

Interactive comment on “Just passing through: the risky mobilities of hazardous materials transport” by J. Cidell

J. Cidell

jcidell@illinois.edu

Received and published: 15 March 2012

I am glad that the referee found fire space to be a useful way of thinking about mobile spatialities and mobile risks, as it seemed to me to be the best way to explain the disjuncture between residents' framing of the risk posed by hazardous materials in rail cars and the official risk analysis procedure. I agree that the policy implications are not fully developed, because as difficult as it has been to make the abstract concept of fire space applicable in an academic setting, it would be even harder to make it relevant to policymakers. Perhaps a starting point would be to acknowledge that the physical boundary of the study site in an environmental review should extend outward along the infrastructure networks that are part of such a place as Yucca Mountain. This could be done through the scoping portion of an environmental review. In a sense, this is an

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



argument to take a more geographical approach to environmental review in general in terms of considering all of the places and spaces that are connected to development on a specific site. The difficulty would come in convincing regulators that absent places or elements do, in fact, help to comprise that which is present.

Interactive comment on Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 8, 1, 2012.

SGD

8, C10–C11, 2012

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

