
From:
Sent: 10 June 2013 00:42
To: radioactivewaste (DECC)
Subject: Call for Evidence on the Siting Process for a Geological Disposal Facility

Managing Radioactive Waste Safely: Call for Evidence on the Siting Process for a Geological Disposal Facility

9th June 2013

The Managing Radioactive Waste Safely team
Department of Energy and Climate Change
55 Whitehall, M07
London
SW1A 2EY

Dear Sir/Madam

There appear to be an assumption that the majority of Copeland residents are in favour of going ahead with GDS in our area and that anyone who is not for this proposal is anti-nuclear. I assure you that neither of these is true.

I have attended a number of consultation meetings over the past several years. I attended CoRWM meetings held locally and have also been involved in the local consultation meetings.

I was one of a group of local residents invited to full day consultation exercise held at the Copeland Borough Council Offices, Catherine Street, Whitehaven on 8th January 2011. I was even paid expenses to attend!

Local residents met with a consultation team, VisiontwentyOne, led by Hanna Carly. We were given a detailed questionnaire with our responses collected via electronic voting pads.

To the question "Would you be in favour of siting the waste repository under the National Park?" the response was a very definite **NO**.

The question was then asked "How would you feel about the waste being put under the National Park with the entrance being outside?"

The response was a very definite **NO**.

The question was rephrased several times but the response continued to be **NO**.

It was made clear to the team of consultants that any attempt to put nuclear waste under the Lake District would have a very serious affect on the Lakes image. So how did we get ever get to the point of considering the National Park as a possible site for the GDF?

I feel I have been consulted and my views and those of others in that and other meetings have been deliberately ignored. Is it any wonder that the consultation exercise is so distrusted!

I also looked up the question posed in the Mori Poll which is being used to support the notion that the bulk of the residents in Copeland and Allerdale are in favour of the project proceeding. The question asked was:

"Should West Cumbria take part in the search for a geological disposal facility site?"

I probably would have answered "Yes" but not without further clarification. When I contacted Rose Neville, the designer of the survey, I put it to her that the inclusion of the Lake District National Park in the question would have resulted in a much different outcome. She felt that it might well have done.

Not the care as taken with the Scottish referendum question!

I also asked her to explain a statement in Mori's document regarding the representative cross-section of residents:

"A statistically robust sample of more than 1000 in each area, an overall response rate of 45.6%" The answer was that while 1,412 Copeland residents (Mori figures) had responded positively to the (flawed) question set out in the telephone survey, this represented only 45.6% of those who had been actually been contacted by phone. So correctly, the poll result should have been "68% of those who responded to the telephone survey."

If Copeland's figure are representative of the survey as a whole, then 3096 were phoned, not 1412 as stated. To claim that 68% were in favour is not correct. Rose Neville conceded that while some had not been at home when the call was made, others had declined to take part.

The true figures are that of those **3096** residents of Copeland who were phoned, **960** responded positively or **31%** of the whole sample.

This is not a poll to indicate the possible result of an election. This poll produced a figure which Jamie Reid and Copeland and Allerdale Councils are using to try to claim they have a mandate to proceed in West Cumbria. They do not.

I am definitely not anti-nuclear. I was born in West Cumbria and have had Sellafield as a close neighbour for over 40 years. I have family and friends who work in the industry.

I understand that there is a major national problem with nuclear waste, which must be addressed, but the site chosen must be the best possible site we can find. This is not under the Lake District where the geology is very complex. Even the NDA's geological adviser, Dr Dearlove, at the meeting in Keswick on 12th January this year, expressed the opinion that the chances of finding anywhere in the Lakes was very remote and agreed that "no commercial operation would go down this route".

Please set up a process which will arrive at a safe solution to this problem and ensure that those pushing to go ahead with a GDF regardless of the suitability of the geology in Copeland and under the Lake District are not allowed to do so.

In the meantime, urgent work is needed above ground at Sellafield to safely process and store the legacy waste from our nuclear industry, both civil and military. This is not Copeland's problem. It is national problem and work is needed immediate to secure the waste currently stored in deteriorating facilities which were never designed to accommodate these wastes for this length of time.

Yours sincerely,