

I was disappointed by the rejection of the Nuclear Waste project by Cumbria. Disappointed but not surprised.

I prophesized this situation when the consultation began. Consultation - and I have years of experience of this - works well when it is conducted with those directly involved but always falls flat when outsiders get caught up and tub thumping begins driven by motives from outside the directly involved. Leadership by those with the right background and knowledge is required. In this case it is entirely missing.

That is the nub of HMG's problem. Leadership is totally missing.

All those involved must be required to learn what is at stake. Some items which should be before those involved are

- 1) The cost of Nuclear power compared with other forms of generation.
- 2) The amount of radioactivity generated by nuclear power compared with background from
 - a) local rock output - e.g. Aberdeen and Cornwall
 - b) That experienced by people living at height e.g. Denver, Lima, Mexico City and Johannesburg
 - c) That experienced by airline pilots and passengers.
 - d) The amount produced by in situ deposits
- 3) Statements of the effect of alternatives e.g. CO₂, Radiactive release from mining, dependence on imports of gas from unreliable sources and so on.
- 4) Likely (or possible) sources of energy in future -like Thorium or Fusion - and their timescale and possible problems and costs
- 5) The amount of land required by alternative sources of 'Renewable' energy and the competition for land from food production etc.

If those involved in the decision process are not equipped with this sort of background then they have little right to be heard. Any counsellors voting on the subject must have the right knowledge.

It will be seen that I am requiring a disciplined and knowledgeable approach from those consulted and little input from those remote. In particular I feel that professional pressure groups must always demonstrate professional knowledge before involvement.

REDACTED
CPRE North Yorkshire