

National Geological Screening Consultation Feedback

I attended the National Geological Screening Consultation event in Leeds (Queens Hotel), 21st October 2015. As part of the consultation process please find below my comments on how the National Geological Screening consultation has been conducted.

The comments below are based on my 'individual' feedback and are provided under the four consultation questions.

Consultation Questions

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?

1. It was very apparent that members of the lay public and non-geologists had difficulty understanding the guidance document.
2. Within our discussion group there was much criticism that the guidance document did not adequately cover the safety case that would be required to support the search for a suitable host site.
3. The guidance document did not explain that the planning consultation is being undertaken independently and concurrently with the geological screening.
4. Figure 1 Geological disposal: making it happen is too small and very difficult to read.
- 5.

Question 2 To what extent do you think that these sources are appropriate and sufficient for this exercise?

1. The sources used for the study are not properly defined so that non geologists can understand what type of information they provide.
2. The guidance does not explain what previous work/studies have been completed by BGS on the siting of a GDF.
3. To what extent do the sources provide a fair playing field in terms of amount and quality of data for the selection of suitable host sites. Will there be a report produced which sets out the justification of sources selected and also the limitations of the source data?
4. Do the information sources selected provide appropriate information for deep geological screening i.e. seismic data, deep geological structure, groundwater and engineering behaviour.

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?

1. The guidance document says that the outputs of the screening will be provided as a series of brief narratives. The guidance also recognises that some members of communities who wish to engage in hosting a GDF would like access to more detailed information. No information is provided within the guidance on the output format of more detailed guidance.

Question 4 Do you have any views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

1. RWMD need to consider how they engage with a wider public for consultation on the GDF.
2. The guidance document does not explain what other counties are doing in respect to geological screening for GDF.
3. The guidance document does not discuss the ideal characteristics of a host rock in terms of the safety case for a GDF.

I trust the above comments are of interest.

Kind Regards

Martin Cross MA MBA MSc PhD CEng MICE CGeol EurGeol CEnv CSci SiLC

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]