

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	REDACTED REDACTED
Address	REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED
Email	REDACTED REDACTED
Telephone	REDACTED
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?**

My experience of the MWRS process in Cumbria in 2012/3 makes me make the following observations.

The MWRS process should start with identifying suitable geological sites in the UK and not by asking for volunteer areas and then trying to find reasons that the geology might be acceptable in that area. The Cumbrian process was completely back to front.

The MWRS process should exclude specific parts of the UK including National Parks and areas of outstanding natural beauty, wildlife diversity and unique landscape, and nearby land that would adversely affect such protected areas.

There should be rigorous and predefined and agreed criteria for noting 'community approval'. That a local government 'unelected inner cabinet of a very few people' should decide the way forward under the umbrella of 'community approval' should not be acceptable.

Any survey of the local population regarding their views on a local nuclear repository should be undertaken only after the population are fully informed about the pros and cons of the proposal in a language that is understandable. It should not be acceptable to include responses from the population if they are not aware of the issues. I suspect therefore that this means that the survey should be done at a later stage in the local consultation process after there have been wide public debates and media discussion.

The benefits to the local community should be clearly spelt out so the local

population can more openly gauge the pros and cons of progressing the MWRS process locally to best benefit the whole community.

The ability of the community to withdraw at any stage up to final agreement without penalty should be enshrined in law.

Before final approval the whole community should have a robust and clearly structured independent referendum vote.