

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 proposed approach is in general very good. The information provided in the 'National Geological Screening Guidance' document is clear to someone who does not have a geology background (I do not have such a background), so if the same level and style of writing is used in the regional documents it should be clear to the public too. I attended the workshop in Birmingham. The 3d map/video shown was just about understandable with the RWM representative narrating over it, but for the proposed regional maps I think more information about the rock types shown should be available as a key alongside the maps. I think the proposed geological topics that will be presented to the public (rock type, rock structure, groundwater, natural processes and resources) are all necessary and do not think anything extra needs to be included from a geological perspective.

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.

Respondent skipped this question

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 think providing a combination of written descriptions of findings alongside visual representations in the form of maps as proposed is a good idea. It must be made clear in all maps that the results presented are modelled and are not necessarily completely correct. The levels of uncertainty in the models and maps should be included alongside them. Useful additional outputs: YouTube videos of the maps in a similar form to that shown in the workshop with narration from an expert would be an informative and accessible output form.

Question 4: Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

Respondent skipped this question

Name: **Amy Jukes**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation: University of Birmingham [REDACTED]

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

Yes