

**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.

At the Newcastle workshop, misleading information was given to the participants. It was claimed that nuclear new build would only add 16 per cent to the existing inventory on nuclear waste. This may be true in terms of bulk but is certainly not true in terms of radioactive content. I have carried out an extensive analysis measuring the amount of nuclear waste relative to electricity production in the UK. In these terms, the additional contribution from Hinkley Point C alone over the next 35 years will amount to an additional 29 per cent of radioactivity to be managed compared with the existing inventory. You must define clearly what you mean by the 'nuclear waste inventory' when talking to the public.

**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.

These are limited in scope, for example three problems are not addressed. 1. The problem of heat dissipation from continuing radioactive sources 2. The potential mining of nuclear waste by terrorist groups in the future 3. The particular problem of where to put the 140 tons of plutonium already produced, which may turn out to be a tempting target for military purposes. For this reason, other ways of containing radioactive waste should be considered, for example, building a giant cube near Sellafield composed of granite blocks quarried nearby and placed at least 80 metres above present day sea levels. I note that the Scottish government has precluded geological disposal of radioactive waste and their reasons have not been sufficiently advertised.

**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?

See answer to above question.

**Question 4:** Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

Yes, as already pointed out the draft guidance assumes geological waste disposal is the best option, with which I disagree.

Name: John Urquhart

Email address: [REDACTED]

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

Yes