

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 01 June 2013 21:10  
**To:** radioactivewaste (DECC)  
**Subject:** Call for evidence on the MRWS siting process

Dear DECC,

My comments on the recent MRWS process/recommendations for any future process:

- 1) When it comes to possible nuclear contamination, safety has to be the top priority (not convenience). To this end, the geology has to be studied to find the best possible place for a disposal site before asking for volunteer communities. This is the approach taken by France, Sweden and Finland.
- 2) Those leading a process akin to MWRS in the future must be seen to be as independent as possible, ie not linked in any way to potential sites, eg councillors.
- 3) Exclude all National Parks and environmentally protected areas (eg SACS and SSSIs) from the list of potential areas.
- 4) The process must allow for areas at parish level to exclude themselves from consideration at any time, and for any reason.
- 5) The conditions of the right of withdrawal must be clear, made legally binding, and apply at all levels from parish to county.
- 6) Some time has passed since it was decided that underground storage was the best solution. I suggest that a review is put in place to ensure that this is still considered to be the best way forwards. I understand that science is now casting some doubt on the security of underground storage.

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.