

User ID	Question	Agree	Response
801	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	I have a geology degree and also work in the landfill engineering field and therefore understand the debate. Whilst from a geological point I can see that there is potentially areas that could house an underground facility I do not agree that west cumbria is the place for it. The geology is not suitable as it is basically either sandstones, coal measures or volcanics. None of these rock types are suitable and all are faulted and carry groundwater bodies. All would be impacted heavily by earthquakes such as the recent one near Coniston.
801	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>West Cumbria is isolated and has a poor road and rail network. It also has an unnaturally high population for such as isolated area due to the coal and steel industry which utilised the ports for transport. The centre of Cumbria is a National Park and the lakes and rivers designated SSSI and SAC/SPA and coastal areas SPA/RAMSAR sites under EU Habitats legislation.</p> <p>The development of such a facility would benefit the local population initially with the development and outside contractors - these would be the only benefits. The destruction of wide areas of land for construction housing of extra people, the resources required - extra water-from where? poor transport network, resources for building, plant etc Also waste disposal plus the disposal of the extracted rock from underground-where will this go? - the impact of all of this far outweighs any benefits and will have a negative impact on west cumbria and the routes in and out.</p>
801	3 – Impacts	No	<p>I do not agree that a facility such as this can be engineered or adequately maintained for the length of time required for a nuclear facility. One leak and that will contaminate groundwater for a very long time. Facilities should be like Drigg, on the surface where waste can be moved to another facility if problems arise.</p> <p>The west cumbria community will want this facility as it is jobs - however, this is short sighted for many and understandable. Long term, I do not agree that this facility is fits appropriately with this area of the country.</p>
801	4 – Community benefits	No	Which community are you offering benefits to? A benefits package will always be offered and although it states short and long term benefits - who really benefits in the timescales of nuclear waste - those who make the money, not the environment or the local community as a whole, jobs will be created but still many of those will go to outsiders and contractors brought in which in turn put larger demands on local resources.
801	5 – Design and engineering	No	Although a design has not been publicised I know that it will look and appear to be a comprehensive containment system. However it is unlikely it can be built or built within the timescales and money agreed within the agreed contract following tender. Designing is easy, how to build it is not always considered nor possible. Having dealt with engineering containment designs and some at nuclear facilities I have never seen one completed as designed nor engineered that well and those were above ground, underground is a different

			<p>situation. As with all contractors, their interest is do get the job done and make money and corners get cut. You talk of monitoring - such as leak location detectors - these are unreliable long term and will generally last long enough to confirm that the structure built is not leaking when finished. Much of the materials currently used have an operational life of approx 100years such as geosynthetics, longer away from UV light but no-one really knows after that, concrete-again depending on quality of construction, prone to cracking and decay over time - has to have expansion joints which is not good for containment. Designs always sound fantastic but in reality as humans we can't construct anything without problems and mistakes and this will be no different. Also being underground you will essentially be lining an excavated cell - how will you know the liner is sealed properly? How will you test it? How will you deal with groundwater seepages or flows from faults etc?</p> <p>Where will the radiation go if there is a leak and how will you contain it?</p> <p>Also, how would the facility cope with earthquakes?</p>
801	6 – Inventory	No	<p>See my comments on design. Placing HLW underground seems a great way to dispose of this material - out of sight and mind, stored as a problem for future generations to sort out.</p> <p>As stated earlier I do not agree that a facility can be suitably contained and maintained as impermeable for the period of time required. If it does get the go ahead then I would be opposed to overseas waste being disposed of - every country has a duty of care to deal with its own waste and this would definately be a money making exercise at the expense of Cumbria and its people.</p>
801	7 – Siting process	No	<p>No repository should be below ground. Just because we have Sellafield and the local workforce are used to nuclear so less oposition doesn't mean that all things nuclear have to be sited in Cumbria.</p>
801	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I don't agree they should go forward with this. Money would be better spent back into the existing communities and securing alternative jobs in tourism and small industry with the long term sustainability for local communities and protecting the heritage and outstanding environment we have here.</p>
802	1 – Geology	No	<p>The geology of this area is very complex and efforts have been made to see if it is satisfactory in the past - the answer was no - we should not be looking again.</p>
802	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>No comment was made</p>

802	3 – Impacts	No	Any decision to consider a repository will blight the whole area for 15 to 20 years while decisions are made. We will ruin the area as a great recreation area for the rest of our country - particularly the young people. Any jobs will in the main go to people outside the area who will travel in. Already many people do not wish to visit this area because they see Sellafield as a threat.
802	4 – Community benefits	No	No community benefits could be enough to make up for this. Any community benefits will be negated by the blight on the area.
802	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
802	6 – Inventory	No	I'm sorry but trust is not something I believe exists in the nuclear industry.
802	7 – Siting process	No	Nirex looked and said NO why go through this expense again. We have done our share in the nuclear area - why allow this beautiful area to become a nuclear dump for the world.
802	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I really think that we have our share of the nuclear industry and should go no further with the search for a repository site. Our area will be blighted for many years while decisions are made. We do not have the infrastructure for this neither do we want the noise, disturbance and mess that would come with it. Our beautiful country side which should be available as a playground for the people of our country (particularly the young) will be completely spoiled. I agree that the views of people that W Cumbria is not a place to go because of Sellafield is a bit unreasonable but I'm afraid it is a strong view in the rest of the country.</p> <p>Stop inflicting on us things that might give a few jobs (most will go to outsiders) and look at other ways of increasing the job availability.</p>
805	Comments slip		Having listened carefully at meetings held on this subject and studying the consultation document, I am not happy that we should have geological disposal of radioactive waste in Cumbria.
806	Comments slip		I support the search for a repository because it will fetch 100s of jobs to our area if successful and underground is much safer than where it is being stored now.
807	Comments slip		Yes we should take part in the for a repository site.
808	Comments slip		Objection. I do not think disposal of radioactive waste should be allowed in W Cumbria. We already have our

			share of radioactive waste in the area and surveys show the geology is unsuitable, in fact potentially dangerous because of numerous faults in the ground. There are more suitable sites available. We certainly should not "volunteer" to have a repository.
809	Comments slip		Until a proper geophysical survey has been conducted to ensure the safety of the population this should not be allowed and probably not at all.
811	Comments slip		Utterly and completely against this. 1. We are prone to earthquakes 2. Transport links unsuitable 3. Where would all the spoil be put - and how? 4. Housing for these extra workers. They will not all be local 5. It is not long since eating mutton off the fells was permitted after Chernobyl 6. This will damage the tourist industry - the major earner for many 7. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty, are you happy to ruin this? 8. The fact that no one else wants it. Speaks louder than words.
812	Comments slip		We feel that a waste repository would be detrimental to this area as a second nuclear facility in West Cumbria would destroy tourism, destroy confidence in agricultural produce from the area and deter other business from settling here. We also believe that the geology of the area makes it totally unsuitable for a repository and siting it in West Cumbria just because Sellafield is here already is totally irresponsible and would be a disgusting and shameful legacy to leave to future generations.
813	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
813	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The evidence presented appears robust, both in terms of its logic and the responses to challenges made. The only slight area of concern would be the potential move away from a local planning decision to one by either the IPC or MIPU and the impact of this potential event on local perception of their ability to withdraw from the process.
813	3 – Impacts	Yes	As noted, Sellafield has been present in one form or another for over 50 years - this repository may facilitate the removal of many of the buildings on that site and may actually reduce the visible impact of the industry in the area.

			The repository should also have a positive impact on security of materials held there.
813	4 – Community benefits	Yes	it seems too early in the process to clarify the opportunities in this area
813	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	There are existing models for repositories and it would seem far too early to determine what might or might not be suitable, since this will depend on site specific conditions.
813	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
813	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
813	8 – Overall views on participation		I believe we should - the majority of high and intermediate level waste is currently sited in the county and the opportunity to develop a long term, safe solution for it should be engaged with. The benefit of siting it close to Sellafield also reduces any risks of moving the waste.
813	9 – Additional comments		The county should proceed - there are many points at which we can withdraw from the process and there are many years of investigation before a final decision needs to be taken. If we pull out now we foreclose the potential options for us to locally manage the material that already exists, and the benefits that might accrue from any community benefits package.
814	Comments slip		As we already have the majority of nuclear waste at Sellafield it would make sense for the repository to be in our area, providing the search is successful. When Pond 5 and THORP were planned we were told our roads etc were going to be improved. This did not happen, so this time let's make sure it does.
815	Comments slip		<p>As geology is a key factor in identifying a suitable site, it does seem surprising that the Borough Councils of West Cumbria seem to be ignoring the conclusions from previous detailed geological studies which totally rejected the placing of a repository anywhere in West Cumbria. We are also concerned that whereas the repository that is currently being constructed in Finland is, in effect, situated within an extensive 'wilderness' area with extremely low population density, any construction made in West Cumbria would by necessity be located adjacent to far higher population densities and this population could be at risk from the accidental leakage of waste associated with the transport and storage of such hazardous material.</p> <p>In conclusion, we are firmly opposed to the Allerdale and Copeland Borough Councils taking part in the search for a potential repository site in West Cumbria.</p>

816	Comments slip		Anything that can provide jobs and funding for the area would be good.
817	Comments slip		We are 100% AGAINST this proposed waste repository in West Cumbria. 1. The geology of the area is not suitable and never will be. 2. As born and bred West Cumbrians, in our opinion "no one has the right to make West Cumbria a dump for ever". 3. GET OUT NOW.
818	Comments slip		I am generally in favour of a repository/storage facility, subject to geological suitability and environmental considerations. Employment in construction and management of the site would be welcome, but the area needs to benefit financially and socially over and above this short and long term. I.e. a levy based on the amount of use per annum.
819	Comments slip		Totally unsuitable for the area. The fact that we have Sellafield so close is enough for any area in Allerdale, and not a reason to add further processing plants.
820	Comments slip		In support.
821	Comments slip		I am against W Cumbria taking part in the search for a radioactive waste dump. The beautiful nature of this area attracts many people from all over the world, and I feel this attraction would be reduced if radioactive waste was buried here, impacting our strong tourist trade. The natural vibrations of the earth would be compromised and with the scientists divided about solar flares and global warming/cooling, the geology of the area could change and put any buried toxins at risk of being freed into the atmosphere. As far as community benefits and jobs are concerned, I think more investment in "green technology" would be definite benefits to the area without putting our future health and safety at risk. With current weather instability and recent events in Japan, I feel we should abandon all nuclear power and keep the planet as clean as possible for humans, wildlife and the environment.
822	Comments slip		Totally unsuitable for the area. The fact that we have Sellafield so close is enough for any area in Allerdale, and not a reason to add further processing plants.
823	Comments slip		NO: The decision-making process is fundamentally flawed, if there is only one "candidate". There requires at

			least three realistic potential sites, well spaced throughout the country. I have no faith in the current process.
824	1 – Geology	No	<p>I have attended several meetings, Keswick School and the Kirkland Centre, talked and listened to several speakers amongst them Prof. Hazeldine, Professor Geology Edinburgh and Professor Smythe. They both describe the many faults which occur in the rock strata and express extreme doubt if any of the rocks in the area would prove to be suitable.</p> <p>This is not "nimbyism" but I understand that more suitable areas have the right conditions. Sedimentary soil, lack of water and plastic quality of salt, East Anglia and the East Midlands have been identified as such areas but so far have not "volunteered".</p>
824	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	I believe that the waste would be better underground from a terrorist situation but how could it be monitored for thousands of years and if leakage or seepage did occur how could it be stopped?
824	3 – Impacts	No	Whilst the repository would bring a few jobs to West Cumbria, bad publicity from the media could threaten thousands of jobs in the tourist industry, the county's main employer.
824	4 – Community benefits	No	I do not believe that providing employment today is worth the harm that could be the fate of future generations if predictions by professors Smythe and Hazeldine prove to be correct.
824	5 – Design and engineering	Not answered	Do not have an opinion since I do not have the knowledge.
824	6 – Inventory	Not answered	I think that any waste if it can safely retrieved should be recycled.
824	7 – Siting process	No	I am sure that already a great deal of money has been spent in Cumbria when even the most optimistic person must have doubts due to all the work already done before by Nirex. In these difficult economic times it should be spent in an area that shows more potential i.e. flat and less rainfall.
824	8 – Overall views on participation		These areas should not be used due to the topography and all of the known faults. I believe that this area is chosen as it is politically convenient and some of the population on the coast are desperate for employment, without thinking about the consequences.
825	1 – Geology	No	there seems to be dissent about the suitability of the fragmented rock found in the area. Dr Smythes work

			seems to suggest that the geology is not of a type which should be used.
825	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The security of the area is dubious. Also the risk of flooding is high, if climate change continues on its current path.
825	3 – Impacts	No	I think the effect on tourism would be greater than stated. Also doubt the effectiveness of training which would be needed to qualify local people to work at the site.
825	4 – Community benefits	No	I share the distrust of central government which is mentioned. I also see the so-called 'benefits package' as a bribe. I would need to see a detailed and un-negotiable offer before I went any further.
825	5 – Design and engineering	No	The rock is fragmentary and will therefore not form a secure barrier.
825	6 – Inventory	No	New plans for a reactor in the south already have as part of their submissions that they are going to send the waste to this facility, which rather makes a mockery of this consultation. In addition, the Government cannot really be trusted, and the weasel words are all in place.
825	7 – Siting process	No	I don't believe that Cumbria will be allowed to withdraw if they go to the next stage, as no other council has 'volunteered'. We should get out now.
825	8 – Overall views on participation		I don't think they should go any further, because I don't trust the government to agree to them withdrawing. As several parish councils have voted against it, it is time to say goodbye.
826	8 – Overall views on participation		A survey of all the population who live in Cumbria should have first been carried out to see if this project should even have been contemplated for Cumbria. The project if given the go ahead would threaten the image of Cumbria in general and the Lake District National Park in particular as the jewel in the crown and a candidate for a World Heritage Site. A repository for high radiation waste in perpetuity in excavations on the edge of or under the LDNP would threaten all of this. The current two billion pound annual tourist trade could collapse all for the sake of some employment in the west of Cumbria. Also the present Sellafield site presents a small but finite radiation risk to Cumbria and we should not be involved with projects which increase this risk.
826	9 – Additional comments		From the 'Public Consultation Pack' it is clear that a huge amount of work has already gone into this project at considerable public expense which I think is all premature. However the work carried out may be of worth to another council who might be considering having such a repository and as such could be sold to them to enable Allerdale/Copeland Borough Councils to recoup some of the associated costs.

827	1 – Geology	No	<p>The Partnership should be considering not only the integrity of the BGS, but its fitness for purpose. In particular, its criteria for excluding a geographical area are much too weak. These criteria should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - flows of gases and water in the geology - stability of rock formation - likelihood of movement due to earthquakes, radioactive incidents and so forth <p>You say the BGS is the only assessment required by government, but the Partnership exists to advise local communities, which always outlive governments.</p>
827	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Security of GDF is a very long-term concept. I am amazed that you consider that, for example, the existence of a new independent statutory body, could have any but the most superficial impact on this vast problem. Processes can only be guaranteed for the very short term, if at all. They are simply not equal to the task.</p> <p>There is a lack of open-mindedness about the discussion - it is assumed that a "safety case" can be made and that all issues can be resolved.</p>
827	3 – Impacts	No	<p>All impacts mentioned on p54 are very short term. Health impacts are not emphasised.</p> <p>The impacts considered all have a very much shorter life than the radioactive waste. Short-term economic advantages and "perceptions" are like pieces of confetti on the surface of the ocean.</p> <p>Again under 6.3 p54 there is an underlying assumption that negative impacts can be mitigated. Who will be mitigating in 10000 years time?</p>
827	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Given the long-term picture (half-life of waste) I do not consider any temporary community benefits to be relevant.</p>
827	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>All large engineering projects eventually develop faults. No engineering is forever.</p> <p>Due to the long time scale there is not even any possibility of testing the engineering before implementation.</p>
827	6 – Inventory	No	<p>It is obvious that the inventory would be extended to include whatever might be expedient for the nuclear industry and the government at any particular time.</p>
827	7 – Siting process	No	<p>There is a danger that "volunteerism" will take second place to economic interests as the process unfolds.</p>

			<p>The DMBs are too local - the health and well-being of citizens of a much greater region could be compromised by any nuclear accident.</p> <p>The processes for gauging credible support are inadequate - there should at least be a county-wide referendum.</p> <p>It is not reassuring that (p93(e)) it is already foreseen that potential host communities will be overridden if they dissent.</p>
827	8 – Overall views on participation		That is for them to decide. I have no confidence in the concept of a GDF, nor that one could be built which would be safe in perpetuity.
827	9 – Additional comments		The issues considered in this report are much too narrow, having been determined in advance in line with the temporary policies of a temporary government.
828	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	There is so much information provided it is difficult to understand the views and I think this has been done intentionally to make it difficult for people to understand the position. There are clearly concerns about suitability. In addition, you will always be able to find statistics and evidence to support a particular view.
828	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	You can have the best plans in the world but they wouldn't prevent a nuclear disaster in 250 years' time as it is almost impossible for you to plan that far in advance.
828	3 – Impacts	No	You do not highlight the negative aspects sufficiently. In addition, some points have greater weight than others but each point is given equal value in this review.
828	4 – Community benefits	No	I do not think sufficient weight has been given to the fact these benefits are a bribe and the possibility has generally been presented in too positive a light.
828	5 – Design and engineering	No	You have not given sufficient emphasis to the fact that the details are so vague at the moment, it makes it almost impossible for the public to know whether or not the outcome would be satisfactory.
828	6 – Inventory	No	Again, there is so little information available at this stage that you cannot be satisfied, but instead the lack of information has been painted in a very positive light.

828	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
828	8 – Overall views on participation		I think Allerdale and/or Copeland should withdraw as soon as possible and not take part in the search. Siting a radioactive waste depository in Cumbria is too risky and could destroy the county, and the country. The risks involved are too great, the benefits too few, but even if there were more benefits, I still don't think it should ever happen.
829	1 – Geology	No	I do feel that there is already sufficient evidence to rule out west Cumbria as unsuitable. For example, the Nirex enquiry.
829	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	As before, the unsuitability of the geology supplants all other considerations.
829	3 – Impacts	No	As before, the unsuitability of the geology makes any other potential impacts irrelevant. We must think of the safety of forthcoming generations.
829	4 – Community benefits	No	Nor relevant.
829	5 – Design and engineering	No	Not relevant in view of the unsuitability of the geology.
829	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
829	7 – Siting process	No	Obviously I don't think siting a repository in this area is sensible, given the geology.
829	8 – Overall views on participation		I feel very strongly that the Borough councils should immediately withdraw from the search; I feel that once involved in the process, it would be impossible to withdraw in spite of government promises to the contrary. I do not feel the geology of the area is adequately safe for deep disposal of such dangerous stuff. Burial in any case seems dangerous, as the waste could not easily be monitored.
829	9 – Additional comments		Above all other considerations is the need to safeguard future generations! I understand that this scheme will create some jobs in this blighted area. but what is being proposed could have far reaching and possibly dreadful consequences for the future. On a less doom laden note, the unique landscapes of the western Lake District are likely to be spoilt for many years to come, and this could have dire consequences for the tourist industry. I've nothing per se against nuclear power, we need it, but I am against burying its waste in the wrong

			<p>place.</p> <p>[Additional letter]</p> <p>I have read your consultation document. I do not support any further steps in the direction of geological disposal of nuclear wastes in West Cumbria, on the grounds that Cumbria's geology is not suitable for such disposal. Nirex was turned down on geological grounds. The area has "high rainfall, permeable rocks and hills and mountains to drive the water flow". What is needed for safe underground disposal is a clay area such as the Oxford area, not our wet and fractured geology.</p> <p>The future safety of generations to come is all important.</p>
830	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Allerdale Copeland and Cumbria CC should withdraw from this process now and should not go into Stage 4. These Councils serve areas which are poorly resourced and which struggle with unemployment, low wages and poverty. What prosperity there is comes from Sellafield, and it is natural that the Councils should seek to exploit their nuclear expertise. However it is not wise to do so. Whilst a new nuclear power station may not be objectionable an underground Repository certainly is. The prime consideration should be the geology of the area, and although the Partnership did not choose to look very closely at the geological information available there is sufficient of this to indicate that Cumbria is low on the list of suitable sites in this country. The site must be geologically secure for thousands of years, and the information I have read does not convince me that this would be the case here.</p> <p>This development is of a different order and magnitude from existing installations and it should not be left to Cumbria to deal with the very difficult and complex questions which are arising. The matter should be sent back to the government for proper consideration at a national level, and this can be done by choosing to withdraw now.</p> <p>Although there appears to be a Right to Withdraw until a late stage I do not find the terms in which this is set out at all convincing and cannot believe that once vast sums have been spent in stages 4 and 5 it would actually be possible to withdraw against the Government's wishes.</p> <p>To read the Report is to feel that this is a process which is getting out of hand and could easily end in disaster.</p>
831	1 – Geology	No	I believe that it is clear that the geology of the whole of cumbria is totally unsuitable and dangerous for the

			burial of radioactive waste. I fear deeply for the future of people living here - we have lived in the area for over 50 years as a family and I find it deeply disturbing that a national park will become a potentially hazardous place for people to live. The proposed area for the burial is totally unsuitable because of the unique geology and was turned down when proposed earlier based on scientific studies because of the unique dangers of the cumbrian geology. Please do not open a door for this dangerous proposal
831	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Insufficient scientific evidence exists for trusting the safety security environment and planning issues - the research simply hasn't been done to demonstrate safety - and a range of serious concerns have been raised in the previous scientific research when this was proposed earlier. I suspect that the interests of powerful people will decide on what happens unless government listens to the voices of those of us who live in the area who DO NOT WANT NUCLEAR WASTE UNDER OUR DOORSTEP . It was proposed to bury the waste more safely in Kent, but of course powerful people live there and they rejected it - why should we have the waste unsafely deposited with us because we are not close enough to Westminster for our strong resistance to be heard. I was in Ambleside last weekend and asking local people if they knew about the plans - some local people were deeply concerned, but many people were really shocked to hear about the plans which have not been made publicly available to people apart from in dense documents that people probably won't read - no one wanted this dump when asked about it and many people wanted to have their voices heard through petition.
831	3 – Impacts	No	If we let the process go ahead the stakes will become higher as more money will be spent. We already know categorically that this is potentially hazardous, we know enough to say NO already. It will cost billions to build - if a tiny amount of this money was spent on job creation schemes it could create far more than 550 jobs which is nothing for billions of pounds investment - the positives simply don't add up to anything meaningful besides the terrible cost, in pure money terms, in potential lethal damage to people and the environment, in the reputation of the of the lakes as a holiday destination - if radioactive waste leaks into the water table which seems a realistic risk, or leaks out through fissures in the rock, people will be warned not to come and more jobs will be lost, with the possibility of long term evacuation as in Fukushima. This makes no sense - we already know enough to know this is potentially dangerous to the interests of ordinary people and the environment - only those who will make huge profits from this development will benefit - accidents happen because decisions are driven by financial interests, not by impartial scientific evidence - and severe risks are overlooked as in Fukushima - it was always a possibility, and the impacts are so catastrophic that with hindsight it is hard to understand how these decisions were taken.
831	4 – Community benefits	No	The document says there are no guarantees of any community benefits. And even if there were benefits how could these offset the stupidity of building a repository in an area that has been shown to be unsafe by scientific reports. No community benefits would justify this - and the costs of building this repository are so huge that the money involved would be like a drop in the ocean

831	5 – Design and engineering	No	The scientific evidence for the safety of the plans simply does not exist, particularly in the long term. What we do know is that the current plans for the location of a dump are totally unsuitable. We are giving a legacy of thousands of years of danger to future generations - I care about the future of people in Cumbria - I can't understand how this does not matter enough in these plans for proper scientific research to be done into the safety of the plans - they are irretrievably flawed because they are based on a decision to bury waste in a geologically unstable area that we know is not safe for this kind of development.
831	6 – Inventory	No	If this is agreed to it opens the floodgates to what might be buried here - given the huge cost there will be efforts to use it to a maximum, particularly given the shift in policy to building more nuclear power plants. We will be the dumping ground for the whole country, and perhaps even beyond if enough money can be made out of this. There is no room for a laissez faire attitude to this matter.
831	7 – Siting process	No	It's too open - once you start talking about this its opening the floodgates, and local people will be overridden because too much money has been spent on taking the process this far - people will say, OK we have consulted but actually that was a formality and we just go ahead anyway.
831	8 – Overall views on participation		They should definitely not take part - communities are too weak to stand up to powerful interests once this process starts - the only way to stop this catastrophe for our county unfolding is to stop it now before it goes any further.
831	9 – Additional comments		Please, please protect our county. It is our heritage, it should not be for sale to something as potentially catastrophic as is being planned. We know the effects - we have seen Chernobyl and Fukushima - the evidence simply isn't there to show that this will be any different. I will not sleep easy in my bed at night knowing that my children and the children of future generations have been put at risk because of our short sighted policies. This has been a home for three generations in my family, and we love Cumbria because of it's natural beauty - please do not wreck our future.
832	9 – Additional comments		This is the bedtime reading I was not looking for today. Please withdraw from the consultation. Thank you.
833	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
833	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
833	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made

833	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	As yet no details have been given as to what the community benefits are. It would be better to have an idea of what benefits would be received i.e. minimum to receive.
833	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
833	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
833	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
833	8 – Overall views on participation		The option should always be there to say no to the repository if the local people wish, up to the last possible stage.
834	9 – Additional comments		After careful examination of your report and attendance at your Keswick meeting I have come to the conclusion that decision as to where and how disposal and long term storage of radioactive waste can only be taken by the government of the UK after careful well researched advice of competent experts reporting to a senior select committee of the House of Commons. The final decision must be that of the Government. The commitment of some thousands of inhabitants of West Cumbria might well be of some interest to the decision makers but the final decisions are far too important not be to made other than by the UK Government and even then both Europe and the UN must be kept informed of our progress and decisions on the matter. PS I have sent copies of this to Jamie Reed MP and Tony Cunningham MP.
835	1 – Geology	Yes	Safety is paramount but we should investigate all areas before we come to a decision.
835	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Again safety is paramount but we should not take too much interest in the extreme views of the like who never come up with viable alternatives.
835	3 – Impacts	Yes	I do feel strongly that the railway should be main route for transport, with this should come major works to the Parton headland to guarantee its operations.
835	4 – Community benefits	Yes	The main beneficiary should be on flood relief projects.

835	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	My proviso is that the design consultants should be drafted into Cumbria for the duration to ensure that there is benefit to the area.
835	6 – Inventory	Yes	This must be only the UK's waste.
835	7 – Siting process	Yes	The infrastructure must limit the effect on the local community.
835	8 – Overall views on participation		This should be made to be a benefit to the local area.
836	1 – Geology	Yes	You are not concluding that the area and geology is suitable (which is a matter for NDA/RWMD), only that you cannot conclude that it is unsuitable. The area not ruled out appears sufficient to warrant going to the next stage.
836	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
836	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	The most obvious gap in the explanation given in Section 6 is that it does not explain what the impact assessment is going to be measured against. For example: -Are the socio-economic impacts of a GDF in West Cumbria compared against a GDF elsewhere in the UK, or against a scenario of no national GDF and therefore ongoing waste storage at Sellafield? -If it is against a “no national GDF” scenario, how are the knock on impacts to new nuclear build and to the Sellafield decommissioning programme going to be assessed? -What “baseline” for West Cumbrian socio-economic conditions and onward investment will MRWS use? How will this be forecast over the next 100 years? From the information laid out in Section 6, it is not clear to me whether the MRWS is looking at how the NDA will carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment from a national perspective, or whether MRWS is focussing on the local West Cumbria impact. For example: -Box 15 lists climate change. This is a national/international issue for NDA/HMG to address, but it is not a

			<p>specific “West Cumbria impact”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Property value protection looks at “a demonstrable drop in the value” of a property – what about a lack of growth? -When does the impact start being measured? Property value protection, brand protection and onward investment might all be affected by moving to the next stage, and by the false perception that a repository in the area is going to go ahead regardless. -Box15 does not list “Inward investment” impacts, as these are not relevant to a Strategic Environmental Assessment—but MRWS & West Cumbria need to understand the impacts on these.
836	4 – Community benefits	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 7 does not explain the role of the host community, particularly at parish/town council level, in the process. - You have agreed a set of principles as a “basis for negotiation.” That is a long way from agreeing a set of principles that will actually be applied. - The principles use words like “equitable” (Principle 9), “flexibility” (Principle 8). What do these mean. They are fuzzy and too undefined. - Principle 6 says the benefits should “transform ...West Cumbria”. The benefits should be more focussed on a local host community. If the GDF were located in Millom, why should Wigton get a benefits package (or vice versa)? - Principle 4 refers to not displacing/replacing other government funds or opportunities. The same should apply at County and Borough Council level. A benefits package for Copeland, for example, should not allow Cumbria County Council to reduce spending in the area and route it to Eden, for example. - Principle 11 suggests that “These agreements could take a range of forms including legislation”. The use of legislation or other methods of making the benefits package legally binding should be a principle itself. The absolute commitment must be there before the GDF proceeds. It must be legally binding.
836	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
836	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I am concerned about Principle 6. In many ways the absolute scale of the inventory would not change the impact of the GDF (rather than the amount of the excavation/ construction and of waste transport). Whether the GDF contained 10,000 t of spent fuel or 1000 t of spent fuel, it would still be present and impact on people’s perceptions. Whether 100 packages a year or 1000 packages a year were placed in it, it would still be operational.</p> <p>However, if the benefits package is to be modified in the light of the inventory, then it should not just be a matter for when negotiations take place up front, but also a reason for revisiting the package. If the life of the GDF were to be extended one would expect the package to be revisited. The new nuclear generation programme will inevitably change the inventory, and this cannot be accurately predicted in terms of the</p>

			quantities or durations of additional arisings of waste for disposal.
836	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	The definition and role of the host community needs to be clarified, and in particular the roles and “rights” of parish/town councils resolved. If the GDF surface facilities were in Allerdale, but the shaft stretched south 10 miles to galleries/vaults under Copeland, who would be the host community?
836	8 – Overall views on participation		The councils should continue to take part.
837	1 – Geology	No	I have read carefully the report on Radioactive waste disposal at Sellafield UK edited by R S Hazeldine and D K Smythe of the University of Glasgow and also the report on Geological Environments for Deep Disposal of Intermediate Level Wastes in the United Kingdom by N A Chapman, T J McEwen and H Beale. These eminent scientists are emphatically of the opinion that West Cumbria is unsuitable geologically for the installation of a Nuclear Waste Repository because the rock conditions and hydrological conditions are totally unsuitable. To proceed to carry out further investigation, which must produce the same result, would be an astronomical waste of money. The repository should be sited off the coast of East Anglia.
837	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Waste of time and money.
837	3 – Impacts	No	Waste of time and money.
837	4 – Community benefits	Not answered	I agree that there will be great economic benefits wherever the repository is sited.
837	5 – Design and engineering	No	I am sure that design and engineering will be carried out meticulously. But it must be at the right location. West Cumbria is not the right location.
837	6 – Inventory	Not answered	Not qualified to comment.

837	7 – Siting process	No	This process will cost millions and millions of pounds. Do not waste it in West Cumbria.
837	8 – Overall views on participation		My views are as stated in my answer to question 1.
838	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
838	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
838	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
838	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
838	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Use proven existing technology; follow the patterns established in Finland.
838	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
838	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
838	8 – Overall views on participation		The long and short-term benefits to the community and area of West Cumbria are enormous, provided the safety case can be made.
839	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>1. In view of Professor Smythe’s detailed comments – indicating to me immense understanding, how can you be confident of the BGS opinions. I am not respectful of Dr Dearlove’s command of the situation. Further what from the BGS point of view since the NIREX work some years ago? The confidence you seem to express, conflicts with the statement on P23, which comments that there are uncertainties about the geology. What impression am I supposed to have?</p> <p>2. In general I have the impression that there is not yet enough information on the geology to talk about siting. Professor Smythe is therefore partly correct (refer P 32).</p>

			<p>3. Who are the members of the Geological Disposal Board? All “yes” people. How can I be sure that the 6 bodies described on p13 are of, or will act with, one mind? Government bureaucracy is notorious for infighting with no responsibility for consequences. They are well protected against adverse results. Private industry is not.</p> <p>4. P27: in order to display fairness and bearing in mind the well obvious polarized views the BGS “criteria” mentioned in this page should be stated.</p> <p>5. P33: the regulatory requirements (para 4) should be given. Not everyone will understand this bureaucratic language.</p>
839	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>1. P36: How do you know that communication links are adequate and will continue to be? What have you defined as adequate that the stakeholders have agreed?</p> <p>2. P33 (Regulator relationships) “Our current view is that there is an acceptable level of understanding...” Current? What are you intending to do if that level changes? What have you taken as acceptable?</p> <p>3. P42 (Regulator communications) “We are confident that the Environment Agency has adequately discussed...” What about other “regulators”. Why are you confident?</p> <p>4. P45, 46 it is noted that the NDA have responded to some issues from the NWAA (who members this organisation, what is it’s status?) but no mention of a response to the “peer review panel” on the “lessons for the NDA”, what are these lessons? Who members the “peer review panel”?</p>
839	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>1. The Partnership overwhelmingly is membered by politicians. These are supposed to represent the electorate but rarely do, nor do they work at educating the electorate on issues so that a reasoned democratic position can be taken. Why do I believe this? Because I have been a local councillor and seen this process well embedded in practice.</p> <p>2. Who has taken opinion from public bodies, other than the Partnership members, with a deep interest in the Lake District.</p> <p>3. Affect on property values. How can you be sure that the Government schemes are robust? Governments will do all they can to alter any commitment e.g. U turns, if it suits political purpose or ignore commitment e.g. the long expressed wish of the electorate on UK membership of the EU is constantly ignored.</p>
839	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made

839	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>1. P32 Designs of any process must be for operability and arranged to facilitate modification arising out of experience. Design should also be for foreseeable emergency situations.</p> <p>2. P73 The statement on generic designs being site specific is at odds with the apparent firm views on what a design should look like given in illustrations in the report.</p> <p>3. With repository possibly being 10km away, ventilation design will be a challenge. I know of no underground mineral workings of that extent from the entries. Experience of the Channel and similar tunnels, all at more that 10 km is not directly relevant.</p>
839	6 – Inventory	Yes	<p>1. If the repository is at distance from present stored source, how will be moved from there safely, (bearing in mind restricted water in Cumbria)?</p>
839	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>1. On the whole seem sensible but are not open nor comparative since, as I point out, there is no evidence that active effort is being devoted to proposals for other sites. The strong impression is of a fixed mind that Cumbria is government choice, in spite of its apparent policy – that’s shadow politics – why not sites in Cornwall, Mid Wales, Anglesea, NW Highlands – all with likely hard host rock?</p>
839	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I do not understand why this question included, why shouldn’t these councils be part of the deliberation, knowing the polarised view on geology.</p>
839	9 – Additional comments		<p>1. Why cannot UK nuclear waste be exported to Sweden/Finland? Those countries would seem to have more favourable host rock. Further, other countries have sent spent nuclear fuel here for decades, so transport of nuclear material is proved acceptably safe.</p> <p>2. Is consultation taking place elsewhere in the UK in searching for a potential site? It would give a better impression of the fairness of the whole process, if so. Further the UK government says its intentions cover the whole country, sites in Wales and Scotland are not excludable. Further my understanding is that the Scots prefer above ground storage in contrast to UK Government preference.</p> <p>3. How confident are you that once a site is chosen, “regulators” will cease to cooperate well. How confident are you that the whole process will cope with changes in politics and bureaucracy in 50 or so years time. In spite of seeming present “cooperation”, bureaucratic departments soon return to infighting. They are never to be trusted.</p>

840	1 – Geology	No	I strongly disagree with the use of nuclear power, and I wish it had never been invented, by the fool who did so: I don't want anything connected with nuclear power and radioactive waste in Cumbria, even though because of Sellafield, it is already too late. But certainly we do not need or want any more radioactive waste in Cumbria – or any new nuclear power stations built.
840	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I believe that life is so badly organized in today's world, that nothing is secure. Just to observe the mistakes made in this electronic age – that were not made 50 years previously, tells me that humans today, are not reliable, and are becoming increasingly more stupid, and disorganised. You have to look at this country, dirty, badly run hospitals, where patients cannot even expect a bath or shower, because the staff are tapping on computers. Look at the rubbish covering Britain, by railway tracks, by bus stops, its everywhere – If councils cannot keep rubbish under control, why take on more responsibility. Look at the neglect and filthy buildings in Cumbria; why not clean up Cumbria first.
840	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
840	4 – Community benefits	No	Concerning Cumbria - From past experience, councils will not use the money wisely. Our council executives take huge salaries, employ too many people to sit tapping on computers, waste money on non necessities, but our stage coach buses are filthy, bus stops are inadequate shelters, dirty and neglected. Our pavements are not even, or straight, causing the elderly to trip and fall, break bones, be forever in pain, because of these injuries. The council would rather hang up baskets of sterile flowers, than repair pavements. There is rubbish and dog excrement everywhere in Cumbria. The graveyards, riverside walks, woods, beach walks, parks and pavements stink of excrement. The towns are congested and polluted with cars, yet there are no plans to charge car owners pollution charges, or congestion payments. No plans to have clean, pristine, cheap public transport to wean the car drivers away from their polluting cars. The infrastructure of Carlisle is dirty and neglected, a slum.
840	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made
840	6 – Inventory	No	550 jobs created building a repository, and operations over a 140 year period. Benefits to a community creating jobs, why not create jobs that care for the environment, such as organic gardens, bee-keeping, street cleaning, repairing pavements, cleaning up dog excrement, cleaning bus seats. England must be the most dirty country in the developed world. Council executives could reduce their inflated salaries, which would then benefit the community – why pay £175,000 a year to a computer tapper.

840	7 – Siting process	No	I find it strange that residents, who object to wind farms, actually wouldn't mind a repository for storing radioactive waste near their town. I also cannot understand why residents who object to wind farms, don't mind polluting the air with their dirty, noisy cars, ruining the beauty of villages with cars. And do not do anything to try and reduce their use of energy. Just talk about wanting more, more, more, update the kitchen, have a set of false nails, new unnecessary shoes, a new car, on and on taking from the world, then needing nuclear power to fuel all this greed. We wouldn't be having this problem of nuclear waste if humans reduced needs/wants.
840	8 – Overall views on participation		[Yes, waste more money, what a good idea! I have no interest in this survey, the waste of paper, the unnecessary DVD enclosed, pages and pages of trivia. I don't want any more radioactive waste brought to Cumbria. It is shocking and disgusting to already have an existing amount, because we allowed fools to ruin the delicate balance of nature.
840	9 – Additional comments		Humans in their greed and stupidity are ruining our world. Islands in the Pacific are being flooded with seawater because; you use too much energy in the west. Every resident in our street has at least two cars. They use motor or electric mowers to mow tiny lawns, when the grass can quite easily be cut with a push mower. Each house has a computer – why? Humans use air fresheners, liquid soap in plastic containers, toxic sprays – where 50 years ago, a packet of soap wrapped in paper would clean everything. Instead of using nuclear energy, we need to reduce the need for so much energy by looking at everything we use or buy, asking is this really necessary?
841	1 – Geology	No	The initial opinion rules out most of the area outside of the National Park. Surely the presence of a National Park makes the rest of the geology unsuitable. Therefore there is not sufficient land to consider for a repository in the remaining land which is largely residential.
841	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	Of course safety, security, environment and planning are important. The initial opinions are so vague because they are based on so many unknowns.
841	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	Again the initial opinions are so vague it is hard to disagree with them but since they have answer 'yes' three times to the question will there be a negative impact and will this need further assessment it is hard to see why this document needs to go further

842	1 – Geology	No	Information already known about Cumbria's geology e.g. hills and mountains and high rainfall does not make it suitable for further investigation so I do not agree with the initial opinions. Papers have been previously submitted to rule out the whole of West Cumbria on geological grounds.
842	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	While I think safety and security is taken as a priority, the effects on the environment for such a project would be huge and affect many areas. Safety cannot be 100% guaranteed. At Sellafield, it's documented about who will foot the bill for the cost of upkeep of the waste there now, surely this should have been sorted out at the time this was built. So who will foot the bill for upkeep of a repository and possibly being retrievable? Will this be the government who are millions in debt now!! There's no other structure of this kind to compare its safety or security. You say repository would be safer from terror attacks – where there's a will there's a way!!
842	3 – Impacts	No	I don't think it fits in to the community. Would affect tourism, property prices, have doubt about offer of "recompensated" the offer shows there would be impact on the area. Could affect farming, could end up being totally reliant on the nuclear industry in the future. Jobs cannot be guaranteed for local people and local skills would have to be trained but do people want to work in this industry? It's a pity the same amount of effort cannot be put into encouraging other industry to this area, because they won't after this.
842	4 – Community benefits	No	Community benefits to me just seem like a bribe and consider health and safety first. These benefits from the government do not give any guarantee for the future especially long term, look at the government, country financial position now and cut backs to society, so long term if they cannot pay these benefits will they remove the repository? That will be a no. If this is going to be such a good thing why hasn't anybody else "volunteered" to have a repository in their area!!
842	5 – Design and engineering	No	At the moment there's not much can be said, as siting etc would depend on design and structure.

842	6 – Inventory	No	Government policy says only UK radioactive waste to be disposed of in this country. BUT we all know government policies change!! No guarantee this would not change and end up being a dumping ground. Financially situations change and governments tempted, after all we always thought elderly etc would be taken care of but look at them now.
842	7 – Siting process	No	We have the right to say no! Not everyone will want this repository so obviously if the “Yes” outweighs the “No” it will go ahead. So everyone does not have the right to say “No”. Others who produce radioactive waste are not “volunteering” to have a repository – no, lets dump it in Cumbria. Earthquakes recorded in Cumbria. The siting process should not be being considered because of the impact on people, environment, landscape and papers already submitted by Professor David Smythe and NIREX.
842	8 – Overall views on participation		Don't want it (see previous pages) so why take part in the search.
843	1 – Geology	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not know enough to say definitely that the geology is suitable. • The NIREX Planning Inquiry found that some /all of the geology is unsuitable. • Both these facts are mired in such uncertainty it should be sufficient to find more suitable disposal sites elsewhere.
843	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I do not trust the integrity of NDA RWMD. Everyone in West Cumbria knows of Sellafield's safety record and the length to which management will go to maintain confidence in flawed checking mechanisms. Who would ever feel safe or secure having radioactive waste under the Cumbrian earth whatever policies were in place?
843	3 – Impacts	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which tourist would want to visit an area which was the geological waste dump of the world? • Cumbria is unique in its beauty and healthy air – not with a repository! • The jobs supposedly available in the short term could never justify the rape of the area long-term. • Flooding and affecting water sources is a huge concern in a county so recently hit by floods which no one

			<p>imagined could happen so dramatically.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I worry that people's concern will be brushed aside in the very short-term financial interests of the local economy. We should be thinking of future generations. West Cumbria must not be a dumping ground.
843	4 – Community benefits	Yes	<p>I agree that nothing can be promised and nothing is being promised.</p> <p>I am pleased about the integrity of this remark. However, I do not believe a community benefits package would ever deliver enough to justify being an underground nuclear dump. We must not decide this for future generations!</p>
843	5 – Design and engineering	No	The best design and engineering in the world at this time would never justify despoiling our beautiful heritage.
843	6 – Inventory	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am totally appalled by the higher activity waste and low level waste which could not be disposed elsewhere because of the "specific type of radioactive material it contains" • Why do other countries not want nuclear dumps? We all know why – why are we even considering this? • Possible terrorist concerns. • There is too much uncertainty about what might go into a repository.
843	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Do we really believe that the Government will act honourably about Right of Withdrawal?</p> <p>We have not received reassurance!</p>
843	8 – Overall views on participation		It is a total waste of money. Don't put it here – surely any sane council would agree with that!
843	9 – Additional comments		<p>This repository is phenomenally and potentially dangerous and must not be allowed to be sited in Cumbria. Too little is known about geology, actual waste and long-term impact.</p> <p>Cumbria is a beautiful tourist area and despoiling the environment would amount to rape.</p> <p>WE DO NOT WANT A REPOSITORY HERE!!</p>
844	1 – Geology	No	<p>I disagree with the initial opinions on geology.</p> <p>Several years ago a geological assessment was undertaken by NIREX that ruled out the suitability of the whole</p>

			<p>of West Cumbria for the siting of a nuclear waste facility. What has changed since then? Certainly not the geology of the area.</p> <p>I therefore agree with Professor Smythe who maintains that there is enough existing evidence to rule out the whole of West Cumbria on grounds of its geology.</p> <p>This existing doubt about the geology of the area indicates to me that further investigations are on the contrary NOT worthwhile. Where there is doubt regarding suitable geology, there is also doubt concerning the minimisation of the escape of radiation and therefore West Cumbria should not be considered further.</p> <p>The NDA have a vested interest in finding a site with suitable geology.</p>
844	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NDA have a vested interest, therefore any evidence from them will be biased towards finding a suitable siting. • No matter how many re-assurances given by the NDA regulators it would not be safe to live near a Nuclear Waste Repository, and whatever standards were set, there would be issues of environmental protection, safety and security for the communities affected by such a siting. • A repository for radioactive waste would be detrimental to the environment by its very nature, both in the present and for future generations and would present West Cumbria with a long-term blight. Similarly it would have adverse effects on the safety and security of those living there. • The National Park would be detrimentally affected. • Could a Geological Disposal Facility ever be deemed safe and secure? • Planning systems can be put in place to achieve a desired outcome and no amount of planning could compensate for the negative effects of the hosting of a Nuclear Waste Repository by West Cumbria.
844	3 – Impacts	No	<p>West Cumbria would gain a reputation as “the NUCLEAR COAST”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A negative impact on all the communities living here. • Many residents will MOVE FROM THE AREA (I personally will not live beside a Nuclear Waste Facility however “safely” underground it is stored). • The LANDSCAPE of West Cumbria is beautiful and will be harmed greatly, firstly by the presence of such a repository, visually and aesthetically, and by the removal of rock spoil (& storage of it). • The impacts of CONSTRUCTION: noise, dust, pollution, traffic increase with which the transport infrastructure of West Cumbria could not cope. • The impact on health and well being of residents having their environment and home spoilt. • Tourism would be dramatically affected negatively. <p>Were the residents of West Cumbria asked if they wanted “An Energy Coast”? I disagree with the long term</p>

			<p>direction being imposed on communities living here. The existing presence of Sellafield does not mean that those living here wish the entire area to become a “Nuclear” Industry to the detriment of any other possible developments here.</p> <p>Economic Sustainability – there is such a thing as “putting all your eggs in one Basket!”</p>
844	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>A Community Benefits Package = BRIBERY, A SWEETENER</p> <p>Short and sweet (However you phrase it!)</p> <p>(and No amount of benefits could compensate for the devastating impacts of a nuclear waste repository).</p>
844	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>Not being an expert on design and engineering, I cannot comment in depth on the MRWS initial opinions on design and engineering, but am also sure that the MRWS are not all experts either, and that anything can be presented in an attempt to achieve desired outcomes.</p> <p>How are the general public to assess information being presented by “experts”?</p>
844	6 – Inventory	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other country deems it sensible to dispose of both higher activity waste along with low level waste. • Assurances given now are not necessarily those that will be adhered to in the future.
844	7 – Siting process	No	<p>It is disgraceful that an area can be “volunteered” for such a thing as the siting of a Nuclear Waste Repository and Copeland Council should be ashamed at “offering us up”!</p> <p>I feel we are being roller coasted along in the process with nobody actually caring if we want it.</p> <p>The residents should have been consulted FIRST before all the expense and rigmarole of consultation went ahead to this stage. I certainly am not volunteering. Why did the London Borough Councils not volunteer their communities?</p>
844	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>NO! I do not wish my Council (Copeland) to offer up my home for the search for a nuclear Dump. (A more accurate word than the grander “repository”). The beauty of this landscape would be destroyed and the perception of this lovely area would become that of the “Nuclear Coast”. Our safety and security, health and well being would be compromised. I do not believe we should be part of the search for a repository, even if not committed at this stage. Offering Copeland as part of the search indicates the possibility of acceptance and I am disgusted with Copeland for doing such a thing, and should its “Volunteering” lead to the eventual, actual siting of one, near my home, I would leave the area.</p>

844	9 – Additional comments		<p>Why do the low populated areas have to sacrifice so much for the rest of the country?</p> <p>Having recently opposed the proposed siting of a New Nuclear Power Station at Kirksanton (a most ridiculously unsuitable site indeed), I cannot believe that we are facing a similarly disturbing scenario – but this time WE HAVE BEEN VOLUNTEERED! By those supposedly caring for West Cumbria and the well-being of its residents i.e. our representatives! It is hard to believe possible.</p>
846	1 – Geology	No	<p>I am more persuaded by Professor Smythe’s arguments.</p> <p>It seems extremely unlikely that really safe geology can be found here, so much so that it would be a waste of public money, and unnecessary delay to spend more time investigating West Cumbria.</p>
846	7 – Siting process	No	<p>The process should start by finding areas with promising geology and only THEN trying to find a way of making further investigations acceptable to the residents.</p>
846	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>No they should not take part.</p>
846	9 – Additional comments		<p>I have not considered most questions as I would only consider them if the geology looked promising.</p>
847	1 – Geology	No	<p>No one can rule out seismic activity in this area, we have experienced some tremors, even in our lifetime.</p> <p>I do not believe that the geological landscape is at all suitable for a development of this scale. Smythe disagreed with other geologists – he has no “vested interest”. I am persuaded rather to believe him.</p>
847	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>For me anything connected with the nuclear industry is not safe. I do not feel at ease, having Sellafield so close to where I live, it is not safe, and certainly is not good for the environment. I would not feel at all happy about a repository of nuclear waste on my doorstep.</p>
847	3 – Impacts	No	<p>I see the impact of a repository as only being negative.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dangerous material planted here forever. 2. Hideous construction, 3. Detrimental process relating to seal a facility set near a beautiful National Park and an outstanding West Coast.

			4. Enormous cost.
847	4 – Community benefits	No	The repository has so many damaging features I can't see how any "benefit" can compensate for this. I would be suspicious of any "benefits" offered to our locality, connected with this.
847	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	Surely we do not know the exact design and scale of this proposed facility – this does not instil confidence or trust.
847	6 – Inventory	Yes	No one, at this stage, can itemise the inventory – accepted. A further unknown quantity – worrying!
847	7 – Siting process	No	I am not at all happy about this process, I feel totally, dis-empowered, many statements used in the consultation are couched in "consultation speak" and are obscure and avoiding reality.
847	8 – Overall views on participation		No search should be even considered by Allerdale or Copeland. I own a property in Allerdale – the last thing I want is this awful construction site nearby.
847	9 – Additional comments		The repository is a waste of money. Nuclear energy must be closed down totally – Germany has already decided – so should we. Please keep our beautiful county free of a nuclear dump.
848	1 – Geology	No	I know that David Smythe is an eminent geologist, and he has real concerns about the suitability of West Cumbria as a possible nuclear repository.
848	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based upon previous history – I do not believe that regulators/monitors would be transparent. • Nuclear materials are some of the most dangerous materials known to man - not a wise plan to bury it in such a geologically uncertain terrain. • I do not forget trouble in Winscale, Sellafield, 3 Mile Island, Chernobyl, Fukushima – I do not want any more nuclear build – especially here!
848	3 – Impacts	No	Building a repository is not "compatible with the economic aspirations of West Cumbria".

			Cumbria intends to extend tourism drawing in people attracted by a beautiful mountain area, coast and outstanding natural beauty. A hole the size of Carlisle filled with nuclear waste will not exactly enhance this.
848	4 – Community benefits	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principles seems to say very little. • I would only see “benefits” as a bribe to local authorities/communities to accept the repository. The detrimental effects of this repository far outweigh any benefits.
848	5 – Design and engineering	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am not technically able to comment on the design. I am not at all happy with any design. • Retrievability does not even enter the equation – lets not put it there!
848	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	I do agree that the type and volume of waste is uncertain – which only makes me feel more uneasy.
848	7 – Siting process	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It seems to me that having attended as many of these “consultations” as possible –I haven’t bumped into anyone as yet who really wants this to go forward, but the process ticks on seemingly without any reference to the previous concerns expressed by many. • I attended a “consultation” recently in Carlisle about 50 people sat and listened – out of a city/surround of around 70-80,000. Is this a consultation?
848	8 – Overall views on participation		No neither Copeland nor Allerdale should take part in any search for a repository, we do not want such a dangerous, degrading blot on our wonderful landscape. Instead put the phenomenal amount of finance into building environmentally friendly energy sources. We have had enough of anything with a “nuclear” label.
848	9 – Additional comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is such a serious, and huge development impacting the county virtually forever. • Because of this the only fair and just way is to test public opinion is by having a countywide referendum.
849	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
849	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
849	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
849	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made

849	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
849	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
849	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
849	8 – Overall views on participation		I consider that the areas covered by Allerdale and /or Copeland should take part in the search for a site for a repository, but maintain their right to withdraw their commitment!
850	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I do NOT want the areas covered by Allerdale and Copeland to take part in the search for somewhere to place a repository.</p> <p>The basic reason for this is that I have no faith in the decision making process. West Cumbria is the only area to have allowed itself to become candidate for a depository. This inevitably creates a bias in thinking towards a conclusion that it is suitable. The assessment is already complex, technical, and almost inevitably without clear cut consensus. The process cannot be objective in a situation where West Cumberland alone is being assessed.</p> <p>Suitable geology and very long term safety are the essentials for a repository, wherever it is sited. West Cumbria should cease to be part of the decision mmaking process unless there are several candidates to be sites for a repository. These candidates should be those most likely to be geologically suitable, but otherwise disparate.</p>
851	1 – Geology	No	We do not consider that decisions on the stability of the geology can be made as the system is dynamic and therefore unpredictable.
851	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Can not guaratee 100% therefore not acceptable for future generations.
851	3 – Impacts	Yes	We agree that there are positive and negative impacts but a few jobs cannot justify the long term pollution and destruction of the countryside.
851	4 – Community benefits	No	We feel that these packages are just bribes and should be resisted.

851	5 – Design and engineering	No	No amount of design can give 100% protection against natural forces as demonstrated in Japan.
851	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
851	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
851	8 – Overall views on participation		Since this decision has such far reaching implications it should not be left to two borough councils to decide whether to enter the siting process.
852	1 – Geology	No	I think that the criticism of the study's integrity from elsewhere is significant, and that it would be a waste of time and money to pursue further investigations.
852	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Of course the NDA will say that it will be safe; they are hardly an independent body in this issue, and their past record does not inspire confidence. The uncertainties are far too great to commit to this method of storage at this stage, especially given the storage time scale involved. I am not confident that sufficient flexibility is built in either for development of better technologies in the future, or for unforeseen climatic or geological events. I also feel that it is extremely short-sighted to put all high level nuclear waste in one place.
852	3 – Impacts	No	As someone working in the tourism industry, I am extremely disappointed that the Brand Protection survey has not been published in time for this consultation as was promised. The scale and nature of the project, and the inevitable lengthy disruption to the area could not possibly be mitigated, as far as tourism is concerned. I do not feel that the possible job creation would be of net benefit compared to the job losses in the tourism industry and the severe reduction of any potential to develop a more diverse economy in the area. I also feel that simply running an advertising campaign will not counteract perceptions of the safety of food grown in this area. A state of the art long term surface storage facility, with proper retrievability, for the radioactive waste already at Sellafield (new nuclear waste remaining at the sites where it is produced), would be far more advantageous to the nuclear industry, the tourism industry and the farming industry.
852	4 – Community benefits	No	It's all far too woolly, and anyway, if it's all so safe and economically advantageous, and impacts are so easily mitigated, why should we need bribing?
852	5 – Design and engineering	No	The size of the surface facility site required is stated. Wherever it is built, it will need the same facilities, so the

			<p>lack of detail is worrying, not 'understandable'. Equally, the amount of spoil has a minimum and maximum figure already, and there does not seem to be any concept of the quantity involved and quite where it is going to go.</p> <p>With future generations in mind, I am extremely concerned that a decision against retrievability is still on the agenda.</p>
852	6 – Inventory	No	<p>Agreement with a community siting partnership on the inventory is meaningless unless that partnership properly takes into account the views of local communities, and I am not confident, on current experience, that that will be the case. Commitment to a proper consultation process is not sufficient for the community to move to the next stage.</p>
852	7 – Siting process	No	<p>'Consensus across PSAs' is far too important to be judged by 'a representative opinion poll' even if such a result was binding, which would clearly not be the case.</p> <p>Given that no part of the area is ruled out regarding the siting of surface facilities, the whole of the area covered is currently a 'PSA'. A binding referendum should have been held at this stage to inform the DMBs whether local communities wished to withdraw now. It is patently a waste of time and money to continue to the next stage with investigations in areas which are already opposed to the project in principle.</p>
852	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Copeland Borough Council should not take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository. Continuation of the uncertainty generated by the process will be counterproductive for the area, and I feel that the continued assertion of 'without any commitment to have it' is very misleading and should be tested now. Regarding this 'Right of Withdrawal', I feel that, contrary to the Partnership's assertion, the White Paper demonstrates that Government commitment to the principle is by no means certain, since on page 47 (in the white paper) it is stated that 'in the event ... voluntarism and partnership does not look likely to work the government reserves the right to explore other approaches'.</p>
852	9 – Additional comments		<p>I feel strongly that the storage of intermediate and high level nuclear waste is a national problem, and should not become a Cumbrian problem. The waste currently at Sellafield is the nation's waste, not Cumbria's. I feel that we, as a nation, need to take the issue seriously and ensure to the best of our ability that the waste which we have generated does not become a problem for generations to come in future MILLENNIA. Because we are not simply talking 'a couple of lifetimes', voluntarism is actually irrelevant. We cannot 'volunteer' on behalf of generations that far in the future. The search for a site (or sites) and method (or methods) to deal with the waste is a nationwide responsibility and should be based on the safest possible site, not just 'the site which has most of it anyway'.</p>

			<p>That 'voluntarism' has been invoked acknowledges that there is at least a perceived problem with the storage of nuclear waste.</p> <p>Support for nuclear power, right down to a personal level, should include taking responsibility for the safe management of the waste generated for your 'benefit', including an acceptance that if the safest place for its disposal in England and Wales happens to be at the bottom of your garden, then that is where it should go.</p>
853	1 – Geology	No	W Cumbria is one of the most investigated areas in the UK. Long history of mines here which were abandoned due to high costs of removing the water/flooding. We have high rainfall here - this would mean leakage to the surface.
853	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	NO! NO! The risk is too great.
853	3 – Impacts	No	A nuclear dump would blight/destroy Cumbria's farming & tourism - the largest industries. PLEASE INVEST IN THE FUTURE - THE FUTURE OF TOURISM. THIS IS SUSTAINABLE & WILL NOT DESTROY THE EARTH.
853	4 – Community benefits	No	NO! NO!! We should not be bribed - hospitals & schools are our right just as in other parts of the country.
853	5 – Design and engineering	No	No, it is not safe & never will be.
853	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
853	7 – Siting process	No	NO!! The area was ruled out by Nirex enquiry but goal posts have been changed to rule it back in. Naughty!!
853	8 – Overall views on participation		Rubbish. What a waste of public money - this search should not be taking place - it is WRONG,WRONG. Let's stop now before too much money is spent.
853	9 – Additional comments		West Cumbria is God's own country. We do not own it but hold it in trust for the next generations. Do not accept this dump because that is what Cumbria would become - a dump! Our grandchildren will curse us if this goes ahead. Invest in tourism & gain their praise.
854	1 – Geology	No	From previous studies it has been already established that there are other areas in the UK (for these purposes

			<p>we are talking about England & Wales) where the geology is likely to be more suitable for locating a repository than that found in West Cumbria. For a start the complexity of the geology here will mean that the cost of further surveys will inevitably be higher than in areas where the geology is easier to understand. The more money that ends up being spent on carrying out these surveys the harder it will be for the government to allow a "Right of Withdrawal" even if the host community expresses its reluctance. Secondly and most worryingly no other sites are even being considered. It is understood that there is a national need for at least one repository for nuclear waste and yet they are only looking into West Cumbria, as our three council's were the only ones offering to be considered as potential locations. It is either insanity not to have a plan "B" in case a suitable site is not located in West Cumbria or come what may they know that they will find a site that will do - maybe not ideal but will be OK. That is not acceptable.</p> <p>This is not an area normally associated with earthquakes but might this change if "fracking" continues in Lancashire?</p> <p>From the webcast of 6 March I feel the views expressed by Pete Wilkinson are very relevant - basically the whole procedure is being rushed and done the wrong way round.</p>
854	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>When looking at the permanent storage of nuclear waste, that will remain hazardous for thousands of years, I am not convinced about the safety of future generations. It has not yet been established what levels of radioactive waste will be stored nor the quantities. It is an open ended commitment. Just think what has already happened with the present surface storage at Sellafield - the quantities have increased way above what was originally envisaged.</p> <p>Besides the nuclear waste aspects I am also concerned about the environmental impact of any construction work that will involve the excavation of such large amounts of material as well as its transportation implications.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the current consultation process as I feel it is open to manipulation by those with a vested interest for it to proceed. Many of the smaller parish and other councils have already voted to reject the idea of a repository being sited in Cumbria. But according to the webcast of 6 March there is already deemed to be enough support to proceed to the next stage. If the scheme can allow the views of objectors to be ignored on the grounds that they are not properly informed, how valid is this consultation?</p> <p>Keswick Town Council (where there was no Council elections due to lack of applicants) only chose to accept continuance on the mayor's casting vote based on employment opportunities in West Cumbria rather than on the wellbeing of countless future generations.</p>
854	3 – Impacts	No	<p>Whilst they talk about the repository providing new jobs in West Cumbria, the actual number of jobs is not that</p>

			<p>impressive and a large part of the workforce during construction is likely to come from outside Cumbria. The enormity of the risks involved in accepting this repository far outweigh a few jobs in West Cumbria. Cumbria has more to it than just the West Coast and the views of rest of us should also be considered.</p> <p>Whilst the tourist industry is concentrated within the Lake District, great efforts have been made to expand it to the surrounding areas, including the West Coast. Turning us into the national (or quite possibly eventually international) nuclear waste dump will not enhance these efforts. Remember nuclear pollution from as far away as Chernobyl proved detrimental to the local farming industry.</p> <p>Besides the dreadful long term risks involved with burying nuclear waste, there will be other problems for the local community including those associated with the transportation and storage of debris from the excavations.</p> <p>There is a very large difference in the long term risks associated with having a new power station based in Cumbria, using local expertise and providing continued employment, and having a repository, which is an unknown quantity and whose effects will be around for countless generations to live with.</p>
854	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>To date there are no details of any benefits package. As Elaine Woodburn said in the webcast of 6 March "details of any community package would need to be thought about later".</p> <p>Any benefit package will be a bribe by any other name. This matter is far too important and we cannot put our County's whole long term future at risk for the offer of a few jobs and whatever else the government sees fit to offer.</p> <p>For those few jobs we may be risking employment for a huge number of people involved in other industries such as tourism and farming. In the event that the worst happens, will those living in places such as Manchester appreciate the added ingredient in their water supply?</p>
854	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>As a repository will need to be designed around a specific site and that (or those) has yet to be identified, there is little to be said on the subject. The fact that an inventory for the type and quantity of waste to be dealt with has yet to be established is a further complication but more about that in the next section.</p> <p>As I have already mentioned it seems apparent that, unless we take the opportunity to opt out now, it is inevitable that a repository or even two will be sited in Cumbria as no other locations in England and Wales are even being looked at. A national solution for the long term storage/disposal of nuclear waste is required but it is worrying that the only three councils that have offered to be considered are all in Cumbria - does that say something about the sanity or desperation of those Councils?</p>

854	6 – Inventory	No	<p>There are far too many uncertainties. The volumes of waste are totally open ended. Baseline and Upper figures are shown but these can be changed. The risk level of waste being disposed of is also liable to change.</p> <p>There is a presumption the repository will only be used for UK produced nuclear waste but this may prove to be incorrect. I fear that this is the thin end of the wedge and we could end up being an international nuclear waste dumping ground. Will acceptance of waste from overseas be seen as a possible source of income? Is it possible that a time will come when, for security reasons, it will be considered preferable for us to accept nuclear material from other countries rather than risk it falling into the hands of rogue states or terrorist groups?</p> <p>Bribes, also known as community benefits, will no doubt be used as inducements to allow such policy changes to take place. This raises the question - who is the community that will be making those decisions? I feel that this is not clear and will again be open to manipulation.</p>
854	7 – Siting process	No	<p>It is understandable that PSA hosts will have a major say in whether they are prepared to volunteer to have a repository built nearby, as they will have to suffer the disruptions caused by construction etc. However, any decision will affect many more people than just those living in the immediate area. The views of these residents MUST also be taken into account.</p> <p>The whole process is being rushed and West Cumbria is the only area being looked at despite previous surveys coming to the conclusion that the geology of the whole of West Cumbria is unsuitable. The accepted process is to locate a suitable site and then to ask the community to volunteer. In this case the community has been volunteered by its Councils and unjustifiably large sums of money will now need to be spent in an attempt to locate a possible site. If no site is located, a vast amount of money will have been wasted and the whole process will need to start from scratch elsewhere.</p> <p>This money would be better spent carrying out detailed surveys elsewhere in locations where the geology is known to be less complex and likely to be suitable for the construction of a repository. Such possible sites have been identified in previous studies.</p>
854	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>We are being asked to agree to move on to the next stage with the security of knowing that we will still retain the option of withdrawal. However, I am aware that, as more money is spent, we will be in serious and increasing danger of losing that right. Pressure will be exerted to ensure the process continues. We are told that "all parties in a Community Siting Partnership should work positively to seek to avoid the need to exercise the Right of Withdrawal". If they fail, the option of withdrawal could be withdrawn by the government. It seem that come what may we are going to be blighted by this repository.</p> <p>We are the guardians of Cumbria and the uniquely beautiful Lake District and we need to protect it for the</p>

			benefit of the nation and countless future generations. Now is the time to opt out of this project before it is too late.
854	9 – Additional comments		<p>I hate to say it but I suspect the decision to continue to the next stage has been taken already.</p> <p>I am aware that thanks to the lack of planning by successive governments the country finds itself with the prospect of electricity supply shortages in the not too distant future. As a result of this and the present lack of realistic low carbon alternatives (wind farms are not the answer), I reluctantly accept the need to build another generation of nuclear power stations. By accepting that there is a need for another generation of nuclear power stations, I can hardly reject the idea a siting of one of these in Cumbria.</p> <p>However being prepared to accommodate a nuclear power station and having a repository located in Cumbria are two completely different things. I am not prepared to gamble with the potential long term risks for future generations from enormous amounts of buried radioactive material. The current process for deciding where it is best to locate a repository is far too flawed and should have been stopped before now. Certainly it should now be rejected and not be allowed to go to the next stage.</p> <p>A properly organised study needs to be started from scratch based on geology and not from those deprived areas of the country that are willing to be volunteered by their Councils.</p>
855	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
855	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
855	3 – Impacts	No	Understated
855	4 – Community benefits	No	Do not believe that the community would be adequately compensated.
855	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
855	6 – Inventory	No	Not convinced that in the long term the criteria will not change. Lackof trust

855	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
855	8 – Overall views on participation		There are far too many unanswered questions for such an important process that will affect generations to come. There are many more reassurances needed before any further progress should take place.
855	9 – Additional comments		There needs to be a deep feeling of trust in the process and I dont feel that is there at the moment. Any attempt to move forward without it will only compound the problem and store up bigger problems, resentment and entrenchment. Comments by people who just see jobs and money coming out of this (as important as that is) seem to want to rush headlong into it. That is very worrying.
856	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Being a supporter of using every form of power generation available including nuclear I have attended presentations and read the documents from MRWS</p> <p>As only some parts of this area have suitable geology and there are fault lines in adjoining geology we believe this area is not suitable for deep underground disposal using natural rock strata and it would be safer to provide storage using concrete and stainless steel where conditions are well known and in everyday use. This may be above ground or partly below ground or even after a very big hole has been excavated but it is not safe to rely on natural geology in this area.</p> <p>We need to find a suitable location that has correct geology either in this country or even pay to have it stored abroad.</p> <p>As there is no plan B for disposing of waste we are now decidedly nervous of the attitude that as the only community to agree to consider a disposal site the industry is clutching at straws and will spend too much money on underground repository and not concentrate on looking at other means of safe disposal that will need lots of research obviously and may take considerable time to achieve.</p> <p>It would be safer to manage the waste as at present on the surface until a foolproof way is found.</p>
856	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	When the planning process can be ignored if national need OVER RIDES the planning system and this repository can be FORCED onto a community and where only a few councillors ie the ruling cabinet of Allerdale council and subject to party whip to make it worse and less democratic are the decision makers it is a very flawed planning process and these facts are buried in the small print of the document on page 93 and 94 I think from memory and is very underhand to a community who accept the nuclear industry quite happily

856	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	I believe the harm to the tourist industry has not been stated strong enough in the document
856	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	No definite community package has been given. At present it is a carrot dangled but no definite benefits stated
856	5 – Design and engineering	No	Because we don't know from the information we have been given in the consultation document what the geology is definitely like and no NIREX information is disclosed it appears that the process is putting the cart before the horse. ie the disposal site has to be sited here as it's the only host community at present in the frame irrespective of the rock strata found.
856	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
856	7 – Siting process	No	As stated that mineral mining areas and faults in rock strata where water courses may suddenly appear are unsuitable the cost of doing further work seems to outweigh deep geological disposal therefore it may need to be above ground and man made rather than rely on natural rock
856	8 – Overall views on participation		As previously stated in the small print on page 93 and 94 of the document this repository can be forced on the community if national need dictates. This has really shocked me in the way it has been hidden and the fact that the impression is being constantly stressed that nothing will be forced on to a community if they didn't want it. Even die hard nuclear supporters are stunned by this fact that was picked up by Above Derwent council but missed by most of us.
857	1 – Geology	No	Without detail of the technical requirements for geology to be investigated at the next stage it remains possible, even likely, that these requirements will be tailored to the available volunteered areas. This therefore damages the objective of securing the safety of the waste through ensuring the geology provides the primary barrier. We should therefore not proceed until the requirements for that primary barrier have been clearly set out as this does not yet seem to be the case. Plenty of comment in principle, but detail is required otherwise the further geological investigation ends up the wrong way round, first look what is there and then decide if it is suitable. This will result in accepting poor quality geology by deciding with clever models that it is good enough. The

			investigations even at this relatively early stage must be the other way round, looking to see if what is there is suitable under some predefined criteria.
857	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Close supervision of the NDA will be required to ensure that appropriate funding is provided for new work into various aspects of suitability rather than just adapting work from "similar" situations in other countries which although broadly similar will have significant differences which will be poorly understood by an underfunded retrofit approach.
857	3 – Impacts	Yes	I find the NDA reply on the issue of spoil unconvincing and this will be a significant issue going forward. I am pleased to see little comment on transport of the waste as it is true that this will affect West Cumbria regardless of the location and is therefore a separate issue at this stage.
857	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Any funding should be distributed by a fully accountable body. The current Copeland Community Fund is not directly accountable to the public only via the two councils and at Council elections there are bigger matters making it extremely difficult to hold the fund board to account. Please try not to make the same mistake unfortunately I realise the councils are making the decision to proceed and therefore it probably will be.
857	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Good to see retrievability kept open.
857	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
857	7 – Siting process	No	I am concerned that the text for stage 4 leaves open the possibility of a particular area being identified for further work but the local people eg parish council being against participation. Then the decision making bodies being advised that this would kill the process and so deciding for some reason that to progress was in the best interests of say Copeland as a whole and doing so in the fact of local opposition.
857	8 – Overall views on participation		I think more detail should be sought on geological criteria before investigations start otherwise it will turn into, this is the best we have found in West Cumbria, is it good enough and work will then be undertaken to prove it is. Instead, with detailed criteria published first, the search is do we have anywhere that meets the criteria and therefore is suitable for intrusive investigation.
857	9 – Additional comments		A key point is that transparent (whilst very much required) is not the same as accountable. Councils are accountable for many things and have to do either many badly or one VERY badly to be properly held to account. They really have to try and keep political gesturing out of it.

859	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	Think that the best geological areas in the country should be pursued and not only places where local councils etc have expressed an interest in hosting a repository.
859	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	Concerned that access to waste is maintained. Concerned about how water may carry radioactivity elsewhere. Concerned about the security of the transportation of radioactive waste from other parts of the country.
859	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	Concerned about how developments may deter new business/industry in the area. Concerned that it will make the area even more dependent upon the nuclear industry. Concerned about impact upon tourism. Concerned that it will have a negative impact upon economic diversification.
859	4 – Community benefits	No	Feel these are ethically questionable.
859	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	Retrievability presumably does not necessarily mean access for monitoring purposes at all times. Note that low level waste is also included in diagram, whereas I thought this consultation was to do with higher level waste.
859	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	Concerned about whether assurances given by government will be honoured once significant investment in a facility is made. If more than one national site is sought, then the amount stored at any one location could be more easily limited.
859	7 – Siting process	No	This whole process depends upon people colluding with the approach that the government has made with respect to siting a repository. The identification of possible sites should have been based primarily upon geology, not upon communities offering to be considered. A greater national educational exercise should have been embarked upon rather than one which has been directed towards the communities offering to look into hosting a repository.
859	8 – Overall views on participation		I don't agree with the process of voluntarism that has been pursued and so I do not agree with Allerdale and/or Copeland Borough Councils taking part in the search for somewhere to put a repository.
859	9 – Additional comments		The consultation documents etc. are rather daunting and therefore are likely to discriminate against the views of those with low literacy ability.

861	1 – Geology	No	There is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the suitability of West Cumbria. It is geologically complex and fractured. The document acknowledges that there are significant differences taken within the geological community. To state(P33) 'there is an absence of undisputed detailed geological evidence clearly ruling out all parts of West Cumbria' is not accurate; and the document also acknowledges (P28) that the screening study was 'limited in nature'. Given the complex geological structure, and the criterion to exclude areas that may in future (or present) be sources of water, it is clear that the hydrology is too uncertain to make a confident judgement on this criterion. If a report, drawn up in the 1990's (NIREX) is now considered to be 'just a personal opinion of Professor Smythe' (P32), who is to say that at a future time Dr Dearlove's personal opinion should have been set aside - by which time it could be too late?
861	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	We are entering unknown territory scientifically and therefore also unknown territory in terms of safety. It is not possible to predict future geological events. Given this uncertainty it would be far more preferable to minimise the potential geological and hydrological dangers by selecting an area that is less geologically complex. Much of the area to the south and east of the Exe/Tees line is much more uniform in character and therefore simpler to predict the potential hazards and to eliminate them,
861	3 – Impacts	No	Anyone who has been involved in the construction industry will acknowledge that, despite their best efforts, noise, dust pollution, and traffic problems are inevitable. Access to the proposed area has to be gained along routes which will also be used by people seeking to gain access to a National Park. It is inconceivable that construction traffic will not make a serious impact in the area of transport. Anyone who has witnessed large scale developments(you cite the Channel Tunnel!) will acknowledge that, despite the best efforts of those involved, it is impossible to mitigate the effects of their work to such and extent that an area such as the Lake District National Park will not suffer extensively from such activity.
861	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	I totally agree (P66) that 'exactly what (a Community Benefits package) might be and when it might happen can not be decided yet'. Given this statement and the set of twelve principles that you set out, it is not very encouraging to read that these principles will only " form a basis for negotiations in a potential Stage 4". They have not been accepted by government and give future administrations too much wriggle room - ' We can not be certain what specific package the government might agree' (P71). Whatever these benefits might, or might not prove to be in the near future, they can not outweigh the potential dangers for countless generations to come. Short terminism can be attractive for people and communities who are currently suffering from social and financial difficulties, but it is no fit response to the future dangers arising from a Nuclear Waste Repository in West Cumbria.
861	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	I am not competent to respond to this question but I am never impressed with glossy diagramatic presentations of what it might be.

861	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>In this section there are far too many uncertainties.</p> <p>Principle 1 'DECC does not provide this specific commitment.....'</p> <p>Principle 2 ' The Government would expect.....'</p> <p>Principle 4 and 5 'DECC points out.....it has concerns about the extent to which a single inventory statement will provide.....timely and potentially detailed information....'.</p> <p>Principle 6 'The Government acknowledges.....'</p> <p>How can we be expected to give a considered and balanced response to such a set of statements?</p> <p>New Nuclear Power Stations. It is understood by people living in the southeast of England that the waste from there new nuclear power station will find a home in Cumbria. Might I suggest that geologically the eastern half of Britain is eminently more suited to a repository.</p>
861	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>There are concerns around the concept of 'right of withdrawal'. The assurance that the MRWS has received is classified as only as 'adequate'. Given the serious natures of the issues surrounding this very controversial proposed development, 'adequate' seems a singularly low level of guarantee. As a comparable measure schools under the new Ofsted approach that were considered previously as 'satisfactory' are now considered to be 'unsatisfactory'. Adequate in this form of thinking must become 'inadequate'.</p>
861	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>We feel that it would be inadvisable to progress this consultation any further. The next stage of development will be very costly and will prove difficult to halt, despite assurances, once further expenditure is undertaken. Councillors bear a heavy responsibility not just for the current population but, in this particular case, for countless generations to come. To proceed further would be foolhardy and reckless.</p>
861	9 – Additional comments		<p>We would like simply to register our complete opposition to the siting of this facility in Cumbria.</p>

863	1 – Geology	No	Cumbria exhibits complex geology all packed within relatively small areas. There is a wide range of rock types and the rocks have been subjected to a number of mountain-building pressures in the past which has left many of them fractured, both on a small and large scale. The region is also affected by a number of larger faults. All these features affect the rock's stability and, very importantly, the passage of groundwater. The high rainfall in Cumbria and the mountainous landscape both exacerbate the threat from groundwater. Other overseas repositories have been constructed in low-lying areas with more stable less-complex rock types and with mountains further away. I believe that the complex geology of Cumbria together with the high rainfall and proximity of mountains makes the county an unacceptable site for a repository. The ideal repository site would be in an impervious rock, such as clay, in a low-lying region with low rainfall - just the opposite of Cumbria! As far as I can ascertain, no one has built a radioactive waste repository in an area which combines complex geology with high rainfall and nearby mountains!
863	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I don't really have much confidence in safety aspects since I believe if safety was a concern, then Cumbria would never have been put forward as a suitable site for a repository and that the nuclear industry would have pointed that out at the outset. I cannot really help thinking that it is all too easy for the government to use bribes of extra money for the community as a way of making sure they don't have a repository in their own back garden. Push it up north is their attitude and we will make the people up there so desperate for money that they would agree to anything. Cumbria is a lovely county with many lovely people and I am certainly not against Sellafield being here but if an underground repository is built in such a complex geological area with high rainfall and high mountains nearby this gives me no confidence in the decision makers. My own children have moved away from the area but I feel those youngsters remaining in the county need protection as it will have an impact on them or their descendants.
863	3 – Impacts	No	I am not satisfied that the impact of a repository has been fully assessed. Many more people in Cumbria are employed in the tourist industry than would be employed in the construction and operation of the facility. People in general are very wary of anything nuclear and can easily be put off coming to an area. Look what happened during the foot and mouth epidemic - the tourist trade suffered terribly as visitors stayed away from the area in huge numbers. How do we know how they would react to the building of an underground repository close to or within the Lake District. That would not be something which would be over in a year and things would be back to normal. What would they think of the increased heavy traffic and the dust and noise pollution! It does not take much for people to shift their allegiances elsewhere and there are many other beautiful areas of Britain for them to visit. And, in years to come, I think we can all guess how they would react to any hint of radiation leakage. They would stay away, especially if they have children. We are being asked to agree to the county volunteering to be a site for a repository without any knowledge where this would be situated! Why are we risking severely damaging the tourist industry when the gains do not really justify this.
863	4 – Community benefits	No	I would like the lives and prospects of the people in Cumbria to be good with many opportunities but there does

			<p>not seem to be any guarantee that if a repository was built here the government would honour any commitments put forward. In these difficult times I am sure there are many ways that funding can be reduced one way or another if the economy continued its downward slide. The offer of money as an inducement has all the hallmarks of bribery and that I cannot condone. Would future generations of Cumbrians thank us for that especially if there were radiation problems due to the complex geology, heavy rainfall and nearby high mountains. The situation would be even worse if the repository had an effect on the numbers of tourists visiting our region. In the worst case scenario, government withdraws its promised funding and the tourist industry collapses as a result of the repository. Surely if the siting of a repository was so welcome to people, every county would be clamouring to get a slice of the money. If people are so wary of having this construction in their own areas are they really going to want to come and spend a holiday in an area which has one?</p>
863	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>I am concerned about the impact of such a large storage facility. Repositories abroad have been built in areas with substantially lower populations so the construction phase can proceed with minimal disruption to the surrounding population. In comparison, Cumbria does not have a low population - it has towns, villages and hamlets, all within short distances of one another. Thus the impact is bound to be greater. The huge area planned for the repository is going to create quite a large amount of construction traffic. Huge quantities of rock debris will need to be moved. Roads such as the A66 are already fairly busy and smaller roads are certainly not suited to large heavy vehicles. I expect Cumbria County Council will have to find the funds to repair all the resulting pot-holes which will mean yet another increase in Council Tax for everyone. What are visitors to the area going to make of all the extra traffic, abundance of heavy-weight vehicles and the constant dust resulting from the excavation works? My guess is that prospective visitors will soon learn about the change in the environment. Perhaps we will see signs such as 'Cumbria Open For Business', 'Keswick Open for Business'. etc, springing up all over the place in an attempt to convince visitors that nothing has changed. However, visitors will soon realise that such signs signify a detrimental change is occurring in the area.</p>
863	6 – Inventory	No	<p>If there is the possibility that large amounts of nuclear waste are going to be transported to Cumbria for storage in the repository then this is going to have a marked effect on road traffic and will be disruptive to other road users, many of whom are visitors who bring a great deal of money into the area. This is not something which should only be thought about in the future as and when it arises.</p>
863	7 – Siting process	No	<p>I think the process for siting a repository is going ahead without a large number of people realising what is happening. There is very little understandable information getting to people. I have been amazed and horrified at the number of people I have spoken to who do not even know it is being discussed. Also many people think it is a problem that is only going to affect the far west of Cumbria so they don't see the relevance to their own localities. I think there has been insufficient information given to people and before any decisions are made, there should be a lot more information on TV, radio and newspapers in order to correctly gauge public opinion. At present it is fairly easy for people to be blissfully unaware of the debate and its consequences. At the same</p>

			time councillors (representing a tiny, tiny percent of the population) are making very important decisions about the repository before the majority of people actually realise what is happening! Do the councillors fully understand the problems involved or does the lure of government money and promises of more jobs for the county affect judgement. If the issue is such an important one, surely a great deal more effort should be put into making sure people are better informed and that the information is clear, concise and easy to follow. The lack of public debate and clear information reaching the public suggests to me that the consultation is being hurried through to a stage where pulling out will not be an option.
863	8 – Overall views on participation		I do not believe that we should be taking part in the search for a repository site. My main concern is the unsuitable geology of Cumbria coupled with the high rainfall and the effects of the nearby high mountains on groundwater flow. These three factors put together make our County unsuitable for such a site. We need to consider future generations and not just think of our immediate needs (government money and increased jobs). In addition, I believe that the detrimental effects on tourism have not been properly looked into and tourism employs many more people than would be employed in connection with a repository. A reduction in visitors to our region will mean a loss of jobs and a reduction in the economy of the County. I have studied Geology at the University of Sheffield (B.Sc Honours Geology) and have an M.Sc in Information Science from the University of London, so I do have knowledge about the geological complexity of the area and the risks involved in siting the repository within the local rocks. I worked as a Senior Scientific Officer at the Building Research Establishment (BRE) near Watford. My work at BRE was mainly concerned with identifying those rock aggregates which caused concrete to crack in motorway bridges. I also investigated ways of preventing the expansive cracking from taking place.
864	1 – Geology	No	<p>The overall geology of The Lake District is well known and has been for many years. It is an extremely complex and deeply fissured, hydrologically active region of extremely limited area. The area has a high rainfall and is steeply inclined.</p> <p>Trying to find a volume suitable for a repository will be like trying to find space for an egg yolk in a wet sponge. No other country has a repository in such a geologically complex area and so close to centres of high population. I think that further exploration would be a waste of time and money.</p>
864	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Fine words and comprehensive reports are all very well but in the next decade or so will the mechanisms still be in place or will they have been eroded by time and financial constraints?</p> <p>In the (unlikely) event of a containment failure and the release of radioactive isotopes into the environment via groundwater, I doubt whether the authorities will have the manpower or resources to deal with the resulting contamination with any haste, except by moving large numbers of people away from the area. I suppose that is</p>

			<p>protection of a sort.</p> <p>I also doubt whether any planning process could deter a determined government from building surface facilities within the Lake District boundaries. SSSIs and AONB are routinely destroyed for roads and other developments.</p> <p>If it is so safe what is wrong with East Anglia since that is a geologically a better area?</p>
864	3 – Impacts	No	<p>Construction: I can see an increase in the amount of traffic coming past Keswick on the A66 to the M6. The A66 is a single carriageway and already destroys the tranquility of the Northern Lake District.</p> <p>Health: probably not directly but stress?</p> <p>Investment: Probably not affected</p> <p>Employment. The Tourist Industry in Cumbria - mainly in the Lake District, including Cockermouth, Whitehaven and Maryport - employs over 36000 people and attracts more than 15 million visitors a year. The repository will employ about 550 people a year. It is hard enough attracting visitors in the light of increasing fuel costs and seemingly increasingly erratic weather without having to content with the spectre of a Rad Waste Repository on your doorstep, however well constructed and thought out. The merest sniff of a problem and you could lose 5% of your visitors (remember foot and mouth?), 750000 less visitors equates to people being laid off.</p> <p>Special Qualities of the Lake District: Depends where the surface workings were. There is nowhere really flat enough inside the boundaries, if there were it would be seen by many as an act of environmental desecration - you are looking at something (above ground) half the size of Keswick.</p> <p>Tourism: Almost certainly detrimental - how many people do you see flocking to see a Rad Waste Repository.</p> <p>Food production: Almost Certainly Detrimental - would you advertise food as 'farmed within 25 mile of a Rad Waste Facility'</p> <p>Impact: depends where it is</p>
864	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>I have seen the way the Government handles (and wastes money - Nimrod MR4A 4.1bn and nothing to show for it!.)</p> <p>Believe it when it is in your hand, but watch the wallet in your back pocket!</p>

864	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I assume that the best civil engineers would be used and that they would use the best engineering solutions available. Based on figures from the USA the cost of the enterprise is likely to be in the 'tens of billions of pounds' range. We would expect the best engineering solutions.</p> <p>Rad waste repository design is based on the premise that within a few hundred years of the closure of the facility ground water will have penetrated to the primary containers - metal and concrete encapsulation and corrosion, accelerated by the heat of the radioactive decay, will begin. Corrosion will eventually allow ground water to leach the radionuclides out of their containment. At this point the engineered environment becomes largely immaterial. The longer the ground water is kept away the better one could say. There have been a number of instances where concrete has failed (Chloride attack, Sulphate attack, Alkali - Silica reactions to name but a few) I hope the engineers take note and do not try to be too revolutionary in their designs. I appreciate that the Romans built concrete structures that have survived for 1500 years or so (Hadrian's Wall for example) but they have not been kept warm and in contact with ground water.</p>
864	6 – Inventory	Yes	<p>The repository will be used for high, low and intermediate level nuclear waste. The NDA will be responsible for filling it. The community has neither the knowledge, nor, I suspect the desire to decide what goes into it. Probably not a good idea to put unused nuclear weapons in it.</p> <p>The designers will decide how much waste, how big. Then they will fill it up. I cannot see how the community will influence this. If it is there and they need to make it bigger they will if they can. If it is needed to stay open for 150 years it will.</p>
864	7 – Siting process	No	<p>As far as I see there is only one region that has expressed an interest in a Rad Waste depository and that is Cumbria. That is because Rad Waste is already deposited at Sellafield and it has probably been made clear to all who work there that that is where it is going no matter what. The project is a foregone conclusion because it is 'up North' and the seat of the Government is 'down South'. The processes for selection look good but I suspect that once they start drilling it will be too late to back out and the Government will make some excuse and carry on.</p>
864	9 – Additional comments		<p>Before I came to Cumbria I was a professional Physicist (MInstP CPhys) working at the Building Research Establishment, Garston, Herts. For many years I work on projects for NIREX concerned with the longevity of Ca-Si hydraulic cements (Ordinary Portland Cements) for Rad Waste encapsulation.</p>
868	Comments slip		<p>I think the NEW Repository should be in Copeland to protect Copeland jobs.</p>

869	Comments slip		I think it would be a good idea to put the repository near Sellafield as it already stored most of the companies' nuclear waste.
870	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
870	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
870	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
870	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
870	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
870	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
870	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
870	8 – Overall views on participation		Any council must take all precautions through searches etc before giving any commitment to proceed!
872	Comments slip		Sellafield holds the majority of the country's nuclear waste, so the only sensible place to put the repository is as close to Sellafield as possible, this would reduce risk, cost of transporting waste.
873	Comments slip		Yes, I'm in agreement with looking for the right place for an underground site/store.
874	Comments slip		Yes, I think it is a good idea to have the repository in the Copeland area.

875	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
875	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
875	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
875	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
875	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
875	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
875	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
875	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>We must say YES to the search because we want nuclear material to be secure. To be free from danger from damage and in safe custody. As nuclear workers we know a lot about nuclear safety, so if the geology passes the test, this is where the store should be.</p> <p>For providing this service for the country the Government should reward our community</p>
876	Comments slip		I think it is a good idea to site the repository in Allerdale or Copeland, and the councils should go ahead with the search for somewhere to put a repository.
877	Comments slip		I agree with a repository being given consideration for West Cumbria as Sellafield already exists.
878	Comments slip		As I may think the repository is a good idea, I would like to think the benefits would go to West Cumbria and not to the country that runs the repository e.g. the USA!
879	Comments slip		This area would be a better place to put one, if it is possible due to the experience of working with nuclear material. These councils should take part with no commitment.
880	Comments slip		It would be better underground than above ground where the waste is now. Less transportation for nuclear waste if Cumbria or Allerdale and Copeland was chosen.

881	Comments slip		We wish to object to the storage of nuclear waste in Cumbria, because of the geological structure of the landscape. We also believe that the storing of nuclear waste in a repository in or close to the Lake District National Park would be unsuitable and detrimental to the tourist industry. We fear for the dangers to our families and future generations to come: - leakages into rivers and land.
882	Comments slip		I think the repository should be built in Allerdale or Copeland because most of the UK's nuclear waste is stored at Sellafield.
883	Comments slip		There is much historical knowledge regarding the geology of the Lake District that indicates that it would be entirely unsuitable for installation of a repository for high-level nuclear waste. This is upheld by much of the recent information given as to suitability of locations. The legacy for future generations from such a project is of paramount importance and should not be jeopardized by short-term thinking. We should not submit to pressure as the only councils to show interest. This project has got to go into the right location in order to provide the best long-term barrier against radiation leakage into the local environment. Therefore on this basis I say definitely NO to the installation of a nuclear repository in Cumbria.
884	Comments slip		We need as much as we can. Work !! I would agree to a repository
885	Comments slip		Being from Allerdale and a worker within the nuclear industry I know just how much this site and the future of the nuclear industry means to this area, so YES I am in favour of a search.
886	Comments slip		I support YES to the search for a repository because it will bring with it some cash or other direct resource for our community in return for us volunteering. The waste is already here in West Cumbria, we work with it every day, so lets get something out of it.
887	Comments slip		We have been using and storing nuclear material for over 50 years in West Cumbria safely and as we already store 70 percent of Britain's nuclear waste, I can't see any better place to build and with today's technology it will create jobs in a safer environment.
889	Comments slip		This is a very ambiguous document. Since, in theory, the site for waste disposal hasn't been determined, none of the objections can be answered, yet apparently can all be dealt with appropriately! Earlier extensive geological investigation found West Cumbria totally unsuitable for disposal of radioactive

			<p>material. What has changed? The geology hasn't.</p> <p>Environmentally and socially this is a non starter. Tourism is a main area of employment – people will not visit a potential hazard zone when security cannot be assured. Cumbria is not the area in which to dispose of nuclear waste.</p>
890	Comments slip		<p>I support yes to the searches taking place and believe it can only be a positive thing for the area. It is something the local area has a vast knowledge of and the waste is already here so we must use it to our full benefit.</p>
891	Comments slip		<p>Our views are that we should participate in such a scheme. The nuclear industry is well established, and accepted in this area. A repository would not only be a huge advantage to the nuclear industry, it would create much needed employment in the construction of such a plant, and the promise of long-term employment when completed.</p>
892	Comments slip		<p>I think it is a good idea to look into a repository as it will bring in much needed employment to the area. I think any money we get should not be wasted on pet projects of the council but used to improve transport and attract other employers to the area.</p>
893	Comments slip		<p>I thought this a very balanced and clear statement of the case for both sides.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the use of nuclear energy for any purposes, but given that it has been forced on us and we have no option but to benefit from its output, I think it is fair to search for a repository here in West Cumbria as the waste has, unfortunately, to go somewhere.</p>
894	Comments slip		<p>The knock on effect of such a proposal would kill our tourism industry off – look what happened back in the early eighties when there was thought to be an early radiation leak into the Solway, people tar all the area with the same brush, it took years to recover, then there was the radioactive fall out from Chernobyl. This would really be very short sighted!! It may create jobs – but at the loss of many others.</p>
895	Comments slip		<p>I am against plans to have a nuclear waste repository in West Cumbria.</p> <p>My understanding is that geologically the area is unsuitable. My fear is that there will be the temptation to “engineer” a solution, even if the geology is unsuitable. This will likely result in long term environmental problems in the future.</p>

896	1 – Geology	No	The Governments own 'Nirex Report' in 1995 PROVED the geology and hydrogeology of Cumbria would be UNSAFE for such sensitive, harmful radioactive waste.
896	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The Government aims to put "first wastes into the repository by 2029" A Public enquiry and appeal agreed with Cumbria County Councils view 15 years ago that the risk was too great for geological disposal of intermediate level wastes. Today's plan includes high level wastes - a world first.
896	3 – Impacts	No	A Nuclear dump would blight both agriculture and tourism - Cumbria's largest industries. Even before the emplacement of wastes' the mining operation would rival the biggest mines in the world adding earthquake risk and disrupting West Cumbria's water table.
896	4 – Community benefits	No	West Cumbria should be assured of essential infrastructure such as schools, roads and hospitals without being bribed.
896	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>NO THEY SHOULD NOT!</p> <p>All evidence, including the governments OWN Nirex Report in 1995 proves that Cumbrias unique geology and hydrogeology would be UNSAFE for disposal of radioactive waste. West Cumbria and Cumbria should not be bribed.</p> <p>This process is a travesty of democracy. IT substitutes persuasion and incentives backed by lavish public relations 'spin' in place of wisdom and integrity in the governmental process. It is a potential tragedy for Cumbria and for our neighbours because it is future generations of both Cumbrians and neighbouring communities, possibly far and wide, who will have to live with the consequences.</p>
896	9 – Additional comments		<p>See response to question 8. AND</p> <p>The MAJORITY of Cumbrians do not actually KNOW about the proposals and this consultation, THEREFORE THIS IS A VIOLATION OF DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS. One only has to look at the affects still prominent generations after Chernobyl to see the need to find a safe, secure, SAFE place for the waste.</p>
897	Comments slip		I am in favour of disposal of radioactive waste below ground. It will be safer for everybody.
898	Comments slip		I agree that Allerdale and Copeland Borough Councils should take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository. However, house prices must be protected by the Government if a repository is built here. Also the

			waste should be retrievable and monitored. Also the public consultation response form is asking for far too much detail and will discourage people from participating.
899	Comments slip		It is common sense to carry out a search in this area. The majority of the UK radioactive waste is stationed at Sellafield so if this area is suitable then the waste can be stored safely without travelling the roads of the UK.
900	Comments slip		A repository will need to be built underground. It will provide jobs for the people needed to construct it.