

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.

Quite appropriate overall subject to comments below: In Table 2 Attributes. It would be helpful for the Natural Processes line to explicitly include faulting and tectonism together with assessment of risk of fault reactivation. The consideration always at the regional scale could lead readers to think that too little geology was known at the area or local level and get the impression that this was somewhat starting from scratch. I think that the exercise should be at the County scale or similar. 3.18. Suggest that 10s of metres thick is insufficient even for a potential part inventory. 3.25. Groundwater age from BGS data would be a helpful indicator of the rate of real groundwater flow processes. 3.27. National maps for seismicity are okay but suggest going to regional or County area subsets for consistency and context with other information. 3.31. Suggest also researching other non-Governmental sources such as historic mines research societies and similar. They are good at locating old workings that have never been on the official radar.

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.

Mostly very appropriate, subject to the suggestion above. Rock body shape and outcrop information is generally reliable but deep structure in cases will be less defined. Fracture characteristics and deep groundwater flow circulations may be less defined. The GB3D model from the BGS is an excellent tool for analysis and presentation to professionals and the public both. Make sure that use is made of all previous research for CoRWEM and similar, Harwell work and selected Universities.

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?

Agree except for the matter of scale. 3.34. Regional is too broad unless the report uses regional analysis to rapidly bring the consideration to approximately a County scale very quickly. Table 3. 1:625,000 is too small a map scale for this purpose. Suggest 1:250,000 or even 1:100,000 in some areas or rock types. Without being somewhat focussed communities are likely to always assume that somebody else will step forward if presented with maps covering half of the country.

Question 4: Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

Ensure that plain language is used throughout. Devolution is unfortunate in this regard since Scotland has the benefit of significant old, deep, Basement, stable, low groundwater flow rock bodies that could offer great potential. After 'early 2016' what are the next steps for any communities that might volunteer prospective sites and indeed for the project in the round. The UK is 15 to 20 years late in undertaking this and real progress must be made. Avoid the NIREX public relations disaster and do not repeat those mistakes.

Name: **Ian Wardrop**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation **Wardrop Minerals Management Ltd**

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