

# 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](mailto: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)	REDACTED
Organisation Type	REDACTED
Job Title	REDACTED
Department	REDACTED
Address	REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
Email	REDACTED REDACTED
Telephone	REDACTED
Fax	

Would you like to be kept informed of developments with the MRWS programme?	Yes/No
Would you like your response to be kept confidential? If yes please give a reason	Yes/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?

1. The problem is a national one. The process that fell apart last year was marginalised as Cumbrian issue, with insufficient national debate.
2. Site selection using geological criteria must **precede** local consultation. The geological characteristics of a good disposal site are well understood by the international scientific community, and preliminary site selection need not take long or cost a huge amount – the BGS already made a preliminary site list in the 1980s.
3. I recommend a panel of geological experts **outside** the BGS (people like **REDACTED** of Leeds University) be involved in the process, ensuring maximum public transparency
4. Once suitable locations have been identified, then discussion with potential communities should follow. It is imperative that community benefits are made clear at the outset. One of the shortcomings of the Govt approach in Cumbria was that the benefits were not clarified.
5. Benefits such as employment are intangible and, in the case of a geological disposal facility only likely to accrue to future generations. I suggest simple up-front financial inducement is more likely to persuade a local community to host a disposal site.

*Note:* These comments are made in a private capacity. I do not claim to speak on behalf my employers.