



What if devolved administrations opt-out ?

Max Wallis

Barry & Vale Friends of the Earth



Geol Disposal of nuclear waste as a 'viable' solution.

- ❑ does not meet the Flowers criterion
- ❑ Westminster government believed 'viable', but lacked supporting science
- ❑ accepts CoRWM's "best available" recommendation for a deep geological dump did **not** have a "basis in sound science"
- ❑ major problems to be resolved say IAEA
- ❑ NIREX 'viability' report was inadequate (EA's 12 issues) – extended research needed – perhaps rock laboratory (CoRWM2)
- ❑ conflict between allowing H₂ gas escape and preventing methane gas escape

Concept of viability – based on politics or science?



Principle of Disposal

“The principle of geological disposal is to isolate the waste deep inside a suitable rock formation to ensure that no significant quantity of radioactivity ever reaches the surface environment.”

DEFRA Consultation Document 25 June 2000, p15

“A framework for implementing geological disposal”

nuclear industry: “isolation” is neither expected nor achievable

‘Vents’ (or holes) in the waste drums,

Corrosion of the Drums if the cavern is open for up to 500 years

A Porous Cement Surround, and

Flow through the Rock Fractures

IAEA report (Oct '07) the necessary research is "far from being complete".



NIREX's legacy – insoluble conundrum ?

- **carbon-14 containing methane**: *it could be necessary to establish siting criteria that would ensure that significant gaseous release to the biosphere would be unlikely.*
‘Viability Report’ November 2005 – Nirex Report N-122
- **Hydrogen gas** from iron corroding under ‘*anaerobic conditions*’ gives:
“risk from over-pressurisation due to gas generation for a repository in a hard fractured host rock” (page 55)

Nirex has stated [4] that generic issues will need to be satisfactorily resolved before an application for permission to investigate sites or to proceed with excavations at a volunteer site. It would be helpful if Nirex could clarify what is meant by "satisfactorily resolved".



On waste disposal policy as basis for consents

- no SEA of the strategic options – an EU requirement for policy framework for planning and regulatory consenting
- inadequate consideration of options - the Netherlands strategy was excluded
- waste disposal criteria - undefined by CoRWM
 - *partially by government (ice-ages, current dose standards)*
 - *NIREX scenarios don't all meet – probabilistic rather than science-based)*
- nuclear waste management is a devolved function in Wales and Scotland

What if Scotland and Wales refuse 150 yr storage of spent fuel?



What is the GDA team to do?

- formulate their own belief or accept disparate government (*administrations*) beliefs?
- accept that GDA will differ for Wales/Scotland from England?
 - our Sustainable Development criteria are violated by creating waste for which there is no disposal route in Wales
- set different requirement on a proposer of WylfaB from one in England?

What if Scotland and Wales refuse 150 yr storage of spent fuel?