

**NuLeAF view on Energy Review for input to LGA response** 21 March 2006

The LGA recognises that any future commitment to new nuclear generating capacity would result in new radioactive waste accumulations during operational and decommissioning phases. It is estimated that, from the point of new plant commissioning through to final decommissioning, a 10Gw (10 reactor) nuclear programme would add about 10% to the existing radioactive waste inventory by volume, and initially about 3 times to the existing inventory by radioactivity content. This accumulation would be intergenerational, spanning many decades.

Public concern about radioactive waste management policy and practice must be acknowledged and is apparent from its history to date. To help overcome historic difficulties and assist government with future radioactive waste management policy implementation the LGA has established a Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF).

NuLeAF notes that problems associated with radioactive waste management will not be solved by the establishment of a new Government policy on long-term management alone. It is NuLeAF's view that any progress with radioactive waste management will require ongoing partnership between central and local government. The burden of risk carried by present and future generations living with the existing radioactive waste legacy must be recognised and a willingness on the part of Government to explore openly and transparently how this can be offset is required. It must also be recognised that any new waste accumulations may create new societal dilemmas over the implementation of future long-term management policy. It could also add complexity to the legacy management policy process now in hand. NuLeAF considers that these potential implications arising from any commitment to a new nuclear programme must be carefully weighed by Government prior to any decision to proceed with such a programme.

At 15:48 20/03/2006, you wrote:

Dear Stewart

With the LGA Environment Board now having met I will be firming up the LGA response to the Energy Review. Thanks for your previous emails with points which largely reflect the LGA view on need to promote energy efficiency/renewables and reduce CO2 emissions/fuel poverty. The Board have decided not to put in particular pro or anti statements on nuclear specifically but recognise that the LGA's nuclear waste SIG will have a view. I'd like to put in a reference to that - it won't be in huge detail as we are only making a top line type of submission, focusing more on positive LA examples of effective work, but it would be useful if you could let me have perhaps a couple of paras that sum up the SIG viewpoint.

It would be very helpful to have something in the next couple of days if that would be possible - by Wednesday 22nd if at all possible.

Many thanks indeed.

Sarah Coe