

Local and regional public involvement in the Swedish site selection process

Kjell Andersson, Karita Research

BFE, Baden, September 23, 2009

SKB site selection programme 1(3)

In 1992 SKB announced a new phased site selection process based on municipality voluntariness at all steps, 8 municipalities proposed for feasibility studies

Two municipalities in north Sweden said "no thank you" in referenda

Feasibility studies went on on in six other municipalities, all with nuclear installations or municipalities close to these

SKB site selection programme 2(3)

- In 2000 SKB proposed site investigations, including deep drilling in three municipalities
- Tierp municipal council voted no
- Östhammar and Oskarshamn voted yes with large majority
- Site investigations took place at the two sites

SKB site selection programme 3(3)

In 2009 SKB announced Östhammar to be the chosen site

In 2010 SKB is expected to submit a licence application for a final repository in Östhammar

Then follows a review process expected to be 3 years

The licensing authority SSM plans for an open review process with communication building on earlier work and experiences in participation and transparency

The legal framework

The Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Company (SKB) has to do all the necessary R&D and site investigations, and to submit a license application.

Two arms of licensing

1. The Environment Code - Environmental Court procedure, municipality veto right
2. The Nuclear Activities Act – Review by the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority (SSM)

Final decision by the government

Oskarshamn initiative

1994 LKO Project started with funding from the nuclear waste fund (2 MSEK per year at the time)

1994 EIA Forum in Kalmar County (EIA became a formal requirement in Environmental Code in 1999!)

Aims: 1) to build best possible decision-making base, 2) to have real impact on the process.

The Oskarshamn model 1(2)

Openness and participation

everything on the table, real influence

The EIA process

development of basis together - decisions independently

The Municipality Council as client

competent elected officials responsible towards the voters

The public - a resource

The Oskarshamn model 2(2)

The environmental groups - a resource

their members and experts give valuable contributions

The competent authorities "our experts"

the authorities visible throughout the process

municipality decisions after statement by the competent authorities

Stretching of SKB and regulators to clear answers

"we build competence so we can ask the difficult questions" , "we ask until we get clear answers"

later developments

Cooperation between Oskarshamn and Östhammar

It became more and more visible that both municipalities wanted the final repository - their role as "neutral transparency arenas" became difficult to maintain

Jointly they required "compensation" for the one not to get the facility. **Added value agreement** initiative in 2007.

2009: Agreement with SKB: to the value of 2,0 billion SEK
75 % to Oskarshamn, 25 % to Östhammar

SKB consultations 1(2)

The applications for permits to build a final repository for spent nuclear fuel must include an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and a consultation report.

The EIS is being developed in consultation. Two forms of consultation meetings:

1. Open public meetings
2. Regional consultation meetings with municipality, County Council and authorities, open to the public for observation. This is the continuation of the EIA Forum in Kalmar County

SKB consultations 2(2)

Altogether about 50 EIA consultation meetings have been held since 2004

The consultation report will account for the consultation procedure, participants, discussions that were held and how the resultant viewpoints were handled

the transparency arenas

- RISCUM model developed for authorities SKI and SSI. Neutral arena for structured dialogue
- Used by SKI - hearings on site selection, 2001
- RISCUM II project – EU research
- Used by Oskarshamn and Östhammar municipalities.
- Used in other areas than nuclear waste management
- 2009 – applied in Czech Republic
- Now the Swedish National Council for Nuclear Waste has a transparency programme using RISCUM

Stretching

**central actors in a decision making process
are gathered in a public arena to let their
claims to truth, validity and authenticity be
challenged in a structured way**

In the RISCUM Model, stretching is a means to get transparency – this needs to be organized in a “transparency arena”

this is how its done

1. Working group – “pre understanding” and organization
2. **Reference group with stakeholders (e.g. industry, academia, authorities, NGO:s) - agreement**
3. The reference group discusses the activities – sets the principles into action
4. Knowledge building activities
5. **Hearings with stretching**
6. Documentation

“Success factors” 1(3)

Clear roles

- Implementer SKB
- Regulatory authorities – have integrity AND are able to participate
- Municipalities – veto right AND resources
- The Council - independent advisor to the government
- NGOs - get funding from the nuclear waste fund

“Success factors” 2(3)

Changing SKB attitude

- from technocratic to more dialogue

Communities with nuclear installations

- Local public in favour of repository siting

Real local and regional influence

- on the decision-making process
- on SKBs socio-economic studies
- on added value to BOTH municipalities

“Success factors” 3(3)

The transparency arenas

- Stretching creates clarity
- Organized by different bodies (but never SKB) due to changing phases of the programme
- The organizers have done this for their own needs
- However, the stretching sent signals also to SKB, believed to be useful for them