

Document ID	Overall Messages	What aspects of the site selection process in the MRWS White Paper do you think could be improved and how?	What do you think could be done to attract communities into the MRWS site selection process?	What information do you think would help communities engage with the MRWS site selection process?	4	Key improvements from West Cumbria Lessons Learned
Above Derwent Parish Council	Previous process failed badly - a great deal to do to re-establish trust	National geological survey by independent geologists with no nuclear connections - screening minimises cost	Clearer picture on impact to environment, safety and guaranteed benefits	Information on changes to infrastructure		Government agencies must promptly address key concerns of local decision makers
		immediately exclude all protected areas	Need for public confidence in process, governance and quality controls	Independent overseer to ensure integrity of the process and proper disclosure of all vested interests		Avoid lack of trust be perceived lack of integrity, vested interest, prejudgement, democratic deficit
		screening minimises cost	Right of Withdrawal enshrined in law			Listen to public feedback and not summarise to the point of losing the message
		Early SEA				MORI questions few, to the point and treat results transparently
						Avoid glib statements which misrepresent the facts
Alan Auld Group	West Cumbria only site ever likely to volunteer, make it work					
Allerdale and Copeland Green Party	Green Party policy is phase out nuclear, waste kept near surface near place of generation - No commitment to large programme until waste problem solved Study other disposal/storage methods other than GDF Geological disposal not demonstrated - needs a credible Plan B Deal with waste in situ and avoid transportation Highest priority is decommissioning and safe storage of waste	Clear definition of parameters - host community carefully defined and used consistently in all dealings and documents Screen on geology and only ask for volunteers in suitable areas	Monitorable and retrievable for lifetime of waste	Clear definition of parameters - host community carefully defined and used consistently in all dealings and documents Clear inventory so host community knows what it is volunteering for Rigorous assessments of long term GDF jobs c/f storage Need demonstration of public support <i>before</i> expressing an interest DECC and NDA biased - must be removed and replaced by a new Statutory Body		
Allerdale Borough Council		Leaving detailed geological exploration to Phase 4 gave time for uncertainty to grow and become a barrier	Sceptical on status of Right of Withdrawal - must be on a legal footing "Community", "benefits" and "volunteering" must be precise and consistent	Clear inventory so host community knows what it is volunteering for Clear information of waste packaging and disposal concept to be used at host site		Information as in WCMRWS final report needed
AMEC	Need many more participating - 'several tens' Stages time bounded, geological screening, clear benefits package	Screen on geology and only ask for volunteers in suitable areas Make GDF a National Infrastructure project More resources available to communities especially near start of process Add a statutory requirement to respond Regulators be more proactive and visible in the early stages More clarity and simpler streamlined process	Community should vote on involvement Simpler structured process - with all stages time-bounded Readily available information Clearly defined benefit package from very start of process	Clear statements of environmental and safety targets, risks and impacts Clearly defined benefits package		Confusion caused through WCMRWS Partnership being set up prior to DTP
AREVA Risk Management		Bring geological studies forward from stage 4 to get more information earlier	Better communication with communities overseas that have undergone the process	Clear statements of environmental and safety targets, risks and impacts - plus socio-economic and infrastructure benefits Clearly defined benefits package and confidence this would be robust to a change of Government		
ARUP	Identify 15 areas and provide GDF briefing packs		Engage Local Enterprise Partnerships	Clarity of early vision with early information to allow reasoned debate Early benefits to counter early perceptions of disbenefit - quantified benefits and disbenefits - objective and consulted on GDF Briefing Packs		
AWE		Accelerate (and parallel) early stages to get to subsurface screening quickly Re-look at national geology screening - is it possible to identify areas of unsuitable geology in simple terms - much of previous (Nirex) information now difficult to access		Clearly defined benefits package for all stages - and at beginning of stage not end		
Barrow Borough Council	Also take into account those indirectly affected	Process needs to take account of areas that are not directly concerned but will be affected Early geological studies	Right of Withdrawal - must be on a legal footing	Clear inventory so host community knows what it is volunteering for Clearly defined and considerable benefits package Fully quantified socio-economics benefits-disbenefits Details of headworks, ventilation shafts etc		WCMRWS reached DTP without knowing inventory, storage of new build spent fuel, benefits package, above ground structures and negative impact on economy of Cumbria

Berkeley SSG		Location of the waste and skilled workforce makes West Cumbria the only viable candidate		Screen on geology and only ask for volunteers in suitable areas				Clearer explanation of benefits	
Black Country LEP and LAs				Screen on geology and only ask for volunteers in suitable areas				Clarity of how jobs will be kept for locals not imported	
				Assess taking population, environment, socio-economic and transport infrastructure and only ask those areas that pass - gives list of suggested attributes					
Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group BANNG		Priority should be given to improving interim storage as this will extend for a long time if not forever		Assess minimum specification for a suitable GDF location in terms of geology, demographics and environmentally sensitive areas		Right of Withdrawal - must extend up to construction and beyond if critical new evidence becomes available		Publish a specification of the effects of GDF on location. Population and economy with disbenefits and compensating benefits into the distant future	Management body must be objective, open, transparent, effective and above all trusted - NDA and DECC cannot fulfil this role
		Avoid interim storage on coastal sites increasingly vulnerable to sea level rise, flooding, storm surge, tsunami		Screen on geology and only ask for volunteers in suitable areas				Specify inventory - new build programme is clearly outside any current considerations	WCMRWS Partnership did not make recommendation, Partnership largely LA controlled
								Specify extent of 'volunteering' area, over what radius, how will public be informed and how engaged - how final decision to be taken	
Bradwell for Renewable Energy		2012 poll around Sellafield showed 80% of people unaware or slightly aware of GDF - so process had failed in early stages						Specify inventory - new build programme is clearly outside any current considerations	
		Geological disposal not demonstrated - needs continuing research to find alternatives (CoRWM 1)							
British Geological Survey				Bring forward geological work to make more information early sooner - identifying potential host areas and with early exclusion of unsuitable areas. Use airborne and ground based geophysical studies					There was no proper balanced scientific debate - and the process must ensure there is one
Chaucer plc		Deals with shale oil and fracking!							
Churches Together in Cumbria		West Cumbria sub-optimal and should not be assessed in isolation		A GDF must meet certain universal criteria (quoted) and this should be up front					
				Screen on geology up front					
Communities Against Nuclear Expansion		Much more consideration of short and medium term radwaste storage - compensation for storage sites. Misgivings about suitability of storage and cask materials		Geology must come first and waste must always be retrievable					Must be a well trusted competent person to pull all the strands together and come up with a long term plan for all wastes - not from the nuclear industry nor with a political mantle
Copeland and Workington Liberal Democrats		Consultation needs to focus on geological suitability and engineering rather than voluntarism						Upto date information on international developments, treatment of waste, other disposal options. Revised during consultation.	Cumbrian Authorities unduly pressurised by Industry and Government
		More attention to current safe storage						Community benefits need full exploration	Confusion over experts on geology and that other areas more suitable.
Copeland Borough Council		Response based on internal Council review of engagement with the process upto 30th January 2013 and the WCMRWS Partnership Final report.		Clearly defined role for Government/DECC/NDA to continually and consistently put over the Government's policy position		State clearly why GDF is appropriate c/f any other alternatives	310	Clear avenue for cost reimbursement for local authorities from the start of the process	Final report of WCMRWS contains a wealth of learning points
		Establish new Advocate body with independent experts and resources to put across case for GDF		Clear definition of how Government will deal with planning matters, SEA etc		Right of Withdrawal - must be on a legal footing and extend up to the approval of the planning application (or equivalent)	315	Clear statement how PSE would be managed both nationally and locally with adequate resource to develop and pursue a viable communications strategy	
				Decision must be with District Council		More consideration of international experience	316		
				Bring forward geological work to make more information early sooner - so much information is available before any decisions need to be made		More visibility and clarity on R+D programmes and results			
				New process needs to allow local partners to apply local site selection criteria		Community benefits set in law			
Copper Consultancy				Should be National Infrastructure Project		Clarity of process, suitable geology and the need for a GDF with national implications.		Clear description of economic, social and community benefits developed	Two tier decision making over rode local support
				Geological investigations at each stage				Engage with youth due to length of project time	
Cumbrians Opposed to Radioactive Environment CPRE North Yorkshire		Opposed to deep geological disposal, favours storage above ground.		Identify suitable geology first then voluntarism					
								Comparisons with other natural and man made exposure to radiation	

							Comparisons with other energy production sources e.g land use, cost.		
<b>Crosscannony Parish Council</b>		Refers to large coalfield in area and the need to find a site with mainly granite geology							
<b>Cumbria Association of Local Councils</b>		Response based on Position Statement of August 2012		National survey to identify suitable geological sites		Strategic Environmental Assessment of MRWS			More focus on role of Town and Parish Councils
						Emphasis on geology and safety			
						Identify GDF as part of wider social and economic development programme			
<b>Cumbria Chamber of Commerce</b>		Nationally important as well as locally important as majority of waste in Cumbria				Acknowledge risk to area brand, fund work and research to mitigate		Talk to a wide range of stakeholders	Need to assess and plan for impact on Lake District brand
						Be clear that community benefits are additional to impact mitigation and the expected positive impacts of the development			
						Clarity on benefit packages and their timing.			
						Combine GDF with other nuclear projects in area in a package			
						Seek to speed up progress to give businesses more certainty			
<b>Cumbria County Council</b>		Review roles of DECC, NDA and CoRWM		Geology before voluntarism		Legal basis for ROW and community benefits		Inventory and scope for retrieval	
						Clarity on ROW in two tier Local Government		Footprint and environmental impacts of GDF	
						More emphasis on safe and secure interim storage and long term management if GDF fails			
<b>Dalton Institute</b>		Enabling communities and public to be involved in wider nuclear debate . Nuclear skills innovation pathway for communities		Reduce 7 stages to two or three key stages		Clarity on DMB in two tier LG and where facilities cover other districts		Communication of science to host communities on geology and engineered barriers	No clear pathway for members of the community including academics to engage in wider debate
		Fully supports geological disposal through voluntarism						Use of social media as well as web and meetings	
								Open laboratories and schools programmes	
<b>Dounreay Stakeholder Group</b>				More emphasis on land not ownership due to length of project		Stress phased process and information to be available at each stage		Higher profile of regulators in early stages	WCMRWS PSE to be benchmark for future
				Identify potential host geologies nationally					WCMRWS Partnership needed clearer leadership
<b>Eden Nuclear and Environment</b>		GDF in national interest		Identify potential host geologies nationally, initial screening and then approach communities		Single tier DMB		Clearly defined benefits package	
				Early surface based investigations		Guaranteed benefits package		Gvt enable balanced debate with expert views; too adversarial at present	
								Communities have access to independent experts; Regulators, CoRWM, Learned Societies etc	
								Clarity on options for specific types of waste in inventory to build confidence	
<b>EDF Energy</b>		Supportive of MRWS		Ensure availability of data for each stage		Clarity on balance of risks and benefits		Need promoter for GDF with local office to give case for participation and continued participation (NDA)	
								Access to experts: BGS, HPA, Regulators, NDA.	
								WCMRWS Partnership Final Report sets out information needs.	
<b>Ennerdale and Kinniside Parish Council</b>				Identify potential host geologies nationally with National Parks, SSIs excluded		ROW in law with right extended to Town and Parish Councils		Town and Parish Councils responsible for collecting community views	Any Partnership should have independent Chair with powers for judicial standards
								Legal requirement for fiscal probity in partnership	DMB as observer only in any Partnership
<b>Environment Agency</b>		Support MRWS and RWMD as separate organisation				National dialogue on need for GDF		Use social media and digital platforms to communicate	
						Clearer definition of roles of DECC, NDA, CoRWM and Regulators		Openly available information irrespective of stage	
						Clarify inventory, benefits, environmental impacts and the planning system to be used			
						Partnership agreement between RWMD and LA to set out roles etc			
<b>Friends of the Lake District</b>				Site selection and geological suitability led by independent panel		ROW in law		Ensure all relevant information available before moving to next stage	
						Clarity on benefits package		Citizen Juries set up to review information and views	

<b>Galson Sciences Ltd</b>	Support GDF		Early geological screening with socioeconomic, transport criteria etc	National Infrastructure planning	More UK specific R&D with URLs		
			Regional fora for proposed screening criteria and information on GDF impacts with results fed back into public meetings	RWMD responsible for stages 1-4	Small independent body to act as mediator and provider of information		
			Involve scientific organisations; BGS, Geological Society, LAs and LA organisations.	More national political support and recognition of importance	Stress key impact will be from surface facilities		
			Approach LAS after screening for interest	Community benefits set in law	International experience with links to other affected communities		
				ROW clarity and potential in law			
<b>Gosforth and Ponsonby Parish Council</b>	Concerns over WCMRWS Partnership and DMBs		Geology and safety before voluntarism but exclude National Parks	ROW in Law	More awareness as IPSOS studies showed low level		
			SEA in early stages	Clearer definition of community and DMB	More info on length of time waste hazardous and design life of GDF and engineered barrier		
				Recognition of role of Parish Councils	Impact on local infrastructure and commitment to improvements		
					Importance of groundwater, hydraulics, rain		
<b>Green Peace</b>	Cannot be assumed that there will ever be a willing host for legacy and new build			Need to separate legacy from new build wastes			
<b>Highland Against Nuclear Transport</b>	Consider no GDF 100% safe. Supports above ground storage and avoidance of transportation						
<b>Holme St Cuthbert Parish Council</b>			National geological screening before voluntarism	Consult surrounding areas	More use of local TV, radio etc to raise general awareness		EOI made with no consultation
				Recognise role of Parish Councils			
				Better definition of voluntarism and community			
<b>Imperial College London</b>	Gvt should work with the two Cumbrian Authorities. County Council should not over ride.						
<b>Kent County Council</b>	Supports volunteerism and partnership in GDF		UK geological baseline study to identify areas of search before approach to communities	Clarity on benefits, Gvt commitment and stages of benefits	Sound technical information on geology and seismicity		
<b>Keswick Council</b>	Safety driven not volunteerism		UK geological baseline study to identify areas of search and the exploration if necessary followed by dialogue with communities.				
<b>Labour Members, Copeland Local Committee, Cumbria County Council</b>	Cumbria CC should have progressed to Stage 4		Geological safety before voluntarism	Formally agreed partnership between LG tiers, including how communities will be consulted before EOI	Size of facility above and below ground, inventory and geology		Risk related research set out by WCMRWS should be continued
				Clarity on ROW and community benefits			
				National advocacy for benefits of GDF over long term storage			
<b>Lake District National Park Authority</b>			Geology first to assess reasonable chance of suitability before volunteer	Clarity on purpose of each stage and process to be followed	More detail on retrievability and monitoring		
			Exclude National Parks from search	Clarity on when SEA takes place	Impact on local Brand and economy		
				ROW in law			
				Clarity on community benefits and when available			
				Identify key strategic infrastructure projects that need improvement in area			
				Better definition of community			
<b>Lancaster University</b>	Repositories at each generation site and under Sellafield or sea						
<b>Lawson Engineering</b>	Voluntarism will not work		Gvt identify potential sites, consultation with public education campaign, then Gvt decision. Scientific not political solution.		Retrieval, degradation of containers, geology and faults		
<b>Maryport Town Council</b>	Cumbria does not have suitable geology		National survey to identify suitable sites				
<b>McCombie Consulting</b>	Support voluntarism		Learn from Canada experience		URL experience with results		
			Set up siting team with experienced experts and approach community leaders in confidence at first				

McEwen Consulting	MRWS rests on voluntarism but other countries have implemented it differently with more effect. France, Finland, Sweden and Japan	Geological survey first to identify potential suitable geologies	Clearly defined ROW and community benefits	Earlier NIREX and NDA Reports set out six geological settings, these should be debated and made visible	
		Suitable disposal environments set out in report by Nagra as part of Amigo project	Learn from French experience in defining communities		
Millam Without and Whicham Parish Council	Not against GDF as a solution	National search for potential geology before local approach			DC ignored views of Parish and listened more to opinion polls
Moresby Parish Council		BGS national survey for suitable geology before voluntarism	Independent chair of any partnership	Clear statement of geological needs for a GDF	
			Community benefits to be seen as part of the wider economic development programme		
			ROW set in law		
National Nuclear Laboratory	Voluntarism and partnership supported	Staged engagement process leading to EOI	All reasonable costs of Engagement met by Gvt	Implications of hosting a facility	
			ROW set in law	Experience of international communities	
			Clarity on community benefits	Scientific basis for GDF	
				Detailed description of process	
National Skills Academy for Nuclear	Supports voluntarism and community engagement		Clarity on community benefits	Clear simple, illustrated fact sheets	
			Formal vote of residents in area		
National Trust		National search for potential geology before local approach	ROW to Parish and Town Councils		Partnership disbanded too early therefore information vacuum
		Include NT land as well as AONB, SSIs etc as excluded			Should be Full Council decision
					NT not fully engaged
No Ennerdale Nuclear Dump		BGS national survey for suitable geology before voluntarism	Independent scrutiny panel to oversee community engagement		
		Exclude National Parks etc	Ensure retrievability with less reliance on engineered solutions		
			Clarity on community benefits		
			Community control on ROW		
			Clear definition of host community		
			Engender trust		
Nuclear Free Local Authorities	CoRWM 2006 recommendations need to be revisited by Gvt	Identify potential geology before voluntarism	Separate process for new build		
		National consultation process on criteria for host geology	Detailed R&D programme for GDF and alternative disposal options		
		Stakeholder engagement programme on issues associated with GD and storage	New oversight Committee with wide range of expertise. Manage fund for communities etc to pay for independent advice		
			Details of inventory and retrievability		
Nuclear Industry Association	Supports geological disposal	NDA as advocate to approach communities	NDA to be advocate for GD	Risks of operation and construction of GDF	
			Clarity on community benefits	Criteria for geology	
			Clarity on ROW	Potential benefits	
			Clarity on socio economic benefits		
Nuclear Institute		Reduce number of process stages with first ROW at end of stage 4	Clarity on host community	Safety aspects, risks and role of ONR more visible	
			Clarity on decision making body	Alternatives such as boreholes	
			Greater commitment to enhance well being of area as part of integrated development plan	National need and benefits of GDF	
			Proactive marketing of GDF and community benefits	Transportation issues	
			Detailed supporting R&D programme		
			RWMD take more proactive approach with governance by independent advisory/steering group		
Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates	Refers to CoRWM 2006 Report and highlights Recommendations not implemented by Gvt	Public and stakeholder programme to define, community, support, issues affecting communities and ground rules for benefits	Consult on R&D programmes for GDF and other waste management options		
	Suggests a revised "optimum" MRWS process	Conference to establish current baseline understanding of science and ethics	Separate process for new build wastes		
		MRWS Phase 2: issue list of areas screened out then if EOI received, judge support against criteria from stakeholder engagement	Establish new oversight committee with range of expertise and ability to fund expert advice to stakeholders		
Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum	Supports voluntarism and partnership	Clarity on how principal authorities propose to work together before any soundings of an EOI.	Cover all Local Authority engagement costs at all stages	Refers to NuLeAF and WCMRWS publications	

			Consider revealing geological data before identification of volunteer communities	Reduce uncertainties .eg footprint, inventory, retrieval			
			NuLeAF supports partnership arrangements as in WCMRWS	Consider hybrid Bill or National Policy Statement to enshrine ROW and community benefit issues			
<b>Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development</b>			Consider national geological screening to encourage community interest	Use techniques from Planning Inspectorates Major Projects Unit; Statements of Community Involvement, Statements of Common Ground and Planning Performance Agreements			
				Firmer basis for ROW and benefits			
<b>Parents Concerned About Hinkley Prospect</b>	Gvt should abandon GDF search						
			Clarity on Stages and ROW	Early discussion on socioeconomic effects			
				Clarity on how to measure agreement of local communities			
<b>Prospect Representative</b>	Favours Two stage process: stage 1 upto decision to build. Phase 2 building of GDF		Benefits, impact mitigation in early phase	Inventory agreed in Stage 1			
				Long term monitoring of GDF with retrievability			
				Decision making powers at district level			
				Process and benefits set in law			
<b>Quintessa Ltd</b>			Not focus on one site for all the inventory	DECC have access to independent technical advice (not RWMD)		Public information on radiation risks from GDF of other sources	
			National search for potential geology before local approach	Independent body to oversee provision of technical information			
<b>Radiation Free Lakeland</b>			Focus on geological suitability not voluntarism	Clarity on inventory for new build fuel			
				Independent study into radiation risks to biodiversity and human health before volunteer			
<b>Rail Freight Group</b>	Rail should be priority for transport of radioactive waste						
<b>RDFL</b>			Focus on geological suitability not voluntarism				
			No benefits or incentives				
			Independent expert evidence on geology				
			Whole of County(s) to be consulted				
<b>Scottish Environment Protection Agency</b>	No comment at this stage						
<b>Seascale Parish Council</b>	Supported move to Stage 4 and would support new consultation in West Cumbria alone						
<b>Seaton Parish Council</b>	No suitable geology in Cumbria		Focus on geological suitability not voluntarism				
<b>Shepway District Council</b>			More work before EOI: information to address community concerns, early desktop studies, employment, financial and other benefits set out.	Siting led by DECC		Information on positive and negative impacts.	
				Costs to reach EOI met		Impact of new build programme	
				Clarity on host community and ROW			
<b>SKB</b>	Comparisons made with Swedish GDF programme		Study of UK geology to open dialogue with communities	Clarity on decision making bodies		Visits to other facilities and set up demonstration facility	WCMRWS Report a positive step
			More time before DTP to resolve issues/concerns	Clear advocate to promote GDF case. This should be NDA/RWMD as the implementer			
				Funds available for communities to interact with developer			
				Stress added value to area of working with implementer			
<b>Solway Plain Against Nuclear Dump</b>	Biggest failure was leaving geology to stage 4		National geological survey which is peer reviewed	Benefits in Sovereign Wealth Fund			
			Screen out environmentally sensitive areas	Funding for opposing groups to access expert advice			
			Seek EOI from remaining areas				
			No Gvt pressure on community				
<b>St Bees Parish Council</b>	Lack of trust a major issue			Simpler decision making process, three LAs too complex			
				Clarity on benefits			
				Legal ROW			

St Johns Castlerigg Parish Council	Geology and trust major issues	National geological survey				Decisions should be made at Full Council
		EOI only from suitable areas		ROW to Town and Parish Councils		
Sussex Energy Group at SPRU		National search for potential geology before local approach		Clarity on benefits		
				Establish Independent Body to conduct research and consider all aspects from a range of perspectives		Socio economic benefits reviewed in participative and deliberative way with communities
				Funding for counter experts		
				ROW in law		
				Legal duty for "reversability" (cf France)		
Swarthmoor Quakers. SW Cumbria	Transport of wastes from Sellafield should not influence site for GDF	Geology and safety are over riding issues		Separate new build waste issues		
		Survey of all UK		National debate and concensus		
				Clear open planning process		
				Benefits only discussed when site selected		
The Geological Society of London		More and better geoscience available ealier in the process before community makes EOI				Role of geology in containment within GDF and uncertainties
		National geology in understandable format				
		After EOI,high level geology and socio economic report				
The Immobilisation Science Laboratory	Generally supportive of MRWS	Early engagement with communities with suitable geology on GDF design, performance, barriers etc		Clarity on benefits		Detailed science case for the performance of a GDF
				Legal ROW		Upfront deatailed scientific case for performance of engineerd barrier systems.
Underskiddaw Parish Council	Agree with GF but have issues with voluntarism as in current MRWS	National survey to identify geology and then voluntarism		Legal ROW		GDF safety, design, size, impacts at each stage.
		Safety prime consideration				Confidence in GVT, implementers and experts
		GVT take over site identification and area studies. LA not have resources.				
Unite Union	Supportive of voluntarism and welcome proposed review	Additional resources for engagement in early stages				Benfits, jobs and economic growth
URS Infrastructure Environment UK Ltd	Support GDF but consider movement of waste away from Sellafield not sustainable therefore Cumbria solution			Independent advocates for GDF available for communities		More input from Regulators
				Legal ROW		Clarity on risks, benefits and decision making
				Benefits linked to infrastructure, environmental improvements, public services		
Wayfarer Project Services		National geological screening with approaches to local communities by Gvt		Staged benefits packages with set amounts at each stage. Final package for GDF site		Health Impact Assessments
						Understanding local population and their interests
West Cumbria and North Lakes Friends of the Earth	Concerns tha this consultation has not engaged with the people of Cumbria	Adhere to MRWS process, no short cuts		Clarity on communities and decision making bodies		
				Public participation in decision making.		
Westlakes Nuclear	Supportive of voluntarism and partnership	Widen search area to salt deposits and seabed.		Strengthen ROW and benefits		Role of Regulators
		Produce rounded geological appraisal rather than suitability test		New planning process to clarify planning issues		Full info, design, size, impacts, socioeconomics.
		Consider retrievable underground store rather than disposal				
Individual responses						
1	Considers Cumbria CC decision correct.	National problem therefore national geology screen.		Clarify legacy/new build		
		Exlude National Parks, SSIs etc				
2	No more waste in area					
3	Approval at district level					
4	Does not accept GD					
5	Identify experts to champion GD					
6	Send waste to space					Demonstrate how waste can be safely stored over such long timescale
7	Queries on radioactive waste					
8	Query on how to comment					

9		Law to overcome CCC objection						
10		Find safe site first then community						
11		Concerns re current storage	Geology first		ROW in law			
					Clarity on host community			
12		Concerns re current storage	Geology first		Only apply to legacy wastes			
13		No information						
14			Offshore and near coastal to be considered		New organisation needed separate from nuclear waste organisations with budget for research, would advise and work with LAs, communities etc.		More research if co disposal	
			Geology first		New disposal agency		Public education on risk, radioactivity, disposal etc	
			Shortlist 6-8 sites with geology		Transportation proven and safe		Technical information sets	
			Clear numerical parameters for GDF pass/fail		Clarity on benefits			
					Clarity on communities			
					Legacy waste only			
					More time for the process and stages			
15		Be aware of strong emotional reactions to waste issues			Early benefits to attract communities			
16		Refers ti Geological studies before NIREX	National survey to identify geology and then voluntarism					
			Number of GDF across country to share burden					
17		GD inappropiate. Deal with storage issues						
18		Do not try to change CCC view						
19			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc		Strong ROW		No telephone polls	
			National survey to identify geology and then voluntarism				Balance benefits and risks	
20		Issue with voluntarism. Benefits equal bribe	Geology first					
21			Geology first					
22			Geology first					Should not have been Cabinet decisions
23			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
24			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
25		Critical of MRWS and political process in Cumbria						
26			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
27		Opposes GDF in Cumbria						
28		Critical of WC process	National survey to identify geology and then voluntarism					
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
29			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
30			National survey of geology with panel of experts		Communitybenefits at early stage with financial inducement			
31		Priority to storage at Sellafield	National survey of geology before voluntarism					
32			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
33			Geology first					
34			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
35		Concerns re storage at Sellafield	National survey first					
36			National survey, safety first					
37			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
38			Independent national geological survey		Legal ROW			
39			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build			
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					
40		Against a site in Cumbria	National survey first		Clear benefits in law			
41			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc					

42			Geology before voluntarism				
43					Benefits in Sovereign Wealth Fund		
					Legal ROW		
					SEA completion		
44			Geology first		Large benefits		
			No NPs				
45			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build		
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc				
46		Not overrule CCC decision					
47		Invest in storage at Sellafield					
48		Not overrule CCC decision					
49			Geology first with search of MOD sites		Clarity on benefits		
50			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build		
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc				
51			Geology before voluntarism				
52			Numerical criteria for suitable geology		Independent panel of critical friends to advise on geology etc	Balance between risks and benefits	
53		Supportive of MRWS			More proactive promotion of MRWS to communities		
54		General statements on Cumbria			Need GDF Champion		
55		Statement on politics					
56		Against Cumbria site					
57			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build		
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc				
58		Sea bed disposal					
59			National problem therefore national geology		Clarify relationship between MRWS,GDF and new build		
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc				
60		Suggests revision of Stages in MRWS	Sub surface screening in Stage 2			Early info on GDF Safety Case	
			Stage 6 underground investigations not operations		Decisions on Continued Participation asDTP appears as a cliff edge	Begin preparation of EIA and Safety Assessment in Stage 3	
			ROW upto end of Stage 6		Clarity on benefits		
					Clarity on inventory		
					Clarity on roles of DMB, advisors, RWMD etc		
61		Review evidence that GDF is still best way forward	Safety and geology first		Process led by people independent of vested interest (eg Councillors)		
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc		ROW at Parish level		
62			Survey and geology first				
			Options for boreholes in suitable areas first then approach community, or Gvt apply for planning permission , or deal as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project		Clarity on benefits		
63		Concerns re Sellafield storage	National survey then approach communities		ROW at Parish and Town Council level		Vote should be at full council
					Clarity on benefits		
64		Suggests sites at power stations, undersea or island					
65			National survey to identify potential sites first		ROW in law		
					Clarity on definitions of communities and local authorities		
66			National survey first then voluntarism		Benefits defined early and set in law		
			Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc				
67			Survey and geology first				
68		General comments on WCMRWS, no plan B					
69			Geology first				
70		Against site in Cumbria					
71		Concerns over Sellafield storage and no plan B					
72		Concerns over Sellafield storage	National survey first then voluntarism		Benefits defined at first stage		
73		Cumbria unsuitable					
74		Focus on safe storage					
75			National survey to identify potential sites first		Tangible long term benefits		
76		Supports MRWS process	RWMD to act as champion to promote GDF but would need more expertise and resources				
			Adapt stages to match geology				
77		Supports MRWS principles and comments on Shepway process	National study of geology then approach communities				
78		No GDF in Cumbria					
79		Special law to enable decision	More proactive approach		Early discussions with nuclear communities		
					Separate process for non nuclear		

				Community benefits set in law			
80		National survey to identify potential sites first Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc		Legal ROW at Parish and Town Council level Partnership must have Parish and Town Council representation			Independent chair of Partnership needed Decision making bodies observers only on Partnership
81	No site in Cumbria						
82	Queries scientific basis for GD	National survey then shortlist then volunteer Search for clay site		Independent body for site search Separate legacy from new build Process for independent review process of site search			
83	Form consortia to give more commercial approach	Early geological investigations		Champions needed to promote GDF			
84	Be aware of emotional reaction to radioactivity			Community benefits at at EOI			
85	General comments on GVT and policies						
86		Proactive promotion of case for GDF		Early clarity on infrastructure and benefits			
87		National survey to identify potential sites first		SEA needs to be completed early Parish and Town Councils should be statutory bodies and part of decision making Presented as integral socioeconomic and infrastructure benefits			
88	General comments on Cumbria	National survey to identify potential sites first		Quantified community benefits			
89		Exclude NPs, SSSIs etc Peer review of geology suitability in selected area		Fund planned local infrastructure projects Clear definition of community Benefits zoned; nearer= more Separate legacy and give it a value e.g £/Tbq Compensation fund for house price fall			
90	Concerns that CoRWM will be inadequately resourced Waste minimisation and enhances packaging to reduce reliance on geology and engineered barriers	Geological investigations at an early stage		Clarity on ROW and how communities will decide whether to continue		Engagement of stakeholders in confidence building	
91	Agree with principle of GDF but major trust issues Concerns re current storage safety	Geology and environment before volunteer		Compensate all communities with nuclear installations for risk No movements of waste without consultation			
92	Support GDF	Geology first Exclude NPs etc		Clarity on benefits Confidence in ROW		Clarity on impacts with information on benefits/risks early Clarity in leadership of MRWS process	
93	Comments on Cumbria process Concerns re storage at Sellafield						
94		Geology first then volunteer Exclude NPs etc		Legal ROW Clarity on benefits			Referendum vote Predefined criteria to assess community support Not a Cabinet decision
95	Impractical to move waste from Sellafield Consider 1,000 year stores if GDF cannot meet safety case	Detailed proposal including geology, safety, environmental impact and benefits before approach		Separate autonomous body to promote GDF		Better communication of national benefits of GDF including costs/safety issues of delaying More information on long term risks e.g carbon 14 escape	
96	Cumbria not suitable and agrees with SPAND comments Improvements to Sellafield storage	Geology first and not rely on engineered barriers		Definition of ROW in host communities			Not be a Cabinet decision WCMRWS Partnership heavily influenced by DMBs
97	Comments on new build policy and not progress unless disposal available	Wales to be included Communities with new build must be included in search Geology first then voluntarism				Clarity that site will be enlarged to meet new arisings. Transparency on information on geological research, assessments and state of knowledge Link wattage of power produced by nuclear power to amount of waste produced	
98	Major trust issues with process					Peer review of all science Info on monitoring, earthquakes and climate change	
99	Opposes Cumbria for site. Produce less waste, move to green energies						