No | Most of those surveyed live in the north of copeland! Much of the coast lies within the national park-this should never be encroached upon for a surface or deep structure. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| 571 | 4 – Community benefits | No | This is trivial and put in to tempt tyhose who have not realised the full impact of this project.Simply bribery. |
| 571 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | do agree that it is too early to look at details waste must be retrievable |
| 571 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | too soon to consider detail |
| 571 | 7 – Siting process | No | At One meeting I attended it was stated that if communities didn't want this then it would not go ahead. Communities should be villages as well as towns.Whicham,within the national park is a way from Whitehaven(outside the Park).Copeland seems to be speaking for those in the north of the area only.The phone poll is not wide enough or good enough! |
| 571 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | There should be no repository in / near the national park.In doing so tourism/ farming etc will be lost and the western fells-one of the most beautiful and remote areas of the park ruined. there is a big difference between some of the industrial northern parts of copeland and the western coastal fells. |
| 571 | 9 – Additional comments | | This whole question is one that should be national and not regional. There may well be much more suitable areas in the british isles for this! |
| | | | |
| 572 | 1 – Geology | No | It seems essential to find suitable safe rock formations to provide a barrier as part of the storage process. To date I have seen no indication that such formations exist in Cumbria. The evidence seems to point the other way. Fractured volcanic fault lines, mountainous regions and very heavy rainfall (disaster of 2009) must all be considered. It is unthinkable to create a facility for other reasons (local money, public opposition elsewhere etc etc) that unless properly drained, will see possibly contaminated water and gases rising to the surface. If this risk exists, how do we know that folk in a thousand years time will still be able to run the pumps that may be needed? |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|
| | | | The current process is flawed with the distracting element of voluntarism. It turns attention away from the vital question of fundamental safety. |
| 572 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>If the geology is not suitable then public safety is at risk both in Cumbria and presumably in the Isle of Man and Ireland. If the geology was deemed by many to be unsuitable under the Nirex regime, what has changed apart from a Ministerial directive to locate the facility at Sellafield or Dounray? It won't be going to the latter! But it needs to be safely located where the geology is right, or stored on the surface.</p> <p>Environmentally, if the facility is located here without full agreement about suitable geology then the National Park and the World Heritage element will all be compromised.</p> <p>As farmers we do our utmost not to pollute our watercourses, we fence, bund and plant trees etc etc. What is the point of that if all is to be risked by a radioactive storage facility that has a chance of leaking!</p> |
| 572 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>This facility will have a major impact on the county as a whole, not just West Cumbria.</p> <p>To even think of having to repair the damage it will cause to our reputation by creating marketing strategies, indicates that something is badly wrong.</p> <p>It is highly likely that the Cumbria brand will be shunned as being perceived as exposing consumers to an unacceptable risk. Whilst the west coast may benefit from jobs (the numbers talked about so far seem to be about the same as a new Tesco's) what will happen to the farming incomes and the incomes of those who rely on tourism?</p> <p>Land and property prices will presumably fall and unless safety is placed at the top of the agenda the whole county will be at risk. Would you buy a small farm at Chernobyl or with a sea view at Fukushima? Any leak, however slight, could have a disproportionate impact on our economy and lives.</p> |
| 572 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>There is insufficient information and detail about such a package. Copeland Council were reported as saying that they were hoping for a 300 year package! Details? There is reference elsewhere to a science park facility.</p> <p>There is nothing in the deliberations to date to give any reason why this section should take us forwards to the next stage. What would there be to lose if the programme does not go forwards? Presumably nothing.</p> <p>In government terms, there is hardly a track record to show that any commitment over the long term will be honoured. Remploi today, Sellafield tomorrow?</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|
| 572 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>The ability to retrieve and monitor the waste should be a cornerstone of the whole process. One assumes that surface storage does give that possibility.</p> <p>Any underground development will need to take water into account. Mines and tunnels are pumped where the water is a problem. Possibly in salt mines or chalk deposits this will not be needed but there must be a guarantee given that drainage can be achieved, ideally without mechanical needs.</p> <p>We have vast quantities of water in this region and have had many notable floods, 1985,1995, 2005 and 2009. To locate a facility near the wettest place in England seems laughable.</p> |
| 572 | 6 – Inventory | No | <p>It seems unreasonable to create nuclear waste that cannot be dealt with and to go on creating that waste. Mr.Blair told us we were moving away from nuclear power but as often is the case in government, time changes the story. I have no confidence in the comments that the facility will only be used for UK waste.</p> |
| 572 | 7 – Siting process | No | <p>A geologically suitable place to site this facility should be the priority. It seems that the process to site this facility is flawed by the irrelevant element of voluntarism, seemingly untried elsewhere.</p> <p>There are undoubtedly nuclear skills at Sellafield but these are transferable to other locations. Such a development needs the highest degree of engineering and geological skills to get the safest location, not voluntarism, promises of unknown community packages and the smokescreens of marketing campaigns.</p> |
| 572 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>The process should stop now and the focus should move elsewhere.</p> <p>What would have been the benefit to West Cumbria if the Nirex search money had been spent on the Community instead of on trying to make the geology fit the Sellafield property portfolio?</p> <p>Safety first!</p> <p>Lastly, Our neighbour was Chief Executive of Copeland Council, sadly he is now dead. When I asked why he should want to live in St. John's in the Vale he told me that it was the furthest place away from Sellafield that he could find, in Allerdale or Copeland.</p> <p>You may wonder what that did to my confidence in the nuclear industry!</p> |
| 573 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>A wider examination of suitable should be made and only then should a final selection be made from those</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | <p>sites which best satisfies scientific and geological requirements.</p> <p>South Copeland and nearby Furness peninsula are rich sources of mineral deposits not shown in your survey. The cessation of mining in the Millom area was only due to flooding and the cost of pumping rather than the depletion of deposits</p> |
| 573 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | In 1999 the area was found to be not suitable by certain geologists. Why all of a sudden is it alright. There are lots of fault lines in South Copeland making it unsuitable. |
| 573 | 3 – Impacts | No | There are positives but they underestimate the negatives. The impact in traffic to and from the site on our narrow roads would be devastating. The special qualities of the Lake District National Park would be severely affected making an incredible impact on tourism in the area. |
| 573 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>There would be some benefits as far as jobs are concerned although the number mentioned is not huge and would these be from local residents or shipped in as a lot of the workers at Sellafield are at the moment. You do not state clearly what the benefits will be. Is there going to be a new infrastructure? " However we cannot be certain the government would agree to this in advance." THAT SAYS IT ALL. THE GOVERNMENT HAS THE LAST WORD. SO NOTHING IS GUARANTEED.</p> <p>Any benefits for the present community would be relatively short-lived and trivial when put alongside the enormity of the project and its longevity. Any disadvantages, on the contrary, will be long lived and serious.</p> |
| 573 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | No comment was made |
| 573 | 6 – Inventory | No | <p>It's being rushed through too quickly. The extreme longevity of this project and nature of the elements to be stored makes the utmost caution essential.</p> <p>The government have said that it will only be UK waste but as we know governments cannot be trusted to keep their word. Besides with 8 nuclear plants in this country, that is a lot of waste. Why should a beautiful county like Cumbria be a dumping ground.</p> |
| 573 | 7 – Siting process | No | The present consultation to identify a suitable site is too narrowly focused, offers no geographic comparisons and gives priority to community acceptance in the areas volunteered by councils rather than geological suitability and secure containment. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| 573 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>A long term project such as this should be sited at an optimum location and be inherently as flexible as possible. THERE SHOULD BE NO COMMITMENT TO HAVE IT.</p> <p>It is the duty of the government and the nuclear industry to investigate widely and give principal weight to criteria based on geological considerations in the most rigorous sense. Therefore the search for a site should not be confined the areas of those principal councils which have at present expressed an interest. Thus excluding a truly wide and impartial study which offers a range of choice.</p> |
| | | | |
| 576 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>I feel that suitable geology is absolutely essential for this process. We should not be satisfied with 'good enough' geological conditions, they need to be 'ideal'. After reading and hearing various geology experts on the suitability of West Cumbria, I am not convinced that there is sufficient potential to make further exploration worth while.</p> <p>It worries me that at this stage, only West Cumbria is participating in a search for a site and that there are more ideal geological locations which are not even being considered.</p> |
| 576 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>The siting and construction of a repository would require additional protection processes to those currently existing as such an operation has not been carried out previously. My research into the Finnish repository showed that it's location is in a far less populated and more isolated location. There needs to be tighter and more demanding safeguards on all accounts as this is such a potentially dangerous undertaking.</p> |
| 576 | 3 – Impacts | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>These issues are massive and largely unimaginable. The three statements above seem inadequate considering the scale of the undertaking and the time scales involved.</p> |
| 576 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>I do not think that a benefits package should be seen as one of the deciding issues in this process. It should certainly not be seen as a good reason to get involved or the only way to transform the economic and social well being of the area.</p> |
| 576 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>The concept of retrievability is clearly a specialist area but I am uncomfortable with the concept of side-lining issues to be resolved at a later stage in the process. This could lead to many unresolved questions building up. Given the scale of disruption in the construction and siting of waste at the outset, it is surely going to also be massively disruptive to retrieve waste at a later stage.</p> |
| 576 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>The partnerships initial opinions seem particularly vague in this area. There is clearly plenty of debate still to be had and it seems unlikely that these questions will be answered before this consultation is completed. That</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | is of concern as it would affect size of repository and therefore its siting. |
| 576 | 7 – Siting process | Not Sure/ Partly | This is a very critical process and differing opinions need to be fully recognised and addressed. There is a suspicion that if West Cumbria progresses to the next stage in the siting process, it will be more difficult to withdraw from the whole process. Only by making all decisions transparent and fully accountable will these suspicions be reduced. The preliminary investigations concerning site suitability will themselves be very disruptive and this also needs to be recognised. Many people will be frightened by the whole process; its scale and potential negative effects. This is also a decision for the whole country as well as West Cumbria. How are these opinions being taken into account? |
| 576 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>I am worried by the fact that West Cumbria is currently the only area in the country considering this step, even when other areas have more appropriate geology.</p> <p>I am concerned that a community benefits package is being considered as a possible reason for our involvement.</p> <p>I am concerned that taking the next step might make future withdrawal from the whole process more difficult.</p> <p>I am worried by the fact that many residents have neither the time or inclination to get involved with this consultation and it will therefore be difficult to get a true picture of community feeling.</p> |
| 576 | 9 – Additional comments | | I feel that all local (Parish) councils should have been provided with resources and requested to hold specific meetings on this consultation in their local areas. With no village bus service, people without their own transport would not have been able to reach the information events held throughout January and February. |
| | | | |
| 577 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>Whilst I appreciate the rigour with which the BGS study has been undertaken I am concerned that this is just going over old ground.</p> <p>The original and very detailed Nirex investigations culminated in an assessment of the Borrowdale Volcanic Group which demonstrated that the geology of the potential hostrock in the identified repository footprint was unpredictable and highly faulted. There is no reason to suggest that the predictability and the structural complexity of the host rock would improve to the necessary extent elsewhere in West Cumbria</p> |
| 577 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | I agree with the initial opinions as set out. I am however concerned that on the basis of the geological information available and assessed to date it is not possible to establish a robust safety case. The inability to |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--------------|---|
| | | | adequately predict groundwater flow in a variable and structurally complex geological setting with high hydrological heads means that we could end up spending an awful lot of money to prove what we already know - that West Cumbria is not a suitable location. Please do not throw good money after bad. The site selection process should begin with identifying areas of suitable geology and then assessing public acceptability, not the other way round. |
| 577 | 4 – Community benefits | Not answered | Whilst the community benefits package is likely to appear attractive to a significant proportion of the local community I am concerned that this will sway public opinion and understanding away from the fact that the fundamental requirement is that the geology is sufficiently robust to deliver an acceptable safety case. |
| 577 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | I have no concerns that a repository could not be designed and engineered in an appropriate host rock but overreliance on engineered barriers rather than the host rock would need to be avoided if the safety case is to be met |
| 577 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 577 | 7 – Siting process | No | <p>The site selection process is fundamentally flawed. Rather than identifying areas where there is a degree of public support, we should start by establishing areas of suitable geology (i.e. areas of low relief, low groundwater flow, predictable and structurally simple geology) and then address issues of public acceptability. This approach will deliver the best chance of identifying a site which will deliver an acceptable safety case.</p> <p>I fully support the deep repository concept but we must start in areas where the geology offer the greatest chance of success</p> |
| 577 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>I am concerned that significant amounts of money will be spent confirming what we already know about the geology of West Cumbria, i.e. structurally complex in an area of high groundwater flow that will not deliver sufficient confidence to generate a robust safety case.</p> <p>Cut to the chase, stop the work here and identify areas that display much better geological attributes.</p> <p>The fact that areas of West Cumbria have not yet been proven as unsuitable does not mean that they are suitable, and expending significant amounts of money proving what we already know from previous investigations cannot be right.</p> <p>Start again with geology as the primary discriminator, not public acceptability.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| | | | |
| 578 | 1 – Geology | Yes | West Cumbria already stores a large quantity of radio active waste so it makes sense to keep it here stored safely underground and monitored by local people who are skilled in the handling of this material. There are also financial benefits for the community which could potentially help the area for many generations to come. |
| 578 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No comment was made |
| 578 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | National public opinion of Cumbria being a nuclear dumping ground will always be sensationalised by the press which could have an impact on tourism. maybe a budget for educating the tourism industry would help. |
| 578 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | No comment was made |
| 578 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | It makes sense to see alternatives before deciding |
| 578 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 578 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | A time line for the location of a suitable site should be controlled at a local level |
| 578 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | This make good sense at at this stage of enquiry. |
| | | | |
| 580 | 1 – Geology | No | Even without a degree in geology I know this area to be highly stratified with seams of unstable rock and water sources (one of which deep in Maiden Moor is my water supply and similar areas the water supply of several other people)and I also have experienced its geological instability in the form of the recent earth tremor. |
| 580 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | I see no mention anywhere of the means of transport of the nuclear waste from the rest of the country to West Cumbria (and despite what is said, from the rest of the world) or of the safety precautions that would be instituted and that are already in place or the suitability of the ports for transport by sea. I also see no comment about the prevailing westerly airflow and the effect on the rest of the country when there is an accident |
| 580 | 3 – Impacts | No | In terms of new jobs to be created - how do you know that there are enough people locally with the appropriate skills or intelligence to learn them, let alone how you could "force" an outside contractor to use the locals. And there is the adverse impact of the increased traffic of dangerous substances without any direct rail or sea connections (assuming most of the waste comes from the rest of England or the ports on the North Sea and |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | south coast ie from the rest of the world |
| 580 | 4 – Community benefits | No | The reply to this was implicit in my answer to (3) - how do you guarantee that the outside contractors employ locals. And more importantly for all this exercise, do you really trust any political party once they have what they want ie a dump for rubbish that is far away from where they live or will be affected? I would expect a reward aka bribe for this undertaking to be available in perpetuity as a source of regular income/subsidy to the whole of Cumbria (as the geological area affected by the potential harms) and this isn't going to happen is it? |
| 580 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | No comment was made |
| 580 | 6 – Inventory | No | I have no doubt that the politicians will minimise the risks to get locals to agree and will then feel able to change the risks once we are lumbered with the fait accompli |
| 580 | 7 – Siting process | No | There is no way that the government will allow us to withdraw from having a repository once bore holes have been sunk and to agree to those is to agree to the project since there will always be experts who can be found to agree a site (without wishing to suggest they have been "bought", just that there is always a contrary opinion) - it is not as if there are several other places fighting for this particular honour. Interestingly, Bradwell already knows it will be sending its radioactive waste here |
| 580 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>Since I don't think the area is geologically suitable, I don't think we should take part in a search especially since we cannot trust any government to withdraw if there is any margin of doubt. I believe that margin of doubt already exists, any way. I do have a vested interest since my water supply and that of many others is from the fells.</p> <p>I don't even think it will offer many jobs to locals, though it may well better ensure the viability of the area with more people coming into it.</p> <p>As for rewards for taking on the waste, once we have said yes and been given bribe money we will be forgotten about.</p> <p>I think the environmental effects have been discounted (not even mentioned), not for the locals but for the rest of the Lake District in terms of road/rail/sea access to the storage site.</p> <p>I also do not trust the politicians with regard to the processing of nuclear waste from other countries - it will be forced on us (and everyone else in the north of England)</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| 580 | 9 – Additional comments | | It would be interesting to discover what happens here already, and in others countries, about the transport of hazardous waste of this nature |
| 581 | 1 – Geology | No | I agree that identifying a suitable site is essential. HOWEVER this might not be found in west cumbria due to the huge variations in geology. Were the site a mere acre or two, then I'm sure something would be found to be suitable, but the proposed size of the dump is huge. As a result, I do not agree that further research should be done. |
| 581 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | In principal, I agree with all nuclear safety and security strategies. It is in the nuclear industries' interest to be as safe and secure as possible. However, with regard to environment and planning, the thought that burying something (possibly for ever) in a man made structure is frankly ridiculous. Nuclear is a relatively new technology, certainly in terms of its own longevity. How can a man-made structure be expected to outlast this? Even the very best structures made today only have a limited lifespan; the pyramids of Egypt would probably offer a better solution! It seems purely apathetic to even consider burying waste, rather a sweep it under the carpet approach than actually dealing with it. |
| 581 | 3 – Impacts | No | I agree that there will be both positive and negative impacts of a repository, of course the jobs that would result would be a huge benefit to the area. However, the partnership view of the impacts appears to be very positive; for example cyclists are shown in rural cumbria on the paper document. This has nothing to do with nuclear repositories, yet it helps the perceived image as it's very green and calm! I do not agree that positives would outweigh the negatives. |
| 581 | 4 – Community benefits | No | It appears that the partnership is confident that a benefits package can be developed. I am confident that one can be developed too. However, a community benefits package is basically a bribe (so of course, all local councils etc will sign up to it as it will benefit their community). The partnership ought to consult everyone in the community in person and without exception. This way a true understanding of the benefits could be achieved. |
| 581 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | Of course, a sound design is essential. Longevity is the problem here and the partnership seem to be overlooking this. A repository is a perceived long term fix - however, the problem is in the nuclear process from the start and ought to be monitored above ground. |
| 581 | 6 – Inventory | No | The inventory is essential. However, I do not agree that the partnership should consider storing waste underground. |
| 581 | 7 – Siting process | No | I think the siting of a repository is a critical factor in the survey. However, I think looking in cumbria is the wrong approach. The only reason the partnership is looking here is because allerdale and copeland are the only |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | councils in Britain to agree to it in principal. The site ought to be sought purely on geology, then the councils approached. I am also distressed as the underground site might well be planned in the National Park - what is this world coming to? |
| 581 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I think we ought to jump ship now and stop wasting money on the investigations. I understand that there might be the odd acre suitable, but for the proposed size of the site, the idea is absurd. I think the partnership should look at the true issue which is longevity and solve the problem at the source rather than brushing it under the carpet. I also think that given the partnerships strong views that safety and security are paramount, it seems foolish to hide something underground. Keep it above ground where it can be constantly monitored. Yes this will cost, but nuclear is a long term cost. |
| 581 | 9 – Additional comments | | Overall, I feel that the surveys and documents which have kindly been provided by cumbriamrws are very helpful but also extremely biased. The questions in this survey have been cleverly written so that initially I'd like to have answered yes to them all. But having thought about the outcomes and then thinking a little deeper, the partnership is jumping the gun and has not thought in enough depth about the real consequences. It's a great idea to bring jobs to cumbria. I agree that sellafield has huge benefits in the area and I have no problem with it being on the west coast. I encourage it in fact. However, I am not happy with the way that this survey has been conducted as it feels fixed and biased. |
| | | | |
| 582 | 1 – Geology | Yes | There appears to be plenty of evidence (including the highly respected BGS) to suggest that large areas of west Cumbria are at least potentially suitable. Surely we should move forward to the next step and seek absolute confirmation (or not) that this is the case. |
| 582 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | There are strong, independent regulatory frameworks in place to manage this sort of project safely. It also appears that RWMD has the capability to ensure public safety is properly looked after. But these are all surely issues for later in the process. For now, let's get on and see if there is suitable geology and where it is. |
| 582 | 3 – Impacts | Not Sure/ Partly | I don't disagree to any great extent. It just seems to me that these are questions that can (and certainly must) be answered later in the process. To NOT move to the next stage would be to deny the community access to possible benefits in the absence of a full picture. Let's get on and find the geology, economic impact and benefits issues as quickly as possible |
| 582 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | Benefits will be important before we commit to hosting a repository. The principles seem sound. Let's get on to the next stage and progress benefit discussions in this stage |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| 582 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | As you say, it's not possible to design something in detail until you know where it's going to be. So let's see if we can find a location. There doesn't seem to be any reason why a safe design should not be possible |
| 582 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | There seems to be lots of information on this issue for this stage |
| 582 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | We can still say no throughout the next stage. So let's get on with that stage so we can find out real site specific information. I don't understand why this stage is taking so long when we're not committing to anything concrete at this stage |
| 582 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | We absolutely should take part in a search throughout Copeland and Allerdale. We have most of the UKs radioactive waste here now. It needs to go somewhere. If a suitable, safe site can be found here and the benefits are ok why wouldn't we host a repository? Not going to the next stage would be deeply irresponsible and would deny residents like me the opportunity to make an informed decision later on when we have better, detailed information. |
| 582 | 9 – Additional comments | | This stage seems to be too complicated and taking too long. Let's get on to the next stage quickly so we can get the full information we need. I thought this stage was supposed to be finished by now on the original plan? |
| | | | |
| 584 | Comments slip | | The crucial question is that of geology, yet no geological evidence has been produced in this document. Once the step to stage 4 is taken, it will be very difficult to withdraw because a lot of money will have been spent and expectations raised, plus the prospect of creating jobs in a depressed area would be dashed. I have no confidence whatsoever that Cumbria is the right place for a repository, the right to withdraw is not robust or unconditionally guaranteed and the specialist information on the geology of Cumbria is at odds with the proposal. |
| | | | |
| 585 | Comments slip | | As I am unable to attend a public meeting to discuss the possible location of a disposal facility for radioactive waste, I wish to express my strong opposition to the possibility of a nuclear waste repository in West Cumbria. |
| | | | |
| 586 | Comments slip | | I am opposed to the areas of Allerdale and/or Copeland to be considered as an area for the repository. I have tried and failed to find one of the comments forms that was supposed to be included in this document – none were available despite repeated visits to Ambleside library. |
| | | | |
| 587 | Comments slip | | The geology of West Cumbria is not the best in the UK in which to store highly active waste for an indefinite |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | <p>period in safety. I believe that BGS would agree with this view. Because the geology must be of paramount importance I do not think the treatment of the geology has been properly done.</p> <p>The geology in New Mexico (where the only comparable storage facility to that proposed in this document is sited under Carlsbad) should be compared with that of West Cumbria. Other factors considered in this consultation paper are of secondary importance.</p> <p>Note: I have no personal interest in this matter. I am over 80 years old and my children and grandchildren do not live in Cumbria. I have lived here for nearly sixty years.</p> |
| 588 | Comments slip | | <p>I found the DVD very informative and easy to understand. As a parent I think it should be shown in the local schools and colleges to get their ideas and thoughts.</p> <p>I support the partnership going forward to explore the possibility of having a repository in Copeland. The social economic benefits to the area need to be made clear in black and white and legally binding. People need to understand that if we do not take this opportunity we will end up keeping the waste at Sellafield anyway. Therefore we may as well have some financial benefit from storing it.</p> |
| 589 | 1 – Geology | Not Sure/ Partly | Not a geologist so don't have enough understanding to comment. |
| 589 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | Until you can say it is 100% safe (which you can't) I won't agree/and I also think tourism will fall. |
| 589 | 3 – Impacts | Not Sure/ Partly | I agree that you have thought of a range of issues but the effects on health are just too high to ignore in my opinion. I would actually move from West Cumbria if this took place and I think people may also think this way and also people may not decide to live/visit here. |
| 589 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | The benefits are good but for me do not outweigh the downsides. |
| 589 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | I am not a designer or an engineer so do not know. |
| 589 | 6 – Inventory | No | Would not want Plutonium, uranium and higher-level waste to be stored. |
| 589 | 7 – Siting process | Not Sure/ | It is OK apart from it is not made easy to show your views on this as an individual it almost feels like it is going |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--------|--|
| | | Partly | to happen behind your back. As this is a very complex and hard to find way to simply say I as an individual and my family are opposed to having a nuclear disposal facility in our area or close to our community. |
| 589 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | It is OK to search out areas in case opinions, circumstances and safety can be 100% guaranteed in the future. So if it is found that it does not work in West Cumbria at present it is good that we can back out but have the knowledge it might be an option in the future. |
| 589 | 9 – Additional comments | | Too much risk to health and I DO NOT agree with having a nuclear waste disposal facility in West Cumbria. |
| | | | |
| 590 | 1 – Geology | Yes | If there is any doubt regarding the geology of the proposed site, safety must be paramount and the site must not be used. |
| 590 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No comment was made |
| 590 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | No comment was made |
| 590 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | This must be agreed and legally binding before the next stage goes ahead. E.g. Road Structure, Employment for local people. |
| 590 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | The design would have to allow the retrieval of waste or facilitate for the waste to be recontained if need be. |
| 590 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 590 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | No comment was made |
| 590 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | As long as the costs are not borne to the local community, and all aspects of safety, health, well being of the community are taken as priority, I do not see any reason why we should not go forward and look for a suitable site. |
| | | | |
| 591 | 1 – Geology | No | I think that there are severe doubts about the geological suitability of West Cumbria. I also think that it would be much more logical for the Government to look at the geology of the whole of the UK and decide which area is best suited to underground storage – not just try and make West Cumbria suitable just because it's the only place that might take it because Sellafield is sited there. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
| 591 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | Safety in the nuclear industry can never be guaranteed and I have a lot of concerns about it. There have been many accidents (and near misses) in nuclear establishments all over the world and the threat of terrorism is always there. |
| 591 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | No comment was made |
| 591 | 4 – Community benefits | Not Sure/ Partly | I'm sceptical that the Government would offer a worthwhile package of benefits and I also have reservations about it in principle. It would be a similar sort of bribe to those offered by supermarkets etc – albeit on a larger scale. |
| 591 | 5 – Design and engineering | Not Sure/ Partly | It seems to me essential that the waste can be retrieved. |
| 591 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 591 | 7 – Siting process | No | In addition to the stages laid out in the document there should be a chance for Cumbrians to vote yes or no whether to go ahead with the repository – not just an 'opinion poll' but a referendum. |
| 591 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | On balance I am against it. Cumbria has got enough nuclear sites already and I'm not convinced that the geology is suitable. As I said in Q1, the Government should start from the point of view of finding the best geological site for the repository in the UK whether it be in built up areas or rural ones. If the best area in the UK is Cumbria then I'll reconsider my opinion. |
| | | | |
| 592 | 1 – Geology | No | This is because I would prefer to have many experts opinions on the matter rather than just the one opinion of the BGS. |
| 592 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | Currently no safe geological site has been found. This has been the case for the last 20 years. As for the environment there is potential water pollution due to seepage through the fault lines and fractured land. There will be no local planning policy so local planning rules will not be adhered to due to the fact that it is a Government Scheme. |
| 592 | 3 – Impacts | No | The placing of a repository will affect the whole of this county. Cumbria has had a knock in it's reputation what with the Floods of 2005 and 2009, as well as the Foot and Mouth in 2001 and the West Cumbria Shootings. So should anything happen with this proposed development, Cumbria's reputation and the way people perceive |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| | | | Cumbria could be damaged beyond repair. The consumption of local produce is likely to fall as the 'Cumberland' name may not be welcomed as it would be associated with a Nuclear Repository. |
| 592 | 4 – Community benefits | No | Having read Chapter 7, it says no where in the text precisely who will benefit from such a development. It seems to me that there is more of an emphasis on money and other financial benefits rather than perhaps the more important matters such as health and safety and the environment. |
| 592 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | The fact that the Government has left the 'retrievability' issue open should be a cause for concern. Retrievability should be the keystone of the design. Do the engineers know that they have chosen one of the, if not the, wettest county in England? Besides, developments should have been made so that it is possible to deal with nuclear waste, to recycle it both properly and safely. |
| 592 | 6 – Inventory | No | The Partnership continually tries to reassure us throughout the document. However, future changes in Government always lead to questions being asked on schemes such as these. The largest issue in my opinion on the Nuclear matter is that it is foolish to be continually producing waste that cannot be dealt with in a safe manner. |
| 592 | 7 – Siting process | No | It is very wrong that West Cumbria has 'volunteered' itself for such a huge project. The project should not have the go ahead until a suitable site has been found that can be agreed on. There are more suitable places in the country than here. It seems that West Cumbria is the place to be only because it has been affiliated with Nuclear since the 1950's but this is not the right or moral approach. Stage 2 of the process should not have been passed without the finding of a suitable site. It should be placed somewhere in geologically stable ground and that is not present in West Cumbria. |
| 592 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I am of the view that if Nirex failed to find a suitable place for a repository and that Professor Smythe's findings conclude that there is no suitable site that the Borough Councils should find somewhere else to put it. They should certainly not have a commitment that if so much as a square mile of suitable land is found that the site is then automatically given permission to be built. |
| 592 | 9 – Additional comments | | Learn from the lessons of Chernobyl and Fukushima. A repository here could have severe effects on the county's economy and could present a severe health and safety to the rest of the country. Since when have Nuclear gases and its' associated pollution ever stuck to county boundaries? |
| | | | |
| 593 | 1 – Geology | No | West Cumbria is one of the most investigated geological areas in the country with a long history of mining. The possibility of burying radioactive waste for thousands of years is a long-standing issue in Cumbria. That was |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| | | | <p>decisively rejected after a £400 million scientific investigation and subsequent inquiry in 1995-1996. How can the rocks have changed in 15 years?</p> <p>In 1999 a Government sponsored video (Pangea) declared: “areas of high rainfall, permeable rocks, hills and mountains to drive the water flow would guarantee leakage to the surface”.</p> <p>To quote Stuart Haszeldene, Professor of Geology, Edinburgh University, Keswick Reminder 3rd February 2012 “It is predicted by my own research that groundwater flowing past underground radioactive waste will return to the surface within only thousands of years. This groundwater will return to the surface much faster, within a few decades if hot temperature, high-level waste is also buried. That heat will also make the land surface rise. No earthquake or extra rainfall is needed”.</p> <p>It is clear that employment of those residents is important, but it is also clear that the complex and fractured geology of West Cumbria makes this one of the worst places in the UK for a long time-scale disposal site.</p> <p>We do not agree with the Partnership’s initial opinions on geology and feel it is a waste of time and money to continue the process in Cumbria when there are known to be more promising areas in England, as the geologists have said. But there are so many unsolved problems, that the waste would be better repackaged on the surface, where the waste is generated, which would rule out geological disposal and the hazardous transportation of waste.</p> |
| 593 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | A public inquiry and appeal agreed with the County Council’s view 15 years ago that the risk was too great for the geological disposal of intermediate waste. Today’s plan includes high-level waste, worlds first! |
| 593 | 3 – Impacts | No | Even before the emplacement of wastes’ the mining operation would rival the biggest mines in the world, adding to the earthquake risk and disrupting West Cumbria’ water table. |
| 593 | 4 – Community benefits | No | We regard the benefits package as bribery. West Cumbria in any case should be assured of essential structures such as schools and hospitals. The benefits package is designed as “a means to an end” |
| 593 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | The Partnership says that “A facility will not be built unless it will be safe during its operations and for future generations.” Their own advice contradicts this: “Geological disposal safety plans do not assume that total containment by engineered barrier systems for ever is possible” Dr Adrian Bath. |
| 593 | 6 – Inventory | No | The inventory is meaningless as this plan includes existing wastes (which are already outside the scope of any inventory) and new build wastes from untried “high burn” nuclear power plants. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| 593 | 7 – Siting process | No | The NIREX Inquiry completely ruled out Longlands Farm and the surrounding area. In spite of this, new criteria has been written to rule Longlands Farm back in. |
| 593 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | We are totally against Allerdale and Copeland Councils taking part. This is a cunning plan to keep the process and nuclear agenda on track. The government is sinking taxpayers' money into a timetabled process which they don't want to fail. |
| 593 | 9 – Additional comments | | <p>While the stated benefits of a long term repository are just 500 jobs a year, the disbenefits amount to excavations the size of two Channel Tunnels, blighted with mounds of debris which would have a negative effect on the £2bn a year tourist industry and result in farmers being turned off the land and character loss.</p> <p>No longer would our magnificent Lake District be a destination that tourists will flock to.</p> <p>Energy efficiency and renewable energy would be positively beneficial to the economy and the environment.</p> <p>[Additional email response]</p> <p>It is puzzling why the Government has prioritized a voluntary approach which has focused the search for a Nuclear Waste Repository, solely in Cumbria whilst ignoring the unsuitable Geology of the Lake District. Back in 1979, when the British Geological Society looked for suitable rocks on 437 sites, which when whittled down, Sellafield was ruled out. In spite of this, due to a political decision in the early nineties, Nirex made 29 boreholes near Gosforth, costing £400m. The geologist involved was Professor David Smythe, who found the rock cross- crossed with faults and permeable with basement volcanic rock. The following Inquiry of the mid 1990's established that the topography, geology and hydrology was not suitable for a dump nor would it be for the rest of Cumbria. How can the rocks change in fifteen years. Today's plan includes high level waste – a world first, which fills us with deep concern. In a letter to the Times & Star, Feb 10th 2012, Professor Stuart Hazledene, geologist, Edinburgh University wrote:.....'It is predicted by my own research that groundwater flowing past underground radioactive waste will return to the surface within only thousands of years. This ground water will return to the surface much faster within a few decades, if hot temperature high level waste is also buried. That heat will also make the land surface rise. No earthquakes or extra rainfall are needed.'</p> <p>Recent experiments in Sweden and Finland show that copper canisters corrode quicker than expected, a combination of intense heat, water and microbes.</p> <p>We regret the intention of the Cumbria County Council to take the decision in Cabinet and Allerdale in the executive, which undermines the process of volunteerism, since so few people are involved in the final decision.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>The Government's (NDA's) consultation is seriously flawed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1/ By putting geology and safety on the back burner in place of volunteerism and compensation (bribery) for site selection2/ By white washing the findings of the 1995/96 Inquiry and not ruling out Gosforth as a site for a repository3/ By using a P.R. firm to put over spin and encourage complacency (the wrong use of taxpayers money)4/ By stifling dissent – no rival view points have been funded to be heard5/ By not stating clearly the Government's intention to clear the decks, (by dumping waste in a GDF) as close to Cellafield as possible, to make way for future waste from new build nuclear power stations.6/ By emphasizing the 500 jobs which could be created building a GDF, but omitting the negative effect on farming and tourism. <p>The Nuclear Industry has been prosecuted for a variety of failures over the past decade. It is hardly surprising that many doubt the ability of the Nuclear Industry (or the regulators, who work for the industry) to safeguard our future and the future of our descendants.</p> <p>While the stated benefits of a long term repository are just 500 jobs a year. The dis-benefits amount to an excavation, at least the size of the city of Carlisle with massive pyramids of debris, and the negative effect on the £2 billion a year tourist industry, farmers being turned off their land (the loss of local food) and the serious threat to Lakeland's precious (at the moment uncontaminated water supply). Recently, 7 water companies in the South of England have imposed hosepipe bans. It should be fully realized our county's asset of high quality water, which is lacking in many parts of the world, yet essential to life on this earth.</p> <p>There being so many unsolved problems,we believe that the waste would be better looked after above ground, where it can be monitored and repackaged until a better solution in the future is found.</p> <p>There are other more sustainable ways of creating employment in West Cumbria, by placing the same sponsorship effort into attracting alternative energy, such as solar, wind and hydro power, Eco Tourism and providing free insulation of homes. This would not only reduce Cumbria's carbon footprint, but also retain the biodiversity of Cumbria.</p> <p>We are convinced by the argument that nowhere in Cumbria has suitable geology and appeal to the Lake District National Park to withdraw at this stage and not to participate in further site investigations, when it would become increasingly difficult to reverse out of the process. In any case we believe a GDF should not be sited on the edge of any National Park.</p> <p>We do not want to leave this 'Time bomb' legacy to future generations.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | |
| 594 | 1 – Geology | Yes | To store nuclear material underground in the present climate is much safer than storing it above ground!!! But I do believe it should be monitored and retrievable as well not just disposed of. Hopefully we can find somewhere in West Cumbria suitable. |
| 594 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | Obviously it takes a massive amount of planning but then can be achieved. Underground would be much more safe both environmentally and secure. Plus we have more nuclear material store in West Cumbria that anywhere else. |
| 594 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | No comment was made |
| 594 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | We need to have some agreement from the Government that there will be community benefits, especially around our infrastructure and local jobs. |
| 594 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | I believe there should be guarantees that the waste should be retrievable. |
| 594 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | No comment was made |
| 594 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | The fact that it would be our choice. |
| 594 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | I agree we should do the geological survey with no obligation. If there is a suitable area then I think it should be built here, rather than storing it at Sellafield where we are more susceptible to terror attacks. |
| | | | |
| 595 | 1 – Geology | Yes | What did the NIREX survey produce 20-25 years ago when studies of several sites were conducted throughout UK? This should be made available/public. |
| 595 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | Safety to include the problems with the infrastructure of West Cumbria. This level of engineering/tunnelling/construction, on top of nuclear new build, would threaten safety on roads, even if no heavy investment is made in road improvements (substantial). |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| 595 | 3 – Impacts | Not Sure/ Partly | Care must be taken not to assume that West Cumbrian population will automatically support this. Most people outside Sellafield may not be as supportive of nuclear if they do not demonstrably see the benefit of support. |
| 595 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | This MUST be a legally binding promise of substantial benefits. This should be pursued vigorously by the various Councils on behalf of the West Cumbrian community. The Benefits Package spend should at least equal the cash of ever getting planning permission in London/Surrey/Middlesex for example. |
| 595 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | Retrievability should be a fundamental part of the design maybe even a starting point. As to whether to be retrievable or not, this should be a decision NOT based on opinion, but on sound engineering longevity, safety, security, structural and environmental grounds. |
| 595 | 6 – Inventory | Not Sure/ Partly | I didn't see there was an opinion! Surely materials to go into the repository will already be decided on (broadly) and will be consigned depending on the need for storage, disposal or retrievable for future needs. |
| 595 | 7 – Siting process | Not Sure/ Partly | Broadly agree. But surely the best way (non-political) to find a suitable storage location is based largely on geology so as to be safe and sound. Proximity to Sellafield (largest holding of ILW/HW) would be an important factor but not necessarily the most important. (Think of location of Japanese reactor site near water as primary requirement – rather than safe locations in an earthquake/Tsunami zone) Political arguments must be divorced from the decision making process. |
| 595 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Ludicrous! This is a national facility/asset and not a local decision for siting! The decision will be better if local support is forthcoming but should not be driving decision making faster. |
| | | | |
| 596 | 1 – Geology | Yes | No evidence to rule out the 1890 km ² of remaining land. |
| 596 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | As a safety case professional, I am confident that a safety case could be made. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | |
| 596 | 3 – Impacts | Not Sure/ Partly | <p>Whilst I broadly support your opinions, I feel that the issue of community benefits needs to be addressed earlier than currently planned.</p> <p>All benefits should be in place prior to a Fixed Commitment, as we do not trust Government not to back out of its commitments.</p> |
| 596 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>Your stated opinion does not make sense, as it does not answer the question.</p> <p>This community currently has a monopoly of area volunteering. In light of this, the examples from other countries amount to derisory benefit.</p> <p>A total package should be in the Billions or 100s of Billions of pounds. This should be explicit up front, as this would provide an incentive for other areas to join the process, potentially lowering the overall cost due to competition.</p> <p>Promises count for nothing, as this area has learned to its cost before.</p> |
| 596 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | Seems sensible, but retrievability expectations need to be managed. |
| 596 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |
| 596 | 7 – Siting process | No | <p>The right of withdrawal seems to be from this process only.</p> <p>If we withdraw, the repository will be imposed on us. Not much of a “right” then.</p> |
| 596 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>You need to “show us the money” upfront.</p> <p>The Benefits package is THE key issue in deciding whether to host the repository.</p> |
| | | | |
| 597 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>The advice of the BGS in the 1980's has been totally ignored.</p> <p>It has been adequately demonstrated that all of W. Cumbria is unsuitable geologically.</p> <p>The hydrological gradient over all of W. Cumbria is high and further borehole investigation cannot negate this.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|
| | | | The proposals ignore international guidelines and practices. |
| 597 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>Cannot evaluate whether a site is safe until further details are available.</p> <p>You have ignored peer reviews with the geology, so cannot have confidence in peer review here.</p> <p>The political process is not transparent.</p> <p>Has been disclosed that you will take results from the MORI pole rather than regard responses to this consultation</p> |
| 597 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>Tourist bodies are not directly involved in having a final decision.</p> <p>Decision is with 3 councils and there are biased political opinions there.</p> <p>It is 'broadly compatible' hence there must be some aspects that are not compatible.</p> <p>Effects on the Lake District brand are not known but no information as to how this is to be measured.</p> |
| 597 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>This has all the hallmarks of a bribe.</p> <p>Nobody asked is going to say no to this promise of future goodies</p> <p>The very fact that this is on offer suggests that this is an unpopular proposition that needs a sweetener to swallow it.</p> |
| 597 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>There are no design concepts in this document.</p> <p>Agree material should be retrievable.</p> <p>It is not whether they fit your expectations it is whether they fit the local community</p> <p>You are asking for a view on the unknown.</p> |
| 597 | 6 – Inventory | No | Too many unknowns. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| | | | <p>What is to stop future legislation eg from Europe forcing the UK to deal with foreign waste.</p> <p>Again it is what you are looking for not what the scientific community would advise</p> |
| 597 | 7 – Siting process | No | <p>Voluntarism is not the correct process.</p> <p>International practice has not gone this way.</p> <p>The site should be sited on the basis of the best scientific advice. You have ignored the best geological advice.</p> |
| 597 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>No the area should not take part in this sham voluntarism process.</p> <p>The geology of the area has already been shown to be unsuitable.</p> <p>The high hydrological gradient can never be overcome.</p> <p>Other areas like E. Anglia have been shown to be better - the geology there is simpler and more suitable.</p> <p>A site should be located solely on sound scientific advice. W. Cumbria has not been chosen on this basis.</p> <p>The local population are being manipulated to support this on promises and on economic expectations. W. Cumbria is not safe in the long term</p> |
| | | | |
| 598 | 1 – Geology | Yes | No comment was made |
| 598 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | No comment was made |
| 598 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | No comment was made |
| 598 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | No comment was made |
| 598 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | No comment was made |
| 598 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | No comment was made |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| | | | |
| 598 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | No comment was made |
| 598 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | Sensible approach which I agree with. |
| | | | |
| 599 | 1 – Geology | No | <p>There is clearly disagreement among geological experts as to the suitability of West Cumbria as a site for a repository.</p> <p>When opinion is divided on such a crucial issue as the geology one must always take the "no risk" approach. In this case that means halting the process at the current stage.</p> |
| 599 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | <p>The feelings/opinions of any community affected by a proposed site for a repository will be ignored or overwhelmed by national opinion.</p> <p>Planning issues are not subject to a legal obligation on the part of the applicant to state the truth in the application. This is scandalous!</p> |
| 599 | 3 – Impacts | No | <p>The Energy Coast Masterplan includes the following aspirations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be globally recognised as a leading nuclear, environment and related technology business cluster. - Have a strong diversified economy. - Project a positive image to the world. <p>To have a strong diversified economy is a very good aspiration. Diversification is extremely important for any region and to achieve this there needs to be less emphasis on nuclear developments and associated industries, not more.</p> <p>Project a positive image to the world does not have to mean accepting the country's nuclear waste.</p> |
| 599 | 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>There should be no participation in this scheme without a clear quantified statement of a proposed community benefits package.</p> <p>In any case, no level of compensation will outweigh the risk and disruption for a number of years while a repository is being constructed.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| 599 | 5 – Design and engineering | No | <p>There is no precedent for designing a structure, the lifetime of which must be measured in thousands of years. Even design of high-speed rail tracks has been found to be faulty after just a relatively few years of operation – trains are having to operate at lower speeds than initially planned.</p> <p>I understand that some of the waste will be stored in glass blocks – glass is a fluid that distorts over time.</p> |
| 599 | 6 – Inventory | No | <p>The amount and type of waste designated for disposal in a repository cannot be guaranteed. This will always be subjected to change by successive governments if the need for increased capacity arises.</p> |
| 599 | 7 – Siting process | No | <p>The “Right of Withdrawal” sounds fine and reassuring but the farther along the process of consultation one goes, the more difficult it will be to exercise that right. The government is likely to increase pressure on an organisation that displays an interest as far as the latter stages of the process.</p> <p>The interests of the community affected by any proposed site will count for nothing.</p> |
| 599 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>Stop now! Why are Allerdale and Copeland Borough Councils the only ones in the whole of England to declare an interest in the process?</p> <p>All the other councils obviously do not think that the offer of a financial inducement is reason enough to subject their communities to possible risk and certainly years of horrendous disruption during the period of construction.</p> <p>The likely level of increased long-term employment is hardly worth considering. Even in the short-term much of the labour required for the project would be brought in from outside West Cumbria.</p> |
| 599 | 9 – Additional comments | | <p>Having a consultation programme is OK but it won’t get the views of the population of West Cumbria accurately assessed. Many people are apathetic until directly affected by the issue. It would be relatively easy to carry out a survey of the people on the electoral rolls of Allerdale and Copeland. This would still obtain a partial response but perhaps a wider response than is likely by the current process.</p> |
| 600 | 1 – Geology | Yes | <p>Much public interest lies in the quantity of land ruled OUT because of coal/oil/water deposits.</p> <p>Not much has been said about the size of the area still to be investigated. Is there still, say, 80% of Allerdale/Copeland land suitable for further investigation?</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| | | | <p>Could the repository itself be housed under rock within the National Park (with the surface facility outside the Park)? Perhaps some of the higher fells might be comprised of better rock for the underground store.</p> <p>What about magna cores of extinct volcanoes? Are there several in Cumbria which could be investigated?</p> |
| 600 | 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | Yes | <p>The Partnership is considering many different reports and ideas on an equal basis.</p> <p>It must be necessary for the Partnership to rely on expert opinions because Councillors would not personally have sufficient technical knowledge.</p> <p>This is a challenging process with constantly evolving safety ideas. It will be difficult to keep up with developments.</p> |
| 600 | 3 – Impacts | Yes | <p>West Cumbria would be considered a specialist nuclear area. A repository could be a big bonus for the area in terms of expertise.</p> <p>As a spin-off the infrastructure of West Cumbria would probably be much improved – roads, rail, etc.</p> <p>The expertise of the “nuclear” workforce/population would help in the construction process.</p> <p>This would bring much employment to a struggling area. The coal, steel and shipbuilding industries faded away. Perhaps the Port of Workington could benefit as the receiving hub for construction materials for onward movement by rail and also be used for the disposal of the mined spoil. (The Channel Tunnel spoil was used at Folkestone – could the same be done at Workington?)</p> <p>Carlisle Airport or a new helicopter “airport” at Eskmeals – where there used to be rail lines – could be expanded.</p> |
| 600 | 4 – Community benefits | Yes | <p>Benefits could include more skilled employment, which could be exported to other countries, in a similar way to the oil/gas industry in the North Sea.</p> <p>Improved infrastructure – road, rail, port, airport (Carlisle)</p> <p>Impetus to provide affordable housing around the whole county. This is lacking in many villages.</p> <p>The repository could also be viewed as Cumbria dealing with the waste problem for the benefit of the country.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| | | | Certainly very great care needs to be taken with the safety aspects. Let's hope that all the European nuclear nations will exchange ideas and learn from each other. |
| 600 | 5 – Design and engineering | Yes | <p>The ideas around design are still very fluid. No country yet has a fully functioning, high level, nuclear repository finished and up and running. Everyone is still learning.</p> <p>There would need to be more than one exit route from underground – just think about the coalmines. However, the more exits the more places for a radioactive leak to find its way to the surface.</p> <p>There is still a lot to learn. The repository will probably be designed “on the hoof” as there is no previous repository to look at. Quite a worrying thought.</p> |
| 600 | 6 – Inventory | Yes | <p>A list of what high level waste is stored above ground at Sellafield now should not be too difficult to compile. Can different types of waste – plutonium, uranium etc be mixed together in the same vault, or will separate vaults be essential? Would there be problems of the different wastes interacting together</p> <p>Will a deep repository be hotter than the land surface? Think about the gold and diamond mines in South Africa.</p> <p>I would not expect the community to have any influence at all on the contents of the repository.</p> <p>Thought needs to be given to what may be useful fuel for newer power stations.</p> |
| 600 | 7 – Siting process | Yes | <p>Unless the general community is going along with the repository idea there will be constant arguments.</p> <p>If the general population accepts that a repository is sensible then the councils will feel more confident about challenging the “experts” so that a really good solution is found.</p> <p>I wonder what will happen if no geologically suitable site is found in Allerdale or Copeland?</p> |
| 600 | 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>With so much waste already in Cumbria and a lot of nuclear expertise this seems an obvious starting location for these plans.</p> <p>Any area chosen needs to be sparsely populated, which means it is open countryside.</p> |
| 600 | 9 – Additional comments | | I hope that the repository is built within Cumbria. It is a project the area could be proud of and could bring a real boost to the area's economy. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |