

User ID	Question	Agree	Response
901	Comments slip		<p>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.</p> <p>Evidence already exists, excluded from this document that the geology of Cumbria makes it unsuitable for a repository. There is also evidence that other areas have unsuitable geology. To be considered merely because an area has offered its totally unsuitable geology voluntarily, playing down the risks for a minimal perceived economic advantage is madness.</p> <p>We should not go to Stage 4.</p>
902	Comments slip		<p>Given that the evidence does exist (but curiously has not been much publicised) that Cumbria is most likely geologically unsuitable for a repository, it makes no sense to look at the area as a potential site, just because the area has been volunteered. We should go no further in respect of a repository being located in the whole of Cumbria due to its geology alone.</p> <p>We should not go to Stage 4.</p>
903	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	There is too much reliance on the 'developer' to do the right thing, and no guarantee that the committee even understand the necessary safety measures for the environment and population. It seems a half-hearted and undeveloped plan.
903	8 – Overall views on participation		It seems a costly and time-consuming process if the councils are not committed, which suggests to us that they are, in effect, committed to having a repository by the effort they will have already put towards it. The 'no commitment' clause appears to be there only to mollify people like ourselves who are deeply concerned about the safety of such a repository. Needless to say, it is not having the desired effect.
903	9 – Additional comments		The geology of the area is not suitable; it has not been proved a safe process; and moreover, the proximity to one of the areas of the UK most beautiful, most visited and most naturally rich in resources is simply foolish. This is not a viable option for the healthy and successful future of Cumbria and should not be considered.
913	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made

913	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
913	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
913	4 – Community benefits	No	No comment was made
913	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made
913	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
913	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
915	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	By your stated criteria there is insufficient information now to rule out West Cumbria completely on geological but it appears to me that reservations about the geology are significant this will remain a weakness in the MRW's case. I accept that the geology need not be the pre-eminent consideration but there is no denying there are places in the UK where the geology is more suitable.
915	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>The 'independence' of the regulators is problematic. Not that they are insincere but that the relationships between all the various parties involved becomes one of mutual dependence. Everyone a clear role but they are united in the collective enterprise. The reputation of 'independent regulation' in other sectors is not encouraging and the reputation on the Environment Agency locally is very low since the 2009 flood.</p> <p>The current government's proposals for changes to planning permissions for major strategic projects means that the planning parts of the consultation are irrelevant.</p> <p>Regarding safety, it all depends upon the capacity and integrity of the NDA. The difficulty is the perception that all parties will strive for a consensus, whatever their separate roles. Can the NDA ever be seen to be sufficiently arms length from the process?</p> <p>I think the ongoing R&D programme is absolutely critical here. Looking back over the past couple of generations at Sellafield shows how much more sophisticated the whole de-commissioning and storage effort has become. With the timescales you are talking about it should be the case that considerable further advances in chemical and structural engineering will be available if the repository ever comes to fruition. DO</p>

			NOT INVEST IN REDUNDANT TECHNOLOGY!!!
915	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Photographs of Sellafield taken from within the lake district (and the other way around) have become iconic without seemingly damaging the brand and reputation of the area. On the ground, the security is generally unobtrusive, people's views might change if that was no longer the case. The potential scale of the facility (above ground) could be problematic. There may also be difficulties if the final location is not close to the present Sellafield complex.</p> <p>Consideration of long-term direction and economic sustainability over the timescale of a repository construction and operation is difficult to comprehend. Did the victorians worry about the economic sustainability of the West Cumbria coal field?</p>
915	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
915	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No problem with the so called legacy waste. But the perception that progress with waste storage will make it easier to proceed with a new generation of nuclear power stations is a concern. The legacy waste HAS to be dealt with. But considering the technical difficulties, and the possible risks, and the costs, decisions that would lead to creating more HLW must not be taken lightly.
915	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>This is one of the most important strategic investments this country has ever made and yet, so far as i am aware, it's only here in West Cumbria, that anyone is thinking about it. Perhaps the government should have said to every local authority, 'we think you could potentially host this facility, let us have your views'. That would have at least raised awareness of the issues.</p> <p>Considering the (deep) timescales there is no need to rush a decision either. Now that de-comissioning and waste security is taken seriously and as the technology improves then it's possible that our present view of what a repository should be might change considerably over the next couple of generations.</p> <p>The meaning of 'voluntarism' is evidently not the same in this country as it was in Finland for example. This feels like 'window dressing'.</p>
915	8 – Overall views on participation		While the bulk of the waste is already stored at Sellafield, it's no surprise that Allerdale and Copland councils have become involved in this process. But the question refers to 'taking part in the search for somewhere...' The councils should include in their consideration 'somewheres' that are not within their own boundaries.
915	9 – Additional comments		I feel the scale of the project and the scope of the issues has a tendency to overwhelm the capacity and competence of local institutions and representatives. The timescales are so long that it becomes very difficult

			to judge how to act responsibly with respect to future generations. Consideration of current personal circumstances seems inappropriate, but how else are we to come to an opinion?
917	1 – Geology	No	<p>Looking at the pink areas on the map, it appears that the geology of the SSI around skinburness and grune point is considered suitable. Surely this should be ruled out irrespective of Geology.</p> <p>It seems that the initial statement of suitability is made on a very thin evidence base with much of it needing to be confirmed "later" We are not convinced that this decision would be made for the right reasons. As far as we are aware, Allerdale council is the only LA even prepared to consider this. With so few alternatives we believe that there is a strong possibility that corners may be cut in terms of geological suitability with a promise of additional engineering measures to compensate for lack of suitability.</p>
917	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Much of the rationale is based on expectations, promises and trust in current systems and their integrity. Once again, we believe that the lack of suitable willing alternatives will unduly influence the decision and undermine its integrity.</p> <p>Changes to planning currently being forced through by the coalition will stack the argument in favour of development at all costs. We do not trust the integrity and motives of government in effecting these changes</p>
917	3 – Impacts	No	<p>Once again we come back to the argument about lack of willing volunteers. We also consider the arguments on job creation and economic enhancement as very thin. Forecasts for jobs and wealth creation have been phrased to make the prognosis look attractive. In reality we do not believe the benefits outweigh the risks and detrimental impact on the environment.</p> <p>Clearly there has been some promise of some kind of payments to the local authorities. Although we have not looked at this in detail, there is a lack of clarity on exactly what payment the local area will receive and what guarantees we as residents have on how this will be spent. once again it's a matter of trust or lack of it.</p>
917	4 – Community benefits	No	see comments in previous section on community benefits. If you expect us to make a judgement on this it needs to be spelt out much more clearly with some guarantees. At the moment it is little more than a vague promise
917	7 – Siting process	No	Seems like a one horse race. Are any other areas as willing as allerdale to go ahead with this. If not then it really cancels out the rationale behind this section

917	8 – Overall views on participation		Allerdale should reject the siting
917	9 – Additional comments		Too high a risk in every respect with nebulous promises of rewards and benefits
918	1 – Geology	No	Nirex enquiry found geology unsuitable. There is nowhere in West Cumbria that is sufficiently flat or with large expanses of clay. Enough is known of the geology of the area to know that the rock is fractured, chaotic and in several places contains aquifers. Much of the area is riddled with disused mine workings, coal and iron ore. I refer you to the work of Prof. Smythe. Millions was spent by Nirex. Now in this time of austerity more millions are to be spent finding out what is already known and published. It may not be paid for by local taxes, but it is coming out of our income tax.
918	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Planning processes have been amended so that the government can drive through projects that it considers to be important and ride rough-shod over local opposition. This public consultation is a massive public relations exercise to give the appearance of listening to the people. The views of democratically elected bodies, such as Cockermouth Town Council carry no weight, and the views of the public are to be assessed by phoning people at random. At the very least there should be a referendum.
918	3 – Impacts	No	It will have a huge negative impact on agriculture and tourism, 2 major industries in Cumbria. It will inhibit inward investment by any other businesses. There will be no diversification away from nuclear, which the local economy is already overdependent on. The promised construction jobs will go to outside contractors and on present indications the profits will go to France and USA. The construction process will be environmentally damaging and with negative impacts on people's health and well-being. Property values will fall, who will want to buy a house over a nuclear repository?
918	4 – Community benefits	No	" We cannot be certain what specific package the government might agree this far in advance" - exactly! I stopped believing in Father Christmas many years ago.
918	5 – Design and engineering	No	There is no engineering solution that will last the thousands of years that it would be necessary to store the waste underground. If it is to be underground it must be contained in a geologically suitable environment, which West Cumbria is not.
918	6 – Inventory	No	I have read chapter 9 and you have expressed no meaningful opinion on the inventory. You cannot even rule out the possibility that it will contain overseas waste. Are you happy that West Cumbria becomes the nuclear dumping ground for the rest of the world?

918	7 – Siting process	No	The whole process is highly immoral and undemocratic. The first priority should have been to find sites in the UK which are geologically suitable and proceed from there. Instead, the government has encouraged an area which is already overdependent on the nuclear industry to "volunteer" to host this repository with vague promises of unspecified benefits. By the time stage 5 has started so much money and credibility will have been spent that is highly unlikely that a potential host community would be allowed to pull out. Millions of pounds of public money are being spent on pushing this site, but no resources are offered to those of differing views.
918	8 – Overall views on participation		The Nirex enquiry has already shown that the geology of West Cumbria is unsuitable for an underground depository. Why are we wasting so much public money going over the same ground? The case has not even been made that deep storage is the best solution for nuclear waste. Allerdale and Copeland councils should withdraw now, before it is too late.
918	9 – Additional comments		I love this county and do not want it to become the nuclear dustbin of the world , or to be regarded as such. Our councils should strive for sustainable, long-term economic development and prosperity based on a diversification of industries rather than chasing some illusory benefits in return for inflicting real and permanent damage on the area.
919	8 – Overall views on participation		I would like to object strongly to the proposal of nuclear waste being buried in the cumbrian fells. The Government proved themselves in the Nirex report, that cumbria is unsafe in its geology and hydrogeology for radioactive waste. I ask Allerdale and Copeland to withdraw from consultaion as proved to be unsafe.
922	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
922	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Because the safety precautions cannot be 100% guaranteed and radioactivity never fades. Also I have grave concerns over the transporting of radioactive waste to the site.
922	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
922	4 – Community benefits	No	No comment was made
922	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made

922	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
922	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
922	8 – Overall views on participation		The lake district is a highly desirable area to live and attracts many tourists every year because of its beauty. By having a nuclear radioactive waste site on its doorstep is not only dangerous and risky in its own right but it also runs the risk of losing its tourism which is its lifeline along with sheep farming. Any nuclear contamination would put paid to all the sheep farming and tourism for ever.
923	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	Agree with BGS;disagree with the premise that there is enough suitable area left for deep depository
923	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
923	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
923	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	Need greater assurance for local issues, employment, economy
923	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
923	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	Rather woolly response from Govt, not confidence-boosting
923	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	Don't follow the one criterion argument
923	8 – Overall views on participation		No decision/commitment should be made until all investigations and queries have been satisfactorily answered
923	9 – Additional comments		I think the very diverse geological nature of this area is unsuitable for deep repository. The implications for water sources is of utmost importance.

924	1 – Geology	Yes	In seeking a volunteer community, it is then very unlikely that the geology in the area of that community will be the best possible geology. This does not matter. What matters is that the geology in the area that volunteers is good enough to allow a credible safety case to be made. The standards of safety required by regulators are high, and the safety case needs to be conservative and credible. This is sufficient in itself. What we are seeking is the protection of the public and the environment to an exacting standard. This can be achieved in a wide range of geological conditions, and it does not need the very best geology.
924	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Every step of the process outlined is subject to regulatory scrutiny and approval, and is regulators will be making their assessments public. This is a more than adequate safeguard for the public and for the environment.
924	3 – Impacts	Yes	On the first point - the simple answer is yes, appropriate opportunities do exist. On the second and third points- the direction of these communities in West Cumbria is nuclear anyway. It will be nuclear for far longer if the repository is not built and Sellafield is forced to store its wastes above ground for the period of time that would be necessary. These wastes will not be leaving West Cumbria and geological disposal offers the best option for their final management.
924	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	The NDA's difficulty here is that of Cumbrian politics. The impact of the repository will only be in West Cumbria and this is where the community benefits package should be directed. It would be inequitable if (say) the bulk of the benefits went outwith the local area to the rest of the County.
924	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	In nuclear terms the repository is a straightforward handling plant and the issues are foreseeable. NIREX as was and now the NDA have been pursuing design studies for long enough for the concepts to be mature and realisable. The mining and geological aspects are currently less mature and need to be supported by site specific data.
924	6 – Inventory	Yes	The emphasis on dealing with Sellafield legacy wastes is appropriate, given the urgency of this matter at Sellafield. Potential arisings from nuclear new build may well also be placed in this repository, but the volumes and radioactive inventory will have some degree of uncertainty at the moment. This should not be allowed to be an obstacle to starting. It is unreasonable to expect accurate predictions of wastes that may or may not arise in 60, 70 or 80 years time.

924	7 – Siting process	Yes	<p>The process was well devised, and the engagement with the public was sincere and plentiful.</p> <p>It is unfortunate for the concept of volunteerism that so few communities have volunteered, and that the ones that have volunteered are perhaps those that could have been predicted at the outset. We are further forward that we were in the 1990's, for at least this time the community has approached the waste owner instead of the other way round. This is not a lot of progress to show for 20 years, but we are where we are.</p>
924	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>It is unrealistic to expect the considerable amount of wastes stored at Sellafield to be taken anywhere else. It is therefore very appropriate that the local councils and the local areas are involved. Their commitment can only be expected when a credible safety case has been produced, when the impacts of construction and operation are clear and a community benefits package has been agreed. Until then it is right that they are involved without commitment.</p>
924	9 – Additional comments		<p>I am grateful for this opportunity to give my opinion.</p>
925	1 – Geology	No	<p>There must be far more geologically suitable areas elsewhere in the UK i.e without the risk of aquifers, upward moving groundwater, fractures or earthquake. Why have none of these other areas been looked at; areas of East Anglia geology would appear to be more suitable. Is it just because West Cumbria is a soft touch and deemed to be desperate for any economic crumbs?</p>
925	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>The planning system must completely independent from any separate council bribed department. There must be a full referendum of all people in areas that the councils have shown an 'interest.'</p>
925	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The impact of the dump would be extremely negative, from the impact on tourism and agriculture, to the sheer impact of such a massive construction project. This is without the huge increase in CO2 emissions during construction and waste tipping. It would be yet another development in the single basket of eggs that is Nuclear. There would also be massive impact of radioactive emissions from a fundamentally flawed geology.</p>
925	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Any benefits that a community derives should be from central funding. We should all have equally high standards of infrastructure of schools, hospitals, transport links, arts and culture etc. and not rely on the bribery of grubby money to provide the fundamental services all communities deserve i.e replacement hospitals etc.</p>
925	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>Whilst I believe theoretically a dump could be engineered we cannot possibly know all the criterion, constraints or potential impacts on it. The disasters in Japan were not foreseen, but if it were to go ahead somewhere then</p>

			it must be in the most suitable geological area and W.Cumbria has already been rejected at the previous NIREX Enquiry
925	6 – Inventory	No	It is unclear specifically what is being proposed to be tipped in the dump, it is NOT a disposal facility, it would be a dump / store. The stuff does not go away, it takes hundreds of thousands of years to decay.
925	7 – Siting process	No	It is a completely backwards way round of deciding where a dump can go. All logical methods would assess where the most geological suitable areas were first before proceeding to garner opinion / go along the planning. W.Cumbria has already been geologically rejected. What would have happened if the council area to go down the 'invitation' route comprised quick sand in a severe earthquake zone?
925	8 – Overall views on participation		The councils should not have agreed to take part and must now withdraw from the process. There will be far more suitable areas elsewhere in the country as W Cumbria has already previously been rejected after much enquiry. W.Cumbria has aquifers, fractured rock, earthquake risk and so is completely unsuitable. The councils must withdraw so as to force the proper logical process of finding the most suitable geology for such a dump first. Many of the lower level councils have rejected participation. Councils cannot and should not be bribed by the alleged benefits; what if it was a cigarette factory, arms factory or dangerous DDT chemical plant, does it not matter at all, so long as they get money?
925	9 – Additional comments		<p>The idea that a small scale telephone poll is considered sufficient to gauge the public's opinion is ridiculous. Every household in the councils area should be sent a comprehensive survey to obtain everyone's opinion. Only the complete Yes answers should be taken as an affirmative to the proposals, every other response, including don't know / not sure should be taken as a negative.</p> <p>[Additional email]</p> <p>I would ask that Cumbria County council withdraws immediately from the dump selection process and rejects any further involvement.</p> <p>I believe that the process is fundamentally flawed; instead of looking at the whole of the UK and assessing what areas would be geologically suitable for further study / investigation the government seems to have taken the starting point as to be what council area can be persuaded to put themselves forward to host one, irrespective of the local geology.</p> <p>West Cumbria has been shown in the NIREX enquiry to be geologically unsuitable and there must be other areas of the country far more suitable; why are investigations / assessments not also being carried out in these areas at the same time?</p>

			<p>Economically West Cumbria needs, and should be encouraging, a greater diversity of industries, not an increasing reliance on a single, dominant one. History has shown the results of relying on a single dominant industry / company in the local area. Tourism is also a major sector of the economy and any significant development of the Nuclear industry at Sellafield must surely jeopardise it.</p> <p>The selection process itself is fundamentally flawed, the geological area is unsuitable and the 'benefits' are, at best, extremely limited.</p> <p>I therefore reiterate that Cumbria County council, and the other Councils involved, cease any further participation</p>
926	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>Given where the process has reached this seems a sensible conclusion. It is worth noting that as the work goes forwards the uncertainty associated with the geological setting may continue to be an aspect that needs to be managed. As a geologist myself I'm happy with the concept of building a reasoned argument for geological understanding based on the information available, recognising that you cannot always have all of the information that you may like to have. The partnership / community may need to understand how it will balance the nature of geology as a science with other factors around the project.</p>
926	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	<p>I agree, and it is good to see some faith placed in the regulatory regime that we have and those who are charged with implementing it, both of which are critical to successful operation of the nuclear industry as a whole. There is always room for improvement, but the current situation is robust.</p> <p>I think that the consultation document could have also considered international comparisons in this area, noting that part of research and development includes working with disposal programmes elsewhere and ensuring that lessons are learnt and shared, particularly in areas such as safety case development. I believe this to be working well at the current time, which should also give confidence.</p> <p>The uncertainty around whether the programme would come under the scope of the MIPU is probably unhelpful. However, as the position becomes more clear, what is essential is that the authority assessing the application (whichever it may be) is supported, funded and resourced to the level needed to assess an application of this type and significance.</p>
926	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I would have liked to see more consideration and description of potential futures for Cumbria with a repository and without. Job creation isn't just about the facility itself, it is also about the other prospects for the area that a geological disposal facility would unlock, for example development of future nuclear business. This vision has</p>

			<p>not been shown and likewise an idea of the future of Cumbria without a repository has also not been set out. What do the alternatives look like? What direction does the area take without a facility. I think this context should be developed to facilitate future discussion and consultation on the project (should it go ahead).</p> <p>Based on a quick look through the Cumbria Tourism website, the most recent data on visitors I can find suggests that in 2009 fifteen million visits were made to Cumbria and it brought in £1Bn. I would question any suggestion that a repository would impact on this when these numbers are achieved with Sellafield already located here.</p> <p>I think it is important that the local community, or perhaps more importantly its leaders take a stronger line on what relationship they want to have with the nuclear industry and either reject it or get firmly behind it. There is a significant opportunity to take a view that the nuclear industry, and even the waste, is an asset and not a burden. Continued reticence about the industry will only further negativity rather than protect against it.</p>
926	4 – Community benefits	Yes	<p>I agree with the opinion set out and in many respects think it is too early for this question. Part of me does query why there should be benefits "Beyond those which derive directly from the construction and operation of the facility such as the jobs at the facility, or roads constructed to service the facility directly" Surely a community is really interested in a sustainable future and the things in the quote above amount to part of that? As I note in my comments on the previous question, there is an opportunity to view this as a huge opportunity capitalising on the already present skills, opportunities and waste in the area.</p> <p>Having said that, I also recognise that this could be huge bonus opportunity for the community and carefully managed it could have a transformational impact on West Cumbria. The negotiations need to be carefully managed to ensure a successful outcome for the area that at the same time doesn't attract rhetoric around "bribes" etc.</p>
926	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I agree with the opinions, but I am slightly uncomfortable with the inclusion of this topic in the consultation. Should the programme go forward I think there is a need to clearly set out what would be "up for grabs" in any consultation on these aspects. The engineering and design will be scrutinised by Regulators and perhaps this is an area where a host community needs to trust their expertise in representing the communities interests.</p>
926	6 – Inventory	No	<p>I do not agree that the host community should have a particular influence on the inventory that goes into a GDF. The development of a GDF is to perform a significant function of national importance. It either does that job or it fails to do that job. Performing some percentage of that job as a result of community interests doesn't address this national need and therefore fails. Why would a project proceed with such a risk?</p> <p>The legislative and regulatory processes should be enough to provide confidence in whether the inventory is</p>

			being managed in a way that is safe for people and the environment.
926	7 – Siting process	Yes	I think the Partnership is in the best place to assess this and so it would be hard not to agree.
926	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Absolutely yes. Surely there is nothing to be lost and the potential for very much to be gained by staying in the process. As a resident of the area, with a career in the nuclear industry, I fully support involvement in the process, which I think is essential to a vibrant and sustainable future for West Cumbria. However, such a future will only really work if there is a positive and beneficial relationship with the nuclear industry.</p> <p>I think future engagement should include a vision of the future with and without this facility because I think the question is more about Cumbria's future, than the future of a Geological Disposal Facility. Critical to this, is the vision of our community leaders for the area, because good strong leadership will be essential whatever happens next. There is an opportunity, but it cannot be delivered against a backdrop of infighting and uncertainty with respect to the relationship the area wants to have with the nuclear industry.</p>
926	9 – Additional comments		<p>I note the consultation has avoided the fact that the majority of the waste is already here. I suppose I can understand why that has been left out, but I think it is a significant issue. If the facility is not here then the waste has to get from here to wherever the facility is, meaning the transport of huge amounts of waste through the area. Or perhaps worse it resides at the surface here for eternity. Do either of those sound acceptable? This may be a thorny issue to bring into any discussion, but it is really, needs to be considered and should be a part of people's decision.</p> <p>And finally, I wish to state that the views expressed in this whole response are entirely my own and not those of my employer, the NDA.</p>
927	1 – Geology	No	We believe there are resources in the in the South West Cumbria that may be attractive for extraction in the future.
927	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	We believe a location for this facility should be selected based on it being the most suitable, not based on who volunteers. This methodology will always fall short of providing the most safe and secure facility.
927	3 – Impacts	No	We would be more cautious of the likely impacts and how this would affect tourism in the area which is a large income for local economy. The area's natural beauty should be preserved at all costs.
927	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/	Currently without any commitment from the government this cannot be considered in the process as value

		Partly	added.
927	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	I agree it is difficult to finalise the design at this stage. However, this comes back to the selection of the most suitable site in the UK based on its likely impact and safe operation. In my mind it is the site that is most critical and the approach that has been taken has limited the options available.
927	6 – Inventory	No	There is no firm commitment here and I deem it as not possible to judge what the final facility will hold, once the facility is in place it is likely that it will be extended to meet future demands.
927	7 – Siting process	No	I believe the siting process is flawed and does not take into consideration the best interest of the country. Moving to the next phase will delay the process if Cumbria is defined as not being completely appropriate this will put pressure on the area to move forward with an unsuitable option. Without having a range of sites across the country to compare the process will always be flawed.
927	8 – Overall views on participation		No, they should participate in the scheme and should insist a worthwhile selection process is constructed which involves a range of sites selected on their suitability.
928	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
928	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
928	3 – Impacts	Yes	I believe the overall impact of a Repository in West Cumbria would be positive with job creation being a key factor in this opinion.
928	4 – Community benefits	Yes	It is important that the community is suitably rewarded for hosting the Repository on behalf of the nation. These benefits must also be sustained over the life of the Repository rather than just an initial "pay off" for hosting. Though there would definitely need to be an element of both to support large improvements in the region's infrastructure and economic status from the outset.
928	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
928	6 – Inventory	Yes	Whilst the inventory information provided at this stage would appear reasonable, I would support the continued re-processing of spent fuel in West Cumbria to recycle the fuel materials for beneficial re-use with only true waste products being disposed of in the Repository.

928	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
928	8 – Overall views on participation		I firmly believe that Copeland should take part in the search for a Repository. Our community is already home to much of the waste and has right people and skill to achieve the disposal objective. Securing sufficient suitable reward for hosting the Repository on behalf of the UK is key to the agreeing to host. I would hope that the Repository would form part of an invigorated economy in West Cumbria with the nuclear industry playing an important role in a diverse economic environment. I believe the right technical solutions are available that will ensure a safe and secure facility.
928	9 – Additional comments		I think maintaining the open and transparent approach the the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership has adopted and encouraged in others is an important element in ensuring the trust of the community in this important decision.
930	8 – Overall views on participation		No, no no... I would like them to withdraw from the consultation. It is proved that the ground is not suitable for this type of development.
931	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	A wider range of opinions needs to be considered. Can the work so far be reviewed by another independant specialist? The previous work on the Nirex study needs to be reexamined. Importantly, the issue of the majority of the proposed area being classed as a National Park does not seem to have been addressed.
931	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	If a potential site is identified and work potentially does not proceed until 15 or more years later, will further research be carried out, particularly in terms of technological dvelopments (either in informing geological surveys or nuclear waste storage)? If an IPC takes over the project why does Cumbria County Council/LDNPA lose it's right to do anything other than make recommendations and comments? Members of the public need to be better informed of the decisions being made and discussions held - these should be promoted so that there is a public awareness of what is happening.Particular attention should be paid to safety issues outlined in reports such as 'Rock solid?'.
931	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	1000-1150 jobs over 140 years is an incredibly low number. Whilst in the short term (whilst a repository is built) it may be advantages for local communities, these figures show that in the long term it is not. The reliance on trining provided so that local people could train and therefore compete for jobs at/building the repository would clearly be subject to funding, and funding is always subject to the wider economy and thus uncertain (as we have seen in the past 4 years). This concern also applies to the Brand protection offered; plus it would be a

			long term consideration for many businesses and the National Park as a whole. Tourism is our most profitable industry and we should be very wary of anything that might decrease visitor numbers further (the economic downturn having had a clear impact).
931	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	The 12 principles listed are sound and reasoned. However, the overall question as to how much benefit communities will gain through various benefits versus the amount of potential revenue lost, for example, from the tourism industry, needs to be carefully weighed up and considered. The benefits would need to be legally binding in some way to avoid them from becoming subject to cuts in funding at a later stage. This is incredibly important to communities.
931	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	Retrievability and monitoring are clearly important issues. Surely it would be necessary to evolve sound monitoring processes to be used in a repository before one was built? Extensive testing of such monitoring equipment would also need to take place - how does this effect the timescale? Why has this technology not been developed, yet a repository is being suggested? How are other countries monitoring their own repositories?
931	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	There is an enormous difference between the baseline and upper inventory estimates; given that we are now two years on, has the upper inventory increased even further? Will communities have the last word on the amount stored in a repository - particularly in regard to the future if consumption and therefore waste of nuclear materials continues increasing?
931	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
931	8 – Overall views on participation		Although I am reassured by the research undertaken so far, I do not think that a repository is viable in an area that is so dependant on tourism. I cannot see how the short term advantages (benefits and jobs provided etc) outweigh the long term implications of a massive construction which would not enhance the environment in terms of quality of life for locals, or attractability for visitors or future residents of this area. It's National Park status should be taken into greater consideration. I think thaat the time, money, expertise and hard work could be put to better use finding a alternative sites or, indeed, looking at alternative solutions.
933	1 – Geology	No	Why do you discredit Dr. Smythe? It seems unlikely to me that his view that all of Cumbria should be eliminated as a potential site on geological grounds should be ignored. As the only independent person you have enlisted in this study (it is my beleif the other two are part of corporations and have thus received financial gain) it seems to me that his views should have the most validity and not the least...

933	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The infrastructure of west Cumbria is incompatible with such a large repository. The roads are already running over capacity in the peak holiday seasons without adding further lorries carrying nuclear waste
933	3 – Impacts	No	Tourism in the area will decline. It would also undermine our application to become a world heritage site.
933	4 – Community benefits	No	Community Benefits package would not help those areas who will really need it - it is the Lake District National park who are going to loose out on huge amounts of revenue through tourism and yet community care package is set to go to Allerdale and Copeland. The LD is an area of outstanding natural beauty. This is not a matter of money. It is a matter of doing what is right. You cannot 'pay' your way into making local communities feel that they 'want' a repository in Cumbria. It is morally wrong.
933	5 – Design and engineering	No	Too much overground will be a real eyesore to people visiting the national park.
933	6 – Inventory	No	Overseas waste is bound to come to this repository if it is given the go ahead. It also gives the go ahead for further building of nuclear stations which are unsustainable in the long term.
933	7 – Siting process	No	There is insufficient evident on the area to support the repository go ahead.
933	8 – Overall views on participation		No - it is nothing to do with Cumbria of we decide that we are unsuitable hosts.
934	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
934	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
934	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
934	4 – Community benefits	No	No comment was made
934	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made

934	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
934	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
935	1 – Geology	No	<p>The brief for the BGS screening survey was unrealistically narrow and so prevented BGS from giving the obvious conclusion that the whole of West Cumbria is unsuitable because of its proximity to an area of mountain building with distorted and fractured rocks and steeply sloping geological features that do not comply with internationally agreed criteria for a repository site.</p> <p>The government's proposals recognise that dangerous waste will be leached from the site into either the Irish Sea or surrounding land, which is unacceptable and not in accordance with internationally agreed standards.</p>
935	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>A visit to the NII web site showed clearly that it had consistently failed to ensure safety at Sellafield and other nuclear sites. There is no realistic prospect that the name change to ONR will improve matters.</p> <p>The NDA reports to the Treasury and so its priority is cost, not safety.</p> <p>Planning authorities are not competent to judge the safety issues, that is not part of their brief.</p>
935	3 – Impacts	No	Since the geology is patently unsuitable, if a repository were to be built in West Cumbria the dangers would outweigh the benefits.
935	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Experience shows that no government can be trusted to honour promises for even a few years.</p> <p>You suggest seeking assurances for around 100 years but that only reaches the start of potential disbenefits, ie leaching of dangerous waste to the ground surface. The repository will continue to be a threat for tens of thousands of years, longer than the combined lives of ancient Egyptian, Greek, Roman and current European governments. There is no prospect of community benefits lasting 1% of that time.</p>
935	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>The government's own report recommending consideration of a repository says its use must be restricted to existing waste. It absolutely rejects using it for waste from new nuclear power stations. This shows that a satisfactory safety case for the repository cannot be made and it is only the unacceptable dangers of existing waste storage that justify moving waste to the new repository.</p> <p>While Cumbria may be forced to retain existing waste, we should not volunteer to host a repository that cannot</p>

			be acceptably safe.
935	6 – Inventory	No	<p>We should absolutely reject the use of any site in Cumbria for storing waste from new nuclear power stations. The government's own report says a new repository should not be used for that purpose and only the pressing need to improve the safety of existing waste storage can justify construction of the new repository.</p> <p>The Minister's decision to accept the report's recommendation to consider construction of a repository but ignore its absolute rejection of its use for new nuclear waste is perverse and therefore open to challenge by Judicial Review.</p> <p>Cumbria should not volunteer to host a repository that cannot be acceptably safe and could be mis-used for new nuclear waste.</p>
935	7 – Siting process	No	It is wrong in principle to begin with voluntarism. A search for the best sites on technical grounds should be completed first.
935	8 – Overall views on participation		We should not have begun this process and should stop it immediately. We know that no other area in Britain will willingly accept the repository. If we show any sign of considering its acceptance we will be seen by politicians as a soft option and have it forced on us, regardless of current assurances of no commitment.
935	9 – Additional comments		<p>The current selection process is a sham intended to maintain an illusion that the government can find a reasonable means of disposing of waste from new nuclear power stations until the irrational decision to build them has passed. The government already knows from many years of study and hundreds of millions of pounds of expenditure that there is no suitable site in West Cumbria and that no other part of the country will accept a repository.</p> <p>We should absolutely reject the storage of waste from any new nuclear power station in Cumbria, either at Sellafield, Drigg or any new site, and challenge the government and proposed developers to explain in detail how they will deal with the waste as part of the safety case for any new power station construction.</p>
936	1 – Geology	No	I am aware that the NIREX enquirey found this site unsuitable for nuclear waste disposal. During living in the area over 8 years, we often felt tremors and others would be reported on the local news. In addition to this there are plans in place for facilities to extract gas in Lancashire using hidrolic fracturing which will have unpredictable results on neighbouring geology. I strongly disagree with the initial opinions on geology.

936	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I DO NOT agree with these opinions. Again, I need to draw your attention to Nirex enquiry and the unsafe geology in which the waste will be held. In addition to this, transport of fuel across and around the country would put people at risk across the district. Absolutely nothing can guarantee this disposal area will be safe for as long as it will be toxic. In addition you have not outlined the likely results should the safety be compromised, which, as you say yourself is not 100%. How can we consent to the treatment of this land when we do not know the full spectrum of possible side effects? There seem no answers forthcoming from this document. I would expect a full list of possible effects due to radioactive leakage on humans, wildlife, livestock, water etc. so we can judge the full risk of this disposal site with accountable transparency.
936	3 – Impacts	No	I do not think this is an appropriate site for nuclear waste.
936	4 – Community benefits	No	These community benefits are very short sighted compared to the longevity of the radioactive waste. In addition to this, the disposal will affect people across the country and beyond. This is a world first.
936	5 – Design and engineering	No	No, this is not suitable as it appears to be far too risky.
936	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	This does not address the long term use of energy or encourage reduction of energy use. I do not wish for international or national waste to be transported across the country. I do not wish for Cumbria to be an experiment for the world's first dump of this kind when it has been proven to be unsuitable in an extensive investigation recently (NIREX)
936	7 – Siting process	No	Cumbria is not an appropriate place for a repository, as detailed in the nirex enquiry.
936	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I think this is a national issues, so limiting decisions to borough councils also limits dialogue about wider issues, to which this repository is pertinent. I think that finding a site would imply to local people that it was happening with commitment, and that it would not be possible to do this any other way. It would identify how the stakeholders in this process could manipulate these communities, especially in areas of poverty or low income. I would like the councils concerned to use their right to withdraw their involvement in any way in order to protect their residents and land.</p> <p>In addition to this, this question is unclear and makes no sense. You can't consult areas. Do you mean consulting the councils? Yes, you have a legal obligation.</p>
936	9 – Additional comments		This repository is an accident waiting to happen and there needs to be a wider discussion and consultation about this. Many people, both local and from further afield are not aware of this, yet are regular visitors or residents of the area. I'm not aware of this in the national press or any significant high profile campaigns.

937	1 – Geology	No	Some isotopes in high-level radioactive wastes can take hundreds of thousands of years to decay until they are finally harmless. There is no way for us to be sure that we can isolate radioactive waste deep underground such that no harmful quantities of radioactivity can reach the surface for the lengths of time we should be considering.
937	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>In geological and evolutionary terms burying our waste in this way is a very hasty decision. Future generations may regret it, but be powerless to fix it.</p> <p>5.2 The focus on the “residents, workforce and environment” of today and the near future demonstrate no thought for communities and ecosystems that may be here hundreds, thousands or tens of thousands of years from now. Or if they do, the NDA RWMD is either delusional, arrogant, or both to suppose it could be satisfied that we have the capability or processes to ensure their protection. Who in 1900 could have accurately predicted the wars, revolutions, religious tensions, resource depletion or environmental degradation of the century then to come?</p> <p>5.3 On page 42 you admit you don’t even know “what planning process might be in place [in 15 years] time”. Uncertainties of future conflict, environmental damage, financial and/or governmental breakdown, wholesale societal change or even collapse, give “Site Security Plans” no long-term validity.</p> <p>5.4 Page 48. Today’s “sound science and good engineering practise [for] developing any future case for geological disposal” would preclude solutions to issues we are as yet unaware of. Our burial of high-level radioactive waste deep under West Cumbria within the next few decades would hugely compound the problems faced by future generations, who may or may not have the resources needed to act effectively.</p>
937	3 – Impacts	No	<p>6.1 Considerations of “construction such as noise and dust; changes to investment in the area, employment and population; traffic impacts; and possible effects on the visual or physical environment and on tourism” trivialise and obfuscate the issue.</p> <p>6.2 Criterion a) is simply not possible to determine even for tens, let alone thousands of generations. Criterion b) misleadingly uses the term “long-term direction” with reference to plans for perhaps only a few short decades.</p> <p>6.3 “Fears of a negative impact due to damage to the tourist industry” are insignificant when compared with the potential for genuinely long-term damage to the DNA of the region’s biological occupants and visitors. Concerns over “landscape impacts as well as land and property prices” of a repository being sited in West Cumbria serve to distract from questions concerning the long-term health of what we now think of as North</p>

			<p>West England and beyond. Brand protection won't shield flora and fauna from damage caused if ever exposed to certain decaying isotopes.</p> <p>6.4 Local employment provision from building the repository is hugely outweighed by the negative implications for other people within and without the region.</p> <p>Genuinely "long-term implications for the urban and rural economy" are not knowable.</p>
937	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Community benefits package – absolutely not "long-term" compared with the necessary safe operational life of a repository.</p> <p>7.2 The phrase "appropriate benefits package" would be more honestly replaced by "a financial incentive to persuade those living close to the proposed repository site to adopt an extremely parochial view of something relevant for hundreds of miles and thousands of generations".</p> <p>7.3 There is no merit in benchmarking similarly morally and philosophically flawed processes. People will expect what they are told is likely and what others have got elsewhere. Financial incentives are bound to unduly influence local communities to make decisions properly left to the wider community.</p> <p>The expectation of community benefits could mean any or all of the following -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the financially depressed local community is opportunistic and sees this as a route to secure financial aid; 2) a certain level of sweeteners are needed to persuade locals to accept the repository; 3) financial investment is necessary to distract local people from the wider issues and to seduce them into adopting a narrow view. <p>When considering high-level radioactive waste storage all of the UK should be viewed as near to the site of a repository and any "benefits" should go to all who may be affected by waste leakage.</p> <p>The desire for community benefits to be agreed in advance, but not paid too early, sounds suspiciously like attempts to assuage doubts over the morality of accepting sweeteners.</p>
937	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>I agree that retrievability should be a design requirement, but believe it would be better to opt for a shallow repository whilst setting a mandate for the nuclear industry to develop safer solutions to this long-term problem.</p> <p>I firmly believe that this issue directly affects a far wider community and that therefore the views of local communities should have no special consideration. The views of the wider population should be considered alongside those of the nuclear industry, its regulators and the Government, and the precautionary principle</p>

			<p>applied to the decision making process in lieu of the contributions of future generations.</p> <p>Whilst future generations may be left to decide whether to backfill vaults and tunnels in what is in reality a very few years' time, we should consider that any decision taken in the next few years to build a deep repository will adversely affect their ability to choose a wholly different solution.</p>
937	6 – Inventory	No	<p>Since Governments have very short lifespans, roughly equivalent to that of a golden hamster, the presumption a Government may make that only UK radioactive waste should be disposed of in this country is fairly meaningless. Any future Government – whether UK, English, European regional, or other - that has future sovereignty over the locality chosen will be just as vulnerable to promises of financial aid as the locality is now.</p>
937	7 – Siting process	No	<p>The “Right of Withdrawal” is likely to be withdrawn by a government under financial pressure.</p>
937	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>“Voluntarism” is not appropriate to the siting of something of at least national importance. This issue affects the whole UK (at least) and more than 3,000 future generations given current life expectancy rates. Allerdale, Copeland and other local administrations can assist in the search for a shallow, retrievable repository and for better solutions to the possession of such extremely toxic material, but should have no special consideration to site one in their area.</p>
937	9 – Additional comments		<p>I am struck throughout by the lack of clear perspective, particularly regarding time-scales. This waste will require safe storage for at least tens of thousands of years.</p> <p>Far too much attention is paid to the effects on things that can easily be seen and measured, such as tourism, employment and the immediate impacts of traffic. Risks associated with radioactive waste storage go way beyond such local and short-term considerations. The Roman Empire failed to see how replacing North African farmers with “estate managers” from other territories, in return for their loyal service, aided the desertification of highly-productive farming lands. We should seek to avoid this short-term trap and begin modelling the consequences of our plans over several thousand years.</p> <p>I therefore see no logical alternative to the conclusion that the entire premise of this exercise is seriously flawed and I cannot give it my support.</p>
941	1 – Geology	No	<p>I believe it is a short sighted and selfish solution to attempt to dispose of waste in this area. I wholeheartedly oppose the plan. I believe the energy industry should look towards safe, renewable sources rather than risking the natural resources and safety of the population of this country.</p>

			Please reconsider this ill thought out plan for disposal.
942	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
942	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
942	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	I think that the road and rail system in West Cumbria would need to be significantly improved so that a GDF could be constructed and operated without significant negative impact on the daily lives of the local residents. This is particularly clear when you see that the best roads in West Cumbria serve the areas excluded by the BGS survey and those areas not excluded are generally served by less substantial roads where a large amount of construction or operations traffic would have a big impact.
942	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	I think that West Cumbria (as a relatively deprived area) should benefit substantially for providing the nation with this service / facility. The type of benefits should have been identified as a 'starter for ten' already but work should start on this without delay. Public opinion should be sought on the component parts. I would like to see better transport links, far greater amenities for local residents of all ages and a significant push on marketing the area.
942	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
942	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made
942	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	I think that there needs to be sufficient local engagement in the decision process and this should be at the parish level, not just the borough council level. The various parishes across Copeland have their own characteristics and needs and we would not want to be in a position where the parish council were against the plan but it was imposed on them by the borough council not exercising their right of withdrawal because the specific parish was considered to be outvoted.
942	8 – Overall views on participation		Provided that the local communities have a voice down at the parish level, I think that we should continue to take part in the search.

943	1 – Geology	No	The NIREX studies in the 1990s spent many millions of pounds to determine that much of West Cumbria is unsuitable. There is no evidence that the rest of West Cumbria would be suitable. Indeed there is evidence that it would be unsuitable, due to the complex nature of the geology with many fault lines and very steep angles of the underlying rock, compared to much simpler areas where repositories have been sited in other countries. In other countries a search over the whole country has been undertaken first before asking for local backing for a repository; this should be the same in the UK. Instead, it seems to be forced upon West Cumbria as a bribe to keep employment and nuclear industry in the area, when actually the geology is unsuitable and we should look elsewhere, and also minimise further highly radioactive waste by closing nuclear power stations and minimising new build, concentrating instead on local and renewable energy and energy saving activities.
943	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	I think that there is too much pressure on these agencies and that they are not sufficiently independent, as they are in other countries. I think that this will mean that there is pressure on these agencies to ensure that they agree to a repository. I do not think that there is sufficient thought given to how to keep such a facility safe for the tens of thousands of years needed before radioactivity has dropped to a safe level. This is a far longer time than human civilisation or any writing systems and I do not think that such long term safety has been addressed.
943	3 – Impacts	No	I don't think that enough weight has been given to the disastrous effects on the local beauty, the likely devastating effects when radiation leaks due to unsuitable geology and the problem of further bonding West Cumbria to the nuclear industry for generations to come without any plan for diversification of industry. The fact that so much of the West Cumbrian economy is reliant on the nuclear industry is a reason to diversify away from nuclear, and not to further tie us to this dangerous industry for generations to come. There will be a massive pile of earth formed in a beauty spot, and hundreds of lorries transporting waste on unsuitable roads. If this repository is to be built it should be built elsewhere in the country with primarily more suitable geology, and also not a place of internationally renowned beauty, and better roads.
943	4 – Community benefits	No	Again, this is another way to further set West Cumbria into further reliance on the nuclear industry, when, for its economic and social well-being, it needs to diversify into other industries. The money would, indeed, be a bribe, would find its way into already rich business while doing little to relieve poverty and would not adequately compensate for the massive disruption and health problems that a repository would cause. The fact that this money depends on the repository shows that the government does not really care about West Cumbrians; it should be relieving poverty and isolation regardless of the possibility of West Cumbria furthering its nuclear plans.
943	5 – Design and engineering	No	I think that if the councils agree to this "preliminary stage" when the overall design is still so unknown, the community will, in effect, be locked into remaining a candidate for the repository, regardless of the promises that

			we can reverse the decision later. It is still far too unknown, and there is insufficient design detail to convince us that the facility will remain safe in the future.
943	6 – Inventory	No	It is far too uncertain how much, and what kind, of waste is planned now, or in the future, for the local councils to put us on this track to host the repository, in a geologically unsuitable area. If we agree to this at this stage we will effectively be locking West Cumbria into hosting the repository, even if there is legally an option to withdraw, because there will be a presumption that councils will not withdraw after money is spent on the project. At this stage, with so much uncertainty about the type and volume of waste, but knowing the large disruption and danger to health that even the lower boundary of waste volume would incur, it would be wrong for the council to go ahead.
943	7 – Siting process	No	There is already too much presumption that West Cumbria will host the repository, as it is the only community in the country whose council has volunteered for this programme. Instead, the suitable geology should be found first, not the other way around. I do not believe that, if the councils agree to this step, that the government will honour a right to withdraw in the future. I think that the agencies responsible for safety and correct siting of such a facility are insufficiently independent to ensure that it is safely sited.
943	8 – Overall views on participation		I do not think that they should. I think that there will be too much assumption in the future that they will host the repository, the NIREX findings in the 1990s have been largely ignored, as the geology is unsuitable, it will make West Cumbria too dependent on one, dangerous industry, it will severely reduce opportunities for diversification in West Cumbria, and it will be devastating for health, and the local beauty which is renowned throughout the world.
945	1 – Geology	Yes	There are options but the process going forward should look at both the salt deposits towards Carlisle and the West Cumbria options.
945	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	Previous experience - Longlands, Drigg - shows a tendency for big ugly buildings and fences. No attempt is made to blend into the scenery, although hiding the ugly building by “landscaping” has been tried. Planning options should force developments to be of traditional Lakeland stone and slate.
945	3 – Impacts	No	House prices would be affected so there must be a compensation for homeowners.
945	4 – Community benefits	No	Too many organisations want their fingers in the pie, its being driven by greed –this is wrong.

			<p>The “package” needs to be defined clearly, as must the split between organisations. Local PARISHES should control their own portion of the money - so for example Seascale could decide to spend it on, say, a sports centre, Gosforth a new Public Hall. Possibly a theatre etc etc. Copeland should only get part of the money, similarly County Council.</p> <p>Else you could find a parish against the idea but forced to accept it by County and Borough!</p>
945	5 – Design and engineering	No	Design must blend in with the locality not like Drigg or Sellafield.
945	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	More research needed on disposal of HA waste.
945	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
945	8 – Overall views on participation		No reason why not, but if the search becomes disruptive, then compensation should go to the Parishes who are disrupted.
946	1 – Geology	No	<p>Disposal was rejected during 1990s.</p> <p>Massive ground water and flooding problems in West Cumbria.</p> <p>Huge excavations and spoil heaps will discourage tourism - our major employer and source of revenue.</p> <p>Is the geology really suitable?</p>
946	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Past experience of disasters involving nuclear energy – Chernobly, Fukushima – have left the landscape blighted for generations.</p> <p>Has any other survey been done to find more suitable sites countrywide?</p> <p>There have been reported incidences of skimmed procedures at Sellafield. Human error and indifferent geological barriers are a huge worry to those of us whose descendents will live here.</p>
946	3 – Impacts	Not	Positive – Some grant funded and some jobs. Yes – retail and hospitality jobs could be found too with

		answered	<p>planning. Plus construction jobs for local affordable housing and repair and maintenance of empty properties.</p> <p>The spoil heaps alone will be huge and on surface for many years.</p>
946	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>What are the benefits?</p> <p>Vague promises are not persuasive.</p>
946	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>The impact is too huge to understand. How many tourists make it a priority to visit Sellafield visitor centre?</p> <p>You are blighting a district (The Solway Coast), which people are just starting to appreciate.</p>
946	6 – Inventory	No	<p>More nuclear power stations – more waste disposal.</p>
946	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>We are at stage 3</p> <p>It is convenient for our councils to accept without real consultation.</p> <p>Nuclear power is a nightmare. Any idea we can manage is arrogance.</p> <p>A few top people will be in the Civil Honours List and the payouts are too slight to benefit destroying the area.</p>
946	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>We are the only area that has consented to consider this.</p> <p>Has any attempt been made to find a safe geological site in other parts of the country?</p>
946	9 – Additional comments		<p>I fear we are being railroaded into providing a nuclear waste disposal latrine convenient for the affluent rest of the country but we need more genuine information.</p> <p>There is apathy locally because people feel this “consultation” is a sham. It is a done deal.</p>
947	1 – Geology	No	<p>I do not accept that there are areas of West Cumbria worth further investigation.</p> <p>After ten years of geological exploration in the 1990s, the rocks of West Cumbria were found to be too porous, too saturated by moving water and too faulted and fractured. Water is a natural carrier of radioactivity and fissures also allow gases to rise to the surface.</p>

			<p>The appeal by Nirex Ltd resulted in a public inquiry and was rejected by the Secretary of State, John Gummer. Although this chapter refers (4.3) to the areas ruled out by the GBS report the Nirex survey was sufficiently broad to rule out the whole of West Cumbria for geological and hydro geological reasons. The report noted that Sellafield's site had not been chosen for any scientific reasons and "no national or regional benefit is to be gained from continuing investigation in this area". The inspector, Chris McDonald, in a letter to the Guardian (June 2007) pointed out that, as a site for nuclear waste disposal, "the location failed to meet internationally agreed criteria for the suitability of the rocks".</p> <p>Further exploration should be elsewhere in Britain.</p>
947	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	In view of the unsuitability of the site it is pointless considering safety and security. In any case it would need to be an international body.
947	3 – Impacts	No	Again, this is pointless in view of Q1.
947	4 – Community benefits	No	This looks very much like the Government trying to bribe a community to accept a nuclear disposal site in a place scientifically unsuitable.
947	5 – Design and engineering	No	The problem is no site has yet been found in Britain, let alone Cumbria, for such a GDF.
947	6 – Inventory	No	All this, particularly Box 28, is simplistic in the extreme.
947	7 – Siting process	No	Fig 13 – "We are here". Sorry, but we are not. Before Stage 1 should be the geological investigation – which in fact took place in the 1990s, and the answer was "unsuitable".
947	8 – Overall views on participation		No more money should be spent on the research. Wasn't £400 million enough?
947	9 – Additional comments		<p>Sellafield should be gradually phased out. We should approach other countries (Finland, Sweden) for the disposal of existing waste.</p> <p>No new nuclear reactors should be built before a thorough geological investigation of the site. And National Parks should be avoided.</p>

949	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	My understanding is that the geology of most of the area is totally unsuitable for any long-term storage of nuclear waste. Although some areas look more feasible, have we issues about water flow which cause concern should this be contaminated – and there is no guarantee of stability over the long time frame involved.
949	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	Given the geological nature of Cumbria, it is not possible to guarantee safety and security, regardless of the procedures followed by the regulators.
949	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	The negative opinions are realistic from my point of view. The risks do not justify the positive potential.
949	4 – Community benefits	No	Community benefits are a bribe to persuade locals to accept an inherently dangerous proposal. There can be no adequate compensation for the dangerous proposals, which risk the health, welfare and indeed the survival of people in Cumbria and beyond. As I understand it, the muster station in case of emergency has been Scotch Corner – and radioactive waste presents a greater threat than any current activity, over thousands of years.
949	5 – Design and engineering	No	Significant work remains to be done before we can be sure about design and engineering issues raised in the report, which are acknowledged. If these address the information from geological expertise, there will be no possibility of taking this scheme forward – voluntarism is not enough, and should not be the first criterion. Even very deep storage, well beyond what is proposed, does not guarantee security from disturbed water flows or potential destabilising shifts of rock formation.
949	7 – Siting process	No	It is hard to understand how we have reached the current stage, as Cumbria is not a suitable site geologically for a repository. Initial geological screening at Stage 2 should have been recognised as identifying the dangerous unsuitability of the site. It is surely now time for the decision to be made to withdraw from the process before more money is wasted on an inherently unsafe and unwelcome proposal.
949	8 – Overall views on participation		The prime sites are those deemed to be geologically suitable and safe. Councillors and residents in Allerdale and Copeland should make that clear and ensure that no nuclear waste is deposited in their areas. There is no reason why they should not take part in the search for somewhere suitable for a repository, but they should certainly not make any commitment to have it in this area.
949	9 – Additional comments		Suitability of a site should be the first priority, with voluntarism desirable but secondary to safety.
950	1 – Geology	No	I think data and statistics are now being skewed. It has been shown once to be unsuitable, now I feel as

			though it's a case of forging ahead regardless as no other part of the country will accept it.
950	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	As long as the partnership will listen.
950	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	The benefits include job creation. But I am not employed in the industry and rely on tourism for my income. My family are grown up and have left the area. My main concern is that I will not benefit, I will be harmed by it in 2 ways. - 1. Loss of holiday let income 2. Reduced value of my property.
950	4 – Community benefits	No	We definitely need a benefits package. This is essential to all homeowners, especially those who rely on tourism, or who do not benefit from jobs on site. I want the value of my home protected. This is not the same as community benefits i.e. infrastructure, jobs etc. These will not help my family.
950	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
950	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	I'm just not able to say, not enough information – its still uncertain. People like me i.e. Mrs Average, are not able to comment on many of these questions as they are not clearly explained. We just know we feel as though we will not be listed to if we object to the repository.
950	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	I wish I could believe all that was written ... “The Government says a repository only be put in an area where people are willing to have it” Mmmm!! I will, again, believe that when it happens ... or hopefully, doesn't happen!
950	8 – Overall views on participation		Well bearing in mind that most of Allerdale has been ruled out, looks like Copeland is the only council left in! South Copeland at that. Again, I would like to believe it, the “without any commitment” part especially.

951	1 – Geology	Yes	The geology in West Cumbria must be suitable to have a repository/store.
951	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Must be safe, secure and limit the impact to the environment.
951	3 – Impacts	Yes	West Cumbria must be compensated for any impact a repository or store would have.
951	4 – Community benefits	Yes	They must be real community benefits for having a depository/store. The best schools The best hospital The best roads Copeland should be the best area in the country to work, rest and play. The best sports facilities, parks and play area. Also a great football and rugby league team.
951	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	All inventory must be retrievable.
951	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	All inventory must be retrievable.
951	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	The process is far too long. We need a repository/store now.
951	8 – Overall views on participation		The repository /store should be located on the Sellafield site.
952	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	The weight of expert opinion supports the initial opinions – but with the very big proviso that detailed work needs to be done. What is not made clear is what the impact of further detailed work would be – when this would take place, the extent of the work, landscape disturbance of exploratory works, traffic impact of these works, period of works and assurances regarding the restoration of the exploratory site back to its original state.
952	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	2.2.i Whilst agreeing in general with the initial opinions (as without having looked at the supporting documents) and accepting that all this is at a preliminary stage, I feel that cast-iron regulatory processes need to be in place throughout the life of the depository (thousands of years?!) with, if needs be an independent overview of these.

			<p>ii The above does raise the issue, however, what safeguards will be put into place if some of the waste has a life of thousands of years, especially if facilities are built in to retrieve some or all of the waste in the future?</p> <p>iii Again, accepting the initial opinions regarding the planning process, as a retired Chief Planning Officer, I am also aware of this inherent weaknesses of the system – in particular with the final process and the difficulties of enforcing a strict enforcement regime of planning requirements/ conditions, enforcement action (when required) is or can be subject to prevarication, delays and avoidance if the developer is so minded and the enforcement section of local planning authorities (district/borough council) is always under pressure but normally the first to be subject to any budgetary cuts. In a process as important as this, that area of work in relation to the development should be given particular statutory safeguards, be ring-fenced and be given additional powers if necessary.</p> <p>iv I have some concern over the research “Rock Solid” commissioned by Greenpeace and trust this aspect will continue to be kept to the forefront. What independent scientific consideration has been given to the scenarios identified?</p> <p>Does the natural release of argon gas pose an additional hazard in this deposit of with waste? Has this been considered?</p>
952	3 – Impacts	No	<p>3.2.i My overall impression is that the questions raised have not been dealt with in a persuasive manner – rather these matters (impact – direct, long term and economic sustainability) have been approached with the hope that answers will be forthcoming at the next stage. Such assurances are easy to give but mean little.</p> <p>Clearly jobs for local people cannot be guaranteed and the immediate job generation is going to be a relatively short-term process – the economy may well be arrested at that point for a period (the knock-on, indirect affect) but at what long-term cost? E.g. detrimental impact upon tourism (which may recover) and irreversible landscape damage, including that from necessary works to “improve” the transport links required both for construction and long term maintenance. Assurances that such improvements will be made may overcome (or mitigate to a degree) some transport problems, but do not touch upon the permanent and quite probable detrimental landscape impact of such new or widened roads.</p> <p>3.2.2 Disposal of spoil – this is major concern</p> <p>a) Scale – how much? – 6-11 times size of Albert Hall (facilities, does that include the upper inventory maximum?) Equivalent to Channel Tunnel. More precision required! n.b. also distance from surface facility – up to 10 km or more.</p> <p>b) Disposal, I had some involvement in the initial discussions, planning and construction of the Channel Tunnel</p>

			<p>and this was a major problem – where transport issues were more favourable. Such assurances as given now, were given by CTG (Channel TunnelGroup) re disposal, but on close examination, disposal at one point was suggested as filling a local valley (in the AONB) until the extension of an existing platform below Shakespeare Cliff (by the construction entrance) provided the acceptable solution – not available in West Cumbria. The Channel Tunnel Solution obviated major transport and environmental/landscape problems and harm.</p> <p>Current suggestions – embankment (major landscape impact) possible backfilling (minor) aggregate (would only nibble at the problem and would exacerbate traffic problems). A vast amount would need to be transported offsite (only a small proportion for aggregate) with all the associated traffic problems, of considerable long standing. And where would it go? The Channel Tunnel solution – on the doorstep, below the cliff is not available. The landscape and transport problems will be devastating both short term and long term.</p> <p>Also issue of Retrievability, need to store backfill. See under 5.2 later.</p> <p>3.3.3. PVP schemes kick in too late – values can be affected well before specific site storage stage.</p>
952	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>4.2 My feeling is that benefits are unlikely to outweigh the negative impacts – see 3.2 in particular.</p> <p>Whilst the 12 principles seem reasonable in theory, the practice is what will count and the quote from the DECC – Document 227 – “ ... a basis for negotiations ...” is not encouraging (either as extracted here or in the full quote). A firmer commitment even at this stage could and should be given.</p> <p>One further point - who is to decide on the benefits and what will be the “community” involvement in first agreeing these – indeed how would such community representation / input be determined in the first place? Would these be flexibility in such input if it proved to be unsatisfactory (i.e. too narrow a base etc)?</p>
952	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>5.2 I accept the site specific/design argument and to an extent the Retrievability thesis. But in respect of the latter (Retrievability):</p> <p>(i) Does this exacerbate or compromise security and/or safety? If it is possible to retrieve the waste by the “appropriate” authorities then the chance exists (however small) that “inappropriate” persons could access it – a period of thousands of years is difficult to build into security systems!</p> <p>(ii) The issue of spoil arises (see 3.2.2 above/preceding p3 of this response) if a final decision is “taken by future generations” (many years away) see p 76 of the consultation document – then this affects the issue of spoil storage/disposal. The NDA proposes backfill as one means of disposing of soil (see p 59 of consultation</p>

			<p>document); but any decision to postpone Retrievability for future generations to consider implies the need to keep spoil on site in reserve for future backfilling – increasing the major visual impact and highlights this particular issue (re spoil disposal) as one of overwhelming concern.</p> <p>To my mind much greater clarification is required at this stage.</p>
952	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>6.2 I can understand the uncertainties and how in the light of these the Partnership came to its initial opinions. Essentially, no one knows that answer! BUT: (i) Any assumptions should be based on the upper figures (Experience shows that even these tend to be exceeded in practice). (ii) These assumptions should dictate initial considerations in respect of design etc. (iii) Impacts should be assessed on these – landscape, economic (pros and cons), traffic and effect on road systems – existing and proposed (and the negative effect this can have), spoil disposal (see preceding comments) – it gets worse as one reads on! (iv) Should inventory agreement be left as late as the end of stage 5? (See Principle 1 – p81 of Consultation Document) (v) Principles that should be enshrined in statutory process – in particular with regard to allowing only UK waste (p80 of Consultation Document) – a “presumption” is too loose/weak. Other factors regarding prior consultation and agreement with local communities concerning inventory – these currently prepared and any future changes/extension should also be enshrined by statute.</p>
952	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>(i) I can see no reason why the Right of Withdrawal cannot be statutorily backed – and would hope that the 3 councils insist on this if they decide to continue. (A White Paper does not carry the same weight, is an expression of policy or intent of the Governments). I feel that the Partnership has too easily accepted the point.</p> <p>(ii) I do not understand the arguments concerning the omission or inclusion of a potential host community in the process if it does not wish to take part see Step 3 e) and i), pages 93 and 94 of the Consultation Document. If such a body wishes to withdraw, so be it, even if this puts the scheme into great doubt; how can it be made to continue if it does not wish to?</p> <p>(iii) Future partnership oversight should be funded to include independent technical review of the NDAs work and advice (as presumably has happened to date?) if required – see step 4 d) page 94 of the Consultation Document and Box 32 final bullet point, page 96.</p> <p>(iv) I have concern regarding Property Value Protection – see page 58 of the Consultation Document. In the circumstances it would seem to kick in too late: after stages 4 (4-5 years) and 5 (10 years) presumably? Yet</p>

		work on the PSA's (Potential Site Areas) could begin to have an effect on values in those areas (see pages 89 and 90).
952	8 – Overall views on participation	<p>I feel at this stage there are issues that could be taken further before a decision is taken whether to continue onto stage 4. As I see them these issues are referred to in 2.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, 5.2, 6.2 and 7.2 above.</p> <p>Within these, are areas that could – should – be investigated further before proceeding and if no satisfactory response is forthcoming the Right of Withdrawal should be exercised.</p> <p>Certainly, certain commitments to legislation should be sought and given as previously mentioned and stronger commitments in other areas also be forthcoming from Government.</p> <p>(e.g.(i) Legislation regarding UK waste only, the Right of Withdrawal; Property Value Protection at an earlier stage, once PSAs have been identified, issues in respect of any proposed extension of the inventory see 6.2)</p> <p>(ii) Firm commitment regarding the 12 Principles (Box 21 pp 69-70) funding for independent technical advice of the next stage is entered; ring fencing for enforcement procedures should the project proceed (see 2.2 (iii) above etc.</p>
952	9 – Additional comments	<p>My feeling is that the establishment of a repository (or more than one) in such a sensitive area as West Cumbria – which already has contributed more to the nuclear energy of the country than most other areas – would certainly adversely impact upon the area beyond any level of mitigation.</p> <p>(i) Outside perceptions will inevitably be affected – to Cumbria's detriment.</p> <p>(ii) Economic mitigation/help is uncertain at the best – certainly jobs for local residents cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>(iii) The Landscape impact will be devastating – not only from the initial works and cold systems to affect construction, but from the long term, even permanent impact e.g. a surface facility</p> <p>(iv) 1km² – possibly made worse by a 12m high bund around; from constant traffic over many years, from the impact of the required road works for construction and spoil removal and the final disposal of the spoil on such a highly sensitive landscape area.</p> <p>That guarantees are there for security/safety for this type of the repository. Indeed what safeguards can be in place for such a long period.</p>

953	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
953	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
953	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
953	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
953	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
953	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
954	1 – Geology	No	<p>NIREX produced a report that stated the whole of Cumbria was totally unsuitable for any long-term storage facility. You state that their findings were totally unfounded.</p> <p>Section 3.2 “ Depending on the type of rock”, you already know what the rock types are.</p> <p>I have a 1984 geological survey map looking for minerals in South Cumbria and the West.</p> <p>It clearly shows the limestone shelf crossing the Morecambe Bay over the Furness Peninsula, over the Dudden estuary up the west coast of Cumbria. This is sitting below a shale bed, which runs pretty much in the same direction as the Limestone. There are other geological mining maps around South Cumbria showing the same strata. These maps are readily available. Also contained in these maps are the South Lakes fault lines running from the interior of the lakes out towards the coast line, following many of these faults are the Aquifers, allowing the flow of water out into the Irish Sea!</p> <p>“Is this area really suitable for a long term storage facility...?”</p>

954	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Yes, in thought that you set out a criteria if you see the possible formation of such a facility. I would agree with the statement of long term i.e. “thousands of years” and more but this has to be borne out by security in the geology of the ground too.
954	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>Yes and no, some of the “positive” comments, i.e. community benefits, i.e. “packages” are short term and very much dependent on the Government. With the current financial climate, I could see these “packages” being very limited and short term.</p> <p>Some of the “negative” comment I feel you have understated. I.e. should the repository go ahead the thousands of tons of spoil, the traffic involved will have a major impact not just in the appointed site but, as I see it out beyond the boundaries. You also state that some of the spoil would be used as a dyke up to 12m high (have you already decided) which low lying coastal area are you thinking about? Again I would think that there’s a slight underestimation. The 10m high wall in Japan clearly not up to the job! Nobody foresaw that the ground would fall by over 1m! Who’s to say that when the ice melts that the most of West Cumbria will be under water? What about a Tsunami carved from one of the Atlantic Islands homorite?</p>
954	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>7.1 Quote, Government has said that any area in which a geological disposal facility is sited would expect some kind of “COMMUNITY BENEFIT PACKAGE” “But cannot be decided yet!” “BRIBERY” springs to mind. Whatever the outcome would be i.e. “Package” it would be only for the short-term gain, 100 years later, all would be forgotten. And those who might have gained will have gone.</p> <p>The area never received any “PACKAGE” from the windmills that are currently springing up all over the area! There was no mention of a “package” should there be “New Build” 9 Nuclear Reactors. Short-term gain for a few, long-term loss for the majority.</p> <p>R.W.E stated that there would be no investment in any of the local villages should they get the go ahead!</p>
954	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	<p>I would agree that the waste should be buried underground in a suitable well-designed store. If man survives the next 5000 years, at least we can say we made the mess in our own back garden.</p> <p>The Romans started this game with their yellow glass, uranium; it may prove a successful way of storing highly active waste. Intermediate waste in concrete, only time will tell.</p> <p>What a mess we are leaving for our great-great etc grandchildren.</p> <p>The West Coast of Cumbria will be a no go area, most of which will be under water by then!</p>

954	6 – Inventory	Yes	<p>You appear to be asking all the right questions provided you come up with all the right answers. This country has a habit of cover-ups and mis-leading people to achieve its aims. Asking MPs a direct question, I've never ever received a straightforward answer.</p> <p>One thing that does worry me, and others, the NIREX report of several years ago told us the whole of Cumbria was not suitable and yet you in your discussion note already try to influence people's minds by telling us that there was no real foundation to their investigations, I have seen old geological maps of South Cumbria, we are sitting on a huge limestone shelf, as stated and backup from the borehole made by NIREX. So how can be this unfounded?</p>
954	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Why just West Coast Cumbria, have you already decided that this is where it will be dug because it would seem so, from what I've read?</p> <p>It should be from the whole of England, the South Coast would make for a better choice, the Channel Tunnel proves that.</p> <p>The selection process should be nationwide. Based on the one true principle "THE RIGHT GEOLOGY" Not, which local council thinks they are going to get 550 jobs and a "Package".</p>
954	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Already Copeland Council have been seen not to be representing their electoral role.</p> <p>Once by ignoring their role over the "New Nuclear Build".</p> <p>Already they have nominated their shelves without asking us, was it the little jolly to "France" I ask!</p>
955	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>I'm not sure that West Cumbria should be ruled out completely. Yes we have resources that might want to be accessed in the future but realistically, is it likely that mining will start up again? However, from an infrastructure and logistics point of view, it is already a very congested place given that most of our roads are single carriageways, although rail and better access could change that, but perhaps locations past Seascale – such as Millom – who have little industry would really benefit from what the facility could bring.</p> <p>I do agree that lots more testing and screening will be essential.</p>
955	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	<p>There are of course huge risks to consider, but nuclear safety processes are second to none here in the UK, and for a new repository where top technology and engineering will be employed, I would expect even more so.</p>

			<p>I think it's sensible for there to be general proposals but I also agree that these cannot be finalised until the unknown is better understood.</p> <p>I don't feel that the National Park is the place for such a facility though – industry has its own beauty, but I'm sure geology of that area, the fact that it's inland would further complicate matters.</p>
955	3 – Impacts	Yes	<p>We'll be hugely affected by the construction if, for example, it was located near Drigg or Seascale where the roads are narrow and often difficult to access, which again comes back to infrastructure. But the benefits of bringing work to the area surely outweigh this - from the companies which would be involved directly, right through the supply chain to those indirectly involved in services.</p> <p>I can't see how it would affect the National Park though, as I can't imagine it would be built anywhere near to it.</p>
955	4 – Community benefits	Yes	<p>This is hugely important, but it certainly shouldn't be the deciding factor. The biggest community benefit should be in the employment and training opportunities for local people, not the building of new facilities, such as playgrounds, which only benefit a small percentage, and for the wrong reasons.</p>
955	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	<p>At this stage I think it would be impossible to decide what to do for the best because the potential build is so far away, and I'm sure the site size and location would have a great deal of bearing upon the design and technology used.</p>
955	6 – Inventory	Yes	<p>Technology is moving so fast at the moment and in 10, 15 years time it will have developed even further, for example, GE Hitachi are currently developing a reactor from which waste risks will diminish at a much faster rate than current waste. The one thing I do believe is that this should be for UK waste only.</p>
955	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I partly agree, I agree that it should be in stages, but the NDA's 15 year timescale is truly shocking especially considering that new nuclear stations will be up and running before the repository could even be constructed! 5 years for this process should be ample and also not waste so much of what little funding this country already has.</p>
955	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>All areas in West Cumbria down to Millom should be considered, but the National Park/Lake District should be ruled out for sure. Nuclear is the industry that we have and we should develop it to its full potential – London is a city and its industry is commensurate with this and I can't imagine a repository would suit it. Equally, we have lots of land with difficult access and networks, which wouldn't suit a "city" type of environment – lets build on our strengths.</p>

955	9 – Additional comments		It would be useful for reassurance of local jobs for local people, but also the training that goes with it to be available to all ages, not just university students or people already with nuclear backgrounds, but for those wishing to crossover.
956	1 – Geology	No	<p>Research papers show that the geology of West Cumbria is not suitable for siting of a repository for nuclear waste. Rocks in the West Cumbria area are faulted and folded and do not provide a suitable siting. In addition, water runs through the rocks. The Disposal site is proposed at the base of permeable rocks- totally unsuitable.</p> <p>The Government should have identified suitable geological sites and then sought volunteers from those local councils with suitable geology. Suitable geology should drive the siting of a repository not as has been done, which is to allow volunteer councils – whether the geology is suitable or not. In the case of West Cumbria, the overwhelming geological evidence is that the area is geologically unsuitable.</p>
956	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>The key issue is that unsuitable geology means that the siting is not safe or secure.</p> <p>There is insufficient mention of the need to take account of the special nature of the Lake District. The Lake District National Park is held in trust for the nation as a whole for this generation and generations to come. Siting a nuclear waste repository near/under the Lake District National Park will impact adversely on tourism, Cumbria's most significant economic growth area. Most people will not want to visit an area which stores high/intermediate level nuclear waste.</p>
956	3 – Impacts	No	Initial opinions on impacts have been shaped by beliefs in the benefits of a nuclear waste repository rather than the negative impacts. It would seem that the supposed benefits of economic regeneration/ job and skills are likely to be very much less than might be supposed. The environmental impact of the building work and spoil should not be underestimated. Nor should the negative impact on tourism and property values.
956	4 – Community benefits	No	The Partnership does not make clear that currently there are NO community benefits. Whilst a set of principles have been agreed, there is no agreement on what package the Government might agree. Given the state of the economy and the degree of austerity, a generous package seems unlikely. However, that a decision on such a significant issue could even be influenced by the carrot of a benefits package is disgraceful. NO benefits package could be provided that would compensate for siting a repository in a geologically unsuitable area.
956	5 – Design and engineering	No	It is impossible to comment on this matter. The key issue is that the repository is sited in a suitable area.

			Since it is not possible to say that this is the case, design and engineering must be left for a later stage. In any case, design and engineering professionals are best placed to decide this matter.
956	6 – Inventory	No	As a member of the public, I am not in a position to judge this.
956	7 – Siting process	No	<p>There are clear reasons why the repository should not be sited in West Cumbria since the geology is not suitable. The NIREX and Glasgow University studies are clear that West Cumbria is geologically unsuitable. Proceeding to Stage 4 will put undue pressure on local councils not to withdraw. The decision not to continue should be decided now at Stage 3.</p> <p>The Partnership needs to include a wider range of interests.</p>
956	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Once Allerdale and/or Copeland Council take part in a search for somewhere for the Repository, they will have made a commitment and it will be very difficult to withdraw. The pressure and “promised benefits” will put Allerdale and/or Copeland under immense pressure, particularly since there is no other obvious area of economic regeneration.</p> <p>Allerdale and/or Copeland Councils should not take part in the search for somewhere for the Repository.</p>
956	9 – Additional comments		<p>Siting a nuclear waste repository in West Cumbria/Lake District National Park would be a dreadful mistake – the geology is not suitable and the benefits are not certain. If benefits were certain and clear, other local authorities would have volunteered. None have done so, even those where the geology is suitable – Oxfordshire, Norfolk.</p> <p>Siting a nuclear repository near or in the Lake District will blight that area and have a significant impact on tourism. People will not want to visit an area with a nuclear repository. Whilst people support nuclear energy, they do not support decisions on nuclear matters which show a total disregard for scientific evidence or geology.</p>
957	1 – Geology	No	<p>Professor Smythe’s reports and various other research papers show that the whole of Cumbria is geologically unsuitable for this nuclear waste dump.</p> <p>The science should drive the choice of where the dump should go – across the whole of England. First the possible sites should be scientifically identified and then consultation should take place – NOT AS IT IS BEING DONE CURRENTLY. Those local councils who volunteered an interest have acted on the basis of not</p>

			knowing the geology and the process and partnership is faulty and undemocratic.
957	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>The key issue is geological safety for future generations. The geology for West Cumbria is not safe and secure. The environment issues do not take into account the absolute need to protect the Lake District for all future generations.</p> <p>The planning issues for this national concern should involve a fair referendum of all people who live in Cumbria and those who wish to express their interest in preserving the Lake District who live throughout England.</p>
957	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The initial opinions have, I believe, been shaped by the local councillor's prior beliefs about the supposed benefits of the waste depository. These benefits are small and have not been adequately scoped nor costed. The negative impacts have been vastly under-estimated by the partnership.</p>
957	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>The so-called "community benefits" are a means of buying local support for needy communities. They match in no way the disbenefits of the proposal to dump nuclear waste (long and short term) in, near, or under the Lake District and /or its nearby West Cumbrian communities.</p> <p>West Cumbria needs a proper economic regeneration scheme, with millions invested in local employment and industry. It does not need a short-term palliative of what will be cheap community facilities as "benefits".</p>
957	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>The design and engineering issues are best decided by professionals. The key issue is to select the location of the dump according to proper scientific principles – which are rational. The choice of "rational" sites would then be democratically acceptable. To ask people to agree the design and engineering on the basis of ignorance of the key issues of location is an exercise in cynicism and futility.</p>
957	6 – Inventory	No	<p>It makes no sense to consult the general public on an "inventory" – when no non-expert could possibly judge what was required in this respect.</p>
957	7 – Siting process	No	<p>The initial geological screening is false and flawed. The Glasgow University studies are clear. Cumbria is not geologically suitable – thus it cannot be "potentially suitable" prior to stage 3. Councils cannot rationally then decide to enter the siting process. The process needs to be reversed. The geology must determine the site. The partnership needs to be re-formed to represent all interests nationally and locally. The Lake District's future cannot be decided by 3 councils in Cumbria.</p>
957	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>No! They should not take part. Once they take part there will be a defacto commitment to having the dump. No community in the Lake District will want to have this site – either in, nearby or under its land.</p>

957	9 – Additional comments	<p>This proposal could blight the Lake District as a pristine and undefiled place of unique landscape value in England - forever. This is a national issue in more than one sense. People all over the UK do not want nuclear waste dumped in or near the Lake District. A Cumbria-wide and national referendum should be held on this issue.</p> <p>[Additional letter]</p> <p>I write to record my own and my family's strong objections to the suggestion and proposal that West Cumbria take part in the search for a nuclear waste dump. My objections relate to three concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The published research on the West Cumbrian geology by Professor Smythe of Glasgow University, and other reports in the public domain, show that the whole area is not suitable for the proposed dump. The community does not need to be asked whether it should take part in the search for a site. The science has already made it clear that it is scientifically unsuitable. The fact that Sellafield employs many local people should not be allowed to influence the location of the disposal site. The science alone should justify the decision, not local opinion which is heavily biased naturally in favour of jobs. The dump will of course not generate many significant skilled and long term jobs for local people. There is an alternative; more effort must be made to develop a non-nuclear future for the West Cumbrian coast.2. The Lake District will be blighted by the nearness of the national nuclear dump. There is only one, unique Lake District in England. A nuclear dump underneath or anywhere near the National Park will stigmatise the most valued piece of English landscape for generations. It is not financial value' at issue here but the part "the Lakes" have played in English culture and what it means to millions of people. The risk to livelihoods and future jobs within the National Park is great. House prices in the Lake District are bound to suffer a significant fall and tourism, the major local industry for Lake District people, will suffer, should a dump be placed anywhere near the National Park. All residents of Cumbria should be canvassed by referendum not just those in West Cumbria since all are likely to be affected.3. The MWS "partnership" now needs to be re-thought and re-constituted. It does not represent the full range of opinion and thinking on this issue. Only since the partnership has been operating has it become clear that the membership represents in the main a self-selected group of people and can be seen to be acting on behalf of Copeland and Allerdale councils. This group of no doubt well intentioned local people is not the best forum as presently constituted to decide an issue on behalf of the whole United Kingdom, or at least England, since it is clear Scotland and Wales will not tolerate a nuclear dump on their national territory. The partnership needs to secure representation NOW from all the local interest groups with an interest in the environment and nuclear safety and in addition from reputable scientific interests and cultural interests at a national level from those who love the Lake District.
-----	-------------------------	---

			As a concerned resident with a commitment to local democracy, I am deeply worried that decisions will be made to progress the siting of a nuclear disposal facility without proper and full consultation on all the relevant scientific and social issues which arise. This is a major issue for the whole of the United Kingdom, not just the residents of West Cumbria. All sorts of people all over the UK have the interests of the Lake District at heart. Their voices also need to be heard.
958	1 – Geology	Yes	Happy with the use of x2 independent geologists. Screening criteria seem appropriate. Familiar with multi-barrier concept.
958	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Familiar with UK nuclear regulation and have trust in their integrity.
958	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
958	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Important that infrastructure can support the repository. Believe local community should receive substantial benefit package to compensate for potential disruption and other negatives, eg. house prices.
958	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
958	6 – Inventory	Yes	I would expect conditions for acceptance to be strongly defined and monitored.
958	7 – Siting process	Not answered	Agree with concept but must be applied robustly and not be open to risk of "making fit"
958	8 – Overall views on participation		The process so far seems robust. I have no problem trusting that this can progress to a more detailed stage.
959	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>“Finding a suitable rock formation that can act as an effective barrier is therefore essential for the construction of a safe disposal facility”.</p> <p>I agree with the above as found on Page 25 of the information pack, but am convinced Cumbria is not safe; safer geology exists in other parts of the UK.</p>

959	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Safety cannot be guaranteed; unsuitable geology could lead to leakage.</p> <p>Too much ground water, only a few miles from the wettest place in England! This is government driven so local planning concerns will be overridden.</p>
959	3 – Impacts	No	<p>This will impact on all of Cumbria, not just the West Coast.</p> <p>A marketing policy is apparently going to be developed. Surely this means that this development will alter people's perception of Cumbria in the way that Foot and Mouth did. Produce of Cumbrian farms could be seriously compromised.</p>
959	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>No one has been told exactly who will benefit, all this talk of "community benefits" sound almost like bribery. Promised money could never appear should government thinking change.</p>
959	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>Again, too much water in Cumbria, which will need to be pumped out of repository. The statement contains no reassurance that only waste from English power stations would be stored here.</p>
959	6 – Inventory	No	<p>Page 80 of consultation document says: - "Government policy says that there is a presumption that only UK waste should be disposed of in this country" – not a good enough assurance that Cumbria will not in future become Europe's nuclear dustbin.</p>
959	7 – Siting process	No	<p>A repository should only be considered in a place with suitable geology for such a project. As both Norfolk and Oxfordshire have better geology, why is Cumbria even being considered?</p> <p>West Cumbrians may be "Nuclear compliant" as Sellafield has been there a long time. This is no reason to put a repository in unsuitable geology.</p>
959	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Unsuitable geology!!</p> <p>Forget commitment.</p>
959	9 – Additional comments		<p>Please do not consider the whole of Cumbria to be "nuclear compliant", the West Coast is only part of the county and at the time of writing there is no guarantee that a repository will even be under West Cumbria alone.</p> <p>Go somewhere where the geology is sound.</p>

961	1 – Geology	No	It is obvious that there is doubt that Cumbria, as a whole, is NOT suitable and so it must be a case of “IF IN DOUBT, DON’T”!
961	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	Definitely NO With past experience on an Emergency Planning Committee and seeing how it failed in many respects, it would take a miracle for me to accept that safety and security planning could be effective.
961	3 – Impacts	No	The impact on Cumbria, let alone West Cumbria, would be total and immense. The initial building of the repository would be so destructive in so many ways. Tourism, not only in West Cumbria but the whole of the County would be disastrous. Farming and local culture would be affected. The impact on all aspects of West Cumbrian life would be immense, and catastrophic.
961	4 – Community benefits	No	Another name for “bribe”???
961	5 – Design and engineering	No	The scale and design of the building of the repository alone is unbelievable. “Retrievability at a later date” is of great concern and the fact we are talking about thousands of years makes it totally unacceptable. Who, in future years, will be “taking account of the views of local communities” will there even be any “local communities” left to discuss the issue with? West Cumbria will be like a ghostly desert – most residents will have left the areas around the site. THERE WILL BE NO “COMMUNITY”
961	6 – Inventory	No	Waste from NEW power stations has not been considered seriously. Lets deal with the current waste problem before we even consider new build and yet more waste. PLUS we must deal only with our own waste – not import from abroad. What if a “willing host” cannot be found anywhere in the UK? Do we have contingency plans? Where WILL the waste go?
961	7 – Siting process	No	So many “negatives” could be listed e.g. noise, dust, health, traffic, tourism, farming, that the so called “positive” of creating jobs for 550 people is laughable!! Two local supermarkets employ the same number of people!!
961	8 – Overall views on participation		WASTE OF MONEY! First the government must investigate ALL the ALTERNATIVE options. There are other sites in the UK that have suitable geology – e.g. Oxford and Norfolk???. Let those areas also commit to public

			consultations. Most worrying is the fact that, in other parts of the UK it seems to be a “fait accompli” Essex County Council claims that their waste will be exported to the “NATIONAL REPOSITORY FOR RADIOACTIVE WASTE IN CUMBRIA.
961	9 – Additional comments		<p>After watching the DVD issued by the MRWS my local creative writing group wrote this:</p> <p>“WORDSWORTH IS WATCHING”</p> <p>I wander lonely as a nuclear cloud, That floats mysteriously o’er my head Whimpering animals scamper away Into the blackened undergrowth ahead... ...nowhere to go in these fields of destruction. Onwards I walk, Softly I tread, As under my feet, The daffodils are dead.</p>
962	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>I believe the BGS to be a competent, unbiased, professional body and hence would expect their findings to be correct. I’m also glad to see the Partnership not just taking that information at face value but using independent experts to review it.</p> <p>The key point is that further work is required and if that work demonstrates the area as unsuitable the repository is not sited here.</p>
962	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I agree that currently there are suitable processes in place to ensure the above key issues are adequately dealt with. The problem as identified in the documents is one of timescales. We don’t know what processes, organisations or people will be in place when these matters are actually processed. The key is to ensure there is a robust “get out” clause if things change for the worse in getting suitable agreement on these matters for our area.
962	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	The key here is to ensure that West Cumbria benefits substantially from taking the country’s nuclear waste. For too long the NIMBYS have got away with getting no negatives but all the positives from any nationwide solutions to issues. Your wording like “mitigation” is not enough, it implies we just want to offset the negative impact whereas we should be pushing, indeed, stating it is non negotiable that we get substantial benefits.

			There must be cast iron guarantees of extra jobs, better infrastructure, improved council funding or services, etc, before we agree to anything. The partnership MUST ensure that above is agreed to, in a binding way.
962	4 – Community benefits	Yes	See previous comments. All apply here equally. What has happened abroad should only be a start. I agree with the statement that we should be better off after a repository is built than before. However, I also think it crucial to add the word “substantially”.
962	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	As you state, until a site is identified design cannot progress much above ideas. Working in the industry, I have faith in the skill and integrity of those involved in the detailed design. However, the key will be to ensure that political, economic and managerial wishes do not override the engineering and safety requirements.
962	6 – Inventory	Yes	The information basically just says at this stage anything could go in but until more details are decided no conclusions can be made.
962	7 – Siting process	Yes	At this stage the key thing is that the DMB acting on behalf of the local population has complete freedom to decide whether to proceed to a later stage or withdraw from the process. As stated currently we have as much assurance about this as is reasonable.
962	8 – Overall views on participation		I think the areas covered should take part. One thing to remain very clear on is that we must not spoil or detract from the Lake District National Park with any scheme if we proceed.
963	1 – Geology	Yes	I can only agree with what expert geologists say, as I have no expertise in this area. I would also hope that geologists would be extra cautious in their views when dramatic natural events such as the tsunami in Japan had such a devastating and unexpected effect on the coastal land there. I see from the geological maps that some areas of West Cumbria are already ruled out as sites for the repository and I hope lots of geological experts are asked for their opinions about the other areas of West Cumbria and suitability. As I talk to friends and colleagues I am aware of differing opinions from geological experts.
963	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Agree with the caution shown. I am aware that if the decision is taken to site a repository in West Cumbria it will have implications for future generations far more than my own.
963	3 – Impacts	No	At first I did feel (as on p56 of the public consultation document) that some of the impact would be positive –

			improving roads and retaining, as well as creating, jobs. However, I am now wary of both. The improvements to the infrastructure sound like a “carrot” if not a bribe and I have heard that new jobs may not go to local people. Why will local people be any less well trained than anyone else (p59) when this is a new project? Surely there is great experience in this area because many people already work in the nuclear industry. I am aware that there are people who would not live and work in West Cumbria because of the existing nuclear industry and a repository might further affect numbers of new residents and visitors.
963	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I agree with the public and stakeholder concerns expressed on p68 in that any benefits need to be agreed in advance but not too much in advance, and that they should not be made to sound like a bribe. However, the whole community benefits package sounds very wishy washy with no commitment from the Government and I am very sceptical that it would materialise even if the repository was to go ahead.
963	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	As I have no design or engineering skills I can only hope that all the relevant experts have, or will be, consulted.
963	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	I am concerned that any repository would grow larger and larger, for more and more waste, as I think the nuclear industry should be putting huge resources into negating the need for such repositories in the future and finding ways to reuse or make safe the waste, I realise something needs to be done with the current nuclear waste but would hate to think that we continue to produce huge amounts of hazardous waste for future generations to have to live with.
963	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	I ticked “Not Sure/ Partly” as you really lost me here! I have tried to read the relevant section in the consultation document but to me there seems to be a lot of waffle! The figure 13 Timeline is useful (p 87) and raised one question in my mind – does the public get to hear if any other councils in the UK have made expressions of interest.
963	8 – Overall views on participation		I don't think West Cumbria should take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository. This is a change of mind in a way as at first I thought there might be benefits for West Cumbrians. However, having read the consultations document and talked with colleagues and friends, I do not feel there will be benefits for local people whilst I am concerned that the geology is not appropriate for a repository.
965	1 – Geology	No	I believe that the geology is inherently unsuitable. I firmly believe Professor Smythe is correct and that

			Allerdale, Copeland and Cumbria County Councils have made a major mistake in “volunteering” an area where the geology is so unsuitable.
965	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Given the gung-ho approach taken to date (i.e. in ignoring international guidance on where to site a geological repository namely in the safest geological area), I have no confidence at all that the NDA can be trusted on any of these issues.</p> <p>To even consider the repository in West Cumbria is madness given the geology, to consider it within the National Park is lunacy.</p> <p>Apart from the inherent difficulties in obtaining planning permission (given the geology) it will be virtually impossible to get planning permission within the National Park.</p> <p>The area also contains SACS and SSSIs and any scheme which is on these catchments is likely to be defended/challenged/opposed under EU law.</p>
965	3 – Impacts	No	<p>I believe any repository will have a hugely detrimental effect on the tourism industry. This is worth £2Bn per annum to Cumbria and around £600M per annum to Allerdale and Copeland employing around 8,000 people. This could be destroyed by a repository. The Lake District would become the NUKE District if any repository were within the National Park.</p> <p>The detrimental effect of a repository would completely erode any economic benefits of a repository. In short it would be a disaster.</p>
965	4 – Community benefits	No	No benefits will compensate the wider Cumbrian community in relation to damaging and disastrous effects the repository would have on the Cumbrian economy/tourist industry. Cumbria has an appallingly poor record of extracting appropriate and commensurate benefits from the nuclear industry as a whole and I have every reason to believe that any benefits package will be wholly inadequate.
965	5 – Design and engineering	No	If the geology is unsuitable, as I believe it is, then no design and engineering solution will be appropriate.
965	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made
965	7 – Siting process	No	The process is flawed from Step 1. Geological screening should determine the safest locations within the UK for a geological repository.

			<p>The safest site should be chosen not the site with the most malleable and vulnerable community. It is nothing short of a disgrace that this process has not been followed.</p> <p>Cumbria and its weak politicians have had their collective arms twisted to breaking point by the Government and bodies like the NDA. The saddest part is that the arms have been proffered willingly. It is disgraceful that proven procedures in line with international guidance have not been followed.</p>
965	8 – Overall views on participation		The process is flawed and should be terminated forthwith. Allerdale and Copeland are behaving with negligence bordering on insanity if they do not do so.
966	1 – Geology	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would appear that the permo-triassic sandstone of the West Coast would not be as suitable as the Borrowdale volcanics under the National Park, or the largely impermeable marl and clay deposits considered elsewhere. This does not appear in discussion, or regarding alternative locations. • Insufficient discussion and reasoning with regard to geological criteria/differences between now and the NIREX proposal, which was cancelled by Govt. • Very little information on alternatives to geological disposal, other than CORWM favours this route.
966	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient discussion and explanation in relation to constant monitoring and retrievability of waste, should the need arise. • Silent on transportation arrangements for waste from sites remote from a repository. • Results of an Environmental Impact study (Independent) will have to be transparent and made public in the event of preferred site(s) being identified.
966	3 – Impacts	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant negative impact on Tourism, housing values, businesses. Inadequately covered in publications due to the lack of evaluation. • Blight will be orders of magnitude greater than benefits (550 jobs)! • Can only see detriment. Very little benefits both during construction and operations. • Infrastructure already inadequate. Combining New Nuclear Build and a repository without a major infrastructure upgrade will be catastrophic.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already being referred to as the “Dump” even in local newspapers!
966	4 – Community benefits	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little disclosed in terms of qualification and quantification. Benefits package will need to be very substantial, even then it will probably not offset detriment to those most impacted upon. • Benefits need to be on a sliding scale i.e. most to those closest, least for those further away. • Need to provide funding for training in West Cumbria in skills, which are transferable, but reside in the area. • This was missed during Capital Investment at Sellafield in the 1980s, whereby labour travelled from away to work here, but spending back at their home. • Need to attract sustainable business to area. Hence a need for massive improvements to Rail, Sea, Road and Air infrastructure and Community Services. • Need to demand as part of conditions of contract that manufacturing businesses are established locally, saves on cost, carbon footprint and provides major socio-economic benefits to West Cumbria. • Big opportunity for sharing with Reactor New Build.
966	5 – Design and engineering	No	No other Engineering Solutions, of which there are many, are discussed.
966	6 – Inventory	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information on potential inventory! e.g. High level waste from Reprocessing, Untreated Spent Nuclear Fuel, ILW, MA. Waste, LLW, PCM, Pu, Moxtails, decommissioning residues from B30 and B38 etc. Orphan Wastes, contaminated Oils and Greases, Heavy Metals. All these will have different levels of risk and environmental impacts. • Will only UK waste be allowed? Current “Substitution Arrangements” will make storage of waste from overseas inevitable.
966	7 – Siting process	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who has the ultimate “say”? • Who has/have the power of veto – for or against. • In the event of a National “No” will Government impose? If so – how?

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Plan B? • In any referendum, Allerdale should only be able to vote on an Allerdale preferred location. Ditto for Copeland, Eden ...etc.
966	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I am against a repository, because I do not believe it is the safest, most environmentally suitable nor Best Value for money to other solutions.</p> <p>Therefore, why waste time and money taking part?</p> <p>I am however, a big supporter of Nuclear Generated Power.</p>
966	9 – Additional comments		<p>My belief is that this is a Public “Conditioning” Process.</p> <p>Not a Public “Consultation” process.</p>
967	1 – Geology	No	<p>The whole of the Lake District had intense volcanic activity over millions of years.</p> <p>This has left all the underlying rocks intensely contorted and shattered, completely unsuitable for any reliable depository.</p>
967	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>No thought seems to have been given to the security problem of transporting all this nuclear waste, for years ahead, from all over Britain.</p> <p>Demonstrations could inflame opinion; terrorist strikes would be difficult to deal with.</p>
967	3 – Impacts	No	<p>If this depository was located in the National Park, the effects would be dreadful and tourism would be devastated.</p> <p>The vast amount of rock excavated could be an enormous eyesore and totally at odds with the picture of the Lake District presented to the world.</p>
967	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>A poisoned package.</p> <p>The excavation works would be done by skilled operators brought in.</p>

			General work would be fairly basic.
967	5 – Design and engineering	Not answered	If as seems certain, this will be the only national nuclear waste depository, it will have to be much larger than indicated. It will also have to be planned for a very long-term operation.
967	6 – Inventory	Not answered	This could only work if the repository was in the immediate Sellafield area.
967	7 – Siting process	No	Other countries noted are still investigating underground storage. The USA abandoned it in 2009. We need to look ahead at re-processing the waste.
967	8 – Overall views on participation		The Lake District National Park must be excluded from any involvement in a nuclear repository.
967	9 – Additional comments		Exclude the National Park.
969	1 – Geology	Yes	I agree with the basic geological suitability premise, and also with the exclusion criteria. I would also say that more study is needed into the complex geological makeup of West Cumbria.
969	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	I agree with most of the safety case but would like more peer review on the r&d. I would like more engagement with the scientific community.
969	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
969	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	While short term benefits are attractive and necessary for the local community a long term strategy is possibly even more important. Successive administrations, both local and national have left West Cumbria far behind the rest of the country in infrastructure, transport, education, and opportunities. This would be an ideal long term investment in the area.
969	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	I would say that retrievability is a vital condition. Humans make mistakes and the ability to rectify any mistakes that only become apparent in the future should be considered vital. Monitoring is also vital, as is the ability to maintain any monitoring solutions.
969	6 – Inventory	Yes	No comment was made

969	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
969	8 – Overall views on participation		As a community with extensive experience in the nuclear industry and a not insubstantial quantity of waste already here West Cumbria is a logical choice of repository site. Our councils and other community stakeholders should take part in the process.
970	1 – Geology	No	<p>I recognise there is nothing in the recent BGS screening survey to show that the area not excluded is unsuitable. And the consequent conclusion that further detailed assessment would be needed to prove whether the geology is suitable or not. However, conspicuous by its absence is any mention of the earlier NIREX survey done in the 1990's, and its conclusion that the geology is unsuitable.</p> <p>Since there are no comparisons made between surveys to show why the earlier conclusions are not or are no longer valid – I must conclude the earlier survey conclusions do remain valid.</p>
970	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I have sympathy with Professor Hazeldine's points (page 48). To agree priority of research areas with all involved bodies would be essential.</p> <p>Inherent in an underground repository is improved security (compared to surface storage). But the counter-point is the safety and environment aspect.</p> <p>Wherever the repository is sited it must include monitoring for leaks either within or in close proximity to the store. Also, during design, consideration of how reversible the process can be, in case of containment failure.</p>
970	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>I must start by stating that West Cumbria is much more nuclear tolerant than any other area in the UK. This is clearly because of the existing nuclear facilities and the employment of locals over the period of the facilities existence. However, it cannot be assumed this tolerance will continue even with the potential of 1000/500 jobs for the foreseeable future. New jobs can be generated from other sources.</p> <p>The effect of Sellafield on the environment has largely been contained within the site boundary and the Irish Sea (the Windscale incident excluded). The potential for underground storage to affect water supplies would have a much more widespread impact.</p>
970	4 – Community benefits	Yes	The Partnership does recognise most if not all of my concerns, especially lack of trust in the government. Governments think short-term and make the rules. It is impossible to ignore the fact the West Cumbria returns just 2 MPs so the weight of their influence or demise is very limited.

			Of the examples shown in box 20, the Spanish/Italian agreement that benefits are linked to the amount of waste (both volumetric and radioactivity level) are particularly important.
970	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	I note both my major concerns of Retrievability and monitoring are addressed in this section. However Retrievability is described as an option. At this early stage and hereon it must be a basic essential. Monitoring is equally important. It must be effective and be maintainable until the radioactivity levels of the waste are no longer significant.
970	6 – Inventory	No	The potential is far too broad. The inventory must be limited in volume and for high-level waste only.
970	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Most people seem to agree that underground disposal is the safest and most secure method. Of course West Cumbria is the most likely area to volunteer. I understand there have been no other volunteer areas. If I am correct in this then we must conclude there will be pressure to ensure the area proves suitable. Surely volunteerism will bias the conclusions.</p> <p>The most acceptable approach by all logical reasoning must therefore be to first find the sites with the best geological conditions.</p> <p>Follow then to persuade these areas of the suitability, need and benefits of a repository.</p>
970	8 – Overall views on participation		Both councils must play an active part in all repository deliberations.
970	9 – Additional comments		<p>The geology of Cumbria is clearly complicated. I understand this complication includes many faults and that faults can be either barriers or conductors of water. Whichever type of fault, the water will either be blocked and driven to the surface or conducted to the surface by the fault.</p> <p>Inevitably the immediate containment of the waste will breakdown and thereafter the water flow will become relevant as it leaches out the activity.</p> <p>A site with simpler geological form and flatter, with less water flow must be used instead.</p>
973	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	No comment was made

973	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	Do not trust the integrity of the planning system when the stakes are as high as this
973	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	I think the negative impacts on the are are underplayed and that the repository will damage property prices beyond any area designated for compensation and affect the livelihoods of those working in tourism.
973	4 – Community benefits	Yes	All so vague, have no confidence that there would be any real benefits for residents
973	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
973	8 – Overall views on participation		I worry that the assurances about no commitment will fade away as the process continues. It concerns me that because we already have nuclear waste here, that is seen as a reason to build a repository and that other concerns and problems will be minimised because no other area is willing to have such a facility. I am not reassured by the vague promises of undefined benefits, short term baubles in return for a long term commitment that could cause huge problems for future generations.
973	9 – Additional comments		Not impressed by the way the online consultation ends - no acknowledgement, just loops back to the first question
974	1 – Geology	Yes	I feel that a local option is the only viable option. Any suitable location would be much more secure than 'above ground' storage. This would also provide much needed investment and jobs. I would like the West Cumbrian councils to continue with their investigation into a storage site.
976	1 – Geology	Yes	No comment was made
976	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
976	3 – Impacts	Yes	As a country and a community we really need the repository near to Sellafield to reduce transportation of the materials. We have the expertise to run and build the plant safely in West Cumbria.

976	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Not sure whether it will happen but there are benefits enough in employment etc if the repository came to West Cumbria
976	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	We have the expertise in West Cumbria
977	1 – Geology	Yes	So far so good, there is a need to explore the area further
977	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Nothing can be 100% safe but there is no reason to believe this project cannot be carried out safely.
977	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	The impact on the area would be dependant on the site. Until a site is chosen the impact is not known.
977	4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	Until more information is available I cannot make a judgment. If the go ahead is given the area should be given some substantial benefits. The existing infrastructure is poor and if this project is to move forward would need overhauling substantially.
977	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	I am sure the design and engineering will be to the necessary high standard, I do not have the knowledge to say whether it is or is not up to scratch.
977	6 – Inventory	Yes	OK at the moment. Likely to change as time goes on??
977	7 – Siting process	Yes	The process is fine. The pullout at any stage is important.
977	8 – Overall views on participation		We have, and have had for a long time, a large store of waste in West Cumbria that has to now been managed without any huge mishap. It would be silly and irresponsible not to look into any alternative method of storage that might prove to be better than what we currently have. The waste will be here for a long time yet with the probability of more in the future, we need to find the best method of managing the problem, it will not go away.
977	9 – Additional comments		We need to go to the next stage. It might rule out the area as being unsuitable but we should at least look. The waste is sitting here, will not be going anywhere else in a hurry, and this might be a better solution than the current one.

978	1 – Geology	Yes	The BGS is a highly respected organisation with long-running expertise and both independent experts have validated this study.
978	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The safety case concept is developing throughout Europe and beyond and there is evidence that the UK is participating in this and learning from countries whose experience is greater (i.e. programmes are more developed). National policy is also developing and the Environment Agency guidelines for geological disposal set out requirements to ensure that the safety case will demonstrate protection not only of people but also the environment.
978	3 – Impacts	Yes	both construction and operation of the facility will result in jobs for the local area. however, some impacts may occur economically associated with the perception issues around radioactivity and these can be further evaluated as the process progresses. It would be beneficial to consider the impacts in parallel with those relating to new nuclear build since this will result in additional waste that will require disposal and, at the same time, lead to further jobs in the area that are linked to the nuclear industry which is likely to increase overall public perception in the region and lead to increased economic benefits
978	4 – Community benefits	Yes	Different criteria will be important to different communities in the region and therefore the package would need to be considered in relation to the community most affected hence negotiations would be required as the programme develops. Experience laid out from other countries suggests that it is possible to reach agreement and, with the need for a disposal facility in England, it is considered likely that the Government would be open to negotiation (within reason)
978	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Designs must be finalised in the context of the site and geology to ensure barriers are effective and this must therefore progress with the siting process. I do not however agree with the need for retrieval to be built into the process, whilst acknowledging this may alleviate some concerns for others. The location of waste at depth within both natural and engineered barriers will be a much safer option than leaving in safe-stores on the surface and barriers are most likely to be effective if they are designed to be permanent - minimising the possibility of human intrusion into the facility by future generations
978	6 – Inventory	Yes	upper and lower bounds seem reasonable and idea that community would have a voice in how plans develop over time is good
978	7 – Siting process	Yes	A stage-gated process is presented with multiple points at which the community can withdraw if this is deemed suitable. the staged process is in line with international approaches which also increases confidence in its application in the UK. Only when the science base develops throughout the staged process can an informed decision be made as to the suitability of the region for such a facility

978	8 – Overall views on participation		I think volunteering to take part in the process that may lead to construction of the repository in these areas is a good thing for the region. Cumbria has the majority of higher activity wastes with Sellafield and disposal locally will not only increase economic input to the area through investigation and construction activities, but risks associated with transport of waste to other regions will be significantly reduced if the facility is local. Being familiar with the scientific background to geological disposal I see no reason why we should not move forward, but there will need to be careful consideration throughout the process to ensure that those that may be directly affected are compensated (i.e. those affected during construction activities to those that may be affected by any house price fluctuations)
979	1 – Geology	No	The geological case was investigated by Nirex and was rejected. I don't see what has changed.
979	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The planning and regulatory frameworks have never shown themselves to be robust in the past. There is no evidence to suggest they will be any better in the future.
979	3 – Impacts	No	I don't think the full impact on the Lake District has been considered even slightly nearly enough. The premier tourist brand of the North of England would be very badly damaged by the publicity surrounding the depository. The West coast is a no go area for tourists already. This would spread the contamination of the brand well into the rest of the county. It would damage the World Heritage Site of Hadrian's Wall and damage any potential WHS status for the Lake District. The compensation package couldn't be big enough to ameliorate this.
979	4 – Community benefits	No	I think any community benefits package should be upfront, front loaded. I don't think the partnership has considered the very genuine risk that government will pay lip service to this aspect.
979	5 – Design and engineering	No	Without a siting process, the engineering is conjecture.
979	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	There seems to be a lot of disagreement even at this stage whether the site will take only existing waste or the waste from newbuild, and how much waste that will actually be and what its nature is.
979	7 – Siting process	No	The partnership seems fully aware of the holes in the siting process and yet the document is strangely silent on them. The first question anyone asks is 'What happened to the Nirex siting information?' This never seems to get a straight answer. The real nub is whether the government will impose a site anyway.
979	8 – Overall views on participation		I would be delighted for everyone in the country to be involved in looking for a suitable site for burying their nuclear waste. However, even a preliminary overview of the previous history of this process suggests that the only thing Copeland has going for it, is a vocal minority with a vested interest in bringing it to West Cumbria. I

			would implore Copeland, Allerdale, and the county council to consider the wider impact of their decision. To work towards a solutions to the problems of jobs, and wealth creation in west Cumbria that didn't involve tying the area to the legacy of nuclear power forever.
980	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	Do not have sufficient knowledge of geology
980	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	There is a will/desire/drive to succeed or be a part in this project and the partnership will be or are blinded by this. We do not fully trust the regulatory bodies to be wholly unbiased or to be unswayed by the governments needs.
980	3 – Impacts	No	To much emphasis has been put on the fact that we have existing nuclear facilities and insufficient emphasis on the negative impact on tourism and local amenities. Insufficient thought and planning will be given to the impact of site traffic either during or after construction. Take the existing Sellafield traffic jams and impact on fell roads as an example. Planning and transport infrastructure have not or did not get that right.
980	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
980	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
980	6 – Inventory	No	We have insufficient control and government WILL change the goalposts on the amounts, type and where the waste comes from, especially overseas waste.
980	7 – Siting process	No	We cannot trust government assurances. They seldom hold good for the duration of a term of office now let alone a change of government. Immediate local concern will be outweighed by wider Allerdale/Copeland/Cumbria views as the whole of cumbria will still be viewed as a "local view" by central government. I do not believe that a few thousand "yes" votes for persons from Workington, potentially employed by a new plant, should outweigh twenty "No" voters from a village directly impacted by the site on their doorstep.
980	8 – Overall views on participation		I do not wish Allerdale/Copeland to voluntarily take part in a search for the repository. I think that the construction and position of a repository will have a huge impact on tourism. It will deter visitors from coming to the area for a long time and have a huge negative impact on our reputation for a place of

			outstanding natural beauty.
980	9 – Additional comments		The Partnership shouldn't have volunteered without public consultation and a mandate. There is too much drive and ambition to succeed with Nuclear sites on the basis that we already have a site.
982	1 – Geology	No	The rocks of the Lake District are fractured, one of the reasons for the spectacular landscape. These movements are still occurring. Fractured rock allows seepage through the faults in the rock strata. Should any leakage of nuclear material occur then this will flow through the fault lines to heaven knows where. Drinking water will be contaminated. Eventually the waste material will reach the sea and thus the rest of the world. A nuclear waste repository should be located in a large area of hard solid rock such as granite.
982	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	The Fukushima, Chernobyl and Three Mile Island nuclear plants were 'safe'. These were designed and built by 'experts'. I have no reason to believe that safety, security and environment have been perfectly addressed. We need perfection when storing nuclear waste for thousands of years.
982	3 – Impacts	No	I believe that the opinions have been insufficiently thought through. The positives are short term. The negatives are long term.
982	4 – Community benefits	No	Community benefits are ill defined. Community benefits are bribery and I thought that this was illegal. 'Promises' can also be broken. The UK government has a history of going back on its word and cannot be trusted. All too often 'promises' are broken for one reason or another. Politicians can say anything and are unaccountable when they wriggle out of their commitments.
982	5 – Design and engineering	No	The rock is not just the ultimate barrier it is also the weakest link.
982	6 – Inventory	No	Plutonium! Which type? The half life of Plutonium can be 88 years (for 238), or 80 million years (for 244). Half life is often misunderstood. If Plutonium 244 decays to half after 80 million years it only decays to a quarter after another 80 million years. Still highly dangerous. And what if the government decides to take waste from abroad? The USA alone has reportedly 77,000 tons of waste. We certainly don't want anybody else's waste. The toxic coast already has too many nuclear facilities.
982	7 – Siting process	No	Chapter 10 just seems like waffle. Palliatives promising much but with no substance.

982	8 – Overall views on participation		I strongly disagree that Copeland or Allerdale play 'host' to an additional nuclear depository. We are already the toxic coast without adding further contamination. Once that stuff leaks out there will be nothing we can do about it.
982	9 – Additional comments		<p>I remember that when Sellafield opened it was stated that it would generate electricity that was too cheap to meter. Then came the near melt down followed by Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima. The promises of politicians and their 'experts' cannot be trusted. Nothing can be totally safe.</p> <p>I would expect that an underground depository would preclude any mineral exploitation. No oil wells, no fracking for gas, no iron, coal, sandstone, limestone extraction nor any geothermal energy extraction. All these would be possible without a nuclear depository. If the nuclear depository goes ahead all the natural resources in much of west Cumbria will be denied to us and our heirs.</p>
983	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
984	1 – Geology	No	<p>Given the time scale for this dangerous material to become safer is measured in centuries, too much is unknown, not least the potential affect of climate change over this huge length of time.</p> <p>This area was ruled out in the recent past. Does desperation to find somewhere change the attitude to risk taking?</p>
984	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Placed within Cumbria, it is approximately at the geographical centre of the United Kingdom and of course Ireland. Is this wise?</p> <p>It is also near the sea which has always been a source of worry to many throughout Sellafield's entire existence</p>
984	3 – Impacts	No	<p>The number of jobs both in construction and long into the future as predicted seem fairly trivial (apparently directly little more than couple of supermarkets (though admittedly higher quality) and cannot start to compensate for the losses that would probably result in other industries, particularly tourism.</p> <p>Mention of Sellafield to an audience away from home has always resulted in negative comments and beliefs, regarding Cumbria and the Solway coast in particular. This development should it happen could be a real killer for hopes of developing Cumbria's main asset. namely for tourism and holiday destinations and leisure.</p>

			There is also the threat of impact on Cumbria's other vitally important big industry, agriculture and whether food produced here will always be safe. This industry has felt the impact of nuclear incidents at home and abroad in the past.
984	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>Can it possibly be right for people today to commit many future generations to these unknown dangers. Nothing has previously been proposed with such a long term potential for a disaster.</p> <p>The nuclear industry has always appeared to be using what could be described as both blackmail tactics on the one hand or bribery on the other.</p> <p>History is full of examples where long term promises whether made by governments or lesser authorities over are overturned and discarded as time passes.</p>
984	5 – Design and engineering	No	Nothing in engineering can be guaranteed to never fail and failing in the human operating and design factor cannot be ignored.
984	6 – Inventory	No	Given past history, could we be sure it would not in time become the world's dustbin for waste nobody else would tolerate
984	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Given my previous response I cannot see how this is relevant.</p> <p>Is it not very telling that nowhere else in the UK is even interested in considering if this is something worth looking into.</p>
984	8 – Overall views on participation		This is a risk no one has any right to take, the length of time and the scale of any mistake could be way beyond imagination.
985	1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	As the intended repository will be expected to be safe for hundreds of thousands of years, I believe that it is of utmost importance that the geology is as good as can be found to the exclusion of all other considerations. The reason for this opinion is that future generations will be unlikely to have lower standards than we have today and in terms of the life of the proposed facility people are, essentially, transient. I also believe that in this case, second best is not good enough as engineering to last this timescale will be hard to say the least and should not be made harder by political considerations. As this is a project of national strategic importance I believe that the country as a whole should be examined and not just West Cumbria. This is the number one criterion.

985	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	At this stage of the process this is not a high priority. It will become higher as the remaining steps are taken such as geology, inventory, design. If these steps are taken first, this step will be easier with less aspects to consider. As an aside, this appears to be a mixed bag of criteria which should not be lumped into one question.
985	3 – Impacts	Not Sure/ Partly	The impacts being looked at in the consultation are limited to those of the current day and the near future. There is a great deal of time after the assessments in the consultation which have not been taken into account. Indeed these cannot be known but a contingency must be built into any decisions to try to cover them. I feel that this consultation is skewed towards accepting a repository in West Cumbria before essential preceding steps are completed to the detriment of the best solution to the problem of long-term geological storage of nuclear waste.
985	4 – Community benefits	No	I do not think that this item should be considered until after the site is chosen as it also gives the impression that the decision of the final choice of site has been taken.
985	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	The design should only be considered after the choice of site is made and a detailed inventory of the proposed waste to be stored is known. Anything else may lead to overlooking novel design features which could possibly improve the repository.
985	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	The inventory is an essential piece of information which is needed by designers. This must be a complete list and there is no reason why this cannot be compiled now by the NDA as they are the government agency with the responsibility for Most of it. If other bodies have an input into this list e.g. MOD, NHS they must make this information available to the NDA as the owner of the repository and I would think that six months would be more than adequate for this to happen if the relevant bodies are taking their statutory duties seriously!
985	7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	This process is not for West Cumbria to lead. It is properly the responsibility of the government of Great Britain. It logically follows the selection of best geological conditions. If West Cumbria leads on this, the repository may be politically sited using short term criteria.
985	8 – Overall views on participation		I believe that the consultation should not be pursued at a local level until others have exercised due diligence i.e. National government, NDA.
985	9 – Additional comments		I would suggest the following order is a more logical way of proceeding to ensure that the project is completed to the a level of excellence that should be expected from such a long life expectancy building: 1 The best geology for the repository should be found within GB.

			<p>2 The inventory for storage should be declared and fixed. 3 The design should be completed to outline stage. 4 The site should be chosen within the area in step 1. 5 Detail design should be completed (including safety, and security). 6 Agree community benefits. 7 Planning & environment. 8 Construction.</p> <p>Anything less is to leave a sub-optimal solution for future generations to manage.</p>
986	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
986	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
986	3 – Impacts	No	The potential risk to the reputation of the lake district and subsequent impact on tourism etc would be catastrophic.
986	4 – Community benefits	No	No comment was made
986	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made
986	6 – Inventory	No	Why not look at someof the innovative work in France in significantly reducing the half life of radioactive material
986	7 – Siting process	No	Looks like there is only one option and the consultation is designed to rubber stamp it
987	1 – Geology	Yes	A wide range of views have been listened to and reports verified by independent advisers. The need for further detailed studies before a final decision is made have been acknowledged. At this stage in the process I don't see why the issue of geology should be a barrier for further investigations.
987	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made

987	3 – Impacts	Yes	<p>At this stage I agree that its appropriate to move forward based on the information currently available but I would have preferred to see the results of the brand protection research before making a decision.</p> <p>I think the brand protection research is vital as existing non nuclear industries such as tourism need to be protected from any negative impacts. More information on what is going to be done to protect these other industries, and substantial evidence of the positive benefits of the repository e.g. job creation need to be presented in the next stage so the public can make a fully informed response.</p>
987	4 – Community benefits	Yes	<p>It is essential that any community benefits packages are in addition to existing funding and programmes. While I appreciate that things can't be agreed at this stage a firm and legally binding commitment will be needed from central government if West Cumbria were to become a site. Unfortunately the current government are known for cuts and not particularly trusted in many areas. People would have to be confident that any agreements would be honoured before a commitment was made.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the geographical areas that benefits are applied to. Other industries in other parts of the county may be affected by a repository (e.g. tourism and food production) so community benefits should be extended to mitigate secondary impacts in those areas.</p>
987	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	Detailed design needs to be site specific and is something to be considered in detail at a later stage.
987	6 – Inventory	Yes	More information will be needed at a later stage but not a barrier to further investigations of sites.
987	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
987	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>I think that the areas covered by Allerdale and/or Copeland Councils should take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository.</p> <p>As long as the Councils have a right to withdraw from the process before making a firm commitment I don't see why the options can't be explored further.</p> <p>At this stage I feel we need more information on the potential locations, findings of the brand protection survey, and the positive and negative impacts on community and other industries before a serious and informed decision can be made. We won't get this information unless we move forward to the next stage and investigate whether there is a suitable site.</p>

989	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
989	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
989	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
989	4 – Community benefits	No	Short-term benefits will be dwarfed by the longer-term adverse consequences to tourism etc.
989	5 – Design and engineering	No	No comment was made
989	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
989	7 – Siting process	No	No comment was made
989	8 – Overall views on participation		I don't agree that the concept of what is proposed is a good idea. It's my feeling that once a search starts for the siting of a repository, the cost of this will be taken into account when a final decision is made about whether to go ahead with the repository. Then the people who ordered the search won't want to have seemed to have wasted the money on it. I think there are strong local feelings against a repository, and that therefore the sooner this idea is nipped in the bud, the better for everyone. It's most alarming that, as I understand it, the proposed schedule for burial is being brought forward.
990	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
990	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
990	4 – Community benefits	No	No comment was made
992	1 – Geology	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No-one can be 100% certain of the effects of low-level nuclear leachage on the strength of soils. Assessing geology as it stands can only be an incomplete and inadequate part of the answer; 2. No-one can be sure of the impact of geological disturbances elsewhere in the world; 3. No-one can be sure of the impact of future developments relatively nearby, eg fracking on the Fylde Coast. This has to carry a high level of uncertainty, and a high level of risk

992	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>1. There is no assessment of low level leakage on geology</p> <p>2. There is inadequate assessment of the long term effects on health locally</p> <p>3. There is inadequate assessment of long term health impacts nationally</p> <p>4. There is no assessment of the impacts of fracking on the Fylde Coast, which is relatively nearby (in geological terms)</p>
992	3 – Impacts	No	<p>1. There is no need for a repository in Cumbria</p> <p>2. If politicians believe that storing nuclear waste is safe, then it should be stored within the Palace of Westminster</p>
992	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>I don't trust the engineers because we have been assured too often in the past that facilities are safe. History teaches us that they are not.</p> <p>No-one can change this series of repeated failures.</p> <p>Our current "experts" can do no better.</p>
992	6 – Inventory	No	No comment was made
992	7 – Siting process	No	<p>Site the repository within the Palace of Westminster.</p> <p>Only then can we be confident that politicians have accepted the risks in full.</p>
993	1 – Geology	No	<p>The information is slanted and biased towards your obsession with volunteerism. Volunteering to have a repository in Cumbria does not make the geology safe.</p> <p>The Partnership says “further investigation” is needed. West Cumbria is one of the most investigated geological areas in the country with a long history of mining. Mines were abandoned not because they were mined out, but because of the energy needed to dewater them. Areas of “high rainfall, permeable rocks and hills and mountains to drive the water flow” would guarantee leakage to the surface (1999 Government sponsored video – Pangea) Universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow for example have made studies of the area over the past 15 years but you have not allowed Professor David Smythe to give his measured judgement(although you took days to visit France - completely another geology) nor listened to Professor Stuart Haszeldine.</p>

			<p>The MRWS geologist who accompanied the exhibition around Cumbria was dishonest in putting forward your arguments. He told me and others that he was wanting the repository under his house in Ennerdale. (This is in the National Park)</p> <p>He told me granite was safe for such a repository (It is not. It is porous)</p> <p>He told me that the areas in red in the 1980 British Geological Survey map he had at hand were granite. (They are not)</p> <p>He told me the rock was solid and even brandished samples (The rock is not solid but fractured with faults and boreholes)</p> <p>He was adamant that hydrology was a misunderstanding. (It is an important consideration. Ask Manchester about the source of its water being contaminated and how they will deal with that please.</p>
993	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>This Government aims to put “first wastes into the repository by 2029.” In 1997 the Nirex Public Inquiry and Appeal agreed with Cumbria County Council’s argument and the findings of experts that the risk was too great for geological disposal of intermediate level wastes. Have you read the conclusion of this report? I brought your attention to this at the meeting in Septmeber I attended. In reply to my written enquiry if you had read this report hardly any of the partnership members had read it.</p> <p>Today’s plan includes high level wastes – a world first.</p>
993	3 – Impacts	No	<p>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 to the earthquake risk and disrupting West Cumbria’s water table.</p> <p>I am an artist who has invested the last two decades in studying the landscape and its pure beauty. If you go ahead with this repository my work will be ruined. All my paintings will be blighted as the spirit they portray will be tainted with the subtitle "O that is where the nuclear waste is buried". This repository will ruin the culture that has grown up in this wilderness that has nurtured the Romantics and sceptics alike. Wordsworth, Coleridge, Hunter Davis, Melvin Bragg all will be sad echoes of another age when men worked with and for their land, freely accessing its riches and beauty. Not living in fear of the shortcomings of others.</p>
993	4 – Community benefits	No	<p>West Cumbria should be assured of essential infrastructure such as schools, roads and hospitals without being bribed.</p>

			What measures have you in mind in the case of a nuclear accident.
993	5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>The Partnership says that “ A facility will not be built unless it will be safe during its operations and for future generations.” Their own advice contradicts this: “Geological disposal safety plans do not assume that total containment by engineered barrier systems for ever is possible.” Dr Adrian Bath</p> <p>You have no designs nor any engineering plans as you do not define the waste you are planning to deposit in this repository.</p> <p>Thoughts you do have are flawed as gasses from reactions of the fissile materials will escape upwards to ground level and water will become contaminated too and rise to the surface. It is considered likely that this may take place in a matter of decades from the repository being loaded due to your siting it in Cumbria. Cumbria is geologically unsuitable for this repository.</p>
993	6 – Inventory	No	<p>You have made no inventory. I keep asking at your meetings about the inventory. You say you have one but where is it? Professor Stuart Haszeldine keeps asking too and he found your reply depressingly wanting. I witnessed this. The inventory you talk of as your inventory is meaningless as this plan includes existing wastes (which are already outside of the scope of any inventory) and new build wastes from untried “high burn” nuclear power plants.</p>
993	7 – Siting process	No	<p>The Solway Firth was suggested by your geologist. He ointed to anarea only 10 miles from CARlisle. You cannot be serious.</p> <p>Other areas he pointed out were in the National Park.</p> <p>Longlands Farm and the surrounding area was ruled out by the Nirex Inquiry. New criteria have been written to rule Longlands Farm back in.</p> <p>You are choosing this area because it is remote and has few inhabitants. The people who live here are desperate for income. You are exploiting their situation. This is not a robust nor flexible approach to the siting problems. You are using volunteerism. Volunteerism des not make Cumbria geologically safe.</p>
993	8 – Overall views on participation		<p>This is a cunning plan to keep the process and the nuclear agenda on track. The government are sinking tax payer £millions into a timetabled ‘process’ “too big to fail.”</p> <p>There would be a geological nuclear dump NOW in the Eskdale area if CCC had not opposed the plan 15 years ago.</p>

			I am shocked and deeply unhappy at this process you are running. It is unethical being a complete waste of money and a dangerous approach to the problem of nuclear waste. We desperately need to address this problem with intelligence through the democratic process as a nation, not just pushing in onto and under poor Cumbria.
993	9 – Additional comments		<p>I have in my possession answers to my written questionnaire which I submitted to the partnership last autumn. In reply to my request for a definition of the purpose of the partnership I received the answer that it was to identify the opposition to such a repository so that this could be addressed. That is no way of finding a site for such a repository.</p> <p>Cumbria is geologically unsuitable for such a repository. It is dangerous and downright unethical to continue this process.</p> <p>I say NO to the geological dumping of nuclear wastes in Cumbria.</p>
994	1 – Geology	Yes	<p>I believe that we know enough about the geology of West Cumbria to move forward in the process, although I accept that there is much more we would need to find out before we could ever identify a suitable site.</p> <p>I believe the BGS study leaves enough potentially suitable land. I am satisfied with the integrity of this survey,</p>
994	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	I believe we have enough information at this time, and that the regulators are working to ensure there is a suitable legislative framework in place to ensure safety.
994	3 – Impacts	Yes	There would clearly be major impacts on West Cumbria if a repository was ever to be sited here. Indeed, there are impacts that already exist by being in the process now and looking to host such a facility. I believe that the Partnership understands these impacts and recognises that there would need to be mitigation for these, where possible.
994	4 – Community benefits	Yes	The Partnership's initial work on community benefits is strong and emphasises a clear set of guiding principles. I strongly believe that the community benefits of a facility must be an additionality for the area that hosts a facility, and for example, infrastructure and health care required for the build are not considered benefits. These things must be in place prior to agreement being reached and work commencing.
994	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	From my understanding of the design and engineering issues, I believe that the Partnership can be satisfied in

			<p>the design concepts being developed. I agree that the option for retrievability should be left open at this stage.</p> <p>Like a lot of people, I recognise that the generic design concept will change when a site is found. I think it is important that clarity exists when a site is found and that all design and engineering issues are then addressed before we could consider moving forward again at that stage. I appreciate that isn't something the Partnership can control but it should flag this up for the future.</p>
994	6 – Inventory	Yes	I agree with the Partnership's view and their principles relating to inventory.
994	7 – Siting process	Yes	<p>Whilst I broadly agree with the Partnership's principles and guidance for siting a repository, I think that some of the Partnership's guidance is too prescriptive in defining what a future partnership could look like. I don't think the current partnership can make these decisions.</p> <p>However, I do agree that the process is sufficiently robust and flexible, so long as the guidance on the potential future process is seen as just that - guidance.</p>
994	8 – Overall views on participation		There is no reason why the Partnership should not move forward to the next stage. However, this does not mean that the facility should be housed, here, merely that we should continue discussions to see whether the area could be a suitable venue, and to see whether the decision could ever be in the best interests of the people of the area.
994	9 – Additional comments		I have been pleased with the Partnership's work, the thoroughness of its undertakings and the delivery of its work programme. I recognise this is a very important issue and I hope people across West Cumbria have their say on one of the most important issues they'll ever have the chance to comment on.
995	1 – Geology	Yes	It's an initial desktop study, to be followed up by more detailed site investigation. Normal procedure for any large project.
995	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	The nuclear industry is so risk averse that the main risk becomes doing nothing and leaving the waste in unsuitable locations above ground.
995	3 – Impacts	Yes	Significant mining and heavy industry has taken place in the LDNP for centuries, yet the landscape is not "spoiled". Job creation, enabling people to live in the area rather than move away, and a range of income sources - not just nuclear, not just tourism, etc. are beneficial to any area. Spoil disposal / aggregate production will probably not load the roads as much as some people think. The positives outweigh the negatives.

995	4 – Community benefits	Yes	As community benefits would be additional to normal investment and the investment needed (for example) in upgrading the road network, this is a chance for the local community to get what they can whilst it's on offer.
995	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	It's very early days. Much more data is needed before an engineered design can be even brought to a working concept stage.
995	6 – Inventory	Yes	Again, early days. UK waste only seems like the right way to go.
995	7 – Siting process	Yes	Plenty of hold points, yet a focus on local matters rather than allowing an external "rent-a-mob" to be involved. Presumably, the surface facilities can be sited on empty land and not require the dismantling of any local communities.
995	8 – Overall views on participation		Take part. It's an opportunity.
995	9 – Additional comments		Don't be derailed by the naysayers. This country has an amount of legacy nuclear waste. This country needs new nuclear, unless a raft of new coal stations are built, and there needs to be a final repository. The waste is not going to go away on its own.
996	1 – Geology	Yes	I am confident in the process and the science behind the findings
996	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	No comment was made
996	3 – Impacts	Yes	No comment was made
996	4 – Community benefits	Yes	No comment was made
996	5 – Design and engineering	Yes	No comment was made
996	6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	The GDF should be used for all HLW and ILW arising from our nuclear programme past present and future

996	7 – Siting process	Yes	No comment was made
996	8 – Overall views on participation		They should as the national benefets outweigh the local issues which can be adequately managed
996	9 – Additional comments		Lets not lose this once in a lifetime opportunity to step up and deliver a solution that serves the nation we reside in and whose benefits we enjoy on more than just a local scale Time to stand up and take responsibility
998	1 – Geology	No	No comment was made
998	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	No comment was made
998	3 – Impacts	No	No comment was made
998	4 – Community benefits	No	No 'benefits package' could compensate for the presence of a nuclear repository in Cumbria.
998	5 – Design and engineering	No	Whether or not design and engineering is 'appropriate' is irrelevant. The idea of a nuclear repository in Cumbria should be rejected outright.
998	6 – Inventory	No	Again, these details are largely irrelevant. We should not have a nuclear repository in Cumbria.
998	7 – Siting process	No	The whole process depends on 'volunteerism' and leaving the door open to opt out later. You are clearly not confident of this. I am certainly not !
998	8 – Overall views on participation		Definitely not. The Boroughs should opt out now.
1000	1 – Geology	No	Geological disposal involves placing radioactive waste within engineered, multi-barrier facilities deep inside a suitable rock formation where the facility and geology provide a barrier against the escape of radioactivity. Surrounding rocks are far too porous and permeable.

			Limited nature of the screening study.
1000	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes	Nuclear industry has a very high safety record and lots of barriers to prevent leaks. I believe any normal leak would be contained, but not sure about how secure it would be if there was a natural disaster.
1000	3 – Impacts	Yes	The county needs jobs.
1000	4 – Community benefits	Yes	I think any benefit should be agreed and in place as soon as possible. Improved transport, rail and road, arrangements would be needed.
1000	5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	Don't have enough engineering knowledge.
1000	6 – Inventory	Yes	Should only deal with own waste, as this has the potential for a ecological disaster if ships containing waste sank. More research should be put into recycling of waste fuel.
1000	7 – Siting process	Yes	Geological surveys should be carried out and all results published by an independent authority to inspire confidence.
1000	8 – Overall views on participation		Yes it should go ahead, but only with the proviso that if the geology is unsuitable the process stops.