

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

Sir, Regarding your 'Ministry wants N-waste views' in this week's edition I would firstly like to provide the addresses that your piece failed to provide - The MRWS Team, DECC, 55 Whitehall, M07, London SW1A 2EY or radioactivewaste@decc.gsi.gov.uk and secondly use this as an 'Open Letter' to the DECC for I cannot understand the reasons for them to once again waste tax payers money on a subject that has been twice rebutted by West Cumbrians, once in the mid 1990's with Nirex and now through to the latest MRWS farce - unless they are hoping to slyly re-open the discussion.

Having spent some 3yrs reading and compiling much correspondence on the subject as well as distributing the essence of the arguments against the hosting of the GDF in Cumbria I know that from within the MRWS's consultation replies alone that there are many valid and disparate views expressed against the GDF which are already in the hands of the DECC/NDA MRWS hierarchy that they have continuously ignored.

REDACTED after the CCC had rejected the MRWS process I wrote REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED requesting that REDACTED take a look at the whole NDA/MRWS process which with the connivance of the supposed West Cumbria political representatives was focused upon producing a YES vote by any means available and not based upon 'the science' or an educated public opinion. Unfortunately 'Benefits, Inducements and Bribes' seem to take priority in the minds of the upper echelons of Copeland's political cadre even to the extent of entering into the initial 'Expression of Interest' phase in June 2008 after only 12 days from the Issue of the 94page White Paper. This action was both contrary to Copeland's Constitution and the White Paper's recommendations and as late as 2012 Copeland's leader had to admit to a further misunderstanding of the Constitution by her in the MRWS DMB voting process.

My REDACTED (which along with REDACTEDREDACTED REDACTEDREDACTED) further fully points out 4 other key areas of abject failure viz. 1) how democratic could the MRWS process be with the same councillors acting as both Judge and Jury on a report that they themselves produced. 2) how the MRWS questionnaire poll results could be accepted when it had to be publicly admitted that 'brown envelopes' stuffed with illegitimate votes were allowed to be included in the results. 3) that an Ipsos Mori telephone Poll (including non-electoral roll residents and after 3yrs of MRWS supposedly informing the public) showed that the OVERALL figure for the randomly selected public who 'Knew of at least a little' or even 'less/nothing/never heard of it' was 80% whilst the figure for the BEST informed area who 'Knew of at least a little' or even 'less/nothing/never heard of it' was still 62%. 4) The hands of the inappropriately named BEC nuclear quango are not clean either with its resources being abused by the NDA/MRWS to promote their singularly YES views.

As in BBC 1's 8/10/12 Inside Out North East 'Cumbria's Nuclear Future' REDACTEDREDACTED of the Finnish POSIVA Nuclear Waste Company said "On the basis of this overall screening there were picked 100 sites that turned out to be suitable for final disposal in terms of geology. We got favourable advances from 5 municipalities and that was the starting point for drillings" why couldn't the Nirex/NDA choose the same strategy of identifying as many geologically safe sites first and then ask for volunteers?

The entertaining thing about the Copeland political relationship is it appears that both the MP and Council Leader are now indignantly trying to denigrate the 'Nuclear hand' that has fed Copeland with the Tax Payers money for the 10,000 Sellafield salaries and for each of the last 2yrs has also shared out £20m in bonuses amongst these employees. Additionally the Tax Payer is now funding via the same 'Nuclear hand' the £20m for a new 1000 seater office building in the heart of a town after their own useless leadership failed in their attempts to achieve the same over many years.

REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

Distribution:

Subject: MRWS: Call for Evidence on the Siting Process for a Geological Disposal Facility Distribution.

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED
 REDACTED
 REDACTED
 REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED
 REDACTED REDACTED

A request to consider the effectiveness, efficiency and economics of the MRWS Consultation Process

Dear Mrs Hodge,

I was informed by Mr Adrian Jenner that it is permissible for me to submit for your Committee's possible consideration a subject that I and other members of the public who live in Cumbria consider to be an abject failure on the part of the DECC/NDA sponsored MRWS Consultation Process on the siting of a underground Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) for Nuclear Waste which we have endured in Cumbria over the past 3yrs at a cost of circa £3.25m to the tax payer. I have intentionally refrained from submitting this request until this process had hopefully, but now doubtfully, reached its conclusion on the 30th Jan 2013.

My issue is about the effectiveness, efficiency and cost of not only the MRWS Consultancy process itself but also the **total cost** since 2004 of 'morphing' Nirex into the MRWS which has precisely the same previously rejected Nirex 'ambition' in mind. Some would say that the total undemocratic, un-transparent nature and 'engineered' process carried out has totally failed to inform the public FULLY of the consequences that came with the project proposed before they were asked to decide on the next step in the process. I tend to agree with that statement and try to show the financial and undemocratic costs of their strategy.

I have limited the 'evidence' in this submission to fit this one page and two attachments as I neither wish to waste your time or mine should you feel that the subject matter is not within your Committee's remit. The initial documentary evidence starts with the 2004 attachment which I consider to also be the start of the financial excesses of those behind the basic thinking adopted by Nirex after their failure in the 1995/6 £400m Enquiry. There is no doubt that this MRWS process is their brainchild in achieving what they failed to achieve under Nirex i.e. an underground facility in Cumbria, and this is somewhat illustrated by the following.

- 1) The financing of a 'MRWS Stakeholder' advisory panel was for it to be able to call for or have evidence submitted to it for consideration from all sources over a 3yr period to enable them to produce a final unbiased report with recommendations for submission to the 'Decision Making Bodies'(DMB's). Oddly however, persons on these DMB's also chaired and served on this advisory panel i.e. thus acting as both Judge and Jury - not the most effective democratic advisory process.
- 2) The financing of a MRWS's Consultancy questionnaire/poll that allowed 'brown envelopes' stuffed with illegitimate votes to be included in the results even after the organising company employed was forced to publicly admit that they were distinctly odd is, once again, not the most effective demonstration of the democratic process held at the tax payer's expense.
- 3) The dubious method agreed by the MRWS Stakeholders of including non-electoral roll residents in the Ipsos Mori telephone Poll but more disturbingly this poll showed that the OVERALL figure for the randomly selected public who '**Knew of at least a little**' or even '**less/nothing/never heard of it**' was **80%** whilst the figure for the BEST informed area who '**Knew of at least a little**' or even '**less/nothing/never heard of it**' was still **62%**. This being the case, what did the 3year £3.25m MRWS Consultancy funding do in supposedly informing the public to a reasonable standard so as to enable them to make an informed decision in the Ipsos Mori telephone poll that they funded? Surely a **20% OVERALL** to at - BEST **38%** who said that '**I know a fair amount about it**' is not good enough when that amount of tax payer money has been spent?
- 4) When the DBM's initial decision day was rescheduled to the 30th Jan 2013 additional unscheduled funding was provided to try to boost their seemingly 'failed process' with full page advertisements in Cumbria's local CN Press to combat the adverse effects of a perceived 'public uprising' against the GDF. This matter also brings into view the MRWS Consultancy's extensive coverage via the CN Media Group's freely distributed quarterly magazine on behalf of 'Britain's Energy Coast' using its local newspaper reporters to provide many of the articles. The BEC is a quango that distributes the NDA-NMP-Sellafield Ltd sourced funding and even administers certain Copeland 'projects' thus the MRWS Consultancy's positive spin is both advertised and distributed using tax payer money ultimately coming from the NDA. Is that in their remit?

The 'public rising' referred to has been basically 'fired' by the evidence contained in Attachment 2 which the MRWS Consultancy failed to promote on an equal footing with their own and in fact tried to suppress and ridicule it as "scaremongering, deceit and lies". (Two newspapers were forced to retract this type of statement) The fact that the MRWS Consultation refrained from also promoting the 'other side of the coin' (and even tried to denigrate it) is a main bone of contention in Cumbria as this is the ONLY information source that fully explained the precise nature and the likely consequences of moving to the Stage 4 of the process. The fact that it was provided, not by the MRWS Consultancy, but by two independent self-funded and respected experts in the field with its distribution being by public meetings, web sites and emails makes one question more what was the aim of this £3.25m MRWS Consultancy process? Was it to suppress and rubbish views contrary to theirs and prevent the public knowing about the possible negative consequences? That would seem so, so not exactly a transparent process paid for by the tax payer then.

Conclusion (at last):- The DECC from the 2004 Nirex management to the present day NDA appears to believe that it, along with a cadre of political and nuclear devotees, could get its way with their historical but internationally disputed modus operandi and which along with its flawed oversight of its MRWS Consultancy process has both financially and operationally failed the tax payer. Surely this sequence of failures deserves your attention when you to consider the effectiveness, efficiency and financial consequences (not to mention its lack of transparency) of this whole MRWS Process?

Yours Sincerely,

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED