

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.

I think the approach is entirely appropriate. I do wonder though who the target audience really is as the information is too detailed for a member of the public with no prior knowledge to really understand, but is probably too simplified for a technical expert. However, the more information that you can supply potential volunteer communities with in advance, the better.

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.

I think they are perfectly adequate. I note (or missed) the BGS screening document done as part of the MRWS process is not listed) - was this deliberate? Is there a concern with using these data in that report?

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?

I agree with your approach to produce regional maps. This will allow potential volunteer communities to focus in on local areas and not get distracted by wading through masses of information. The more visual the displays, using computer packages where possible (e.g. the 3d map shown in the film Avatar where they are looking at the mineral deposits-type display) in preference to big multi-page reports I agree with the breakdown into the different topics - my question is - who is your target audience? The general public will easily be lost with groundwater flow and deep borehole networks, so something appropriate for these people is required. I wonder if a video showing a journey through the process is possible? At a high level? I am thinking about the good narrative in the 2010 gDSSC CD:Rom.

Question 4: Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

I think it is well laid out but too many words and not enough visual images. More diagrams may have helped. I think the flow and structure is good and takes the reader through the process - how many people would actually read it cover to cover without some sort of prior interest? Could it have been condensed into a 1 page version for people who are less interested in the process? As you know, Figure 1 should have been on a whole page so that it can be read clearly. I showed it to my father and his impression was that it looked at it was crammed in as an afterthought, giving him the impression it was "rushed to a deadline". It is a shame but that was his opinion and was shared by the NWAA when presented to them. Given our regional geology, I think it was a bold move to specify a minimum rock volume of interest in Section 3.18, Page 14. This may preclude some areas which are thinly interlayered (I am thinking of sedimentary and evaporite rocks here). I cannot think of many halite (rock salt) sequences that are not interlayered with sedimentary rocks or clays that are not interlayered with sands. I think also some attention is needed in portraying the GDF at a single level underground. Is it not more likely it will have vaults at different depths, possibly stacked on top of each other? By showing always a flat single level, this seems to suggest that many rock sequences will be counted out because they are not flat but dip underground. Can we build a GDF if the ideal rock dips at an angle? Of course!

Name: **Mark Cowper**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation Individual [REDACTED]

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