

Ref.	Organisation/individual	Issues raised	Work packages
1	University of Oxford	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Need to develop trust in safety of geological disposal and explain monitoring process. Science behind decisions should be subject to independent peer-review. Peer review should be assessable and previous disputes fully reported.	WP1, WP4
2	National Skills Academy for Nuclear	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> From experience of MRWS process in Cumbria suggests clear, objective factsheets on geological disposal, widely distributed; series of engagement events; clarity on local community benefits; decision-making by formal vote of those in local communities.	WP3, WP7
3	Individual - [REDACTED],	<b>Other:</b> Requests no more nuclear waste in Cumbria	n/a
4	Communities Against Nuclear Expansion	<b>Other:</b> Poses concerns about new nuclear build at Sizewell (C) until a solution is found for legacy wastes. Believes more consideration should be given to the short term and interim storage of all types of Radioactive waste. Believes Sizewell community residents should be compensated for the planned EDFE Dry Fuel Store (DFS) for Spent Fuel. Misunderstands why a DFS is being built at EDFE's Sizewell B's PWR station and doesn't appreciate the uniqueness of the circumstances that arose to its requirement. Thus is concerned that they would be needed at all new build sites and they would be 'sprung' on those communities. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> geology should come first, then exclude national parks and AONB, suitable sites then engage in volunteerism. <b>Info:</b> work on retrievability. Develop full, clear plans for how the all the various types of waste which we have created over the past 50 years, are to be managed - should be undertaken by a well trusted competent person independent from the nuclear industry.	WP1, WP2, WP4, WP6, WP7, WP8
5	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> GDF siting should be based on approval at District, rather than regional, level.	WP3
6	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> No substantive comments	n/a
7	Imperial College London	<b>Other:</b> Government should engage with District Councils in west Cumbria who voted to continue in siting process. Cumbria County Council decision should not over-ride national interest.	WP3
8	Chaucer Plc	<b>Other:</b> Suggests need to address risks to nuclear installations of earthquakes caused by shale oil production (fracking).	WP4, WP9
9	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Waste should be kept at Sellafield indefinitely.	n/a
10	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Proposes approach to managing radioactive waste refers to use of Thorium-based reactors.	n/a
11	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Following votes in west Cumbria options seem to be a law to overrule vote or overground storage.	n/a
12	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Argues geological disposal inappropriate because of high cost and lack of volunteer communities. Advocates continued storage above ground at active nuclear sites, re-evaluating that policy in 50 years time.	n/a
13	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Concerns re. demonstrating safety of geological disposal over required timescales. Advocates sending waste into space/sun.	n/a
14	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Proposes industry experts to champion need for nuclear facilities and the wealth and jobs they bring. Should build GDF in Cumbria where there are the core industry skills and expertise.	WP1
15	Lancaster University	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Suggests i) segregating different waste types and ii) investigating having GDF sited beneath Sellafield site or under the sea with access from Sellafield or site where the fuel is generated.	WP4, WP6
16	Friends of the Lake District	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Should follow two fundamentals of international practice for site selection processes i) process led by independent panel representing a broad range of key stakeholders ii) geological suitability overseen by the independent panel. DECC consultation should cover stages in the process, the independent panel & clear governance arrangements. White Paper should be debated and approved by Parliament. May be legal requirements for RoW etc. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Community benefits should follow geological suitability and not lead site selection. Need independent panel for decision-making as local authorities' objectivity is compromised by them facing budget cuts. <b>Information:</b> Suggests independent panel reporting to Government & overseeing process. Sees voluntarism as needing all parties, overseen by independent panel, to agree information requirement or issue resolution dealt with before moving to next stage. Citizens juries should be established to inform decision-making. Building people's trust requires participation & ownership of decision-making process.	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7
17	Rail Freight Group	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Suggest sites where rail freight can be used to deliver construction materials, and to transport radioactive waste should be given strong priority. This would reduce impact of construction traffic on local communities and deliver carbon reduction compared to road alternatives.	WP4
18	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Disagrees with geological disposal on health/environmental safety grounds and proposes that investment in such an infrastructure project does not provide economically/environmentally sustainable basis for work that benefits society & people's welfare.	n/a
19	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Expresses interest in GDF site selection process	n/a
20	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Opposed to geological disposal in Cumbria and proposes that nuclear waste should be kept above ground where it can be monitored.	n/a

	PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT	
21 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Suggests geological screening of UK & omitting National Parks/SSIs; explaining downside to GDF as well as offering community benefits; using referendum to check local views, not telephone polls; using impartial panel to run local process.	WP4, WP7
22 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Opposed to geological disposal.	n/a
23 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Safe geology a priority; voluntarism a flawed process as it allows those who stand to gain to volunteer others; community benefits seen as bribe; offers suggestions of local needs that could be addressed. <b>Other:</b> Sees number of local jobs created by GDF as small and expresses concerns about safe management of underground facility.	WP2, WP4
24 Parents Concerned About Hinkley	<b>Other:</b> Opposes geological disposal and supports indefinite on-site storage of nuclear waste.	n/a
25 Radiation Free Lakeland	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Suitability of the geology of a proposed site must come before voluntarism. Independent, expert evidence of suitability of geology should be subject to public scrutiny. There should be no benefits used as incentive for hosting facility.	WP4, WP6
26 REDACTED	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Proposes i) a paper search to identify most likely sites ii) exploration of safety of most promising sites iii) a dialogue with local democracy, to gain agreement of one of the sites iv) proceed to build. Argues site selection based on voluntarism will not lead to site that is safest possible nationally.	WP4
27 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> First step of process should be establishing whether geology suitable. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Key facts re. feasibility (especially geology), security, methods of operation, democratic process with opportunity for local views to be heard & acted upon should be detailed and presented upfront before asking for volunteers. Suggests guaranteed RoW at all stages.	WP3, WP4, WP7
28 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Geology should be proven to be safe before any decisions are made. Voluntarism process should be reviewed as process in west Cumbria resulted in people of Cumbria having little say - views of Borough Councils not seen to represent those of wider communities.	WP3, WP4
29 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Should acknowledge radioactive waste is a national issue. To implement safe geological disposal an objective, independent assessment of national geology should be undertaken. Voluntarism will only work if area volunteering known to be potentially geologically suitable/safe. Reflecting on MRWS process in west Cumbria, suggests DECC and NDA as not trusted and proposes their possible replacement with a new statutory-based body. Suggests it should be made clearer that participation in MRWS process not related to investment in nuclear new build/other nuclear facilities. Opposes voluntarism including National Park, SSSI, Special Areas of Conservation, RAMSAR & AONB areas. <b>Other:</b> Proposes focus on procuring better & safer interim storage of nuclear waste at Sellafield.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
30 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
31 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Should identify geologically safe sites first and then seek volunteers. <b>Other:</b> Criticises MRWS process in Cumbria including role of Councillors in contributing to and making decisions based on Partnership report; legitimacy of results from MRWS questionnaire poll and Ipsos Mori telephone poll; British Energy Coast's remit re. the MRWS process.	WP4
32 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
33 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29. <b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> First step in process should be a national survey of suitable geological sites - concentrating on areas where possibility of locating a suitable site is greatest. Initial survey should exclude National Parks, SSSIs other environmentally sensitive registered sites. Only after all suitable sites have been identified and feasibility studies carried out and costed should volunteers be sought. Any future public consultation process - needs to reach grass-roots public from the outset. Public meetings should be held routinely at every stage where conflicting arguments can be properly debated.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
34 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
35 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Nuclear waste disposal is a national issue requiring national debate. Site selection using geological criteria must precede local consultation. Process should involve a panel of geological experts independent of BGS to ensure maximum public transparency. Once suitable sites identified discussion with potential communities should follow and community benefits should be made clear at outset. Upfront financial inducements are more likely to persuade a local community to host a disposal site than employment benefits likely to accrue to future generations.	WP1, WP2, WP4, WP7
36 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Claims Government was originally making proposal without any proper geological survey and that engineering techniques for making waste deposits safe in perpetuity do not yet exist. Supports development of fast breeder reactors. Acts Government to respect its commitment to localism.	n/a
37 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
38 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Seeking volunteer communities should be based on [suitable] geology. <b>Other:</b> Claims that in Cumbria wishes of Parish and District Councils were ignored and that Allerdale Borough Council went against wishes of residents of the National Park.	WP4

39 Individual - [REDACTED]	PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
40 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> An independent national geological survey should be undertaken before seeking volunteer authorities. <b>Other:</b> DECC & NDA should focus on procuring a safe interim storage facility for nuclear waste at Sellafield.	WP4
41 Lawson Engineers Ltd	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Suggested process - Establish correct geology & depth for a GDF and identify potential sites with the correct geology; negotiate whether favourable identified sites can be used & impact on surroundings; simultaneously run public education campaign to explain issues & risks; legislate to locate GDF at 'correct' site(s). <b>Information:</b> Lists typical questions public might want answering. <b>Other:</b> Need to improve above-ground nuclear waste storage facilities at Sellafield.	WP4, WP7
42 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Should be a national geological survey which identifies areas which are geologically suitable/safe. Proposes use of simpler, more predictive geology. <b>Other:</b> Criticises lack of openness in discussions during west Cumbrian MRWS process.	WP4
43 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
44 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Should be an independent national geological survey which identifies areas which are potentially geologically suitable. <b>Other:</b> Refers to distrust of Government's ability to find totally safe solution to storing nuclear waste underground; environmental sensitivity of much of area under consideration in west Cumbria and impact of proposed development on tourism/related industries; lack of legal framework for RoW; criticism of Nirex process; failure in west Cumbria to engage with electorate rather than politicians.	WP4
45 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
46 Westlakes Nuclear Ltd	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Widen invitation to industrial volunteers (i.e. access to large salt deposits) and re-examine possibility of sub-seabed sites. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Clarify 'rules of engagement' e.g design & publish a new, simple definition of 'communities'; make steps through voluntarism/partnership process less formulaic; strengthen withdrawal process; ensure community benefits can withstand future national political/economic changes; replace geological 'unsuitability test' with rounded geological appraisal; include Independent review/validation of technical steps; suggests developing subsurface retrievable storage facility for ILW as a way forwards that helps better understanding of science of the site & performance assessment; implement additional oversight/authorisation mechanism to reassure communities (as reliance on regulators to authorise appropriate developments undermined). <b>Information:</b> Make greater use of enshrines/confirmed positions; switch to more open 'selling' tactics; for potential communities there should be a full exposition early on of what the disposal scheme might entail e.g. numbers of construction workers, traffic, noise, visual impact etc.)	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
47 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Opposes a GDF in west Cumbria due to potential impact on Lake District	n/a
48 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Start process by eliminating areas unlikely to be geologically sound & recognise National Park boundaries. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Improvements to area/benefits must be clearer & legally binding; discussions about the proposals should take place within the communities that will be affected; suggests Parish Councils have better understanding than Borough politicians of local level feelings; for local communities to feel involved in process of site selection, and to maintain trust, there needs to be a more detailed explanation of possible outline proposals.	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7
49 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Starting point should be areas with simple relief & simple geology. <b>Information:</b> Need to make clear & detailed information available to community on what exactly is involved in construction of a GDF, impact on existing infrastructures & industries, and community benefits. <b>Other:</b> Points to progress in geological disposal in other countries being in countries that are more sparsely populated than England & Wales.	WP4, WP7
50 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Geology should be starting point of process and National Parks should be ruled out. To inform communities about the process the government should have gone door to door in the villages or written personally to the properties potentially affected. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Community benefits should involve 'life-changing' amounts of money for communities & home-owners directly affected.	WP2, WP4, WP7

51	ARUP	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> From outset should develop strong, compelling vision that demonstrates advantages to any potential host community of hosting a GDF. The detailed evaluation should also be frank re. potential disadvantages to maintain credibility - establishing this balance is critical. People's concerns must be addressed and benefits must be clear. Currently early stage of MRWS process relies on community champions/local politicians engaging in discussions and registering an Expression of Interest at a stage when they have insufficient non-generic evaluation of benefits. Disadvantages associated with hosting a GDF can be better articulated at this stage. Later in process benefits are more tangible. Early imbalance means little political incentive to defend the dis-benefit. To deliver a local, specific, objective, balanced vision for GDF, for approximately 15 objectively selected district-sized areas could create impartial evaluation pack. These would provide basis for early stakeholder briefing - articulating likely local community advantages while outlining associated risks/disadvantages.</p> <p><b>Attracting communities:</b> Briefing Packs would be grounded in the issues &amp; realities of the district to which they relate and could be discussed with general public, potential local champions &amp; potential members of a Decision Making Body (DMB) and support submission of an Expression of Interest. Also suggests engaging with Local Enterprise Partnerships and having champions who are politically non-aligned. Important that DMB democratically robust &amp; representative of the local community &amp; longer term public policy priorities. To develop public trust messages about nuclear waste should be impartial, properly scientific and ideally conveyed by impartial, trusted authorities. Also need deeper understanding of stakeholder concerns to ensure messages in right language reach right audience.</p>	WP1, WP4, WP7
52	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> From experience of MRWS process in Cumbria absolute certainty of a veto &amp; opportunity to withdraw from process at any stage, enshrined in primary legislation were vital; as was the guarantee of a considerable economic package (i.e. legislated Sovereign Wealth Fund). Highlights need to ensure a local authority has backing of its people before committing a becoming a waste site community - suggests referendum for decision on whether to host a facility. <b>Other:</b> Claims Government's approach of engaging community first then checking geology created vacuum on geological information filled by others. In west Cumbria proposes storage for existing waste in near-surface facilities. Sees a greater role for County Council, as statutory Strategic Waste Authority, on matters relating to the treatment of nuclear waste within the county.</p>	WP2, WP3, WP4,
53	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Wrong to seek volunteer community before identifying geologically adequate sites. <b>Attracting communities:</b> In west Cumbria Government did not articulate advantages would accrue to local communities hosting a GDF so local authorities could do nothing to convince their residents. <b>Other:</b> suggests assessment of MoD sites (i.e. large unpopulated areas) as potential sites for a GDF.</p>	WP4, WP7
54	CPRE North Yorkshire	<p><b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Ensure those consulted/voting in process have the right knowledge and ensure limited input from those not directly involved. <b>Other:</b> Ensure all involved have background knowledge about i) cost of nuclear power compared with other forms of generation, ii) amount of radioactivity generated by nuclear power compared with background radiation from local rocks, altitude, airline flights; iii) effects of alternative energy sources on CO<sub>2</sub>; iv) land required for renewable energy etc.</p>	WP3, WP7
55	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p>Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29. <b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> First step in process should be a national survey of suitable geological sites. Long-term safety needs to be seen as the priority, not short-term economic benefits. <b>Other:</b> Claims Government ignored geological case put against siting a GDF in west Cumbria.</p>	WP4
56	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p>Endorses comments from [REDACTED] (see response 29) and Friends of the Lake District (see response 16). <b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Need independent national geological survey before seeking volunteer communities. Safety risks to any host community should be fully explained/compensated for. Response to such risks depends on factors such as culture and nearness of subject populations - so what is acceptable in underpopulated Sweden/Finland may not be acceptable by consent in UK. <b>Other:</b> Supports procuring a safe interim storage facility for nuclear waste at Sellafield.</p>	WP4, WP7
57	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Other:</b> Opposes a GDF in west Cumbria due to unsuitable geology and impact on tourism.</p>	n/a
58	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> Advocates a thorough national investigation to identify sites secure in long term. (Claims that in west Cumbria residents felt they were being made to accept GDF with little concern for long-term environmental safety or shorter term environmental damage.) <b>Other:</b> Supports investment in storage at Sellafield.</p>	WP4
59	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p>Endorses comments from [REDACTED] - see response 29.</p>	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
60	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> National Parks should be removed from any future consultation for a GDF. After that, geology, rather than 'ignorant volunteerism', should be the determining factor.</p>	WP4

PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT		
61 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> supports points made by Friends of the Lake District (see response 16). Suggests scientific work should be carried out before community engagement as well as full involvement of county, town and parish councils. Suggests numerical targets for criteria such as speed, volume and predicability of water-flow, data on direction, return time and chemical properties of the soil etc. All such information should be published & widely available plus peer reviewed if necessary. Suggests that most prominent critics of repositories should be involved and a representative from the judiciary.	WP3, WP4, WP7
62 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Concerned about safety of geology and flooding. Perceived lack of community support from Sellafield.	n/a
63 Individual -[REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Generally supportive of MRWS team and CoRWM approach to siting review. Suggests that public at large are suspicious and fearful of nuclear power / waste but that nuclear communities are more comfortable with the discussions. Suggests more proactive approach to the process.	WP1, WP7
64 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Supports geological disposal. More proactive role for RWMD and NDA. Information provided to Cumbria County Council to inform decision was imbalanced (NDA vs opposition groups). RWMD should be able to challenge information provided by other groups and individuals. Suggests distance geological disposal from political cycle as far as possible & that a cross-party agreement would be useful. Suggests GDF is a nationally important infrastructure project and should be treated as such.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
65 Churches Together in Cumbria	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Support geological disposal. Safety should come first. Geology in a volunteer community should be compared against geology elsewhere in the country. Geology should be sought that is seismically stable, provable to be water impermeable, can be engineered to prevent water penetration, deep enough to exclude possible future glacial disturbance and immune from terrorist activity at the surface, makes monitoring and retrievability possible. Geological screening should be carried out across all potentially promising areas of England before any decision is taken. Welcome community benefits package including improvements to enhance local communications.	WP2, WP4
66 Individual - [REDACTED]	Endorses [REDACTED] comments - see response 29.	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7
67 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Remind local councillors of their obligations to the party rule book and their Government (they are obliged to give way to what their party wants at a national level). Allow enough space before the next elections for councillors to debate the topic locally, whilst being effectively engaged and assured of the inherent safety of a GDF. Local broadcast media should be engaged early and followed up in the local press to get a wide hearing across a community.	WP1, WP3, WP7
68 Solway Plain Against Nuclear Dump	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Geological suitability and environmental sensitivity should be considered before seeking expressions of interest from potentially suitable communities. DECC should not pressure communities or councils to make decisions. Voluntarism means having the right to say no. If an environmentally sensitive site is selected within a volunteer community, the law requires that all other unprotected sites in the UK are ruled out before a protected site can be considered. Protected sites must be ruled out of the process by law. DECC / NDA need to distance themselves from Nirex legacy. Any councillors directly involved with MRWS should be excluded from voting on the matter. Town and parish councils should have the option to withdraw from the site selection process at any time. Right of Withdrawal should be enshrined within law. A benefits package should be drawn up in the form of a sovereign wealth fund and be sufficient to provide a substantial improvement to the wider area for the full life of the waste. Opposition groups should receive funding to allow them to obtain scientific and legal advice from experts throughout the process. <b>Other:</b> Secure interim storage should be pursued at Sellafield.	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP7, WP10
69 Berkeley (Harwell) SSG	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Identify areas with suitable geology first and then ask the communities to volunteer. <b>Other:</b> Illogical to consider an area away from Sellafield who has the highest volume of the highest level waste - grave risk to public safety to move it to other areas. <b>Other:</b> Cumbria has the best skilled workforce to deal with waste and packaging/processing of this material. They would have to be relocated away from the area if Cumbria was not selected and the impact of the loss of such a skilled workforce on the local community would be significant. <b>Attracting communities:</b> The benefits of having a GDF should be more clearly explained.	WP2, WP4 , WP7
70 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Volunteerism should be preceded by an identification of suitable sites based upon sound geological information. This should be in the form of a national assessment of geological data so that all safe potential sites can be identified. It should include Wales and Scotland, as well as England. Environmentally protected areas such as national parks, AONB and SSSI should be excluded from this process. Part of the selection process would be to identify the level of voluntarism that existed in a community. It is not enough for local authority politicians to volunteer their community. Parish councils need to be consulted as do representative groups from other interest in the community; business groups, tourism bodies, etc. This process must be widely publicised at the outset. Engagement has to be immediate and short, not a self-defeating long drawn out process. <b>Attracting communities:</b> The benefits package should be stated upfront and guaranteed by legislation against withdrawal by future governments. If more than one community is identified out of this process then a further process would have to be designed to differentiate one 'bid' from another. This might be a reverse auction	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP10

71 Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Process should start with geological screening using international criteria. Communities with best geology should then be approached to discuss volunteering. Environmentally sensitive areas should be excluded. <b>Other:</b> Supports geological disposal and recognises link to new nuclear power generation.</p>	WP4, WP7
72 Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Of the opinion that another round of voluntarism will not be successful. <b>Other:</b> Suggests using offshore pipelines to store / dispose of waste canisters under the Atlantic.</p>	WP7
73 Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Suggests carrying out a desk-based assessment (perhaps supplemented with geophysics) of geology earlier in the process using BGS as a neutral and trusted party. Suggests that there should be multiple Decision about Participation throughout the process rather than a 'cliff-edge' Decision to Participate to put a positive emphasis on the decisions. Highlights need for Government to clearly set out lines of accountability in the process. Wants greater clarity on community benefits, both direct and indirect. Supports the idea of reports assessing the potential socio-economic impacts of a GDF in a host community. Supports the positioning on GDF as a 'prize' to be proud of hosting. Previous attempts to attract communities have been overshadowed by events in Cumbria so we should not be dissuaded from trying again. Suggests approaching nuclear communities. Suggests the production of area-specific GDF safety assessments and Environmental Impact Assessments earlier in the process. Suggests increased clarity on inventory for disposal and how / when a community would be consulted on inventory decisions for a GDF in their area. Comments on the need for a clear 'go-to' website on geological disposal and integrate website strategies with other involved organisations. <b>Other:</b> Suggests that construction should not begin immediately after the end of Stage 5 but that (due to uncertainty) underground investigations, including R&amp;D, should take place to confirm suitability of site. Final community Decision about Participation would be at the end of underground investigations. Suggests need to consider innovative ways of financing geological disposal.</p>	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7
74 Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Other:</b> Opposed to geological disposal in Cumbria based on information from Prof. Hazeldine &amp; Smythe, perceived damage to infrastructure, tourist industry and negative opinion of Sellafield safety record. Perception that Government are not interested in wellbeing of Cumbria.</p>	
75 Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Suggests geological study prior to asking for volunteer communities and cites international experience. Those leading the process must be as independent as possible. Environmentally sensitive areas (SSSIs, SACS etc) should be excluded from siting studies. Parish councils should be able to exclude themselves from the process. Conditions of Right of Withdrawal must be clear, legally binding and apply at all levels from parish to county. <b>Other:</b> Suggests a review to confirm that geological disposal is still the most appropriate option.</p>	WP1, WP3, WP4
76 Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Decide whether volunteerism principle should continue to be pursued. Invitations to participate in the process should be targetted on those areas (nationally) judged to be capable of providing a suitable host geology. Narrow down areas based on logistical suitability given current and future locations of GDF destined wastes.</p> <p><b>Planning:</b> Then either 1) seek conventional planning permission for construction of exploratory boreholes, areas found geologically suitable then approached to ascertain if they are willing, 2) progress both the preliminary site investigation works and the construction of a GDF on the eventually chosen site in the usual way using the current planning legislation. In the event of the rejection of the planning application for either preliminary works or for the actual construction of a GDF at the local level, an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate and ultimately to the Secretary of State could be used to decide whether the project should go ahead. The argument for handling the GDF project through the conventional planning process is that the footprint on the surface and the employment levels provided are likely to be comparable to those of a new factory, and that therefore securing planning consent ought to be treated in exactly the same way as a planning application for a new factory. In the normal planning application process there is little or no role for a Community Siting Partnership as each step is part of a well-established formal process, or 3) progress the scheme under the Planning Act 2008 as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) which might require a re-examination of National Policy Statements and/or the definition of a Hazardous Waste Facility (see Sections 5 and 30 of the Planning Act, respectively). Considering whether the planning laws should be changed to shift the planning lead from County to Borough, i.e. to a more local level. <b>Drafting:</b> Guidance in Annex C of the MRWS White Paper on Community Siting Partnerships left the process open to veto by too wide a community. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Publish details of the benefits package explaining costs and benefits of participating in MRWS. However, It should not be necessary to 'bribe' a community to accept a development of this kind. Concentrate on the usual planning considerations of environmental impact, job creation, etc</p>	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP10, WP11

77 Individual - [REDACTED]

WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP10

**Improvements to the site selection process:** The very first step of MRWS should be to conduct an independent and detailed national survey of the geology to highlight the most geologically suitable areas in the whole of the UK for a GDF. MRWS should only seek expressions of interest from areas which are both geologically suitable and not environmentally sensitive.

**Other:** Lack of public trust in MRWS a lot of those involved in MRWS have history with NIREX.

**Decision-making:** Any future process should be transparent and fair. All votes must go to full council to help prevent the culture of grooming senior councillors. MRWS must allow towns or parishes to exclude themselves from consideration at any time for any reason. **Legislative:** The Right of Withdrawal must be enshrined in law.

**Attracting communities:** A benefits package must be specified and sufficient to provide a substantial improvement to the wider area for the full life of the waste. **Other:** There is an urgent need for secure interim storage on the Sellafield site to remove the intolerable risk identified by the NAO

78 Moresby Parish Council

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Any future call for volunteers must be after BGS has screened the country and probably in greater detail than was the case in West Cumbria. Draft a clear statement of the geological requirements of a GDF in terms which are independent of the rock type and are clear and unambiguous such as the volume of the formation, the permeability, distances to other features (water courses, valuable minerals....). Such a specification would ensure that when a site is under discussion, the suitability could be clearly demonstrated by reference to the specification. This has clear benefits in removing the suggestion that a site has been selected and then the geological conditions of the site then declared suitable because it is convenient and no other site has volunteered. **Decision-making:** Much closer adherence to 6.18 of White Paper both by the local authority and central government. Clear independent leadership of any group however formed that undertakes the work in moving to a decision to participate. Acceptance that even when an expression of interest is made for a certain area it does not follow that a decision to participate need be made for the whole of that area. **Attracting communities:** The community benefits that were to be part of the package should have been seen as one part of a massive economic development plan (including the West Cumbria Britain's Energy Coast) with extensive benefits. **Legislative:** Enshrine the right of withdrawal in legislation.

WP2, WP3, WP4, WP10

79 Individual - [REDACTED]

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Government should consider placing the GDF 1) near a nuclear power station, 2) under the sea, 3) into old oil or gas wells or 4) on an uninhabited island such as Rockall 320km from outer hebrides which would remove the need to consult local people.

WP4

80 Individual - [REDACTED]

**Improvements to the site selection process:** The process should begin with the technical assessment of potential candidate sites nationally based on suitability of geology. A hierarchy of technically preferred locations should be generated, and this should form the basis of any subsequent public consultation processes. **SHE & Communications:** MRWS was progressed in conference rooms and working groups, and understood from those perspectives, but when the public i.e. 'the community' first truly engaged in debate it was in the village halls, streets, pubs, shops and local media of West Cumbria where DECC/NDA had no presence; no control. **Attracting communities:** MRWS process applied in West Cumbria conflated 'local authorities' with 'communities' and therefore Government was in dialogue with proxies for communities rather than communities themselves. There is the political potential for the larger population to chase community benefits whilst dumping the disbenefits onto a minority community, and therefore community engagement must be direct and not indirect. DECC/NDA got community engagement wrong. **Legislation:** A statutory Right of Withdrawal (RoW) to be invoked by the actual potential host communities and not by their proxies would help alleviate some of these issues.

WP1, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP8, WP10

81

Scottish Environment Protection Agency

**Other:** SEPA have no specific comments at this time but wish to be kept informed of any developments in the process

n/a

82

Individual - [REDACTED]

**Improvements to the site selection process:** A geological survey should be carried out at the start of the process and should lead into the voluntarism process. Geologically unsuitable areas should not be able to enter the process. Financial and other benefits should be clearly identified and legally protected. National parks should be excluded.

WP2, WP3, WP4

83

Radiation Free Lakeland

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Prerequisite should be geological suitability of an area rather than willingness to volunteer. **Other:** Research into radiation risks to the Cumbrian environment, biodiversity and human health should be carried out by independent scientists before the community volunteers.

WP4

84

Individual - [REDACTED]

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Suitable geology should come before asking for volunteer communities (cites international experience). **Other:** Distrusting of NDA and MRWS Partnership. More compelled by information provided by opposition groups than that provided by NDA.

WP4

85

Individual - [REDACTED]

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Nationwide geological assessment of suitability should be undertaken and only volunteers accepted from potentially suitable areas. Not enough information provided in Cumbria about potential job creation, negative impacts to tourism etc. Not enough communication within Local Government. Questions in public meetings were not always answered. Lack of clarity about nature or volume of waste to be disposed of in a GDF. Absence of a 'plan B' was a cause for concern to community, making them feel as though HLW would be disposed of in Cumbria regardless of its suitability.

WP2, WP4, WP6, WP7

PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT			
86	Seaton Parish Council	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> The selection process should focus on seeking areas around the country which have suitable geology &amp; selecting a preferred site from those, rather than seeking suitable geology after an area has expressed an interest in hosting such a facility.</p>	WP4
87	St Bees Parish Council	<p><b>Decision-making:</b> Lack of an effective and acceptable decision making process and body - the process of requiring three authorities to separately agree to proceed was not an effective decision making process. <b>Attracting communities:</b> The benefits to a local community of hosting a deep geological storage facility were too vague with non-specific timescales. <b>Legislation:</b> the right of a community to withdraw from the process at the next stage was not clear and unambiguous and there was no legal guarantee <b>Other:</b> There was a widespread lack of trust in the site selection process and a perception that the exercise was not a genuine consultation.</p>	WP2, WP3, WP7, WP8, WP10
88	Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development	<p><b>Attracting communities:</b> Government could have been much clearer much earlier about community benefits. <b>Legislation:</b> Believes MRWS position on RoW until end of Stage 5 is clearly specified enough. <b>Other:</b> Re perceived negative impact on tourism in Lake District - believes the Sellafield Exhibition Centre was an important wet weather tourism destination. <b>Decision-making:</b> Perceives that there were gaps in communication between bodies such as the Cumbria Partnership, the NDA and the Central Government, and the three key local authorities—especially their vital decision making committees. <b>Other:</b> there are also lessons to be learnt from countries that appear to have successfully managed the local area volunteer approach to decisions on deep mined disposal facilities. <b>Planning:</b> Considering trying some of the new procedures of the Planning Inspectorate's Major Projects Unit? For example: Statements of Community Consultation (SoCC), Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and Planning Performance Agreements (PPA). <b>Policy:</b> Appendix B to the Nuclear NPS (DECC, 2011), the Government notes that: "Government is committed to geological disposal as the technical solution, such that it will seek to develop alternative ways to implement that solution if the current framework, as set out in the MRWS White Paper, ultimately proves to be unsuccessful in the UK". Merit in carrying out a nationwide search for sites, based on key criteria, to help to widen the scope of, and encourage more, potential volunteer communities. Indeed this could be seen as good and necessary practice in considering alternatives in the assessment process.</p>	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP7, WP8, WP10
89	Nuclear Free Local Authorities	<p><b>Policy:</b> Revisit CoRWM recommendation of Deep Geological Disposal. Alternatives should be evaluated. <b>Other:</b> There needs to be an open, transparent and inclusive engagement process at public and stakeholder level beginning with consultation to determine how they would like to be consulted. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Establish ground rules on community benefits. <b>Other:</b> Consideration of the security issues around the storage of high and intermediate level radioactive active waste, both in existing facilities and in any new facilities <b>Other:</b> Government should establish a new oversight committee which has a wide range of expertise including social science and ethics. This committee should manage a fund to which communities, NGOs, etc can bid for support to pay for independent expertise. <b>Other:</b> Need to determine the likely inventory communities will be expected to accept. <b>Other:</b> Further discussion needed on the 'retrievability issue'. <b>Other:</b> RWMD's work on the 'Issues List' should include critics, NGOs, nominated representatives of major stakeholder groups and appropriate minority groups. RWMD should be required to progress all 'generic' issues. <b>Other:</b> A process to develop storage options should be implemented. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> The first step must be to review the existing UK data and identify the most appropriate geological areas of the country. This should begin with a consultation process which looks at the criteria potential host geology would have to meet. Then a list of those regions which have been screened out as unsuitable should be issued and a call for volunteer communities made</p>	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7, WP8
90	Crosscanonby Parish Council	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> the best way forward is to find a location where the geological structure is mainly granite and build a repository there.</p>	WP4
91		<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Supportive of staged process, right to withdraw, community benefits, volunteerism and partnership approaches. Suggest RoW and benefits should be enshrined in legislation. New oversight committee should be set up with skillsets in social science and ethics and they should manage a fund which communities can draw on for independent advice. Identify what constitutes a 'host rock' and establish criteria a site would have to meet. Appropriate geological areas should be identified as a first step. Inventory should be discussed with communities so that they understand what they are volunteering for. There should be separate processes for new build and legacy wastes. Ongoing public &amp; stakeholder engagement is required at a national and regional level. NWAA document sets out a number of suggestions for how stakeholders and communities could be engaged. Previous process was remote from 'the community'. A definition is required of what constitutes a 'community'. Decision making needs to be clearly set out. <b>Other:</b> Going back to CoRWM's recommendations, NWAA question whether geological disposal is the right approach and claim that Government have ignored CoRWM's recommendations or interpreted them as Government wanted to. Lack of progress on interim storage. RWMD's issue management process lacks visibility. Consultation should be carried out on how R&amp;D programme should be carried forward in an open and transparent way.</p>	WP3, WP6, WP7
92	Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Starting point has to be geological suitability.</p>	
	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Other:</b> Is of the opinion that Cumbria is not geologically suitable for a GDF.</p>	WP4
93	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Other:</b> Is not in favour of a GDF in Cumbria</p>	



		PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT	
94	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Known safe geology should inform siting. Solid and long-lasting community benefits would make a volunteerism realistic option. Lack of advocacy harmful to the process. <b>Other:</b> Suggests more investment in storage facilities at Sellafield and suggests stopping new build.	WP1, WP2, WP4
95	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> More clarity required on inventory for disposal, particularly whether new build waste is included. <b>Other:</b> Holds the opinion that Cumbria is geologically unsuitable. Concerned that future generations will be involuntary hosts to nuclear waste.	WP6
96	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Potential host geology should be identified before asking for volunteers. Benefits to the local area should be spelt out at the time that communities are asked to volunteer. <b>Other:</b> Security at Sellafield should be reviewed to secure against the danger of terrorist attack	WP4
97	Gosforth & Ponsonby Parish Councils	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Need to build trust amongst any new partnership and with the general public by truly being open and transparent. Definition of 'community' required. Clarity on RoW and any decision points is required. Geology and safety need to come first, then voluntarism (cite international experience). Should exclude national parks from the siting process. Need more detail on how dangerous the waste is, how a man-made barrier system is expected to contain it etc. Need clarity on potential benefits including infrastructure developments. Government needs to ensure that any future partnerships work as intended. The full democratically elected membership of decision making bodies need to be engaged rather than just Executives. Parish Councils have a part to play in the process. Future partnerships need to engage properly with opposition groups or detractors. <b>Other:</b> Suspicious that NDA / Nirex had a greater understanding of West Cumbrian geology than they shared. Criticise lack of Strategic Environmental Assessment before Stage 4.	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7
98	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Other:</b> Grateful for the opportunity to contribute. Highlights a number of issues which he believes have been sidelined in deference to GDF. Security of interim stores at Sellafield needs addressing along with surface management and shallow interim burial, which should be considered as sister topics to GDF.	
99	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Attracting communities:</b> There needs to be a tangible benefit that lasts a long time. Financial incentives need to be defined carefully at the start of the process and not vaguely promised. One suggestion would be that the local taxpayer is compensated for having a local facility, either by a reduction in council tax or the county getting the equivalent of the business tax that the GDF will generate over an extended period of time. Such as the time the repository is under construction and open to receive waste. <b>Decision-making:</b> the relationship between local and central government in other countries may be a factor in how communities come to a decision. <b>Drafting:</b> what guidance was used to define 'safe' disposal, if it was 'one equivalent death per million people per year' then this should be publicised and balanced against other known government expenditure to protect its citizens ie ~£1.5m cost per road death saved <b>Other:</b> the same principles of risk and benefit could be employed for the current "fracking" debate. <b>Roles &amp; Responsibilities:</b> Central government should aim to be at arms length in the site selection process and confine itself to identifying all geologically suitable areas. Centrally setting the policy via the Environmental Agency and the HSE should be used as these bodies have an overall view of safety of the public and environment.	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP11
100	Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> MRWS GDF siting approach adopts what is widely considered internationally to be best practice in terms of putting involvement and voluntarism in prime position. The fundamental basis of MRWS should be retained and the emphasis should be on enhancing it, rather than making significant changes. An acknowledged willingness to be flexible in MRWS staging would also be helpful, adapting the technical staging to the technical differences between potential sites/communities. A flexible programme might wish to target certain geological indicators early for some potential siting locations, with limited, targeted surface or borehole investigations. A fundamental consideration today is whether to permit an additional pathway in MRWS, where RWMD would express preferences for the geological and geographical environments in which they would work. This would not replace the open volunteer process, but would be an extension to it, where RWMD continued to respond to any volunteers that come forward via the existing mechanisms of MRWS, but could simultaneously focus special efforts on approaching communities in certain areas. Preference should be expressed unambiguously. <b>Roles:</b> A champion organisation that has the authority to promote the GDF and its essential place in the energy infrastructure of the nation is needed. the GDF siting and development process needs to be actively marketed to, and negotiated with, prospective host communities by an organisation that can speak with absolute confidence and authority. NDA's RWMD is the only organisation with the knowledge and ultimate remit to fill this role. criticisms from some key players in Cumbria about the lack of information and clarity on topics seem justified. It would be helpful if Government spoke with conviction and enthusiasm from ministerial level about the national requirement for geological disposal and ensured that the resources and legal basis are functional and not inappropriately constrained. In a more proactive role as champion, RWMD would need improved internal resources to extend its science, engineering and science communication capabilities. To date, geological disposal has been treated rather as an unwanted orphan in the UK. GDF development needs to be seen as a key component of our national technological capability. <b>Inventory:</b> We cannot be sure today about the materials that the UK will wish to dispose of over the rest of this century, or even	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7,

PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT			
101	Individual - [REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Dungeness local taxpayers were resentful of a considerable amount of their money being spent to fund the survey - if funding had been provided for the cost or at the least some matching funding it would have dispersed a major grievance from the outset. There are a limited number of sites which are available for this kind of facility in the UK. It would be useful if DECC would identify these areas/sites and target their efforts in this direction. Saves time, effort and money and eliminates unsuitable sites from the outset. Then sites identified as suitable should be informed and invited <b>SHE &amp; Comms:</b> NDA/DECC could have provided direct or indirect support for the publicity campaign (including explanation of benefits) for which Shepway District Council was severely lacking. SDC lost the PR battle from the outset to a very well organised PR campaign against them.</p>	WP1, WP2, WP4, WP7, WP8
102	AREVA Risk Management Consulting Ltd	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Undertake some site-specific elements from Stage 4 prior to communities deciding whether to participate so more information is available.</p> <p><b>Attracting communities:</b> More examples of similar international programmes. Make information available on the following: impact of a GDF and its construction on the socio-economics of the region, impact of a GDF and its construction on the environment, additional transport and transport infrastructure that could be expected, better understanding of where a GDF might be sited within the area put forward, more clarity on the benefits package, confidence that any benefits package would be robust to changes in Government.</p>	WP2, WP4
103	Individual - [REDACTED]	Raises trust issues believes that authorities involved cannot be trusted to have an honest input and that they will go over and over the process until they get the answer they want.	WP8
104	Allerdale and Copeland Green Party	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Facilities should be located as close to the site where the waste was produced and must demonstrate how wastes would be retrieved. No new nuclear until capability of long term management of wastes is demonstrated. Remit should be widened to include possible siting of storage/disposal methods other than a GDF. Public support should be demonstrated before councils express an interest (builds trust). Look at geology first then approach volunteers from suitable communities. <b>Roles:</b> NDA and DECC came out of the process badly and maybe should be removed from siting process - may need a new statutory body. <b>Drafting:</b> A credible consultation should recognise the possibility of failure. During the MRWS process, it was repeated by DECC officials several times in public that Plan B was to make Plan A work. A credible Plan B is needed. Failure was a lack of clarity over definitions and parameters.</p>	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP11
105	Cumbria Association of Local Councils	<p>Asks Government to allow 12 consultation period. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> An initial appraisal of the relative geological suitability of different parts of the country needs to be undertaken. The cost of not undertaking such an appraisal and failing to generate credibility for the site selection process in the minds of the public at an early stage will be far greater than the cost of undertaking it. Communities need to understand why alternatives to GDF have been rejected - suggests an SEA. Present the GDF project as an integral part of a wider economic/social development programme. <b>Roles:</b> Government needs to consider a more active role for itself in promoting interest in a GDF based development programme. <b>Decision-making:</b> Any reviewed site selection process should explicitly recognise town and parish councils as statutory local authorities and place them appropriately within decision-making arrangements at all stages in the site selection process.</p>	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4
106	Underskiddaw Parish Council	<p>MRWS has been demonstrated not to work. Perceives that existing information on unsuitability of geology was ignored. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Site safety and suitability should be considered before volunteerism. This must be a reputable survey : independent, authoritative and capable of being internationally recognised and respected. Government should detail the information which any volunteering body will need to have. <b>Decision making:</b> Decision making was entrusted to bodies which did not have the status or resources to deal with the responsibility. Larger authorities such as District and County can "volunteer" to have a GDF situated in a host community which may not wish to have it. Decisions should not be made on the basis of dubious polls, but by a properly conducted vote. <b>Legislative:</b> the Right of Withdrawal should be guaranteed to the host community by law. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Clear and guaranteed package of benefits. Open and honest dealings with all stakeholders. Agencies competence needs to be demonstrated from independent bodies.</p>	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP10
107	Kent County Council	<p>KCC supports the volunteerism and partnership principles. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> commission a baseline desk study of the UK with regard to geology and seismicity in order to (a) eliminate areas that are unlikely to be suitable and (b) to identify 'areas of search' where the geological and seismological conditions may be suitable, subject to further exploratory studies. This would assist communities in deciding whether they wish to engage in the MRWS process. <b>Attracting Communities:</b> The package of financial benefits for the host communities should be identified and a commitment should be made to make this available in a staged manner.</p>	WP2, WP4
108	Millom Without and Whicham Parish Councils	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> The previous process seemed adequate (as far as it went), in that it allowed Parish Councils to make our views known. However, Copeland did ignore the views of their parish councils so any further consultation should ensure the views of the Parishes are taken into account and given as much weight as the views of the Borough Council. The government itself should come up with areas within the UK that would be safe/able to take such a facility and then take an informed final decision, after consultation, in the knowledge that all the important considerations can be met by the designated area</p>	WP3, WP4

<p>109 Cumbria County Council</p>	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> DECC should consider ways of ensuring greater clarity and transparency in any future MRWS decision making process. there may be a case for reviewing the approach taken by successful programmes overseas where identification of geology preceded identification of volunteer communities. More active community engagement and pro-actively address and deal with the questions and concerns that communities will have. Make clear proposals setting out how the waste could be alternatively managed in the long-term, in the event that the establishment of a GDF was not successful. There was a perception that there was no Plan B and that Government would push through with MRWS in West Cumbria come what may. <b>Legislation:</b> Provide legal underpinning to the right of withdrawal up to the point of GDF construction (and the detail of how the process would work, particularly in a 2-tier local government area). Provide legal underpinning for community benefits. <b>Inventory:</b> DECC and RWMD to bring greater clarity to the inventory of wastes earmarked for disposal and the scope for waste retrieval. <b>Roles:</b> Review and clarify the roles of CoRWM, NDA and DECC. Maybe establish a national forum of key stakeholders to provide ongoing advice to Government, at least while this policy review continues</p>	<p>WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7, WP10</p>
<p>110 Shepway District Council</p>	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Make site specific information available prior to even an EoI. The local community should be allowed sufficient time to absorb and learn about the possibility of hosting a GDF before being asked to vote or otherwise express an opinion. A decision to submit an EoI was seen as the beginning of the siting process - make it clear that there is no substantive commitment to the process unless and until a Decision to Participate is submitted. Consider geology before seeking volunteers. Make socio-economic impact information available. <b>Decision making:</b> Provide greater clarity on issues around democratic accountability and decision-making. Responsibilities for, and influence over, decision-making of local and neighbouring councils at parish, district and county levels, particularly if not all of these councils agree. <b>Roles:</b> DECC should lead on promoting a GDF, RWMD should be limited to solely providing technical information. The form, powers and democratic accountability of 'Community Siting Partnerships. <b>Attracting communities:</b> consider providing some financial assistance to Local Authorities before EoI. Single most important change is to clarify the benefits package. Earlier available information from which to allay concerns from community members. <b>Legislation:</b> Clarify the community's rights to exercise the Right of Withdrawal. <b>Inventory:</b> Would it be possible to limit the size and type of the waste inventory that could be disposed of in a GDF without further agreement by the community, thus ensuring that their agreement would not be open-ended.</p>	<p>WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP10</p>
<p>111 Individual -[REDACTED]</p>	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> the siting process should have begun first with an open and honest discussion with the West Cumbrian communities, together with a small number of other existing nuclear communities, in recognition of their unique status as the current 'hosts' of the stored wastes. A much more proactive approach is needed in which Government actively and practically engages early with both nuclear and non-nuclear communities, and provides considerably more information about the GDF, and the likely benefits and disbenefits that could accrue to a host community, especially in relation to the community benefits package. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Different approach needed for nuclear and non-nuclear communities with additional background information provided to non nuclear communities. <b>Legislation:</b> Community benefits package should be protected by statutory legislation. Existing legislation does not fit the complexities of a GDF so bespoke legislation needed to deal with - roles and responsibilities, planning application and consents, regulation and volunteerism.</p>	<p>WP1, WP2, WP4, WP5, WP7, WP10</p>
<p>112 [REDACTED] - NOEND "No Ennerdale Nuclear Dump"</p>	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> There needs to be a National geological survey to first to identify suitable sites and then the white paper developed to provide process to encourage volunteers. Sites of natural, historical or heritage importance, especially those that have a high level of legal protection should be excluded at an early stage. a Cost/Benefit analysis would have been carried out and the Lake District National Park would have been removed from consideration. <b>Attracting communities:</b> The Government needs to be crystal clear on the: Definition of a "Host community"; Community Control with regard to the "Right of Withdrawal"; Community Benefits Package; Compensation. Build trust through clarity because trust was a fundamental issue with the WCMRWS process and take the politics out. Any new White Paper should include a serious commitment to forming an independent scrutiny panel to oversee any future engagement with the local community. This panel must not include people with any form of self-interest in the outcome. decisions need to be based on science and trust. People tend not to engage until they feel threatened. <b>Other:</b> The WCMRWS Partnership was viewed with suspicion and too politically motivated. Sufficient financial commitment should be made for short term secure storage. A WP must build public trust in the methodology by ensuring "retrievability" at the fore front of the process. Parish Councils should be given more control in relation to managing the benefits package.</p>	<p>WP1, WP2, WP4, WP7 WP9.</p>

**Improvements to the site selection process:** The number of stages in the process may be too many; perhaps 2 / 3 key stages will be enough. Communication of science to the host community is crucial and having a good debate on the geology and on aspects of the engineered barrier and how they behave with respect to radionuclide behaviour with a representative range of stakeholders will be crucial going forward. It is also important to consider and communicate the risks and costs of, for example, long term storage and bulk transport of higher level wastes across the UK. A healthy debate where advocates, independents, the opposition and the community have a voice is essential. Incentives and training for stakeholders including “experts” needs to be part of the forward programme. **Attracting communities:** Use social media, web and local meetings to engage. Be innovative – what about open laboratories, Schools programmes etc. being part of the forward plan. Ultimately, the debate about “how safe is a GDF in my community” needs to be had across several levels and the process needs to have facilitation of this debate at its heart. A clear statement of value and commitment to financial and other incentives before any community is expected to host and communication of this to the wider community and stakeholders will be essential.

[REDACTED] - Dalton Nuclear Institute  
114

WP1, WP2, WP7.

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Defined benefits (both in terms of scope and value) to encourage communities to start and then maintain their involvement. Visibility and guarantees of earlier and more tangible benefits realisation for the community in order to achieve local political and public support - possibly a staged benefits process, (includes suggestions). Government could be more proactive in undertaking early geological and environmental screening and to go out and identify and engage with local communities. National screening could be overlaid with environmental considerations similar to the SEA undertaken by the DECC as part of the siting process for new nuclear build locations. More/quicker challenge to misinformation. **Attracting communities:** Use Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as a vehicle for stakeholder engagement tool to identify, quantify and enhancing the local benefits a GDF would bring whilst helping recognise and mitigate where possible any detriments of health. This would have benefit in ‘localising’ stakeholder engagement discussions. The ‘what is the effect on me’ question has to be answered on an individual basis, not just county/borough. A much more rapid and flexible approach to stakeholder engagement needs to be adopted. In WCMRWS engagement was too focused through the Partnership - there are other groups that could be advocates. **Other:** Employ local people early in the process.

[REDACTED] - Wayfarer Project Services  
115

WP2, WP4, WP7

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Any future MRWS process needs to be chaired and managed by a person independent, of any government body, build in fiscal probity. The DMB should have observer status only in the process and have no influence on, or role in assessing, the potential host communities’ views or in representing those views - that should be done by town and parish councils. Right of Withdrawal should be extended to the host community, not solely vested with the DMBs, RoW enshrined in statute. A UK wide search for the most suitable geology before continuing. National Parks, SSSIs etc. should be excluded areas from the outset. Cumbria should be excluded from any future MRWS process due to the lack of trust in the DMB BCs. Not in the National Park. **Other:** repeated instances where information is omitted from data provided by NDA and DMBs. Flexibility is open to abuse. Community views were misrepresented by the MRWS Partnership.

Individual - [REDACTED]  
116

WP1, WP3, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP10

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Site selection should be a gated approach with a number of hold points where a community could pull out this was not communicated widely or clearly enough. **Attracting communities:** Engage more widely with potential communities rather than wait for an expression of interest. Engagement should be on the basis of a more positive spin of a GDF. A URL would allow people to visit and see that the GDF would be an engineered facility rather than a “waste dump”. This would widen interest and understanding. **Other:** A URL would keep (the benefits of) research and engineering tests in the UK.

[REDACTED] - Parsons Brinckerhoff  
117

WP3, WP7.

**Improvements to the site selection process:** The roles of organisations such as DECC, the NDA/RWMD and the CoRWMT should be clear and communicated especially responsibilities (advisory/decision-making powers). Clarity on the role of the regulators during the early stages of site selection (Govt. role in promoting their independence). Relevant information should be made available and used, irrespective of the particular ‘stage’ of the process. RWMD should become a prospective SLC. **Attracting communities:** Reduce uncertainties on inventory, community benefits, impacts during characterisation and facility development, early consideration of geological suitability, community veto and the application of the local or centralised planning system. Use a partnering agreement (between community and RWMD) to clarify the process. Consider how to initiate early discussions and information exchanges with local authorities and more general discussion on the process with other groups, for example learned societies. Use social media and digital platforms to support engagement.

Environment Agency  
118

WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7

**Other:** west Cumbria/Sellafield is the most suitable site and no other area will volunteer. In my opinion, the Stage 4 and Stage 5 work must proceed at Sellafield.

[REDACTED]- Alan Auld Group Ltd

119	Member of the GDF User's Group	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Earlier preliminary geological investigations would be useful - volunteerism approach must continue - DECC need to take stronger position. Community benefits in the early stages of the process are necessary, but the continuation of benefits should be predicated upon prompt (not rushed) progression of the process. The GDF needs a 'champion'. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Perhaps starting with individuals and organisations would be more effective. Communication strategy could consider attracting individuals, organisations or Government departments that are land owners. More national awareness, debate and publicity is required but will need careful handling of presentational aspects. Greater awareness of the socio-economic benefits during construction and operation is needed. All communities want to know is 'what is in it for me'. If we approach councils and local authorities = they consult = anti groups mobilise. Has any consideration been given to establishing a consortia to give the concept of the GDF a more commercial persona?</p>	WP2, WP4, WP7.
120	[REDACTED] - Ennerdale and Kinniside Parish Council	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Any future MRWS process needs to be chaired and managed by a person independent, of any government body, build in fiscal probity. The DMB should have observer status only in the process and have no influence on, or role in assessing, the potential host communities' views or in representing those views - that should be done by town and parish councils. Right of Withdrawal should be extended to the host community, not solely vested with the DMBs, RoW enshrined in statute. A UK wide search for the most suitable geology before continuing. National Parks, SSSIs etc. should be excluded areas from the outset. <b>Other:</b> repeated instances where information is omitted from data provided by NDA and DMBs. Flexibility is open to abuse. Community views were misrepresented by the MRWS Partnership.</p>	WP1, WP3, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP10
121	West Cumbria and North Lakes Friends of the Earth	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> If voluntarism is going to work, there must be a high degree of respect on the part of government to those who have taken the trouble to get involved. MRWS in W. Cumbria bore little resemblance to the stages in the White Paper. <b>Decision-making:</b> Conflates 'communities' with 'decision-making bodies'. Although the Borough Councils made favourable decisions there were many communities who were not in favour of continuing the process. DECC's policy on windfarms makes clearer distinction between local authorities and communities giving residents greater rights to oppose. <b>Other:</b> Nature, scope and remit of this consultation is of major concern and restricted to written responses.</p>	WP1, WP3, WP7
122	Cumbria Chamber of Commerce	<p><b>Attracting communities:</b> Acknowledge risks to the brand of a volunteering area and fund work to research and mitigate potential impacts. Be clear that community benefits are additional to impact mitigation and additional to the expected positive impacts. Be more forthcoming with community benefit packages. Consider timing of benefits and possible ring-fenced fund. Recognise integration of geological disposal with other nuclear opportunities as one package. Seek opportunities to accelerate the process. Ensure displacement issues are assessed and addressed prior to the start of construction.</p>	WP2, WP5, WP7
123	Dounreay Stakeholder Group	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Some participants have actively tried to force decision or conclusions too early in the process which has stalled the initiative. Any future MRWS initiative must include much stronger emphasis to communities and participants on the measured step-by-step process. It has to be accepted now that the suitability of the geology is a key factor. Initial screening of the areas in England and Wales to identify potential suitable areas would be advantageous. Due to transport issues the process should acknowledge that proximity to Sellafield is crucial. It would be better to give more emphasis to land and land ownership. Planning permission is attached to land not communities. Regulators should take a more proactive role in supporting geological disposal. Engagement processes in west Cumbria were excellent. Elected officials should be more proactive. Land owned by Government should be identified for potential use.</p>	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP7
124	Seascale Parish Council	<p><b>Improvements to engagement:</b> WestCumbriaMRWS consultation was extremely thorough, probably too much and over too long a timescale. Would support a renewed consultation exercise in West Cumbria alone.</p>	WP1, WP7
125	Swarthmoor Area Quakers (SW Cumbria)	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Producing a robust safety case must be the overriding motivation for the process. Nationalism should be excluded as a constraint on the process. West Cumbria geology not suitable. Transporting waste from Sellafield to a safe repository elsewhere is manageable and affordable. <b>Policy:</b> New nuclear build must not be a constraint to the waste disposal process. No plan B implies a complete lack of rigorous, open-minded critical process. In Finland and Sweden geological integrity was the over-arching parameter. The search criteria here should be for appropriate geology first followed by voluntarism. Presenting community benefits as part of the initial decision-making process amounts to bribery. <b>Other:</b> Areas, including Cumbria that were excluded in the past cannot be resurrected now. A coherent national strategy on nuclear waste management is essential.</p>	WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7, WP11

126	McCombie Consulting	<p><b>Improvements to site selection process:</b> The voluntary process is correct. UK has and can learn from experiences in Japan and Canada. Confidential initial talks with local community leaders. Potential volunteers should not be publicised individually. Siting team needs to have a rapid and flexible approach to engaging with communities. Persons acting as direct interfaces to communities should be chosen, not on hierarchical principles, but proven ability to communicate and empathise. Siting team must have technical credibility. Openness and flexibility are required in technical assessment of disposal options. <b>Policy:</b> A national Underground Research Laboratory (URL) would offer more build-up of technical know-how and be a valuable communication tool for the public. No successful programme has attempted to proceed to repository implementation without having an underground laboratory. <b>Other:</b> UK should try to revive public pride in its nuclear capabilities. The waste management mission should be presented as a dynamic, forward-looking effort.</p>	WP1,WP3, WP4, WP7
127	McEwen Consulting	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Significant factors and processes not included in MRWS have been undertaken in other countries' programmes. Andra in France carried out analysis of suitable geology for a URL. In Finland there was far more direct contact with municipalities, over many years, than has been the case in the UK. SKB in Sweden carried out studies on what characteristics of rock mass and the hydrogeological and hydrogeochemical environments that were most important. Japan defined which parts of the country were most geologically suitable. In Switzerland geological environment was taken into account first. The exclusion criteria in the UK only define areas that are obviously unsuitable. There is a definite requirement to define geologically suitable areas of the UK before approaching communities. Should be examined by people outside RWMD. Suggests the implementation of a National Radioactive Waste Management Programme. Community Right of withdrawal and benefits not well defined in UK. Definition of a "community" and most appropriate methods for discussions with them is needed.</p>	WP1,WP4, WP7
128	[REDACTED]	<p><b>Policy:</b> There is no scientific case for geological disposal. Onshore geological disposal is a matter of expediency that of scientific argument. Not advocating that it be abandoned but approached with caution. <b>Other:</b> Detailed history of UK experience of geological disposal attempts in recent decades. Looks at international experiences. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Other countries carried out systematic geological surveys of their countries before homing in on potential sites. UK Government should set up an independent review agency like Swedish NGO Office for Nuclear Waste review (MKG).BGS has an ambiguous role and has become untrustworthy. Widespread suspicion that DECC may try to restart a new process in west Cumbria without the county council. Responsibility for site search should be removed from the NDA. A new truly independent organisation should be set up under the Environment Agency. <b>Other:</b> DECC refuses to engage with detailed geological objections.</p>	WP1, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7,
129	[REDACTED]	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Current process not conducive to encourage communities to express an interest. Needs to address emotional matters. There must be short term benefits to a community early on. Soon after an expression of interest test drilling should take place. Information to help a community move forward in the process should be available at an early stage.</p>	WP2, WP4, WP7
130	[REDACTED]	<p><b>Other:</b> Carts before horses go backwards in circles (until they notice and change it). Cites recent changes announced by DECC allowing local people more say on whether to allow windfarms be built in their area and suggests the same approach for MRWS. The MRWS process in west Cumbria was in contradiction to HMG's code of practice on consultation.</p>	WP3, WP5, WP7
131	Individual -[REDACTED]	<p>Endorses CALC views stated in 105</p>	
132	Cumbria County Councillors	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Voluntarism and Partnership should be retained. Two tier Local Authorities to consider developing a partnership between such Authorities. Identify how to engage and consult communities before any EoI. Arrangements to involve members of any Partnership should be explicit. Greater clarity on the Right of Withdrawal. An approach which prioritises Voluntarism over any meaningful assessment of regional geological suitability will lack credibility with the public unless real effort is made to explain and justify it. WCMRWS Partnership worked well with an unprecedented level of public and stakeholder engagement, but limited advocacy for the process was outweighed by opponents. Alternatives to GDF and issues such as retrievability need to be spelt out. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Quantify and guarantee community benefits. The offer of a referendum to, say, a Borough/District area may be appropriate. "We were extremely disappointed that the previous Cumbria County Council administration did not agree to move to phase four of the MRWS process. Despite the issues and concerns we were confident that all matters could and should have been addressed during that phase of the programme. It is clearly in the interests of the people and communities that we represent, that a solution to the issues surrounding nuclear waste management is resolved". Crucial that a project of this magnitude and importance is properly explained to the communities engaging with it. This requires a professional capability. <b>Info:</b> Explain why interim storage is unacceptable in the long term and also why there is a national interest in ensuring a GDF site is developed.</p>	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP8, WP10

133 Individual - [REDACTED]

PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Proponents of radioactive waste disposal could mount a more robust argument in its favour. For the community here in West Cumbria the problem of radioactive waste disposal is not an abstract one. Failure to secure the best option, namely deep geological disposal, will have significant safety and socio-economic consequences as the alternative of indefinite surface storage is followed. Counter the argument that 'the host rock here in West Cumbria is not the best available' by explaining that the regulatory criteria for the performance of a geological disposal facility are demanding and ensures public and environmental safety in the future. A site for a geological disposal facility needs to meet these criteria, but it does not have to be the best available host rock in the country. **Attracting communities:** Develop a hypothetical scheme of infrastructure and benefits. **Info:** Outline of what would be, for us who live with so much radioactive waste stored at Sellafield, the consequences of not proceeding with deep geological disposal.

WP1, WP2, WP7, WP8,

134 AMEC

GDF needs to be accelerated to allow the UK to meet its climate change targets. **Improvements to the site selection process:** Volunteerism to be retained. MRWS needs to be simpler and easier for communities to follow. A significant number of communities need to be motivated to complete MRWS Stage 1 - helps to create a sense of 'competition' which would benefit the process. Stage 1 to be time bound. Reverse stage 1 and stage 2. Would help if Government published a UK-wide map showing potentially suitable areas. Greater responsiveness and debate involving key stakeholders. **Planning:** Consider if MRWS could be managed as a nationally significant infrastructure project. **Attracting Communities:** Proactive approach needed to clearly define benefit package to enable communities to understand the merits of participation. Provide greater clarity of the types of risks (physical, environmental, radiological, commercial etc.), their magnitude (relative to other day-to-day and industrial risks) and the timescales over which they may occur. **Roles:** RWMD and supporting experts need to increase their visibility to provide scientific and technical information available, as well as being involved in constructive and robust debate, to support all stages of the process. DECC needs to provide practical support (and funding) to the community, to allow early engagement with the community. Many stakeholders (especially regulators) operate in a purely responsive mode because their statutory remit (which was never designed for the purposes of the GDF) allows them only to engage once a formal application has been made to them by the developer. This significantly reduces their ability to engage in a public debate during early stages in the MRWS process. A way of breaking out of this position would be beneficial. **Inventory:** 2. Greater clarity of the inventory which the community will host. **Info:** Clear statements (in layman's language) on the environmental and safety targets and impact that a proposed facility would have, supported by graphical simulations.

WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8

135 Individual - [REDACTED]

Government is correct in its belief that near surface storage of radioactive waste is not a sustainable long term management strategy. **Improvements to the site selection process:** Government should give consideration as to how the Right of Withdrawal from the siting process can be safeguarded in law at the earliest opportunity. Include consideration of how different elements of local government (e.g. Borough and County Councils) engage with the MRWS process to exercise the Right of Withdrawal. Consider how elements of the scientific investigation programme could be brought into an earlier phases of the MRWS process. **Attracting Communities:** Government should consider developing and publishing a framework for negotiation of community benefits at the earliest opportunity, with appropriate consultation. The lack of confidence of local stakeholders in the scientific basis for radioactive waste disposal highlights a critical disconnect in engagement between scientists, implementing authorities, national and local government, and local residents. Give consideration as to how local stakeholders can be supported to develop confidence in the soundness and trustworthiness of the scientific evidence, at each stage. **Roles:** Government should consider whether the CoRWM is sufficiently resourced to scrutinise the MRWS process as it develops. **Other:** Government should incentivise operators to condition radioactive waste to be suitable for interim storage and final disposal at the earliest opportunity. Also Government should incentivise operators to minimise the volume of conditioned waste as far as possible; this may, for example, require reappraisal of the waste transfer pricing arrangements to provide the necessary commercial driver for waste volume reduction.

WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP10

136 Above Derwent Parish Council

**Improvements to the site selection survey:** Internationally recognised independent geologists with no connection to the UK nuclear industry should conduct a National Geological survey at national level, incl SEA. All government agencies must be seen to proactively engage and positively support local MRWS leadership groups and their decision making bodies by quickly addressing their concerns. **Attracting Communities:** Ensure a clear picture of what a GDF will mean in terms of impact to the environment, safety considerations and the guaranteed benefits it would bring. Ensure the right of withdrawal is available to host communities (as defined by the consultation document) and enshrined by law. Listen to public feedback when freely given and do not summarise their concerns to a point where they are lost or unrecognisable. **Roles:** Independent overseer who will ensure the integrity of the process and the proper disclosure of all vested interests.

WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP8, WP10

	PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT	
137 Individual - [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED].	The MRWS process represents a credible approach to long term management of the UK inventory of radioactive waste. <b>Improvements to the Site Selection Process:</b> Simplify the MRWS process with less stages. The lack of an upfront detailed scientific case for the performance of engineered barrier systems is a key failing of the MRWS process. In order for communities to have confidence in the MRWS process, building the safety case cannot be left until late in the process, and should become a key feature of the earlier stages. Develop a detailed understanding of the behaviour and performance of engineered barriers. Present this to the volunteer local authorities during an earlier stage of the MRWS process which will help to convince communities of the safety of a potential repository. <b>Attracting communities:</b> It will be necessary to comprehensively re-evaluate engagement with potential host communities. In the early stages, greater engagement will be required with communities which hold potentially suitable geologies, to encourage entry into the site selection process. The detail of the nature and extent of community benefits should, therefore, be addressed earlier. Acknowledge and protecting in law the right to withdraw.	WP2, WP4, WP7, WP8, WP10
138 Bradwell for Renewable Energy	A poll in 2012 showed that 80% of the general public around Sellafield were either only slightly aware or not aware at all of the issues surrounding a geological repository- shows consultation failed. <b>Improvements to the Site Selection Process:</b> what constitutes a community? How far do you reach into that community? What are the boundaries? Do local government representatives have the ear of all levels and of all ages? Do these representatives vote in a disinterested fashion, or do they toe the party line? Should representatives of local interests and national NGOs have a vote? These questions have not been satisfactorily answered. Hope that there will be more to this consultation than this on-line method. <b>Attracting Communities:</b> Take the issues into schools, work places, into community groups. All sides of the arguments should be aired. Respected constituencies not paid by the state should be funded to participate, especially in giving counter views. <b>Inventory:</b> Conflating historic waste issues with the prospect of new build wastes will put many parties off even considering volunteering.	WP1, WP3, WP6, WP7, WP8
139 Individual - [REDACTED]	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Geology first then willing community. The entire community should have had their say and this should have carried weight. <b>Other:</b> Perceives the RoW 'get out clause' was denied to them and doesn't believe the RoW would have been honoured if it had progressed to Stage 4. So implied improvement would be to guarantee the RoW in law.	WP4, WP10
140 Individual -[REDACTED]	Endorses SPAND response. Endorses [REDACTED] response. Distrusts the last consultation process and believes it failed as in a poll only 80% were aware of the issues. Believes BGS was manipulated into the 'reappearance of Solway Plain' as an area for investigation. Queries if BGS could therefore have any further 'credible' involvement in MRWS. Believes an FOI request was overly redacted (no date given for the FOI request). Believes there is workplace intimidation within nuclear industry against those not supporting a GDF. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Any communications in schools and/or workplaces should be balanced representing all views. Geology should be assessed before volunteerism. National Parks should be excluded. Issue to be resolved is "what constitutes a community". Any new process must from the outset have at has its core principle; transparency. <b>Attracting communities:</b> In order to gain the interest/acceptance of communities where optimal geology exists the money [community benefits package] will have to be on the table. Decisions concerning which projects should be funded must come from within the local communities and would be best decided by Local Authorities/Elected representatives. However, I would add to any benefits package the funding of a community college with specific emphasis on energy, renewables and waste to degree level. – This could be done in conjunction with an established university and Sellafield. <b>Has written detailed ideas on how community benefits could be distributed recommend full read of bullets 8-11 and 17 -18 from the conclusion for WP2 leader.</b> <b>Other:</b> The transportation of nuclear materials is safe and well regulated so current location of wastes should not dictate GDF location. <b>Other:</b> it must be the case that new build generators will have to pay for their waste treatment and disposal. <b>Other:</b> the treatment and current storage of legacy waste needs much more to be done concerning interim storage as identified by the recent NAO report.	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7, WP8, WP10
141	<b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Principle of volunteer process are correct but openness, trust and partnership need to be restored before further GDF negotiations can take place. Locations found to be environmentally or geologically unsuitable should be excluded before Government approaches any area to volunteer. Areas should not accept waste from other areas without prior consultation, agreement, planning consents and compensation. <b>Other:</b> Process in Cumbria failed due to loss of trust in Government and nuclear industry. Need to ensure we have sufficient safe and secure interim storage facilities to deal with existing waste. Areas subject to living with nuclear waste for the long term should be adequately compensated.	WP3, WP4



142

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Supports policy to explore options for long term management of higher activity radioactive waste and agrees that GDF is the preferred approach. Suitable geology should be found first and then other criteria taken into account (e.g. National Park status). National Parks should be excluded from the siting process. If suitable geology is found then voluntarism can be applied in those areas. Community benefits and impacts need to have clear parameters from the outset. Benefits and disbenefits of a GDF in a host community need to be better understood. Views of community located closest to a chosen site need to be fairly represented at a local level. There needs to be clarity on who leads the MRWS process (and is accountable).

WP2, WP3,  
WP4, WP7

Individual - [REDACTED]

143

Was a member of the public involved in a consultation held at Copeland Borough Council and feels his comments were ignored and thus distrusts the consultation process. Believes the questions asked in the Mori poll were flawed as they were not drafted properly. The site chosen must be the best possible site we can find nationally. **Other:** urgent work is needed above ground at Sellafield to safely process and store the legacy waste.

WP4, WP7, WP8

Individual - [REDACTED]

144

**Improvements to the site selection process:** The question of identifying suitable geology should be addressed earlier in the process (cites overseas experience). If this is done, the screening criteria would have to be explained in a clearer way and relevant stakeholders would have to be included in their application. Screening criteria should not be solely geology based and should include socio-economic factors. Criteria should be based on internationally agreed criteria (cites IAEA). Involve all interested scientific organisations and representatives of local authorities, NGOs and nature conservation bodies in a series of regional fora across England, Wales and Northern Ireland and present details of what a GDF would look like / what the surface requirements would be in terms of land area. Report the outcome of these deliberations in a subsequent series of public meetings to explain them in clear terms. Identify potentially suitable areas and invite communities to come forward, approaching nuclear communities with potentially suitable geology. Recommend that a National Policy Statement developed for GDF and associated investigations. Support staged decision making process. Pass legislation to guarantee community benefits, including engagement costs and provide more clarity. Provide more clarity on Right of Withdrawal & enshrine in law if necessary. Allow for local referenda at specified points. Employ independent body comprised of respected independent individuals to act as mediator and information provider. Need to be more specific in our proposals. RWMD should be 'concept champions' and take a more proactive role. A number of stakeholder engagement suggestions are made that are worth looking at. Regulators should be more involved and act as an 'honest broker'. Challenge NGOs who oppose GDF to propose alternative strategies. **Other:** Carry out research programme examining specific UK geological environments.

WP1, WP2,  
WP3, WP4,  
WP5, WP7,  
WP10

Galson Sciences Ltd

145

**Improvements to the site selection process:** Start with identifying suitable geological sites in the UK and not by asking for volunteer areas. National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, wildlife diversity and unique landscape should be excluded. There should be rigorous, predefined and agreed criteria for noting 'community approval'. A local government 'unelected inner cabinet of a very few people' should not be able to decide the way forward without true community approval. A survey of community support should only be undertaken after the population are fully informed about the pros and cons in a language that is understandable. Survey should take place later in the process after public debates and media discussion. Benefits should be clearly spelt out. Right of Withdrawal should be enshrined in law. Before final approval the whole community should have a robust and clearly structured independent referendum vote.

WP1, WP2,  
WP3, WP4,  
WP7, WP10

Individual - [REDACTED]

146

Strongly in the national interest for a geological repository for radioactive waste to be developed from both the point of view of environmental protection and controlling the cost of the management of the UK's nuclear liabilities. **Improvements to the site selection process:** Government's Geological Disposal policy needs more effective advocacy. Areas of the country could be selected for investigation prior to any region coming forward, taking account of a full range of issues (technical and social). The local community and local politicians could then be approached. Suggest identifying a single organisation whose agreement is sought (rather than 2 tiers as in Cumbria). Government and the NDA should take a more proactive lead in identifying the most suitable areas and engaging with community representatives. It may be appropriate to consider disposal solutions that may apply only to certain components of the inventory. **Attracting Communities:** specify and guarantee a benefits package for the local community. Ensure that appropriate independent advice is available to any community that might volunteer.

WP1, WP2,  
WP3, WP4,  
WP6, WP7

Eden Nuclear and Environment Ltd

	PROTECT - POLICY IN DEVELOPMENT	
147	<p>Whilst interim storage is potentially a long term option, we believe public confidence in the MRWS process would be enhanced by continuing progress on the GDF issue. We agree with Government that geological disposal is the appropriate policy. We agree, looking at overseas programmes, that volunteerism is the preferred approach. <b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Public understanding would be greatly improved if a specific GDF advocate was identified. Independent and well regarded expert bodies – such as the CoRWM, BGS, HPA, ONR and the EA - could also make an important contribution in putting potentially alarmist claims into perspective. NDA should undertake the GDF advocacy role and be under an obligation to communicate not just with the community, stakeholders and the public, but also the local and national media. More detail around potential socio-economic benefits would be helpful. <b>Attracting Communities:</b> New communities are more likely if they are approached by a GDF advocate with a clear narrative explaining the case for participation. NDA are in the best position to undertake the advocate role. Make the benefits and risks of hosting a facility clear as well as terms of the right of withdrawal.</p>	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7
148	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Selection process should be based on the identification of areas nationally which are considered to be geologically suitable for nuclear waste storage, from which a suitable site or sites could be selected. <b>Other:</b> Complex geology in west Cumbria renders it unsuitable for a GDF.</p>	WP4
149	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Speed up the sharing of information with the communities. Consider site suitability prior to volunteerism. Engage with the general public through social media. All the relevant bodies associated with the Nuclear Industry should have a balanced membership which can provide an open and transparent challenge on the basis of being a “critical friend”. Explore other options also, e.g. interim storage, shallow or subsurface disposal and discuss access/retrievability should new technology be developed. <b>Attracting Communities:</b> Define the community benefits package.</p>	WP1, WP2, WP4, WP7, WP8
150	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> There needs to be far more information and certainty at an early stage. Including: Inventory to be disposed of, the nature and extent of a benefits package, the wider negative impacts on the economy and the extent of any above ground works. The geology needs to be addressed in far more detail before the decision can be made. The right to withdraw from the process and the outline of the benefits package needs to be put into legislation. The potential impact on neighbouring authorities needs to be taken into account. <b>Attracting communities:</b> far stronger, and guaranteed, benefit to the community. The transfer to underground storage, of the waste currently at the Sellafield site, is a major incentive for West Cumbria. What size of incentive would be required to attract a community elsewhere?</p>	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP6, WP7, WP10
151	<p><b>Improvements to the site selection process:</b> Government must communicate to the public that the repository is now a major national necessity. Risk of producing the wrong waste products until the repository location and design is finally determined. Provide a whole value proposition to targeted communities i.e. a wholly underpinned technical and business proposal providing the correct science, engineering, safety case, environmental case, security etc. Finding wholly homogeneous rock difficult so repository integrity must depend upon man made engineered barriers. Have to face the fact that is impractical to transport it from Sellafield. NDA should not be responsible for delivering the repository a separate autonomous body should take it forward. <b>Attracting communities:</b> Need good communicators like those in the media. <b>Other:</b> voluntarism will not work due to the nation’s current mind frame and the central and local government structure with the full support of regulators. Nation may need more than one repository in the UK to overcome local prejudice. May need to construct long life near surface stores if robust safety case for a deep repository cannot be made with regulators.</p>	WP1, WP2, WP4, WP7.
	individual - [REDACTED]	