

.

From:
Sent: 10 June 2013 19:55
To: radioactivewaste (DECC)
Cc:
Subject: personal response to Call for Evidence on Process for MRWS

Dear Sirs,

Please find below my personal response to your Call for Evidence on the Process for MRWS.

I am unable to download your formal response form. Also as a result of recently being a victim of internet fraud, I do not currently have Word. Therefore, I am using e-mail to correspond with you.

Yours faithfully,

E-mail:

As this is a personal response, the other questions on your formal response form do not apply.

RESPONSE:

1. It is fundamental that the public has trust in the Government and the nuclear industry. Unfortunately, there is currently very little, in part owing to:
 - the 'revolving door' that exists in DECC, whereby members of staff from e.g. EDF are seconded to work in the department, which creates the impression of a cosy relationship;
 - the privileged access that the nuclear industry operators have to Ministers, which creates the impression of an incestuous relationship;
 - the impression that neither the Government nor the nuclear industry is really listening.

It is to be hoped that the 'No' vote in Cumbria will be a wake-up call.

2. The current MRWS process should apply only to legacy wastes, for which a fairly accurate inventory should exist. As things stand, it is difficult to imagine any community that would be willing to accept wastes from new build as the amounts involved are completely unknown. Under the current process, Government should simply not be asking any community to take this on in ignorance (Government and community) of what is involved.

The storage of new build wastes should be subject to a separate consultation, similar to that carried out after intensive public and stakeholder engagement by the first Committee on Radioactive Waste Management, and in which the public can have trust.

3. We should actually not be proposing to create new nuclear wastes. The proposal to invest in nuclear new build should be dropped in favour of investment in renewable energies, that will not require to be decommissioned and which will not have lethal wastes that require storage for centuries to come. If highly-industrialised Germany can do it, so can the UK with its greater renewable resources.
4. It might be best to follow the process as recommended by CoRWM1. For example, the Committee

suggested that deep geological disposal was the best approach in the state of current knowledge but only in conjunction with a proper process for interim storage. Long-term storage of wastes will, in any event, be necessary as no national GDF is in sight and may never be.

I suggest re-visiting the Committee's proposals instead of re-inventing the wheel - and spending more taxpayers' money.

5. The priority at present must be the safety and security of the wastes being stored at Sellafield, the state of which was recently heavily criticised.

The fact has to be faced that the UK is not doing well with storage for its legacy wastes, some of which will have to remain in completely unsuitable locations, such as Bradwell, for decades to come, if not indefinitely.

6. Instead of asking all communities if they would be willing to host the nation's radioactive wastes, a screening-out process should first be undertaken and sites that do not have suitable geological conditions, that are important culturally or are close to large populations, etc. may be omitted. This was a CoRWM recommendation.

7. The idea of voluntarism must not be abandoned and any communities that do volunteer should have the opportunity to withdraw at any time prior to the start of construction of a GDF. Volunteer communities should also receive compensation and benefits commensurate with agreeing to become a national sacrifice area.

8. To create a level playing field, voluntarism - and compensation - should be applied to those communities already hosting ILW (e.g. Bradwell) and spent fuel (e.g. Sizewell).

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.