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	REDACTED
Organisation / Company	
Organisation Size (no. of employees)	
Organisation Type	
Job Title	
Department	
Address	REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
Email	REDACTED REDACTED /
Telephone	
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?**

Firstly, in order to get councils to volunteer there needs to be a tangible benefit that lasts a long time. Modern building methods will mean the GDF will be built relatively quickly-who remembers the jobs that were generated by HS1 or the M25, or how long will those jobs generated by Crossrail last? An analysis of these projects in terms of the number and length of time of jobs created may inform the process. From that and publicity around the need for a decision will encourage volunteers.

Secondly, I think the population demographic is different in England and Wales to the other mentioned countries that are looking at deep disposal, which may be the reason why there are so few volunteer communities. There are much higher densities of people here and the types of example areas used in Sweden and Finland for comparison are precisely the areas in Britain that are cherished as natural treasures. Other countries solutions such as those of France, Belgium and Germany should be included as examples. Also Korea is well down the path of selecting a disposal method and site and should be cited. I'm not familiar with the relationship between local and central government in these countries, but that may be a factor in how communities come to a decision.

Unless there is a national crisis, I think it is unreasonable for small communities to selflessly volunteer, for the benefit of the whole country. The more conventional method is to compensate people for a loss, whether it is tangible or intangible. Therefore financial incentives need to be defined carefully at the start of the process and not vaguely promised. One suggestion would be that the local taxpayer is compensated for having a local facility, either by a reduction in council tax or the county getting the equivalent of the business tax that the GDF will generate over an extended period of time. Such as the time the repository is under construction and open to receive waste. This may also act as a stimulus to dealing with the nuclear waste quickly. The principle should be that the area most

inconvenienced should receive the "compensation" in terms of, for example, the full local business tax.

Central government should aim to be at arms length in the site selection process and confine itself to identifying all geologically suitable areas. Which I assume to be most rock types, as EU and other countries are looking at granitic, clay, salt and gypsum formations. Centrally setting the policy via the Environmental Agency and the HSE should be used as these bodies have an overall view of safety of the public and environment and may be more trusted than other bodies.

I do not know what guidance was used to define 'safe' disposal, but if it was 'one equivalent death per million people per year' then this should be publicised. Perhaps equivalent costs of public protection from other hazards should be published as well. Using emotive terms like "dangerous for thousands of years" need to be qualified- other industrial chemicals are dangerous for ever eg mercury, asbestos and arsenic, but are safely disposed of/stored using modern techniques. Therefore costs should be balanced against other known government expenditure to protect its citizens ie ~£1.5m cost per road death saved for new road schemes, the cost/benefit of having a standing army, lives saved/prolonged by a national health service etc.

As a final thought-the same principles of risk and benefit outlined above could be employed for the current "fracking" debate. Get some hard numbers on risks and benefits and people will be able to make informed decisions. (Perhaps extracting all the gas now will preclude the danger of future generations drilling into a GDF!)