

User ID	Question	Agree	Response
602	1 – Geology	No	I subscribe to the view that Prof Smythe and NIREX have already proven that the whole of West Cumbria has sufficient concerns about the long-term geological stability that it should not be considered.
602	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I believe there is sufficient doubt about long-term safety to justify abandoning any future plans/investigation.
602	3 – Impacts	No	I believe that the Partnership has been irresponsible in over emphasizing the potential economic benefits – which are very short term compared to the very long-term environmental risks.
602	4 – Community benefits	No	This should not have been emphasized.
602	5 – Design and engineering	Not answered	Not relevant. A repository would be nothing short of a potential catastrophe for the entire area regardless of its design.
602	8 – Overall views on participation		No. We should have nothing to do with it.
603	1 – Geology	No	<p>The BGS screening report was based on too narrow a remit.</p> <p>The geology and topography of the areas remaining in West Cumbria is unsuitable. I believe evidence provided for the NIREX report should have been considered as part of this work.</p> <p>There is evidence that other parts of the UK are geologically far more suitable and I believe this exercise should be led by geology first and then voluntarism, not vice versa.</p> <p>I believe Finland, France and Switzerland also started by looking for suitable geological sites first.</p>
603	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
603	3 – Impacts	No	The repository will harm long-term hopes for a more diversified economy in West Cumbria and will not enhance the tourism in the area.

			The job creation involved is pitifully low compared to those that could be created with similar amounts of money invested in developing sustainable energy technology in the area – wind, solar, wave etc.
603	4 – Community benefits	No	I think community benefits are ethically wrong and skewing the decision making process. Whether the local community is able to benefit in the short term is irrelevant when considering the safety of future generations over hundreds and thousands of years. Not considering future generations is wrong.
603	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
603	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
603	7 – Siting process	No	As expressed elsewhere I think voluntarism is not the right starting point for this process. The right geology and safety for present and future generations over thousands of years is where the process should start. I have doubts about the planned opinion poll and that it will be carried out evenly and in a fair, representative way. The bribes for local communities unfairly skews this area.
603	8 – Overall views on participation		I don't think they should take part in it. If they do I believe they will be putting short-term gain before the safety of generations to come and will be morally responsible for the possible harm. There is already enough evidence to suggest no site in West Cumbria is safe. They should be looking to diversify local economy and move away from nuclear dependence. The repository will do further harm to the prospects of tourism developing further in their areas.
604	1 – Geology	No	The BGS screening uses limited exclusion criteria. This maximises the number of areas which are included

			<p>rather than excluded. I have listened to the arguments of Professor Smythe and read some of the evidence. West Cumbria does not seem to have a geology that conforms to the internationally agreed criteria for the best sites for nuclear waste repositories.</p> <p>This means the argument over siting then slides into whether there are sites in West Cumbria which would be “good enough”. This is not a satisfactory way of deciding the best place geologically in the UK for an underground nuclear waste repository.</p>
604	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>This section of the consultation document is too vague to make an adequate assessment. The use of the future tense e.g. “the NDA will have suitable capability and an acceptable process in place” (page 52 Criterion b) Safety case) is not reassuring. There is no mention in this section of international standards and criteria which do exist.</p> <p>There will be general criteria to meet as well as site-specific criteria. These ought to be known by now and it would have been useful to list them in the consultation document.</p>
604	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The public is notoriously irrational about nuclear issues.</p> <p>The presence of Sellafield does not have a negative effect on the tourist industry in West Cumbria because it has not had a headline-grabbing incident within most people’s lifetime. The building of a repository for nuclear waste under West Cumbria will generate publicity and draw people’s attention to the presence of nuclear waste here.</p> <p>This is likely to have a profound effect on the tourist industry and Cumbrian food producers’ ability to sell their products.</p>
604	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>I do not agree with the community benefits concept at this point in time. The information contained in the consultation documents is too vague to mean anything. It just seems like a potential bribe to the local community to agree to the repository. In times of economic hardship any government is likely to be reluctant to give significant extra benefits whatever it appears to be saying.</p> <p>At this stage in the process it is more important that there are guarantees of sensible levels of compensation for anyone adversely affected in both the short and long term.</p>
604	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>I agree that detailed design work is only possible when a specific site is chosen. However, it would be helpful to give information about the constraints to design. It is important that these are spelt out at this stage to minimise the risk of unsatisfactory compromises being made to overcome constraints at a later stage in the</p>

			process.
604	6 – Inventory	No	I do not agree that the local community will have any significant say in what goes into the repository. Cumbria is currently the only area to express an interest in siting a repository. It will be very expensive to build. If it is the only repository built it will contain every item of nuclear waste needing underground storage until it is full. To pretend otherwise is foolish.
604	7 – Siting process	No	Box 33 page 97 concerns me “If a community wished to withdraw then its involvement in the process would stop”. This is not the same as saying the process will stop. I lived near Stewkley in Buckinghamshire when it was one of the proposed sites for the third London airport. The local community was opposed; this did not stop the government choosing it as the favoured site. An expensive fight ensued before the government backed down. Once expensive geological surveys are completed, if the local community does not want the repository, I believe history suggests they will have an expensive fight on their hands. They would have to fund this themselves; the generous funding the partnership has access to would not be available to them.
604	8 – Overall views on participation		I am not in principle against underground storage of nuclear waste but after reading the consultation document I found I could not tick yes to any box. I do not believe the areas covered by Allerdale and Copeland Borough Councils should take part in any further search for somewhere to put a repository. This is because I think the further you go along with the process and the more government money is spent the less likely it is that veto will be possible. In other words unless the geology of the whole of West Cumbria proves to be totally unsuitable continuation with this process at this stage means the repository will be built here.
604	9 – Additional comments		I am a psychologist and the consultation document you have produced alarms me considerably. The wording is such that many people are likely to feel they are being unreasonable if they do not tick yes to all the boxes. However, the document contains only a list of the partnerships’ concerns and an acknowledgement by government and relevant organisations that they have listened. I cannot find anything tangible that has been said in response. This in effect leaves the government free to do whatever it wants regardless of local views.
605	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
605	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made

605	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	I cannot decide until I know what the final opinions are which you will report to the councils (see 6.5a P64)
605	4 – Community benefits	No	In view of the time scale of this project, I doubt whether the principles accepted by the current government will necessarily be accepted by future governments.
605	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	Retrievability is essential in the hope that new technology can make the waste harmless and possibly use it to produce power in the process (Hitachi fast reactor?)
605	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
605	7 – Siting process	Yes	Considering rail access early in any future stage would reduce the area which you would need to consider.
605	8 – Overall views on participation		Allerdale should not take part in the search since Copeland, with all its existing nuclear facilities and rail access, should be an obvious number one choice. Neither surface nor underground facilities should be sited within the National Park.
605	9 – Additional comments		It is vital that you sort out the fundamental difference between the information in section 12.3 in the public consultation document and Document 240, paragraph 4. Your 0800 048 8912 is useless. I am still waiting for a response to a message left on 13.2.12. It is now 25.2.12.
606	1 – Geology	No	The criteria which appear intended to govern the choice of geological site are not reassuring: “that no harmful quantities of radioactivity can reach the surface” and “that the facility should minimise the escape of radiation” (our emphases). These seem to be setting the safety bar rather low, since their implication is that there is going to be some escape of radiation. The acceptance of the BGS survey is not reassuring. We note that their initial findings had to have “several rounds of comments and amendments”. This suggests that there is some scope for differing views. You have chosen to disregard the views you say Dr. Dearlove dismisses as “personal opinions”. However, all opinions are in the last analysis, by definition, opinions, as well as personal. The fact that some coalesce into a majority opinion does not necessarily mean that this is the correct opinion. It is not reassuring in terms of either the rationality or the integrity of the consultation process that so small an area is excluded at this stage. No explanation is offered as to why the areas “unsuitable at specific depths” are not shown as excluded. It would not be very easy to test-bore or insert a repository in a layer between

			<p>aquifers. It is confusing that here the BGS refers to “volume of rock” as needing to be excluded when this issue is otherwise defined as area. Further, since more desk-based studies will have to be done at Stages 4a and 4b in order to exclude other unsuitable areas, commonsense says they should have been done at this stage.</p>
606	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Again, it is not reassuring to be starting from the premise that “safety can never be 100% guaranteed.” Some statement of the percentage risk considered acceptable is called for, along with some description of the risk, which must be some radiation leak either from the repository or transportation of waste to the repository. This could not be cleaned up like, say, an oil spill.</p> <p>It is striking that this section of the consultation document does not deal with safety as such but only with procedures and processes which might possibly be developed to ensure a safe site. In the absence of some statement of the results expected from these processes and procedures it is an unjustifiable leap of faith to “believe” that what you want will happen.</p> <p>The fact that several countries have opted for underground storage is not evidence for the efficacy of this system. There is no long-term experience of what will happen in this situation. Far more work needs to be done on the areas suggested by the cited Greenpeace report before committing any further in this process. There are no grounds as yet to believe in the safety of an underground repository.</p> <p>As regards the planning issues it is totally unsatisfactory that the basic considerations regarding the Lake District National Park are put off as something to be decided by an as yet undetermined planning authority. Clearly, if the MIPU makes the decision, it is going to make a decision in favour of government policy. This policy, as you emphasise, is to have an underground repository. It should be possible at this stage to decide in principle whether the national park area is to be included in, or excluded from, the search area. If the park designation is regarded as having any meaning, this area should be excluded altogether from the search area, both underground and surface. Even if such a decision were to be overridden later in the process, which is clearly possible in a situation where necessity and force majeure are going to be decisive, there is no need to avoid a decision in principle at this stage. It would at least be an acknowledgement of the priceless asset which the park represents to be weighed against all the other considerations on which a price could possibly be put.</p> <p>Apart from safety and health issues (yet again) the direct physical impacts need more analysis. The spoil issue is an obvious one, and the quantity to be excavated must depend on whether 6 or 11 times the capacity of the Albert Hall (which of these is one Channel Tunnel?) is to be excavated, which, in turn, depends on many other things still to be decided, particularly those related to inventory. How exactly this spoil could be accommodated in 12m high embankments is not clear. It would clearly be a major eyesore.</p>

			<p>Merely to list “the effects of construction such as noise and dust” as one of the impacts of a repository does not adequately portray these impacts. If there is an application for borehole work in 5-6 years then some work will start in 2017-2018. If there is an application for a repository in “around 15 years” (2026-2027) then clearly, even if the granting of permission is fast-tracked, construction work is not likely to be completed by 2029, but perhaps by the originally envisaged date of 2040.</p> <p>There could, therefore, be several years of low-intensity work, followed by more than 10 years of high-intensity excavation and engineering work. This will involve round-the-clock, seven-days-a-week movements of heavy plant and heavy vehicles, since it would be not economic to leave them idle. This equipment will, in its nature, all be using huge quantities of fuel, creating a pocket of intense air pollution from exhaust emissions. In addition, there will be considerable quantities of dust which will be spread between excavation and dumpsites and inevitably be spread from there by vehicle movements and wind. As well as atmospheric pollution there will be noise pollution and extra light pollution from site lighting. The effects on local health and ecosystems are incalculable.</p> <p>The issue of the national park has to be faced again here. The roads infrastructure from the west will not be adequate to get the equipment for borehole drilling on site, and it is clearly not adequate for the transportation of the massive quantities of spoil needing to be removed if the repository access is further inland than the coastal strip. Any up grading of the small roads would have a disastrous effect on the landscape of the western valleys.</p>
606	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The jobs issue is inadequately explained. It is not clear whether the 550 figure refers to net extra jobs over and above those already in nuclear-related work in West Cumbria. This figure is an odd island of certainty in a sea of uncertainties. Surely the as yet undecided size of the repository will determine at least the length of the construction project and the number of workers involved in this and the work in surface facilities? Thus suggesting that the 550 figure should rather be a range. If job creation is the only positive impact, then this must be the most gigantically expensive job creation scheme ever. While this might be a benefit from the scheme it can hardly stand or fall on this criterion.</p> <p>What you say needs to be put in place at the “next stage” of the process needs to be resolved now, before proceeding to the next stage. These issues include all those implied by Boxes 15 and 16, as well as all those relating to the national park.</p>
606	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The Box 20 examples of “benefits” are pretty paltry. Also, to include “roads constructed to service the facility” as an example of a “benefit” is stretching a point, as these will not be available for public use, unless you are including in this definition all road up grading necessary to accommodate general traffic generated by</p>

			<p>exploration and construction work. It is a moot point whether this is unquestionably a benefit. Greater road capacity generally creates more traffic. Not everyone would accept this as a benefit.</p> <p>It is clear that the putative benefits are intended as compensation for hosting the facility. Since compensation is, by definition, in return for some disadvantage or downside, it is evident that “mitigation” is not going to be successful. This bears on issues already dealt with in our responses.</p> <p>The 12 principles sound very grand, and it is easy for the government to agree to discuss principles, since this commits them to nothing. The DECC Letter reads as a brush off regarding the discussion of benefits as distinct from mere principles. As already indicated in our responses, there is clearly no suggestion that these “benefits” are a make-or-break issue. In terms of expectations there is no knowing either the economic circumstances or which government will determine a benefits package. There is no point in agreeing to something you say you “cannot be certain” about. This uncertainty is compounded by the point you make in the Inventory section regarding changes in the benefits package which would be dependent on changes in “volume and radioactivity”.</p>
606	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>Your position on the retrievability issue appears to be contradictory. Having said you want to make sure “that any designs being developed do not rule out the option to retrieve waste at a later date”, you go on to say that this issue “would be dealt with much later in the process”. If this is an essential criterion for you, why not establish it now?</p> <p>This issue should not be postponed, especially as the government has mooted the idea of backfilling and sealing the repository. Since future problems cannot be anticipated, it is essential that monitoring access and retrievability are confirmed as requirements now. If the “no harmful” escape and minimal escape criteria set out in the geology section are proved over-optimistic, it would be another major engineering job to get access to deal with problems in a sealed site.</p>
606	6 – Inventory	No	<p>Again we are asked to deal with a slew of undecided issues. It should not be impossible to decide what the proposed repository needs to contain. Existing waste is a known quantity, and the processes which have produced it are known. Therefore it should be possible to decide what, at a given time, the capacity of the repository would need to be and to go ahead with these specific requirements as determining criteria. Instead, we are again in the airy-fairy territory of principles – “inventory principles”. That the Minister of Energy’s letter “warmly welcomes the broad approach” is hardly surprising. It is like a thank you for not looking at these issues too closely and critically.</p> <p>It is not realistic to be looking at an operating timescale of 100-130 years for the repository, since developments in energy production over this period cannot be guessed at. This period represents several</p>

			<p>generations of nuclear power stations, but to base guesstimates on this ignores the fact that current work in energy production is likely to lead to dramatically different energy sources from those we have now. This is likely well within the 100-130 year timescale. This would make projections based on current technologies totally inaccurate. This is why a calculation of inventory and needed capacity over a much shorter and more realistic time-scale is needed.</p> <p>More realistic working dates for inventory calculation would be 2040 or 2029 (again, uncertainty). A suitable geological site can only be found with a specific repository capacity in mind, since some geologically suitable sites might have to be ruled out because of insufficient capacity and another sought which provided adequate capacity. It is, therefore commonsense that a specific capacity requirement has to be worked out before any search for a site begins. This cannot be left unresolved indefinitely, and logic suggests that now is the time to do this work.</p> <p>The effect on repository size of different rock types clearly re-emphasises the point we made earlier about the need for much more desk-based geological investigation before going further in this process.</p> <p>The prospect of nuclear waste being transported into the area for 100-130 years is alarming in the extreme. The likelihood of an accident increases in proportion to any increase in the transportation time-scale. As you have said "safety can never be 100% guaranteed".</p>
606	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Box 29 confirms our previous observations regarding the totally inadequate preliminary geological studies. The colossal expense and disruption of the Stage 5 investigations requires drastic restriction of the areas to be surveyed and investigated.</p> <p>We note the statement in the consultation summary pamphlet that "the Government says a repository will only be put in an area where people are willing to have it". We note that the full consultation document contains the more nuanced statement that the government "does not want to force a facility upon a community: it is looking for volunteers and wants to work in partnership. It calls this voluntarism"</p> <p>It is clear from Section 10 of the consultation document that the voluntarism principle is a sham, and that the veiled threat in the "does not want to" is real. Step 3(e) makes this crystal clear: "In the event of the partnership concluding that the omission of a potential host community from the PSA would create insurmountable problems for the siting process, then it would recommend the inclusion of the community concerned if this was supported by a full justification and explanation". The importance of this principle is re-emphasised through a verbatim repetition on the next page in Step 4 (i). Put another way, this is saying to a community: if you don't want it in your area but we do, you're going to have it (but we'll go through the pointless exercise of telling you why the voluntarism principle wasn't worth the paper it was written on).</p>

			<p>Again, if the RoW principle is valid up to the time just before construction begins, it is impossible to understand the new requirement set out in Step 5(a) for RoW negotiations with DECC prior to borehole investigations.</p>
606	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>The councils should not take any further part in this process. They should ask themselves one basic question as to why no other areas have volunteered to take part in this process if it is such an attractive proposition.</p> <p>They should also consider whether placing even more eggs in the nuclear industry basket is in the best long-term interests of their communities.</p> <p>In the first instance there will be an intolerable period of disruption and environmental disbenefits for residents during the construction period. After this they will have to live with a totally unpredictable and rising level of risk from the repository.</p>
606	9 – Additional comments		<p>This is the most frustrating consultation document we have ever had to deal with. Frustrating because it is almost exclusively concerned with matters of process rather than substance. These process matters are resolved into microscopic bureaucratic steps leading to questions which seem designed to make it difficult to answer them negatively, since everything is referenced to a future stage in the process, trying to complete acceptance of a move to the next stage or appear unreasonable for not accepting this. Again and again there is a morass of unknowns, uncertainties and issues to be dealt with in the future. Getting to grips with the consultation content is like getting hold of jelly.</p> <p>Even what appears to be the one certainty – the decision that there is going to be a repository – seems in doubt at two points. In the Ethics section (p22) we read that the decisions “will impact many generations to come, whether that decision is to leave the waste where it is or to place it in a repository” (our emphasis). In Section 6.1, Context, we read, “These impacts, both positive and negative, would need weighing up against the impacts of waste remaining in its current form and above ground storage at Sellafield and elsewhere in the country” (our emphasis). It is hard to understand the point of including these two statements (which would appear to be basic commonsense) when the background to the exercise is as set out in Section 3.3 (p19): “Government policy is for geological disposal. Therefore the Partnership is only discussing geological disposal and not other potential approaches to managing higher activity radioactive wastes in the long term”. The issue does not seem to be open in the way suggested by the two statements quoted. Is it, or isn’t it? Our position as respondents is like that of voters in an election with just one candidate.</p> <p>The repeated re-statement of the possibility of withdrawal does seem very over-done. If the RoW is genuine (which we have questioned) there should be no need for this repetitious emphasis. It leads at one point (p69) to the rather silly statement about “hosting a potential facility”. It is not possible to host a “potential” facility, only</p>

		<p>an actual one. Even the gratuitous “Safely” (surely this goes without saying?) in the Partnership title seems designed to contribute to the cushion of reassurance. The whole process looks like an elaborate charade designed to rubber-stamp a government decision already taken. It may be that geological consideration will finally stop this project, but it looks as if every point will be stretched towards making it happen. Depressingly, it looks like the out-of-sight, out-of-mind principle – a high tech and highly expensive version of sweeping dirt under the carpet. In this context the doubts expressed in the summary consultation leaflet that “we cannot rely on societies hundreds or thousands of years from now to manage these wastes safely above ground” looks distinctly quaint, if not arrogant. That there will still be societies thousand of years from now is an interesting speculation, but that if they exist they will not have advanced in their technical competence (provided we leave them adequate notes about what they are dealing with) is a speculation which goes against the evidence of the last 50-100 years.</p> <p>We would like to add a statement of our personal disinterestedness in these issues. We will be dead long before any of the things mooted in your project are realised. Nor do we have any children or relatives who will be living in the area after we are dead. Our scepticism about this exercise, and our doubts about its bona fides, is based entirely on your presentation. This raises our concern for the future of this area. We have loved the Lake District and walked in it since childhood. We remember well the Windscale fire and its effects, subsequently compounded by the Chernobyl fallout. This area is under threat now from many directions, not least the crass and gimmicky commercialism inspired by the ‘Adventure Capital’ slogan. The last thing the Lake District needs is a nuclear time bomb buried under West Cumbria. To continue with this project would be an act of staggering irresponsibility.</p> <p>Going outside the permitted parameters for our responses, we must finish by making the point that secure surface storage on site of waste from nuclear power stations is the most cost-effective solution from the point of view of all round safety and the environment, leaving only waste from other sources to be transported for storage on the nearest appropriate site.</p>
607	Comments slip	I'm in favour of moving to the next stage of consultation on geological survey.
608	Comments slip	I fully support the repository.
609	Comments slip	I fully support the idea of the nuclear repository.
610	Comments slip	I fully support the proposal.

611	Comments slip		I fully support the idea.
612	Comments slip		I fully support the idea.
613	Comments slip		Fully support it.
614	Comments slip		I support it.
615	Comments slip		Yes very supportive of the idea.
616	Comments slip		I am supportive of the repository.
617	Comments slip		I fully support the idea of a repository.
618	Comments slip		I support the actions proposed to find a suitable repository in Cumbria.
619	Comments slip		Yes fully supportive of the idea, get it built lad eh!
620	Comments slip		All for it.
621	Comments slip		Yes
622	Comments slip		Supportive
623	Comments slip		Yes
624	Comments slip		I fully support the building of a repository.
625	Comments slip		I fully support the idea and hope it happens.

626	Comments slip		I agree with the proposal to build a waste repository in West Cumbria.
627	Comments slip		I fully support the plan for a waste repository in West Cumbria.
628	Comments slip		I support the build of the repository in Cumbria.
629	Comments slip		I fully agree with the proposal.
630	Comments slip		I support the build of a repository in Cumbria.
631	Comments slip		I agree with the proposal.
632	Comments slip		Jobs for the local community better road systems in and out of Cumbria.
633	Comments slip		Road infrastructure and legally binding contract to do work as stated.
634	Comments slip		I say NO to the building of an underground nuclear waste repository anywhere in Cumbria. It will be the final nail in the coffin for West Cumbria.
635	Comments slip		NO - I think it would be utter madness to even consider siting a radioactive waste repository in West Cumbria. There are too many question marks regarding the geology. The nuclear industry in West Cumbria has a very dubious record with frequent accidents. The area should be doing everything possible to boost the tourist industry, which has tremendous potential with the drop in overseas travel.
636	9 – Additional comments		<p>What gives anyone the right to leave a GDF for all the future children of Cumbria? There are far too many mistakes at Sellafield now with finding waste down drains and on tips.</p> <p>WE HAVE THE HIGHEST RATE FOR CANCER IN CUMBRIA NOW</p> <p>ABSOLUTELY NO TO A GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL WASTE</p>

			[Additional comments slip] What gives anyone the right to leave a GDF for all the future children of Cumbria? There are far too many mistakes at Sellafield now with finding waste down drains and on tips. We have the highest rate for cancer now in Cumbria. NO to a geological disposal waste
637	Comments slip		In my opinion Cumbria has enough radioactive problems now. Why should we be taking any part in seeking an area for a deep repository. Areas like Caithness should be taking a more active part in depositing the waste sent to us up there. Areas further south like Wales could be examined say for depositing waste from nuclear sub's based down south. Likewise other areas through out the county for any other.
638	Comments slip		Please investigate further.
639	Comments slip		Please investigate further.
640	Comments slip		Please investigate further.
641	Comments slip		I agree to go ahead with the proposal.
642	Comments slip		I agree it should be investigated further.
643	Comments slip		I wish to investigate further.
644	Comments slip		Please do further investigations.
645	Comments slip		Please investigate further.
646	Comments slip		Please investigate further.
647	Comments slip		Please investigate further.

648	1 – Geology	Yes	Seesm to be a reasonable approach based in the information so far avaiable
648	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
648	3 – Impacts	Yes	We need a balanced approach to employment in the area we cant' be reliant on tourism not nuclear with carefull planning and infrastructure support this should be achievable
648	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
648	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	at this tage I support approach I would longterm prefer that the material stored by retrievable as knowledge and technology will chnage and better solutions may be avaiable in future.
648	6 – Inventory	Yes	The possibility of inventory includingused fual would further the arguement forthe waste to be retrievable in the future
648	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
648	8 – Overall views on participation		I support in general terms the approaches being considered,I strongly support the siting of the repository in Cumbria if demonstrated asuitable site, as it would minimise the risk associated with transporting existing legacy already in Cumbria
649	1 – Geology	Yes	The Partnership is right to recognise the uncertainty regarding the suitability or otherwise of the areas not screened out by the BGS survey. Issues raised by Prof Smythe and others will need to be considered following any DtP. The initial opinion is reasonable given these uncertainties and the emphasis on voluntarism in the MRWS siting process.
649	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Safety- Regulators' requirements are clearly set out in the EA's Guidance on Requirements for Authorisation and the ONR's Safety Assessment Principles. Regulators are engaged in the MRWS siting process now (a significant difference from the Nirex process) and RWMD, as prospective operator, is already subject to voluntary regulatory scrutiny. The generic Disposal System Safety Case gives confidence that the regulators' requirements could be met if a suitable site can be found.

			Planning- It will be many years before development consent for a GDF is applied for. The right of withdrawal provides safeguards to ensure that arrangements acceptable to any community that hosts a GDF are going to be in place.
649	3 – Impacts	Yes	As with any major project there are potential negative impacts, but there is no reason to think that these cannot be mitigated so that the residual impact is acceptable. The GDF has the potential to support the economic development of Cumbria, starting with the approximately 500 direct jobs with the potential for enhancements closely linked with the project. These benefits should not be forgotten in the debate about additional benefits. In the next few years additional benefits should be focused on “defensive” measure to anticipate and mitigate potential negative impacts eg Property Value Protection and Brand Protection schemes.
649	4 – Community benefits	Yes	<p>A Property Value Protection scheme should be considered as an early part of a benefit package. Having a PVP in place before the start of site identification could help allay genuine concerns that the siting process could have an early, adverse, effect on property values.</p> <p>Although jobs can not be reserved for local people actions can and should be taken to maximise opportunities for local people from the GDF project starting during Stages 4 and 5. Training and other actions should be put in place soon after any DtP.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to early establishment of brand protection arrangements.</p>
649	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Important aspects of the GDF design, including factors affecting the appearance and hence visual impact of the surface facility and the incorporation of retrievability into the design and operation of the facility, can only be progressed as the siting process moves forward. It will be important for RWMD to work with communities to ensure that community input into the design process is obtained.
649	6 – Inventory	Yes	The inventory of waste for disposal has a significant effect on the design and hence the impacts of a GDF. The Partnership’s Inventory Principles provide a sound basis on which to develop a process for managing the inevitable changes to the inventory that will take place during the life of a GDF.
649	7 – Siting process	Yes	DECC’s frameworks for desk-based identification and assessment of Potential Candidate Sites and the Partnership’s suggested steps for organisational arrangements provide a good basis for moving forward following any decision to participate.
649	8 – Overall views on participation		The relevant areas should take part in the search, without commitment, for a site for a geological disposal facility. This project has the potential to bring significant benefits to the area. Until further work is done on site identification and assessment it will not be possible to say whether a safe and technically acceptable location,

			in an area with community support, can be found. Also, it will not be possible to be clearer about all the potential benefits and adverse impacts until more work is done on potential sites. Thus it would be sensible for west Cumbria to participate in the siting process so that the impacts (both beneficial and detrimental) can be better understood.
649	9 – Additional comments		I have no additional comments.
650	1 – Geology	No	In 4.1 context, it is stated that "Such a facility would be designed so that the geological and engineered barriers work together to minimise the escape of radiation" not prevent the escape of radiation. I think that unless the facility can prevent any leak it should not be considered.
650	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	5.1 states "Safety can never be 100% guaranteed". At present, without a facility, safety is 100% guaranteed. why would we want to change that even to 99% guaranteed.
650	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	I agree that a repository would create employment for the area, however I feel that this would be offset by the probable loss of jobs in tourism, I for one would not want to holiday on top of a nuclear dump. I can also foresee loss of business for people working with Cumbrian branded products particularly food stuffs
650	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	I agree that west Cumbria should receive a benefits package should it proceed with the installation. however, under no circumstances should it proceed to the next stage until it knows what this package will consist of and has a firm and binding agreement that it will be paid by whatever government comes to power.
650	5 – Design and engineering	No	I cannot see how you can form an opinion on design and engineering when ,as you say, you will not know what the design will be until a site is found. I feel that the question of retrievability needs to be resolved before proceeding as it raises the issue of whether the site is to be used to dispose of nuclear waste or merely be a warehouse to store it. This would raise questions of why it was being retrieved, for what uses and is nuclear material going to be transported to and fro in Cumbria.
650	6 – Inventory	No	Having read this chapter, it would appear that no one really knows exactly what will go into the repository or where it will come from. there are too many ifs and buts, maybes , could bees and assumptions. I would want to know exactly what we are committing ourselves to before saying yes to proceeding.
650	7 – Siting process	No	I do not for one minute believe that the wishes of the local communities will be taken into consideration. I do

			not say this lightly, I say it from experience. West Cumbria has over the last few years had several wind farms forced upon us, about 99% off the population did not want them, they have been rejected by our democratically elected council, yet the planning inspectorate ignored this and gave permission to build. Many letters of protest were sent to government ministers, including the prime minister but despite Mr Cameron's big picture, all cries for help were ignored. I cannot believe that the building off a nuclear dump will be any different.
650	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I feel that there needs to be more definite answers to questions such as what type of waste is to be deposited, will it be retrieved and for what purpose, how will the waste be brought to the site etc.</p> <p>I also think that we need a more legally binding agreement that we could pull out , even at the last minute, rather than the word of a few politicians.</p>
650	9 – Additional comments		Ideally I think that a referendum of the west cumbrian residents should be the next step, I can't see the point of putting any more effort and money into a project that the people of west cumbria might not want in the first place.
653	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>It is quite disturbing that acknowledged experts differ on the suitability of the geology of West Cumbria. I think that further investigations should proceed, but I am not happy that no other area of the country is having its geology studied 'in depth', to coin a phrase.</p> <p>Geology should be the prime factor in determining the location of the facility, whereas at the moment it seems that willingness to host the disposal site is the main criterion.</p> <p>There are many areas, where the substructure is more suitable, especially where it is clay, but these appear to be mainly in the Midlands and the south, ie politically sensitive regions.</p>
653	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I trust the judgement of the NDA and the scientific reasoning behind this conclusion.
653	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I think the list of possible impacts is good, but it doesn't sufficiently emphasise that the massive construction activities would completely overwhelm the current transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The roads, especially the A595 southbound, and the coastal rail line are quite inadequate. I believe the railway should play a major part during the construction phase and beyond. There are long single track sections on the</p>

			<p>railway with inadequate passing loops. extra traffic on the railway would disrupt the current restricted passenger service even more. See my further comments on community benefit, below.</p>
653	4 – Community benefits	Yes	<p>As I mentioned above, the transport infrastructure is inadequate even without the construction and operation of a repository. It should be a condition of acceptance that the A595 south of Calderbridge should be improved and re-trunked and that the coastal railway line should receive substantial investment, such as more double track, better rolling stock, improved communication on train times, etc to passengers waiting at stations and upgraded station facilities. This would not only improve things for residents but would encourage tourism, which will be a vital industry in the future.</p> <p>Because this would be a nationally important facility, communications with the rest of the country should be improved in terms of road and rail connections, superfast broadband, etc.</p> <p>With regard to employment I would like to see great diversification of industry and jobs, away from the unnaturally high overemphasis and overdependence on a single activity, the nuclear industry.</p>
653	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>The only point on which I am doubtful is whether the repository should be designed such that the material should be retrievable. It all depends on whether spent fuel (strictly speaking this is not 'waste') is to be reprocessed, in which case it should be, before it is placed in the repository. In that case there is no need to retrieve the true 'waste', since it would consist of fission product residues (vitrified) and active fuel element component materials, eg cladding, which are of no further use.</p>
653	6 – Inventory	Yes	<p>Separated unused uranium, and plutonium formed during irradiation should not be regarded as waste, since they represent valuable energy resources.</p> <p>Spent fuel placed in the repository could be retrievable for reprocessing, since economic and political conditions could change in the future and further fresh uranium supplies might become difficult to obtain or be unaffordable. But as I said in a previous answer it would be better if the spent fuel were reprocessed straight away, after the appropriate cooling and conditioning period.</p>
653	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>As I said in the answer to question 1, and this reflects the concerns of the submission of Churches Together in Cumbria (CtiC), of which I am a member, a much wider study of the geology in the country as a whole is essential, voluntarism is not the sole or even the main criterion.</p> <p>In a decision of such great national significance it is not right that a few local councils should be asked to bear the burden of deciding.</p>

			To quote from a letter written by CTiC to Mr Ed Davey, the Environment Secretary: It is the UK Government that should be seen to be taking responsibility for the nature and location of a nuclear repository for the nation because it is the safety of future generations of Britons, and neighbouring countries, which should be the overriding factor
653	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes, it should, but only after the concerns about limited geological study areas have been addressed, and commitment to infrastructure improvements on the part of Government have been clarified.
653	9 – Additional comments		I think the Public Consultation Document produced by MRWS is a very fine and well presented piece of work. What I would like to see is a similar document prepared for distribution in those other geologically moer suitable areas which then might express an interest if only they were in fuller possession of the facts about safeguards, community benefits and the importance of such a facility to our future energy needs
654	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
654	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	A Public Inquiry and Appeal agreed with Cumbria County Council's view already that the risk was too great for geological disposal of intermediate level waste. Today's plan includes high level wastes so I question how this idea is still in the running.
654	3 – Impacts	No	A nuclear dump would be a disaster for farming and for the tourist industry - Cumbria's largest industries. I believe that there would be an increased earthquake risk and irreversible damage to the water table
654	4 – Community benefits	No	I can see the temptation for west cumbria to be offered money to regenerate the area, but the risks far outweigh the benefits.
654	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
654	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
654	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
654	8 – Overall views on		The government are wasting tax payer money at a time when the country cannot afford it as

	participation		CCC have already once opposed the plan for a nuclear dump.
654	9 – Additional comments		I feel that this idea of underground nuclear storage is far too risky. There have been incidents around the world of nuclear disasters and earthquakes - one only has to think back to the horror of Fukushima which demonstrated how unsafe nuclear power plants can be, especially near the coast. The people undertaking the work in this consultation will not even see the effects in their lifetime, and it is our future generations we should be thinking of. What sort of a legacy is this for the beautiful county of Cumbria and its inhabitants?
655	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	It requires further study, as you have acknowledged
655	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Not enough detail on how safety procedures will be implemented. I don't have much faith in these agencies based on prior performance.
656	1 – Geology	No	I don't accept that the earlier report by Nirex is insufficient evidence of serious problems in and around the small margin area left. I don't trust you to find the "right" answer regardless. The volunteerism is fundamentally flawed. The aim should be to find the safest areas and then consult.
656	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I don't accept the reassurances and future planning ability of an industry with such a deeply flawed history.
656	3 – Impacts	No	The direct impact, immediate and long term will embed West Cumbria as an area to be avoided by the rest of the world. A tiny fraction of the proposed investment in, for example, communication technology and education could set up this remote area as a high tech and tourist destination. A dump will send all the wrong messages. West Cumbria will be thought of in the same bracket as Chernobyl and Fukushima whether you like it or not.
656	4 – Community benefits	No	Community Benefits should not form part of this deal. This generation should not have short term sweeteners influencing outcomes with such a long term impact.
656	5 – Design and engineering	No	There is too much uncertainty dependent on engineering and political/financial considerations to accept any even tentative designs. An open book is being offered to an industry with an appalling history of overspend and future planning.
656	6 – Inventory	No	I accept that this issue is dependent on such a wide range of factors that an opinion either way is currently

			more or less invalid.
656	7 – Siting process	No	<p>This aspect is the most important. The problem faced in nuclear waste disposal is extremely important. The industry which started in secrecy and continued for decades without a proper end plan is at the most crucial stage relying on the desperation of the an isolated overdependent host community for all this toxicity to make the "right" decision.</p> <p>What if the answer is No. Perhaps the bribes would increase and a different form of consultation would arrive at the "right" answer.</p> <p>The only correct way to deal with this is to find the most stable geology, come up with a safe transportation plan and get on with it.</p> <p>Or even check out the proposed new generation of fast breed reactors that are claimed to safely consume much of the waste and leave less toxic waste after producing safe power. http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/feb/02/nuclear-reactors-consume-radioactive-waste</p>
656	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>The councils should not take part in this process. This would then make the nuclear industry and politicians ask the right questions i.e. where are the safest places and how can we get the waste there. Then take the politically difficult but right decision to take the safest route, not the easiest.</p> <p>Even in the short term, the blight, publicity and embedding of the negative Sellafield image in the world consciousness would be an awful consequence of a vote in favour. The nuclear industry in West Cumbria is here to employ people for generations whether the dump goes ahead or not.</p>
656	9 – Additional comments		<p>Please note the overwhelming number of local parishes voting against the dump. Unless of course that is an inconvenience to you....</p> <p>[Additional comments slip]</p> <p>What “community benefits” will Cumbria residents receive for hosting the nation’s (and ? other nations) nuclear waste. I gather that in France people’s fuel bills are reduced – how about a “Cumbrian” reduction in either fuel bills or Council tax - paid for by the nation as a whole? + think about connecting West Cumbria to Morecombe – either bridge or hovercraft service.</p>

657	1 – Geology	No	already highly investigated geologically. High rainfall area would almost certainly lead to radiation leakage
657	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	15 years ago a public enquiry deemed intermediated waste levels too dangerous for geologicval deposit now you are considering high level waste. how has safety changed?
657	3 – Impacts	No	a nuclear dump would hardly encourage tourism and would no encourage agriculture. also it would be a considerable earthquake risk .
657	4 – Community benefits	No	why should Cumbria have to submit to bribery to receive adequate funding for essential services such as schools?
657	5 – Design and engineering	No	the partnerships own advice contradicts this as total containment can never be possible
657	6 – Inventory	No	the inventory is meaningless as it includes existing wastes and new build wastes from untried high burn nuclear power plants
657	7 – Siting process	No	longlands farm has already been ruled out by the Nirex enquiry
657	8 – Overall views on participation		councils should stand firm and say NO
657	9 – Additional comments		Nuclear power NO NO NO public money should be sunk in to other means of producing power wind solar etc
659	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
659	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
659	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
659	4 – Community benefits	No	No comment was made
659	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made
659	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made

659	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
662	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	The area of possible sites is too great to, at present, make a judgement as to the suitability, safety and risk factors. A much reduced area would allow a more complete assessment.
662	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
662	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	I understand initial opinions must necessarily be somewhat vague and this should NOT prevent an initial, without commitment offer to be part of the search for a suitable site for a repository. But such an approach MUST make clear to the Government and the Nuclear Industry that any agreement to accept a site in this area will require major infrastructure improvements to Road, Rail and sea routes. Anyone who has to travel south of Whitehaven faces a narrow winding road around Muncaster, Bootle, Millom and one accident can close the entire route. Even heading North I was one of hundreds who, in the ninties, had to leave our cars and walk miles as snow and stranded vehicles closed the roads. South of Whitehaven the railway is now a joke! These and other things are fundamental to the safety and future of West Cumbria and the population and there must be absolute guarantees and our being able to see the improvements being carried out BEFORE any repository is started. Promises to "Do something in the future" are not good enough
662	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	See my answer to the previous question
662	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
662	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
662	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	As per my previous answer to questions 6 and 7
662	8 – Overall views on participation		Given that West Cumbria already markets itself as "The Energy Coast" it has presumably given up on any attempt to sell our area as a tourist attraction despite the magnificent efforts of Whitehaven to attract visitors to the town. Also as developers seem to be hell-bent on erecting more wind turbines in the Lakes than there are trees I guess that a nuclear dump (Sorry Repository) or two would not make much difference. So let us go to the next stage and see whether we can at least gain some benefits from it.

663	1 – Geology	Yes	The partnership is clear that there is currently insufficient knowledge about the geology. Therefore it is only sensible to investigate further.
663	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	It is in no-one's interest to proceed without adequate consideration of these factors, and I trust the NDA to give appropriate advice
663	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
663	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	There is not much detail at this stage. Since the generic designs fit current expectations it seems sensible to continue on this basis.
663	6 – Inventory	Yes	It is sensible to proceed given the lack of certainty and the existence of an option to withdraw at a later stage
663	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	It seems to me to be wrong to put voluntarism above geological considerations. But that's where we are, and, if we are able to trust the assurances given about the right to withdraw, we should at least proceed to the point where we are confident that the geology is or is not suitable for a repository in West Cumbria.
663	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes, they should take part. But so should all areas of the country. We would like the optimum geological solution, not one determined by groundless prejudices.
665	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
665	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no definition of the process for managing planning issues post-completion. Will this be via MIPU? What will be the local input? 2. How is the scope of the repository defined (eg to exclude a "Phase 2")? 3. What is the definition of and the process for agreeing "go live"? 4. What will the post go-live safety, security etc process framework be? 5.. There are no references t physical security.
665	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
665	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made

665	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
665	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	1. What is the change management process for inventory definition?
665	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
665	8 – Overall views on participation		I believe that Allerdale and Copeland should continue to engage in the MRWS process.
666	1 – Geology	No	<p>The Consultative Document states that the integrity of the BGS report has no significant criticism. Prof. Smythe makes numerous criticisms of this report and supports his criticisms with evidence.</p> <p>Prof. Smythe also concludes that the areas in West and North Cumbria are unsuitable or unlikely to be suitable. There is a part rebuttal by Dr. Dearlove. However Dr. Dearlove offers little or no evidence to support his position.</p> <p>The most optimistic outcome is that there is a small prospect of finding a suitable geological area. Such a situation does not justify further expenditure of public monies, until a consensus is reached between the differing expert opinions.</p> <p>Furthermore there are unclear or no criteria for identifying what constitutes suitable geology for a repository.</p>
666	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Safety: See Geology comments above as these have a bearing on Safety. We are undecided on the NDA's R&D programme.</p> <p>Regulatory and Planning Processes: There is uncertainty about which planning process that will be used. The planning role of the DMB councils needs to be clarified. There is a potential for conflict of interests between the councils role as DMB and as a planning authority.</p>
666	3 – Impacts	No	<p>Direct Impacts: The Issues Register is incomplete. Some aspects and impacts cannot be assessed until a specific site is found. However, there are many such aspects and impacts that could be assessed in advance of Stage 4 but this was</p>

			<p>not done.</p> <p>Long-term Direction: There is little note made of the long-term impact on tourism and the rural economy. It has certainly not been given the same weight as that for job creation in the energy sector.</p> <p>Economic Sustainability: The Chair of the MRWS Partnership has stated that the adverse impact, of high volumes of low level waste has on communities, tourism and inward investment , has not been weighed. How can we be confident that a high level waste repository will not have a net negative impact resulting in an overall lessening of employment opportunities, unless this is also weighed?</p>
666	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The only reference, in the 12 Principles, to the Host Community and adversely affected groups is in Principle 1. This only states that Community Benefits are used to provide a positive contribution to affected communities. Principles 6 seeks to “transform the economic and social well-being of West Cumbria”. The suggestion that this transformation should not be done to the detriment of the Host Community was rejected by the MRWS Partnership.</p> <p>The 12 Principles do not offer the assurances that the Host Community and adversely affected groups will be given priority claim on Community Benefits funding.</p>
666	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No Comments.
666	6 – Inventory	Yes	No Comments.
666	7 – Siting process	No	<p>The Chair of the MRWS Partnership has confirmed that if a Host Community is unwilling to participate, then the decision can be subjected to a review. However this same review mechanism does not apply to a willing Host community. He has also confirmed that if a DMB considers it appropriate, then it can override the wishes of an unwilling Host Community and include that community within the siting process.</p> <p>What is not disclosed is the justification, in principle, each of the individual DMBs would offer for acting against the wishes of their respective electorates.</p> <p>The Right of Withdrawal is offered as a safeguard to the affected communities. However this right is exercised by the DMBs, who have already shown that they are willing to act against the wishes of an unwilling Host Community. So why would a Host Community expect the DMBs to respect their wishes to use this right of withdraw?</p>

666	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>There are fundamental flaws in the way the MRWS Partnership has been managed, resulting in serious concerns with the integrity of the process.</p> <p>This is compounded by the Chair of the MRWS Partnership statement that councils (who are also DMBs) will be included on the Siting Partnership, despite the Partnership having not taken a view on this matter. One is left wondering what other matters are being decided without consultation.</p> <p>Fundamental questions, on how Voluntarism will operate, took over three months to be answered. Why?</p> <p>The Opinion Survey has misleading explanatory text: In Q2, the statement that communities would have the right of withdrawal is untrue. There is a right of withdrawal but it is not in the remit of the host community to exercise this right. The DMBs (local councils) retain this right and may not respond the community's desire to withdraw.</p> <p>In Q3, the statement that the Partnership assists the DMBs in reaching decisions does not explain the true position. The three DMBs are represented on the Partnership and actively participate in the decision to consider proceeding to Stage 4. The same DMBs will then make the final decision on proceeding to Stage 4 based on the Partnership's advice, to which they had already contributed.</p> <p>This lack of genuinely independent advice and the role played by the DMBs ought to be made clear to those being surveyed. The conflict of interest within the DMBs ought also to be explained.</p> <p>In Q4, the statement that local communities will be involved in discussions about the location of possible sites fails to explain that DMBs may act against an unwilling community's wishes, if there are difficulties with excluding any particular host community.</p> <p>The possibility, of DMBs acting against the wishes of the communities, has been confirmed by the Chair of the MRWS Partnership.</p>
666	9 – Additional comments		<p>There is a lack of transparency and misleading statements arising from the MRWS process resulting in an overall lack of confidence in the integrity of DMBs to respond to the wishes of the communities they represent.</p>
668	1 – Geology	No	<p>West Cumbria clearly is not suitable geologically for such a facility as was proved in the Nirex situation of the mid 1990s.</p>

668	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	How can you consider putting nuclear waste near one of the UK's more treasured natural areas such as the Lake District? There is clearly no planning for safety or the environment here.
668	3 – Impacts	No	While the repository will create some jobs and economic opportunities, the report clearly states that it is unclear how it will benefit the economies of Western Cumbria. The local community is clearly not trained or skilled enough for such positions and it will do nothing to elevate the local community. Additionally, the impacts on health and the environment are so negative that it will clearly outweigh the benefits of any local economy growth.
668	4 – Community benefits	No	This is the worst part of the consultation I have read to this point. Clearly, a community benefits package is nothing more than a temporary bribe to appease the local people to store toxic waste in their area. Not to mention, it is a very poor attempt. The consultation doesn't even attempt to lay out a guideline or any kind of plan for what the benefits plan might be or include. This is ridiculous.
668	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	I do agree with this question and this is very disturbing. The consultation document states that the design of the repository, distance of total facility, monitoring, everything, etc. is unknown. How can you plan something without having carried out the initial research necessary?
668	6 – Inventory	No	The DECC once again provides no specific details on the type of waste or amount that would be stored here.
668	7 – Siting process	Yes	This seems fairly well thought out.
669	1 – Geology	No	The premise appears to be that West Cumbria is a willing acceptor rather than the Geology being RIGHT. This goes back to the original geological investigations carried out by NIREX which indicated that the geology of West Cumbria, was not wholly acceptable. There are better geologically suitable areas elsewhere in the UK. These areas should also be approached.
669	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	There is no indication where the Site would be nor its entrance, therefore the requirements for security are only partially considered, details of location, route from Sellafield and Environmental impact need to be explained further.

669	3 – Impacts	No	<p>There is no universal acceptance in the area, the impact has not been explained nor the potential benefits. If the repository is to come to this area then any economic benefits should be for the LOCAL Community FIRST and then the wider West Cumbria. Whitehaven should NOT see massive investment, especially at the expense of the local villages who will have the environmental issues, on their doorstep!!</p> <p>Perhaps a dual carriage way from Carlisle to Whitehaven to Broughton, to Kendal, would benefit the entire West & South Cumbria.</p>
669	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The Partnership is currently centred on Copeland & Allerdale, with little LOCAL involvement. Get into the local Villages and assess their needs, After all Allerdale look to be in a position to reap many of the economic benefits with little if any impact on their communities. Get the balance right, more voice to the AFFECTED Villages.</p> <p>Kick Allerdale Out!!</p>
669	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>Not convinced you have assessed the engineering feasibility or impact. You are looking at a plant that will operate for 30+ years and then need monitoring for 100+ years. you need to ensure that the many features that need to be intrinsically safe, such as Access, Ventilation, Sealing, Lifting/movements, environmental monitoring and general personnel access for inspection are adequate and can be safely maintained.</p> <p>No where I have found these issues to be adequately addressed.</p> <p>If you are going to drive vehicles for kilometers underground, in an enclosed space you will need to ensure that you adequately remove any exhaust products etc.</p>
669	6 – Inventory	No	<p>The criteria is fairly wide and there is no guarantee that there will not be enforced changes to both the quality, quantity or content of the materials to be sent. Similarly there are no assurances that the "Conditions for Acceptance" will not be varied to suit the whims of future governments.</p>
669	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Siting is a side issue!! GEOLOGY should be the overriding condition. Siting similarly has not yet been adequately defined, Where is the proposed Site? Sellafield. Drigg? I note that it will not be in Allerdale so push Allerdale out of the decision making process!!</p>

669	8 – Overall views on participation		Allerdalk should not be involved in the Proces, it is unlikley to go in their area. The entire Decsion should be localissed and not pushed through by a QUORUM of Whitehaven councillors. The descions must be localised at village level. That is REAL Democracy. It should not come to west Cumbria, unles it is confirmed that it is the MOST SUITABLE GEOLOGICAL SITE in the UK!!
670	1 – Geology	No	Cumbria is in a geologically active area, evidenced recently by quite large earthquakes and tremors. How can any part of the area be deemed suitable if there is a chance of major change from this kind of major natural disturbance?
670	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The instability of the area means that safety/planning/precautions can't be relied on. The movement of underground water causes concern - not enough is know about the risks to long term water resources.
670	3 – Impacts	No	The true impacts of a repository in West Cumbria cannot be ascertained unless the long term safety and security are taken into account and as these are questionable the opinions stated here are meaningless except in a short term view and in this case are being swayed by selfish motivation.
670	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
670	5 – Design and engineering	Not answered	I agree that these issues cannot and should not be resolved at this time
670	6 – Inventory	Not answered	These questions can't be decided until security and safety issues have been resolved and the suitability of the area decided.
670	7 – Siting process	No	Looking at the "Timeline showing the different stages in this process" would indicate that it has already moved beyond a point where we can influence the decision, despite the strong doubts and evidence of UNSuitability. It seems that the "benefits" have already been offered to swing decision makers in favour or to string them along long enough to the point of no return. This last part makes the whole process look like a farce.

670	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>The Councils already have been involved and strong suspicions and doubts indicate that the areas are not 100% suitable.</p> <p>It is wrong that the search should continue because more "incentives" have been put forward to "mitigate" doubts when the situation and the actual composition of the area have been proven to be geologically unstable by the recent earthquakes, never mind reports.</p>
670	9 – Additional comments		The local Councils should not be tempted to sell off the long term security of this area in return for short term gains.
671	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	earlier reserach into the geology around Longlands Farm suggest the geology should not be considered
671	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	The process lacks independence from NDA
671	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
671	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	The issue of new build waste should not be included
696	Emailed letter		<p>For over 30 years I have had many concerns about burying nuclear waste.</p> <p>I have always been told that the waste is safe if so why not store it above ground, better still lets have a least one 'barrel' of it stored at Westminster then the people in charge can actually watch it being safe.</p> <p>The majority of energy in the country is used by the urban cities, shouldn't the associated waste from the energy production be stored in the cities.</p> <p>To hide the waste in an area with a small population and underground seems to be hiding something.</p> <p>The best of all would be for us to spend the enormous sums of money being invested in nuclear power in finding better solutions, tide power has to be the most obvious, constant and pretty predictable.</p>

			Another push into usage wouldn't harm. Especially when our local (Penrith) Environment Agency office leaves many of it's lights on at night.
698	Emailed letter and comments slip		<p>[Letter]</p> <p>I am extremely alarmed that the West Cumbria MRWS is seriously considering siting a geological disposal facility for higher activity radioactive waste in West Cumbria.</p> <p>It seems the primary reason is that this is an economically depressed region where possible work opportunities would be welcome.</p> <p>However, geologically the areas which are better understood are highly unsuitable due to complex rocks, numerous faults and high mountains close by. This does not augur well for the less well understood regions. The inherent dangers are clear, especially pollution of groundwater, unpredictable water flow and the possibility of radioactive gases being forced to the surface where prevailing winds could spread them extensively far beyond Cumbria. Detailed investigations would be extremely costly and the money would be better spent researching areas which already show promise of being far more suitable.</p> <p>The economic advantages, though welcome in the short term, are far outweighed by the possibility of a terrible legacy for our children and grandchildren.</p> <p>Far more suitable sites exist and should be considered as a matter of urgency, with the highest priority given to safety. This has been done in Sweden and Finland where communities were consulted in areas that were, after much detailed research, deemed safe.</p> <p>I urge you to resist the plans being put forward. Enough information already exists to indicate the unsuitability of West Cumbria.</p> <p>[Comments slip]</p> <p>I am very surprised that this proposal is being given serious consideration, Initial research indicates that the geology in West Cumbria is very complex and heavily faulted, with unpredictable water flows. This is not a good start. To spend a large amount of money on further research in the area seems unwarranted. This appears to be a political decision based on the fact that the three councils involved are the only ones in the whole of the UK prepared to consider hosting this repository.</p>

699	9 – Additional comments		<p>I have read the main document and I feel that a good process of consultation is being used however the questions are asking for a high level of understanding that will not generally be available. My concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The Lake District brand will be adversely affected by this development. 2 The investment and employment benefits will largely go to those from outside the area. 3 Once it is established there will be no local control or influence over what happens - it will be centrally determined "in the national interest". 4 The West Coast needs an alternative to the nuclear industry and this should be provided by improving the communication links to enable the existing visitors to discover it and for other to be attracted to it. <p>I spend significant time in Cumbria and own property there, there is a need for employment but the benefits from this are small and the risks are high. The process should not proceed.</p>
700	Email		<p>I am replying to offer (1) comments on the draft questionnaire and (2) a general comment on the proposal for Radioactive Waste Management.</p> <p>This seems the only e-mail address offered for comment.</p> <p>(1) Firstly, I hate cold-calls and generally refuse to be interrupted by them. I wonder how you will make allowance the likely balance of opinions amongst those who refuse to talk – unless you follow up on them. Secondly, I am puzzled by the large amount of information you want to collect about the respondents themselves and wonder whether this will be off-putting and result in people abandoning the enquiry before the end.</p> <p>(2) I am in favour of the options for underground storage of radioactive waste being purposefully explored in Allerdale/Copeland.</p> <p>I am concerned about the chaotic state of national energy policy which panders to public superstition and wishful thinking. Without a prominent (even leading) role for nuclear powered electricity generation the country is heading for serious trouble. If a means of handling the by-products of this crucial form of energy</p>

		<p>generation cannot be developed in this locality, where at least some understanding of the nature of the nuclear industry is generally prevalent, then the outlook for Britain's future energy provision is extremely worrying. I don't know if you are recording supporting comments as well as objections but this is a supporting comment.</p> <p>There is no need to reply to this message.</p> <p>(I have no connection with the Nuclear Industry, Allerdale or Copeland Councils or any interested body)</p>