

Response to Review of Siting Process for a GDF

The decision that has to be made about what to do with the radioactive waste needs to have input from the greatest number of voices as it has huge implications for future generations, the custodians of this planet. The current 'consultation' I don't feel is wide enough to justify any decisions being made on such an important issue.

It is imperative that the public has full, unbiased information and plenty of time to consider all the issues. It is wrong that the information which comes from government over the entire nuclear subject is manipulated with a pro nuclear agenda, giving a false impression that it is safe. None of us can predict what situation will exist on the planet during the lifetime of the radio-active hazard, let alone guarantee responsibility for it.

I don't believe nuclear waste should be buried and a GDF is not the answer. Putting such a hazardous material 'out of sight, out of mind' is not appropriate for the amount of time it is going to be radio-active. The waste should be kept on the surface and monitored – a constant reminder of the stupidity of the last 60 years!

Burying radio-active waste is not the answer as the containment material will not last as long as the radio-active waste it is trying to contain, this has already been seen in a very short time with the waste in various locations on the planet, with copper, steel, concrete and water containment.

Instability of the ground over the timescale needed will surely mean that the waste would be exposed to changes in its environment, which are unpredictable and could result in leaks and contamination of ground, sea and fresh water supplies.

If at a later date it is decided that the rad. waste is to be buried (I cannot see this would ever be the best option) then the site should be determined by selecting the most appropriate geology, not by bribing and undemocratically treating certain sections of our community.

The proposed Hinkley C will form its own nuclear waste dump with waste having to be stored on site for over 100 years so what consideration has been made in conjunction with this Siting Process for a GDF, for the radio-active waste 'C' will produce? Surely you can't say it is unconnected as I was told by the people that run Hinkley A, B and potentially C. You must have a broader and more long-term vision than the managers that are presently on the Hinkley site.

I do believe that decisions on this subject should be made by a cross-section of people which would include equally men and women as well as a mixture of ages as only then could it represent a 'balanced' group and hope to view things from the widest possible angle.

Since the nuclear program started there have been many 'accidents' e.g. Chernobyl and the latest in Fukushima is still contaminating the planet every day since March 2011. I think the most sensible way of treating the waste is not to produce any more and **the new nuclear program should be halted** in recognition of what can potentially happen, as apparently Germany and other EU countries have decided to do.