

confidential? If yes please give a reason

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?

Our company is particularly interested in the design and construction of the access drift(s) and shafts for the GDF. I, personally, have been involved with the concept of a GDF in the UK since 1989, as well as others abroad, when, as REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED EDR, I was a co-author of the REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED which was issued in February 1989. Our company has provided design and construction advice on the above to REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED continuously since 1990, originally as IREDACTEDRED REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED and now through Alan Auld Engineering Ltd as part of the Alan Auld Group Ltd. The work included involvement in all the deep geological investigations at the Sellafield site, carried out from the surface, leading to our design and detailing for construction of the shafts for the RCF. The contractor, REDACTEDREDACTEDR, was mobilised on site to commence sinking the shafts when the project was abandoned a few weeks before the General Election in 1997. Here we are, 24 years later since my first involvement, and no decision has yet been made to confirm a site for the GDF.

In my opinion, the MRWS White Paper clearly sets out the fundamental principles required to move forward towards constructing a GDF. The problem now with the west Cumbria situation is that, because one County Council voted against proceeding to Stage 4, in spite of two Borough Councils voting for, it has been agreed that the site selection process is now closed in this area.

I personally believe that no other area in the country will volunteer to host the site of the GDF. A number of sites throughout England and Scotland have already previously been investigated as possible sites. This led to the conclusion that Sellafield was the most suitable site, with a back up of a site at Dounreay. The BGS should be able to confirm that Sellafield is still the most suitable site. On the basis of this previous work, a substantial amount of geological and hydrological investigation was carried out from the surface at Sellafield, leading to the commencement of the work to construct the RCF, to gain a better understanding of the ground conditions from below the surface, which was abandoned in 1997 as mentioned earlier.

In my opinion, the Stage 4 and Stage 5 work must proceed at Sellafield. This will enable more precise engineering data to be determined on the viability of having a GDF at Sellafield, while

still giving the communities the facility to opt out if they choose, depending on the outcome of the exploration work. Failing an agreement from the communities to accept, when the full information is available to them, then the Government has retained the right at some point in the future to explore other approaches than voluntarism and partnership. If it got to this stage, and the commitment to proceed with a GDF is still the mandate, then it would need to be a dictate from the Government to proceed with the construction of the GDF at Sellafield.

FOOTNOTE

No indication has been given in the current documents as to why the County Council has voted no to proceed to Stage 4 at such an early stage. With the option to say no after any stage, in my opinion, it would have made more sense to proceed to Stages 4 and 5 when all the relevant information would have been available to make a proper informed decision.