

**Question 1:** To what extent do you think our proposed approach to providing national-scale existing information about geology relevant to long-term safety is appropriate? Please give your reasons.

It is imperative to the public's perception that the starting point is "open" so you must give the information on a national-scale and not focus on any particular area. By using reputable information that is publicly available eg BGS's maps and their on-line modelling facility, it ensures that anyone can verify for themselves the authenticity of that information. A lot of consideration has been given to rock properties but I think that the basic setting of the UK in terms of the earth's structure, plate tectonics, earthquakes and volcanos ought to be covered for completeness. Climate change has been mentioned we mustn't forget Milankovitch cycles and the resulting marine transgressions.

**Question 2:** To what extent do you think that the proposed national information sources are appropriate and sufficient for this exercise? Please give your reasons.

The information that is publicly available from sources such as the BGS has been built up over many years. It can be shown that this information repository was not for the purpose of this exercise and is therefore independent of that purpose. A criticism that can be made of this argument is that the available information is not sufficiently specific to the current purpose, but that can be countered in that this is only a feasibility study and that site specific investigations would take place at later stages. It can be construed that the BGS, Environment Agency etc are Central Government bodies, but they are nonetheless independent of RWM and distinct separations must be maintained.

**Question 3:** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed form of the outputs from geological screening? What additional outputs would you find useful?

The consultation document seems to aim at output for communities. I think that a preliminary to this should be a national based output because the consultation is national-scale; then make things more community available. It is vital to keep the public informed but it is difficult to pitch this right in terms of technical detail. It is always preferable that the public has the opportunity to get bored and ignore a constant drip-feeding of information than to be able to claim that "it was starved of information as there must be something to hide."

**Question 4:** Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

Is there any way that RWM can stimulate TV documentary series that deal with geology in synch with your own programme ? The public not only enjoys but respects presenters such as David Attenborough and Iain Stewart.

Name: **H B Mottram**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation [REDACTED]

Do you agree to your responses to this consultation being published? Yes