



# Radioactive Waste Management

## National Geological Screening

### Public consultation response

When complete, please email to [NGSconsultation@nda.gov.uk](mailto:NGSconsultation@nda.gov.uk) or send by post to: National Geological Screening Consultation, Radioactive Waste Management, Building 587, Curie Avenue, Harwell, Didcot OX11 0RH.

Name	Chris Scott
Email address	REDACTED
Organisation	none

#### 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.

*I think it is necessary, but in West Cumbria the earlier surveys, inquiries, and independent opinion strongly concluded the area was geologically unsuited. The only (strongly contested) slight wavering on geological opinion came from the BGS itself. To an outsider it looked as if the BGS were prepared to humour the nuclear industry by taking their money for yet more surveys in an area we already know more than enough about. The Geological consultant representation at "consultation meetings" in the earlier "volunteerism" process was deeply unconvincing.*

*We are wasting time and resources unless the government are prepared to prioritise suitable geology over volunteerism.*

#### 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

No opinion.

**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?

*Has the impact of rising sea levels caused by global warming over a long time period been factored in. Disposal should not take place in vulnerable areas.*

**Question 4:**

Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

*The strong evidence is that only a tiny part of the UK likely to volunteer. Coincidentally, that area Allerdale contains the current extremely dangerous nuclear waste surface storage and a dependent workforce. However, it also has an exceptionally complex and well understood geology which copes with fast flowing water from the wettest part of England. It would be difficult to find a more inappropriate area for geological disposal.*

*It is also close to and may include World Heritage level landscape. The visual of the disposal facility gives no indication of the amount of excavated material that has to be disposed of. It is to a depth of 1 km and an area of 11.5 sq km. It is a huge amount, but no sign of it...*

*There has recently been confirmation of huge investment in more nuclear power at a time of financial constraint.*

*There now needs to be a similarly courageous political commitment to waste disposal based on the best long term safety.*

*Our experience of Volunteerism has shown it to exclude all options except for a part of West Cumbria. More surveys will be a waste of time and money unless the volunteerism principal can be overridden.*

*That can be done, because it was redefined after Cumbria County Council rejected the last attempt. But this time it should be modified to prioritise the safest areas and if necessary a decision on disposal should be made by Government in the interest of national security based on the best safe disposal. That would not be West Cumbria.*