

## Response to Royal Commission – Nuclear SA

The report says this venture is likely to deliver substantial economic benefits to SA and suggests minimal risks.

In this venture, there are some major concerns, which could result in the creation of huge burdens on future generations.

1. No geology is completely stable – and new fault lines may emerge, as has happened in the past. The security of the geology cannot be guaranteed for the life span of the waste.
2. Human error occurs in every venture and the risks involved with long-life waste would be too catastrophic in the long term to justify any risk, no matter how small.
3. The nuclear industry ignored the possibility of a huge earthquake and tsunami experienced in Fukushima. Similarly, natural phenomenon – like meteorites – have been ignored in this report.
4. The costs involved in any attempts to clean up after an accident that could cause waste to leak and affect the wider environment (through air, rain and groundwater transmission) could far outweigh any advantages over the coming years.
5. The people of Fukushima who were won over by economic incentives and assured of the safety of nuclear power now feel betrayed. The cost of constantly trying to contain contamination for decades is enormous, as they try to freeze the ground and a raft of other measures to contain contamination.
6. This report is a strong attempt to provide assurance of the management of risks, without enough consideration of potential burdens on future generations.
7. The focus on the reduction of carbon emissions as a rationale for nuclear power is dangerously limited, given that there are a lot of other alternatives that are safer and do not pose problems that could create immense burdens for future generations.

I am strongly opposed to the use of SA as a nuclear waste dump, as there are many long-term dangers inherent in the whole nuclear process and the world should be exploring other forms of energy.

Thank you  
Carmel Dowd