

**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.

Before you start to describe the solutions under your own terms you should have considered the agenda of those attending the meeting in Manchester. Your team described the urgency to address the situation currently. The one time head of the term responsible for nuclear waste who attended the meeting (can you give me his name and contact details please) advised us on the seriously dangerous state of the current nuclear waste storage. Your team then went on to describe the process lasting decades of designing and agreeing the site for a deep disposal facility. There was no mention of the immediate future and indeed the concept of disposal down wells was specifically denied. I came across this today [http://onlineshop.shef.ac.uk/browse/extra\\_info.asp?compid=1&modid=2&deptid=7&catid=28&prodid=471](http://onlineshop.shef.ac.uk/browse/extra_info.asp?compid=1&modid=2&deptid=7&catid=28&prodid=471) a rather expensive meeting in Sheffield about deep disposal down deep wells. What then of your meeting in Manchester? was it all a diversions? Why was this form of disposal denied and certainly not described or hinted at. The other vital aspect which was not tabled which was of great interest to those who travelled to Manchester was the prospect of calling a halt to the production of more nuclear waste. The massive cost and risk should just not be contemplated. The cost of disposal should be included in the lifetime cost of electricity. The massive subsidies to nuclear power should be added back into the calculations so that the true lifetime cost can be examined and then assessed by academics, politicians and the electorate. The geology was very pretty but without an equivalent accurate understanding of the hydrology is vital for the calculations. So far the opinion of geologists is that the knowledge of underground water is just not accurate or comprehensive. This is of great concern and tends to raise questions about the ability to find a safe site.

**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.

You ask interesting but somewhat irrelevant questions. They do not reflect on the questions asked by the small number of the public at the Manchester event. It is more interesting to ask how a community decides on risk and cash rewards. How do you bet cash today on the well-being of your grandchildren? Can community leaders be held responsible for the impacts? Who gets to decide on the use of the cash handouts?

**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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

If nuclear waste as currently stored is really going critical why do you not discuss the short term answers to the problems of those issues? Can you now supply me with the short term plans and in particular revisit the question I asked - is there a plan or possibility of using deep wells to store nuclear waste? Can you please try to avoid slippery words of uncertain meaning?

Name: **Tim Thornton**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation [REDACTED]

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

Yes