

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 REDACTED
Organisation / Company	
Organisation Size (no. of employees)	
Organisation Type	
Job Title	
Department	
Address	REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
Email	REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
Telephone	REDACTED REDACTED
Fax	

Would you like to be kept informed of developments with the MRWS programme?	Yes
Would you like your response to be kept	No

confidential? If yes please give a reason

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?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

My feedback based on the points above is as follows:

- I support the UK Government's policy to explore options for suitable long-term management of higher-activity radioactive waste, with GDF being the preferred approach.

- The MRWS programme of voluntarism and partnership should not however be the preferred approach for site selection. There should be a much more holistic approach based firstly on finding suitable geology, then taking into account any other designations which exist in those areas (e.g. National Park status). If suitable geology is found, the process of voluntarism can then be applied within those areas.

- For communities to be 'attracted' to a site selection process, there needs to be clear parameters from the outset on benefits and impacts.

Communities need to be confident that they can 'opt out' at any stage of the process and that the views of those communities located closest to any chosen site are represented fairly at local level. I do not think this was achieved through the recent MRWS process.

- I think clarity on who leads the MRWS process (and is therefore accountable) is important and a better understanding earlier in the process of what a GDF would bring to a host community and surrounding area (positives and negatives).

Finally, I think there would be national public outcry if there was any suggestion that a GDF was being considered within the boundary of the Lake District National Park, or any other National Park.