

Dear Sirs

Please accept this email as my response to the above consultation as a concerned private individual.

1: There should be a national media campaign to raise awareness of the issues surrounding storage and disposal of nuclear waste (using TV, similarly to the Aids awareness campaign a few years ago). The support of local people should be sought from the outset, before any representative body can proceed. Any expressions of interest should be made public immediately.

2: There should be clearly defined stages in the process with clearly defined community decisions to be made at each stage, in which a representative body of local people should be involved as participants (not just as consultants). This should be a full partnership approach rather than the Government steering group as currently proposed.

3: The revised roles in the siting process are too heavily National Government biased with too weak Local Government input. Constituent communities should be able to nominate a group of peer reviewers to form an entirely new independent advisory body.

4: I understand a high level map exists which could & should be used to rule out areas which are geographically & geologically unsuitable. Any areas with mining works, aquifers, low lying coastal locations, nationally significant parks etc should be immediately excluded to avoid waste of resources. Then the focus should rest on potentially suitable areas remote from centres of dense population.

5: The Planning Act will have to be amended to include a GDF in Infrastructure Planning, but it must ensure public opinion is not excluded.

6: New build waste should be excluded from the inventory as this does not clarify but rather leaves the inventory open-ended. This GDF siting process cannot be used to justify new-build, but the subject of safe interim storage & possible ultimate disposal with infinitely longer timescales should be the subject of an entirely separate consultation & process. The volumes of waste given are not the contentious issue here, but the radiological content is, which should be defined.

7: How much of the community benefits will come from tax payer funding & how much from new-build(ers)? Community benefits must be used to enhance the local community, not to plug gaps in Local Government funding.

There is no mention of community benefits for those communities already hosting ILW stores, who had no say in the matter. The long term 'interim' storage of nuclear waste is inextricably linked with the options for geological disposal, which should be recognised & dealt with accordingly.

8: The idea that a generic assessment can be made for a GDF is a nonsense as everything will be site-specific. The situation at depth will not be known until detailed investigations & testing have been carried out. It seems to be a risky strategy as issues such as flood risk could slip between a Generic & Site Specific stage.

Yours faithfully
Shirley A. Swan
REDACTED
REDACTED