Chapter 5 – Summary of questions

Questions raised

5.1 The aim of the siting process for a GDF is to implement a safe and practicable solution for higher activity radioactive waste that is deliverable and inspires public confidence. Before embarking on any revisions to the process set out in the White Paper, in pursuit of this aim, the UK Government wants to be satisfied that it has heard, and had the opportunity to consider, all views. Public engagement with this consultation and input on the questions asked is critical to the success of the siting process – your views are important. Specific questions on which Government is seeking views are to be found within the text itself, but they are reproduced here for ease of reference. You may comment on all or only some of the questions raised.

Consultation Questions	
1.	**Do you agree that a test of public support should be taken before the representative authority loses the Right of Withdrawal? If so, what do you think would be the most appropriate means of testing public support, and when should it take place? If you do not agree with the need for such a test, please explain why.**
2.	**Do you agree with the proposed amendments to decision making within the MRWS siting process? If not, how would you modify the proposed phased approach, or, alternatively, what different approach would you propose? Please explain your reasoning.**
3.	**Do you agree with this approach to revising roles in the siting process set out in the White Paper? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**
4.	**Do you agree with this proposed approach to assessing geological suitability as part of the MRWS siting process? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**
5.	**Do you agree with this proposed approach to planning for a GDF? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**
6.	**Do you agree with this clarification of the inventory for geological disposal – and how this will be communicated with the volunteer host community? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**
7.	**Do you endorse the proposed approach on community benefits associated with a GDF? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**
8.	**Do you agree with the proposed approach to addressing potential socio-**

	economic and environmental effects that might come from hosting a GDF? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?
9.	**Do you have any other comments?**

How to respond

5.2 When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please make it clear who the organisation represents and, where applicable, how you assembled the views of members.

5.3 When responses to this consultation have been analysed, the Government will issue a response. When considering responses to this consultation, the Government will give greater weight to responses that are based on argument and evidence, rather than simple expressions of support or opposition.

5.4 This consultation began on **12 September 2013** and will close on **5 December 2013**.

Responding online

Through the Government website https://econsultation.decc.gov.uk/decc-policy/managing-radioactive-waste-safely-siting-process/consult_edit

Responding by post or email

GDF siting process consultation

Department of Energy and Climate Change

Room M07

55 Whitehall

London

SW1A 2EY

Email: radioactivewaste@decc.gov.uk

Alan Auld Group Ltd

Consultation: Review of the Siting Process for a Geological Disposal Facility

Answers to Questions

Question 1

We agree that a test of public support should be taken before the representative authority loses the Right of Withdrawal. Various ways of disseminating the available information are identified in the Consultation Document, although further geotechnical investigations are still required to confirm the suitability of a site before a definite decision can be made. All methods of disseminating the information should be used as quickly as possible. However, bearing in mind the Government has a mandate to develop a Geological Disposal Facility, and Sellafield has been the focussed choice to date, a Government decision will be required to proceed, whether full public support is obtained or not.

Question 2

We agree with the basic concepts of having "Learning" and "Focussing" phases.

Question 3

We agree with the approach to revising roles in the siting process set out in the White Paper. These should help to ensure that everybody is more focussed and positive progress can be made.

Question 4

It is essential to progress the assessment of the geological suitability as part of the MRWS siting process (Stages 5 and 6). However, carrying this forward on the 9 potentially suitable generic settings will be impossible. A specific site should be concentrated on. Bearing in mind the only communities who have shown interest so far are those around Sellafield, this is not likely to change in the future. Therefore the Sellafield site should be progressed further with a view to convincing Cumbria County Council that it will be suitable with all the necessary safeguards (the two Local Councils have bought into it so far).

Question 5

We agree with the proposed approach to planning for the GDF.

Question 6

We agree with idea of fully clarifying the inventory for geological disposal and making it available for communities to access. It doesn't set out how it would be communicated to the volunteer host community.

Question 7

We endorse the proposed approach on community benefits associated with a GDF. They need to be made sufficiently attractive for potential host communities to volunteer. However, the additional criterion is to provide a potential host community with sufficient guarantees on the safety of such an installation.

Question 8

We agree with the proposed approach to addressing potential socio-economic and environmental effects that might come from hosting a GDF

Question 9

The most direct approach would be to focus on selling it better to Cumbria County Council and then moving on to Stages 5 and 6 of the investigations at Sellafield

Alan Auld

Alan Auld Group Ltd

19.12.13