

From: REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Sent: 11 June 2013 20:16
To: radioactivewaste (DECC)
Cc: REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDR
Subject: Evidence to DECC Call for Evidence : Manageing Radioactive Waste Safely : Review of the Siting process for a Geological Disposal Facility

Name	REDACTEDREDACTED
Organisation / Company	HANT : Highland Against Nuclear Transport
Organisation Size (no. of employees)	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Organisation Type	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Job Title	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Department	N/A
Address	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Email	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Telephone	REDACTEDREDACTED
Fax	

Would you like to be kept informed of developments with the MRWS programme?	Yes
Would you like your response to be kept confidential? If yes please give a reason	No

The Government is interested in your views on the geological disposal facility site selection process outlined in the 2008 Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) White Paper. To assist us you may wish to consider the following issues in your response:

- What aspects of the site selection process in the MRWS White Paper do you think could be improved and how?
- What do you think could be done to attract communities into the MRWS site selection process?
- What information do you think would help communities engage with the

MRWS site selection process?

I am aware that the consultation closed yesterday but both myself and our REDACTED REDACTED have suffered from bereavements during the consultation process so were unable to respond prior to this and we would request that this submission be accepted on compassionate grounds related to the circumstances, as this is the day following the closing date

Our Association has recently been set up to campaign for consultation with local communities affected by the transport of nuclear waste from Dounreay to Sellafield

We would argue that all nuclear waste should be stored above ground with constant monitoring and security rather than transporting between sites which increases risks of accident, terrorist attack and increased radiation

A recent report by Environmental Correspondent Rob Edwards highlighted an increase in accidents involving nuclear waste transport to Sellafield during 2012 based on Government statistics

We would therefore submit that the proposal to build a Geological Disposal Facility increases the risks of nuclear accidents as it will result in increased movements to a site from nuclear power stations throughout the UK

In addition we know from Finland and other countries that depositories cannot be constructed to be 100% safe as rock fissures and unforeseen earthquakes can happen in any part of the UK, which would result in a catastrophe on the scale of Fukushima or worse

I would cite a Danish documentary by the Director Michael Madsen entitled "Into Eternity" (released in 2010) about the Onkalo nuclear waste repository on the island of Oikiluoto in which the chief engineer involved in the construction also stated the fact that no depository can be made 100% safe as the site has to remain safe for 100,000 years - an engineering task never previously achieved. The proposal is to seal it and never open it again !

We do not believe this would be a way of managing waste safely and your suggestion in Paragraph 10. that any facility built would not require human intervention is both reckless and misguided – the term "permanent disposal solution" is meaningless as no such solution has been found by the nuclear industry anywhere in the world to date

You cannot protect from "disruption by man-made or natural events" as suggested in Paragraph 12.

There is no safe solution and it is certainly not achieved by burying waste at levels between 200 and 1000 m underground – it is impossible to “ensure that no harmful quantities of radioactivity reach the surface environment”

Given that currently no communities in the UK wish to have a depository built in their areas we will be encouraging any community even thinking of acceptance to take into account all the factors described in this response

The site selection process should be discontinued and nothing should be done to "attract communities into the MRWS site selection process"

Given the above view the question relating to "what information would help communities" will not be necessary

So HANT will join with other environmental groups and supportive organisations to ensure that all waste is stored above ground under constant monitoring

We would wish to be informed about the outcomes of the consultation and any future proposals in the unlikely event of any community welcoming a nuclear waste depository in their community, and any continuation of the process should maintain the principle of voluntarism and it should be illegal for any overt or covert pressure to be applied to communities by the Government or the nuclear lobby and industry

REDACTEDREDACTED HANT : Highlands Against Nuclear Transport (on behalf of the HANT Management Committee)