

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	REDACTED
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?

If, a big if, a depository has to be made, the known safe geology should inform the siting. After that, only solid long lasting bribes of the highest order will make volunteerism realistic. An area already blighted by the nuclear industry, with a financial, environmental, health and safety investment in finding a solution rightly turned it down for sound geological environmental reasons.

The nuclear industry and government never properly engaged with the debate. I asked the DECC rep and the geologist at the Kendal public meeting asked about alternative plans if volunteerism didn't work. What was the cost/risk analysis of waste staying in Cumbria against being transported elsewhere. What could they say to answer points made by anti dump scientists.

Nothing. No reasoned evidence. "There is no plan B"

The nuclear waste situation is a serious problem. It comes from a secretive and free spending industry. No one asked for it. It emerged from the cold war with no long term realistic strategy for disposal. Solving the problem via volunteerism is an abdication of governmental responsibility. The safest areas for disposal are known. There will have to be a law passed to make the chosen area accept on behalf of future generations. Meanwhile, throw money at them as you have done with the industry so far.

You may get lucky and a scientific development may help to burn and reduce the radioactivity of some of the waste.

I find it depressing that the political reality is that no politician, political party or civil servant is likely to advocate any of these difficult outcomes, hence widespread cynicism and mistrust that led to the recent rejection. The politicians, conservative, liberal and labour of Cumbria should be applauded for having an open mind and making the right decision. It was by no means certain, but the evidence based decision was the right one, even though they were placed under enormous pressure by the government and nuclear lobby.

For once democracy, particularly local democracy, came out ahead.

Meanwhile, make some serious investment in the current inadequate storage facilities at Sellafield and immediately stop any new nuclear build. Only resume when the waste issue has a resolution.