

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	REDACTED
Fax	

Would you like to be kept informed of developments with the MRWS programme?	Yes
Would you like your response to be kept	No

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?**

For several reasons the choice of West Cumbria as a potential host site for a GDF was a case of convenience over common sense. The identification of an area with suitable geology should always come before asking for volunteer communities, just as it has in all other countries seeking to store their highly toxic nuclear waste.

Despite claims to the contrary we in Ennerdale (and I suspect others in potential GDF sites too) were remarkably ill informed by MRWS as to the true nature of their intentions. Very few people locally had any idea that this area was being considered as a potential location for a GDF until a matter of days before the initial Cumbria County Council vote was to be taken. It is claimed that this inability to get the message across was a genuine failure of the process but many feel that it was a deliberate policy of the NDA to keep things vague until a positive decision in their favour was secured.

We were told that nowhere had been positively identified which was why it was necessary to move to Stage 4 in order to find out. By not ruling out The Lake District National Park and Ennerdale in particular, the NDA were admitting that, in the extremely unlikely event that the geology was found to be suitable (and the geologist employed by them admitted himself that the chances were very poor) they would be prepared to explore this region despite the objections of the majority of local people and the national and even international protestations.

It was this intransigence on the part of MRWS that forced the parish council to undertake a secret ballot of the entire electorate of the Parish of Ennerdale and Kinniside in order to discover the true feelings of the community, and as you know 94% voted NO to Stage 4. This has been the only genuine test of public opinion to date and it came on top of overwhelming opposition to moving to Stage 4 from CALC the Cumbrian Association of Local Councils.

All I would like to say about the geological issue is that many firmly believe that Professors Smythe and Haszeldine are the most authoritative experts on the geology of West Cumbria (see <http://www.geos.ed.ac.uk> for Stuart Haszeldine's response to MRWS process) and the two with nothing to gain financially from continuing this colossal exercise in gambling with public money.

The NDA and MRWS gave the impression that they felt a YES vote by CCC on Jan 30th was a formality. DECC perhaps believed the assurances from the 'MP for Sellafield' and others in Copeland Council that West Cumbrians were 100% behind this project regardless of where or how it

was to be constructed.

The information that would help communities engage with the MRWS site selection process would be an assurance that the safest possible type of geology in the country had been identified from the outset.