

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 have some concerns about your proposed approach for 2 reasons. The first reason is that collecting this information on a national basis may make the best the enemy of the good. What I mean here is that it is my opinion that a range of geological conditions will allow for the construction of good GDF. However, by collecting information on a national scale there may always be "better" site that could be considered. The second concern is that the construction of GDF is more a political and social problem than a geological problem. I can imagine a range of geological settings that would allow a safety case to be made that would show that the GDF meets the safety requirements. If the construction of the GDF is more of a political and social problem then it would be better to ask communities to put them selves forward in the first case and then see if the geology is suitable to allow the safety case to be made.

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.

It is my opinion that the proposed national information sources are appropriate and sufficient. I trust the skill and knowledge of the BGS and the other identified authors of the maps and reports that will provide the information for this exercise.

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?

I agree with the proposed form of outputs. I would like to see two further output. 1. I would prefer a map that shows a summary that identifies areas that may be suitable. It is my opinion that a suitable GDF could be constructed in a range of different geological settings. I do realize that there are certain areas that are not suitable from a geological point of view. For example, in my opinion, an area with significant coal deposits from the surface down to 1000m depth would not be suitable as a location for a GDF since there is a significant chance that future generation might want to exploit those resources and therefore disturb a GDF. In addition, while geology is important, engineering can deal with a wide range of conditions. By creating a map that I expect would show a large number of areas suitable I would hope we could build a GDF that is good enough as opposed to trying to build the one that is "best" whatever best means in this case. 2. It would be useful if some information on the "uncertainty" of the data presented. From my experience in geotechnical engineering I know that geology is hard, subject to interpretation and always has some uncertainty associated with it. I appreciate that how to identify and measure uncertainty is difficult but I think this would be a useful addition to the information provided.

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

No

Name: **Joseph Heffernan**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation: Not representing any organisation

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

Yes