

## **Context:**

### **Public Consultation**

### **Providing Information**

### **Radioactive Waste Management**

### **National Geological Screening Guidance**

**Objective:** (Paragraph 1.1) to bring together existing information about 'UK Geology' that is relevant to the long-term-safety, of a geological disposal facility, and make it available in an accessible form (to a general audience (paragraph 1.5 bullet point3)).

### **Consultation**

1 Intro – Brief Context -

2 Working Lunch – Discussions with specialists – Excellent Information provided

3 Permeability Demo – Very good

4 Geology of UK - Video/OHP Presentation – Very good

4 Focus Groups - Discussions with Specialists in attendance

5 Groups Feedback –

### **Focus Group Discussions**

#### **Q1 Proposed Approach**

*National Scale – Existing Information about  
UK Geology  
Long term safety.*

Focus Group reflected on Video/OHP Presentation and skirted through the document.

Existing knowledge of National Geology thought to be OK for overview, but must be considered:

- Secondary Research which will require further in-depth Primary research to verify suitability, after an interest has been raised by a community for a site to be developed.

#### **Long term safety**

- Demonstrating Safety
    - o Paragraphs 2.14 – 2.17
- Unsatisfactory –
- Provides general context only.
  - Does not elucidate risks detailed in Environmental Agency, IAEA, or NDA sub notes (not provided)
  - not 'in an accessible form' for 'a general audience'
  - Safety Code<sup>5</sup> (not made available) not 'in an accessible form' for 'a general audience.'

It was generally felt that the document was not clear and did not empower a large section of the intended audience to understand or make informed judgements and decisions based on the knowledge provided in the document.

### **Personal observation**

It may be helpful to run through each question with Focus Groups directing them to specific data in the document and useful sub notes before handing back to the Focus Groups for discussion and feedback.

Presentations, examples, analogies & information communicated by staff were, better by far, than the document, Staff were expected to know the document, but did not appear fully appraised of the contents. (i.e. Focus Group directed to pages in Document when individuals asked where information was, but not to sub-notes which formed knowledge base of Document. (Sub notes were not available to focus groups to review but formed basis of document)

***Sources of Information***  
***Appropriateness & Sufficiency***

**Overview**

It was generally considered the 'Sources of Information' were appropriate, but without qualification, as no examples of these sources were provided for discussion, and their 'Appropriateness & Sufficiency' was therefore not demonstrated.

It was generally felt that the document was not clear and would not empower a large section of the intended audience to understand or be able to make informed judgements and decisions based on the knowledge provided in the document.

It may be helpful to develop a table of known risks, checks and balances to aid decision making, and demonstrate thoroughness and accountability and a determination to eradicate the possibility of human error.

Paragraph 3.32 reflected the view of my Focus Group.

**Other observations1**

Would the research address the public concerns more closely if the primary objective were redefined?

**From:**

**Objective:** (Paragraph 1.1) to bring together existing information about 'UK Geology' that is relevant to the long-term-safety, of a 'geological disposal facility', and make it available in an accessible form (to a general audience paragraph 1.S.3)

**To:**

**Objective:** (Paragraph 1.1) to bring together existing information about UK Geology that is relevant to the development of a geological disposal facility involved in the isolation of radioactive waste from the surface. This is necessary in order to preserve the long-term-safety of planet Earth and its eco systems. Key information, which demonstrates how this will be achieved, and maintained-over-time will be made available in an accessible form (to a general audience. (paragraph 1.5 bullet point 3, and Paragraph 3.32)).

**Other observations2**

Paragraph 1.2 suggests GDF will contain the radioactivity so it will cause no harm.

I was given to understanding during your consultation that radioactivity can only be stored, and not contained as stated. The intention of the facility, as I understand it, is only to slow the radioactivity's progress towards the surface until it reaches a point close to the end of its atomic life prior to reaching the surface. This should mean the rock substrate and the category of radioactive waste should dictate the depth the material should be stored at. Given the above and the known reactions between radioactive material and cement, can you show how the proposed multi-barrier-system (figure2, page6) will remain safe in the long-term.

Given the above, at what point if any, will the ground above such facilities potentially become unsuitable for towns, cities, farming of common land to be used?

**Peter Ward**