

Public consultation: National Geological Screening Guidance

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.

An understanding of the national picture would be helpful and explanation that different geologies would not determine GDF location but the methodology for utilising that area for a GDF.

Groundwater considerations were considered important by our Members and more information is needed on this and flooding issues (fluvial and coastal erosion etc).

We understand (from the presentation in Ipswich) that some areas had already been excluded as the ground was considered too unstable due to mining operations – should this be mentioned?

Members felt it was important for a national picture to be made available to the wider community and that this would enable future generations to understand the rationale during and beyond the final choice of location(s). This national picture may influence a community to put themselves forward but, it was felt that the cost of appropriate methodology could influence this decision.

Why, if any geology could be utilised for a GDF, is this exercise was being undertaken before a volunteer community could be identified. There was existing maps of geology and we understand having attended the RWM briefing held in Ipswich recently, that existing detailed information covered approx. 25% of the country. The cost of carrying out this survey was considered and Members agreed that the scale of the cost was an important consideration.

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.

Information about likely flooding or future ice ages could be useful.

Enabling young people to be educated is vital, given that the impact of the GDF would extend to future generations, including geology on the national curriculum would be important.

There needs to be a wider education/awareness raising exercise undertaken, starting immediately before further rounds of consultation. Information is needed not just by host communities but also donating communities and those on transport routes. Involve current generating sites to help other non-nuclear communities to understand the issues.

Language used is still too technical, needs to be checked by normal members of the public or a group such as an SSG near a site could assist you.

Question 3:

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed form of the outputs from geological screening?

DVD's, maps and other formats of information would be helpful. Any historical information that could be provided will help understand how the process for GDF selection had been undertaken previously would be useful.

What additional outputs would you find useful?

A summary of the process previously undertaken, including why this had not been successful, would be helpful. More information from other countries who are further ahead with GDF.

Question 4:

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

The community should be given a clear understanding of timelines and the process involved. Also, additional information about the types of waste being considered in terms radionuclide content and levels of activity.

Clarity that the location of the access site and the storage site are not necessarily the same needs to be included.

We would like an understanding of how long the packaging itself would last. Information from other countries regarding packaging longevity and, indeed, storage facilities themselves, could be included in the information provided.

A community needed to understand that it's was not just the repository itself but the infrastructure to support it, like a hostel for the workers, transport network to enable waste ingress and a processing plant etc. A DVD explaining how a repository may function being available would be useful.

There is concern that current communities do not understand the full impact of agreeing to host the GDF. It is difficult to understand how future communities would feel about hosting the store, given that economic changes may lead to a scarcity of work and the GDF would provide a source of job opportunities. Infrastructure required building the GDF, and operating it in the future, sourcing the workforce and the materials from within the UK would help British industry.

Please provide the following details:

Name: Marianne Fellowes Chair of Sizewell Stakeholder Group

Email address: sizewell.ssg@magnoxsites.com

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation **Sizewell A and B Stakeholder Group**

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

Yes