

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.gsi.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	
Organisation Size (no. of employees)	
Organisation Type	
Job Title	
Department	
Address	REDACTEDREDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
Email	REDACTEDREDACTED
Telephone	REDACTED
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 do not think that the site selection can be 'improved' as this is predicated on the assumption that waste disposal under a densely populated island is a good thing which can be improved. I think this is a false assumption based on specious assertions such as that underground storage could 'ensure that no harmful quantities of radioactivity ever reach the surface environment'.

Because of the enormous risks to people, country, ocean and atmosphere of the material to be disposed of I think it is immoral to try to 'attract' communities into the 'site selection process', and especially invidious to manipulate them to do so with spurious, short-term bribes such as 'job creation' and 'wider benefits'.

It is well documented that pound for pound large infrastructure projects such as nuclear power stations and nuclear waste facilities, heavily subsidised by government tax receipts, do not provide a local economically and environmentally sustainable platform for work which benefits society and people's welfare; they are not value for money.

Where communities are attracted into the process it will be because they have not been informed about the full costs as well as the benefits of the project.

Information that honestly spelled out the lack of social return on investment, the costs as well as the benefits, the risks and the impact of worst case scenarios would engage communities. They would engage in order to reject the proposals.