

Queen Katherine School, Kendal, Cumbria

Individual pupils filled in a worksheet on the topic of Geology and answered the following questions in relation to the Partnership's initial opinions:

Do you agree with the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership's opinion that....

- a) ... the BGS report can be trusted?
- b) ... there is not enough evidence to rule out West Cumbria from the MRWS project as geologically unsuitable?

A number of pupils also filled in separate Comments slips and these are also included below.

User ID	Question	Response
673	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE Left blank b) NO Left blank
674	Geology - see above	a) NO A lot more research is needed. b) Left blank The research 20 years ago was changed from today – so it will change in future – what's to say it will be safe in the future?
675	Geology - see above	a) NO A lot more research needs to be done, one report is not enough. b) Left blank The research from 20 years ago has changed – it will change in another 20 years. We can't guarantee our safety!
676	Geology - see above	a) NO If information from the 1990s is insufficient, what's to say this info isn't wrong too? b) YES Do more tests.
677	Geology - see above	a) NO If there's insufficient geological information for other areas how can you know it's feasible. b) YES Because there is little tested but even without the extra evidence why ruin somewhere so beautiful? Would the government believe it was feasible if it was an area close to them? Also you can't predict the potential harm of this

		waste as science is always improving.
678	Geology - see above	a) NO Left blank b) NO It all depends on the type of rock and flow of water.
679	Geology - see above	a) Left blank Left blank b) NO I think the safety of the project would be dependent on the type of rock and the direction and frequency of the water flow.
680	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE They say that as a result of the rock in the surrounding area parts of Cumbria can't be used. b) NO Other areas need to be looked at.
681	Geology - see above	a) YES Left blank b) PARTLY/NOT SURE Different views from different experts.
682	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE Because they have considered people before geology. b) YES There has been limited scope for looking at other areas.
683	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE They seem to have decided that Cumbria is the best location even though no ground study has been completed. b) YES No survey has been completed so there could be a possibility but they don't know at the moment.
684	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE They need to develop their reasoning for excluding the highlighted areas. b) YES More research needs to be done.

685	Geology - see above	a) YES Researched heavily, can be trusted and mustn't use areas containing fossil fuels. b) NO Look elsewhere.
686	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE Don't think there is enough evidence. b) PARTLY/NOT SURE More research must be done in other areas.
687	Geology - see above	a) NOT SURE I didn't have enough time to analyse the facts and details. b) NO Because they have what I deem suitable evidence – coal and iron that may be wanted in the future.
688	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE Left blank b) PARTLY/NOT SURE Not enough evidence, more work needs to be done.
689	Geology - see above	a) PARTLY/NOT SURE Done research into suitable and unsuitable locations with possible impacts. b) YES Not explained all factors fully.
690	Geology - see above	a) YES A clear honest presentation with clear facts and the honest impacts on Cumbria. The constant review of the project at each stage gives me more trust in the BGS. b) NO I don't believe we can be sure until samples are taken at possible sites and a full investigation is taken.
691	Geology - see above	[Questions not answered – general comment made] Just do whatever's best for the community/society, with as little impact on destroying the environment as possible.
692	Geology - see above	[Questions not answered – general comment made] I just don't care!! Because I am not that interested. Please just do the safest thing for as many people as possible!!
693	Geology - see above	a) YES Valid evidence/criteria not biased as based on geological exclusion criteria 2007.

		b) YES Not explored all possibilities fully and to a great extent.
694	Geology - see above	a) YES Seemed balanced and well thought out. b) YES Not deemed.
695	Geology - see above	a) YES Left blank b) NO Left blank
905	Comments slip	Yes keeping options open in the current climate about whether we will have power in 20 years, closing doors isn't an option. People seem to only see the negatives but without nuclear power, the country would not have enough power to sustain the lives we currently want to lead. We cannot escape radiation, it occurs naturally in the rocks surrounding us. If all safety precautions are put into place, then the risks to our safety should be small.
906	Comments slip	At the moment I feel I don't have enough information. I think with more debate maybe a forum/facebook pages will mean I could understand it more and make a clear decision on these.
907	Comments slip	Yes, I believe the future benefits outweigh present concerns and fears. However saying that to make a decision young people should be given more direct information.
908	Comments slip	Yes, keeping this option open isn't a commitment and a repository needs to be somewhere. There are many positives to nuclear power and currently it is very important.
909	Comments slip	I think it is a good thing because we have to put it somewhere and its better to be underground. I also think that someone else will have to have it if we don't so we don't have more rights than they do. However, I am very concerned with the "community benefits package" because advertising this to the world is only going to give Cumbria a reputation as a dumping ground. This is particularly problematic because in the south we are already seen as second best by a lot of people.
910	Comments slip	Will offer employment and financial benefits to the area. However, negative views may come about from others across the UK – Cumbria is the dumping ground. If safe then I think it will be a very worthwhile development.
911	Comments slip	We use radiation and it has to go somewhere, but I don't want it to look not very nice or be harmful or be expensive.

912	Comments slip	Absolutely not. Under no circumstances should we be used as a justification of further nuclear build. We should never consent to unknown (unknowable) risk levels for thousands of generations in the future. Any benefits would be negligible, short term and unsustainable. Read the answer you were given in the 1990's and stop asking!
1359	Comments slip	Impartial, we still have radioactive dumps in our area anyway, more information should be provided on the risk of breakages. 500 jobs is not a lot