

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.

Some areas can be ruled out on basic geological grounds. It is correct to produce maps to show the distribution of potentially suitable host rocks and major faults (section 3.13)

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.

BGS 6-inch and 10,000 scale maps are some of the best geological maps in the world. Never-the-less, all geological maps are interpretations and very detailed follow-up investigations will be needed. The data set should include maps of - seismicity - flood (rivers and tidal) and tsunami risk - unconventional hydrocarbon potential - deep geothermal power potential - urban and suburban development

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?

Necessary though the proposed outputs are, I don't think the vast majority of the population will invest the time in trying to understand them. Outputs will have to be supported by a major public understanding of earth science campaign

Question 4: Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

This is not primarily an engineering or geological problem - technical solutions can be found if the voting public supports the general idea. The primary problem is one of public understanding of earth science (PUES). Due to a lack of secondary level teaching in earth sciences over many decades past, the great majority of the public will struggle to understand the technical issues raised by this consultation. They will be frustrated by the mass of technical data presented. The basic idea of burying radioactive waste will create fear, exacerbated by ill-informed "green" activists. The simplest solution for most people will be to reject the proposal with little or no consideration. Voluntarism is politically and morally acceptable, but some areas must be ruled to begin with on basic geological grounds - sandstone, limestone, and heavily faulted zones. A simplified national geological map of theoretically possible areas vs known disadvantageous ground conditions is required. It is not realistic to say we can engineer bad ground conditions simply because funding is unlimited and the local community supports the proposal for their area. Not to declare some areas as unsuitable would be disingenuous and create a lack of trust in what is already a low trust issue. Owing to a general lack of knowledge and understanding, generating public trust is THE key issue. A major PUES campaign will be needed if this is to have any chance of success at all. You will need the opinions of genuinely independent respected experts presented in very accessible (but not patronising) form and given the widest possible media coverage. Both houses of Parliament and all the major scientific and engineering institutions (without exception) will need to support the proposal actively.

Name: J.W. Arthurs

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation Independent consulting geologist

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