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Welcome to the most beautiful part of Sweden
Kalmar County in Sweden
Land Area 1000 km², 5400 islands
Inhabitants 26,200
Municipality Annual Budget

130.000.000 €

~30% income tax
~80% of the welfare
The Simpevarp Peninsula, Oskarshamn Sweden

All Swedish spent nuclear fuel is here!
Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory  Canister Fabrication Laboratory

R&D
Encapsulation

Underground disposal
The legal situation

Sweden has only two administrative levels

Sweden has strong municipalities with a planning monopoly and local veto

The local veto seems to be a significant factor in the progress not a roadblock

The veto is a platform for local engagement.
Party roles

Industry/SKB

The authority/SSM

The court of environment

The municipality and the local public

The government
Party roles and decision making process – Lessons learned

• If you trust the actors and the process you may accept the outcome
• Define clearly the party roles in dialogue with the other parties
• Stay within your role
• Define each step in the decision making process - address what, when, by whom
Main political considerations

- Long term safety
- Environmental impacts
- Health effects
- Socioeconomic aspects
**Societal, and other studies**

- Local supply study - gods and services
- Socio economic effects in case of a final repository system
- Potential effects on real - estate prices
- Local receiving capabilities
- EU and other countries waste
- Potential effects on tourism and image
- Spin-off effects
- Local environmental consequences
- etc
Local engagement of Oskarshamn
Important milestones in HLW-history - Oskarshamn

1992  announced preferred site for encapsulation plant
1995  request for feasibility study
1999  feasibility study complete
2000  request for site investigation - one of two
2002  yes to site investigation
2009  site selection
2011  application for encapsulation plant and final repository
Our basic policy

• The waste is in our back yard - the problem cannot be voted away

• We have a responsibility to find a solution - we cannot wait for a miracle

• We can only move ahead in pace with our citizens

• With our strong position we will secure the local perspective in the decisions
A question you have to ask yourself

How will this affect our image?
Final repository and encapsulation plant = A dump?
...or an advanced environmental project?
What is your attitude towards SKB’s decision to build a canister factory and an encapsulation plant in Oskarshamn Municipality? Are you…?

- Completely for it:
  - 2013: 37%
  - 2012: 35%
  - 2011: 36%
  - 2010: 36%

- For it:
  - 2013: 40%
  - 2012: 49%
  - 2011: 45%
  - 2010: 50%

- Against it:
  - 2013: 7%
  - 2012: 6%
  - 2011: 7%
  - 2010: 4%

- Completely against it:
  - 2013: 12%
  - 2012: 3%
  - 2011: 5%
  - 2010: 1%

- Don't know:
  - 2013: 7%
  - 2012: 7%
  - 2011: 8%
  - 2010: 8%
The Oskarshamn model

- Full openness, participation and influence
- The EIA the legal framework
- The council the local client
- The public a resource
- The environmental groups a resource
- The regulatory authorities our experts
- Stretching of SKB and the regulators
Experience with nuclear operations. Is it important?

Feasibility studies in eight Swedish municipalities

Site investigations in two municipalities with extensive nuclear experience

Experience allows for a direct dialogue

To build similar platform in “non nuclear community” likely to take decades
Added values - The Swedish way

Two municipalities taking responsibility for a national problem

A comprehensive work during 15 years

The municipalities are an asset in the process

Shall contribute to the development of the municipalities

Both municipalities shall be winners
Added values - The Swedish way, cont.

2 billion SEK (≈220 million €)

75 % to the municipality not chosen

Development in different areas
  New jobs
  Education
  Support establishment of companies
  Infrastructure
What happens next…

Comments on the proposal circulated for consideration

Court proceedings, 2016

Final decision and local veto, 2017?
Conclusion - Safety for the public is a feeling of trust for politicians, industry, regulators and for the process

It takes long time to build trust
Communicate – participate
Process is as important as content
Realistic timetable
Predictable process
Openness
We believe that solid waste repository decisions only can be taken with strong local participation.