

Response form

Please use this form to respond to this call for evidence on Managing Radioactive Waste Safely: Review of the Siting Process for a Geological Disposal Facility.

The closing date for the submission of responses is 10 June 2013.

Responses can be returned by email (preferable) or post.

Email address: radioactivewaste@decc.qsi.gov.uk

Or by post to: The Managing Radioactive Waste Safely team
 Department of Energy and Climate Change
 Room M07
 55 Whitehall
 London
 SW1A 2EY

Name	REDACTEDREDACTED
Organisation / Company	St Bees Parish Council
Organisation Size (no. of employees)	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Organisation Type	REDACTEDREDACTED
Job Title	REDACTEDREDACTED
Department	
Address	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDRED DACTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDA CTEDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACT EDREDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
Email	REDACTEDREDACTEDREDACTED
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?

St Bees Parish Council discussed its reflections on the site selection process at its last meeting. A number of different views were put forward and parish councillors have agreed to submit detailed individual responses. The council as a whole has agreed the following key points on the consultation exercise which took place recently in Cumbria:

- **Lack of trust - there was a widespread lack of trust in the site selection process and a perception that the exercise was not a genuine consultation.**
- **Lack of an effective and acceptable decision making process and body - the process of requiring three authorities to separately agree on a positive response in order to proceed to the next stage was not an effective way of managing the decision making process.**
- **Lack of clarity in the community benefits - the benefits to a local community of hosting a deep geological storage facility were too vague with non-specific timescales.**
- **Lack of a clear exit strategy- the right of a community to withdraw from the process at the next stage was not clear and unambiguous and there was no legal guarantee.**

