

John Wilson  
REDACTED  
REDACTED  
REDACTED

This process is flawed as the Affected Area or Host Community is not defined. This should have been defined prior to continuing with this consultation. It is a fundamental definition that makes answering the questions difficult. If the affected area or host community is later defined in its narrowest terms, ie a parish, then those asking for public support to be taken prior to proceeding may be answering this question thinking the affected area is County wide and would like a Countywide referendum. Whereas if this is not clearly stated in the respondent's answer this may allow the respondent's answers to be taken out of context ie "the respondent supports a referendum of the affected area (parish level only)". It will leave the process open to challenge and if the challenge is successful will damage the reputation of the process. These should be easy to define and I cannot see why it has not been defined at this stage.

As this is the National Repository and must be safe for many thousands of years austerity must not be imposed on the process. There have already been vast sums spent on the National Repository and nuclear in general in the past 30 years with no outcome to siting a National Repository so austerity should not be considered in the process.

The consultation is an attempt to remove as many obstacles from siting a repository in West Cumbria and not about finding the most suitable geographical site in the UK to safely house the Nation's Nuclear waste for thousands of years.

Locating the most suitable geology in the UK should be the only consideration at this stage.

I want a GDF but there is a very big risk that if this consultation is implemented, it will have a very high risk of failure at later stages when it needs to provide a safety case and cannot due to the geology.

This would be a damaging blow to building a GDF in the most geographically suitable area in the UK.

***1. Do you agree that a test of public support should be taken before the representative authority loses the Right of Withdrawal?***

Affected Area or Host Community is not defined and therefore the representative authority cannot be clearly defined as the repository may affect several authorities including the National Park and English Nature.

Public support should be taken after a national geological survey has identified the most suitable sites and an education process for the most suitable sites has been conducted.

The repository will have an impact on the Cumbria Brand, which is an important National brand and is becoming an important international brand. Therefore all Cumbria must be consulted via a referendum and not just a tiny minority via a telephone survey. This is important as the process currently lacks credibility and the lack of representation of the people of Cumbria is bringing the process some very negative reactions from both sides of the debate. This is a national repository and the impression is that the process is imposing the repository on an unwilling community that has no say in the issue (see local press).

The Right of Withdrawal should be available at all stages of the process as new scientific, geological, evidence or new technology may change the within the 40 year timescales to construct the repository. If new evidence proves the repository is unsafe or unnecessary then it must be halted and the affected communities should have the right to use this new evidence to challenge the construction.

***2. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to decision-making within the MRWS siting process? If not how would you modify the proposed phased approach or alternatively, what different approach would you propose?***

The Affected area needs to be defined to be able to answer this question correctly. If we know who will be defined as affected I could answer more clearly.

No, the proposed new arrangements outlined in the consultation paper do not have any independent advice. There is a lack of impartial supervision of any part of the processes.

The arrangements that allow District Councils to act as the Representative Authority is not representative of all Cumbrians being involved in the process. The County Council were considered as the Representative Authority in the last process as agreed by MRWS this should continue as there is no credible reason to exclude them other than the fact they rejected the MRWS process. The County Council must continue to be the Representative Authority. The Leader of the Representative Authority should not be chair on the Steering Group this is insidious and makes any challenges very difficult.

**3. Do you agree with this approach to revising roles in the siting process set out in the White Paper? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**

The affected area needs to be defined to be able to answer this question correctly. If the affected area is defined as greater than Borough or District Councils then this question would probably not have been asked.

No, A GDF project will cross many service boundaries, highways, minerals, planning, safety and waste disposal. By limiting the County Council to a consultant role it seems that DECC wishes to remove obstacles to the outcome that they want. DECC are not creating a process properly based on voluntarism.

The proposals will allow for a body, most likely to be a Borough or District Council, to express an interest. This body will then be responsible for steering the project and finally, as Representative Authority (RA), it will decide upon a right of withdrawal. These powers should not be held by one body.

It is vital that any further siting process must include a clear and unambiguous definition of a Host Community and Affected Area.

**4. Do you agree with this proposed approach to assessing geological suitability as part of the MRWS siting process? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**

No, the geology should be the first consideration in the disposal of nuclear waste and must be the number one priority.

A nationwide geographic survey must be undertaken first to identify suitable geology for the National Repository to house the nation's nuclear waste. This must be the only starting point for debate and then the process must educate the people in the most suitable geological area to accepting it.

The long term safety of a GDF depends entirely on the geology in which it is placed.

**5. Do you agree with this proposed approach to planning for the geological disposal facility?**

The affected area needs to be defined to be able to answer this question correctly. If the affected area crosses 2 Borough or Local Councils who would act as representative authority. Not defining the affected area may make some respondents assume that the affected area is confined to 1 authority.

No, The 'representative authority' role should not be delegated to a district council. The County Council must be involved in the process and not only act as consultants.

The final decision about a GDF application must not be adjudicated by the Secretary of State for energy as this is a conflict of interest. The New Nuclear builds need a disposal route for the waste prior to commencing and this will influence Secretary of State to site a repository for political/commercial reasons not geological reasons.

**6. Do you agree with this clarification of the inventory for geological disposal – and how this will be communicated with the volunteer host community? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**

DECC appears to be ignoring the government's Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) recommendations by including waste from a new build programme in the revised Baseline Inventory.

Why set up an advisory committee if you choose to ignore inconvenient conclusions?

**7. Do you endorse the proposed approach to community benefits associated with a GDF. If not what alternative approach would you propose and why?**

The affected area and host community needs to be defined first to be able to answer this question with accuracy. If the host community is defined as small as possible then the community benefits could be misinterpreted by a respondent as believing a wider community will benefit.

No, the offering of community benefits should not be part of the process at this stage. Suitable Geology should be the only consideration. Community benefits should only be brought into the debate during the education process after the geology is found to be suitable.

***8. Do you agree with the proposed approach to addressing potential socio-economic and environmental effects that might come from hosting a GDF? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?***

The affected area and host community needs to be defined first to be able to answer this question with accuracy. There is no indication as to who the potential socio-economic and environmental effects are referring to. This may make some respondents incorrectly believe the potential socio-economic and environmental effects refer to an area that will not be affected and the respondent may give an incorrect answer believing that certain areas may or may not be affected.

No, this has nothing to do with finding the safest geographically suitable site to store the nation's nuclear waste. It should be discussed only after the geological site has been identified.

Why have the environmental and economic issues been referred together in this question? They are totally separate issues.

Environmental issues could adversely affect any nationally and internationally protected areas (National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, World Heritage Sites, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsar Sites, Special Protection Areas).

Socio-economics should not be used to bribe a community and should only be discussed after a geologically suitable site has been found.