

First consultation on the comparison of options paper - log of comments and responses			
Name	Org	Comments	Response
Question 1: Do you agree that the document should describe general principles for comparing options for the management of contaminated land? If not, please indicate why. If yes, which principles do you think are important?			
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions*.
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	They are all important, they are complementary and with no overlap. Giving any one more status at this time is not appropriate. Only after that experience is gathered can the principles be categorised for actual importance.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	Yes	The document needs to make as clear as possible the difference between strategic options and technical options. Strategic options are concerned with objectives such as making land fit for a new use or de-licensing. The strategic options may be open or a preferred strategy may be pre-determined (regardless of the nature of land contamination). Technical options are concerned with how a preferred strategic option may be achieved. This is similar to the distinction between BPEO and BPM. This has relevance to stakeholder involvement (see Q4).
Mark Hill	DE	Yes	Practicality, long term reliability, cost effectiveness, regulatory compliance, risk based.
			These aspects will be covered as attributes in the options comparison process.

Name	Org	Comments	Response
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes 1: Principle 1 - fully understand and document the contamination problem and the site context, before any assessment of management options, and make this information available to interested stakeholders: eg understand - the contaminants, their actual or potential migration behaviour and potential to impact on people and the environment (ie the conceptual model of the site, and actual or potential pollutant linkages) - the site context – integrating the management of contaminated land into the decommissioning and restoration strategy for a site. - the legislative context. Principle 2 – Identify and document the management/remediation objectives before carrying out the appraisal. Principle 3: Document all “records of decision”.	The suggested principles are already captured prominently in the overarching LMG process.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Yes	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	Yes	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions.
Sean Amos	AWE	Yes	sustainability Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions. Sustainability referred to as an
A N Other	CBO	Yes	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments	Response	
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	no	If people are involved in this aspect, they should understand what they are doing and why. I don't see the need for generic guidance (unless its to let unqualified people dabble - which I don't consider to be a prudent option). Stakeholders should express what they want to achieve. In the current cost sensitive world, there is little scope to do more than balance the needs of the regulators. There perhaps is a scope for a techniques document comparing and listing the pros & cons of different remediation options (including monitored natural attenuation and other 'low tech' type of solutions).	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions. The document is aiming to have greater scope than suggested here.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick	yes	I agree. However, stakeholder involvement must be 'upstream' during optioneering phases (with some allowance for proportionality) .	Principles to be included. See note on PSG decisions. Upstream stakeholder involvement covered by LMGv2
Richard Bramhall	LLRC		This isn't a topic I know much about. It seems likely that comparing options will be taxing for non-technical people and new-comers, so Stakeholder Engagement in this area will need particular attention if participation and credibility aren't to be lost. I don't have any other suggestions at this stage.	Stakeholder issues to be recognised in principles and throughout this document.
Question 2: Do you agree that it is useful to present a broad range of option comparison methods? If not, please indicate why. If yes, what information should be presented on the methods?				
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes	Both qualitative and quantitative impact/consequences option evaluation assessment.	Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions. Comment reflected in outline contents.
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	Information to be presented - why there are different methods, a brief history of the application, where they have been used (type by type assessment), the results from their use, what the regulators and other stakeholders thought of them, how successful they have been, where they can be used, assumptions, constraints, exclusions, how much effort is needed, the level of expertise needed, how much stakeholders need to be involved, etc	Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions. These comments have been considered in proposals for outline content of document.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group MAGNOX Electric Ltd	Yes		Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Mark Hill	DE	Yes	Pros and cons/limitations, suitability/applicability, relative resource requirement.	Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions. These issues considered in proposals on outline content.
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes	Criteria by which the options are to be evaluated, and methods used to assess relative importance.	Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions. Criteria/attributes noted for discussion in the document.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Yes		Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	Yes		Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	Yes		Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions.
Sean Amos	AWE	Yes		Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions.
A N Other	CBO	Yes		Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes	Case studies would be useful	Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions. Hypothetical examples have been suggested in proposals.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	no	There is a danger that people will read this handbook and think themselves capable. I studied for 2 years for an MSc in Contaminated Land Management, a first degree in Env. Science (and did a 5+ year apprenticeship with actual site work & drilling rigs) to appreciate contaminated land management options. The practitioner should have similar experience to choose the most appropriate option to them, there are so many site specific aspects, a generic guidance will be meaningless.	The primary audience of the document will be practitioners who should bring the detailed understanding with them. The document will also be intended to help inform others about the options comparison process. There will be specific discussion of the application of options comparison methods to specific situations that should help address the comment.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick	Yes	Yes I agree. Need to think about information needs.	Range of methods to be considered. See note on PSG decisions.
Richard Bramhall	LLRC		I don't see anything to object to in the response previously received, as they were expressed in the Summary discussed at the team meeting in January.	Noted
Question 3: It is likely that options comparison methods will need to be "fine tuned" for use in practice. Should guidance be given on this, and if so what issues should be covered?				

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes	Qualitative and quantitative impact/consequences assessment methods use during option evaluation.	This aspect of options comparison will be recognised in the guide, although briefly (see PSG decisions).
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	Having a method without it being coupled to how it can be implemented is like providing a car to someone without the instruction manual or map. OK, most persons might get the thing started and moving forward, but that's about all.	Practical guidance will be included, e.g. hypothetical examples. See PSG decisions.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	No	It would be preferable to provide examples (preferably based on real cases) rather than to attempt to provide comprehensive guidance on 'fine tuning' to cover all	Practical guidance will be included, e.g. hypothetical examples. See PSG decisions.
Mark Hill	DE	No		Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes		Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Yes	I think some advice can be provided but this should highlight to the reader that a number of approaches may be valid and that they do indeed often need to be customised to the particular application. However, the reader needs to understand that the ability to "fine tune" methodologies does not infer an ability to fix the outcome.	Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	No	I think would be far too difficult and produce an enormous document	Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	No		Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Sean Amos	AWE	Yes	Yes, there should be some scope to make the selected method site or even project specific. If it is too prescriptive and inflexible then there is the risk that it will be ignored totally	Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
A N Other	CBO	Yes	see below	Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes		Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	no	I'm sorry, I just don't see what this document is going to achieve.	Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick	yes	Yes. Need to think more about what issues.	Practical guidance will be included, but it will not be very extensive. See PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments	Response
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	I don't know.	Noted
Question 4: Do you agree with this approach to providing guidance on involving stakeholders in comparisons? If yes, which principles for stakeholder involvement do you think are most important (other than any you may have mentioned in your answer to question 1)?			
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes	Involved at the start, involved in both designing and implementing the process of option evaluation, all to act with honesty openness and transparency and to respect the views of others (no "second class" stakeholders), all to accept responsibility for ownership of outcomes.
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	We do not want stakeholders to end up doing the work themselves. Site owners are the owners of the liability. They should set the scene, working with specialists and the regulators to choose options and put those to the stakeholders where and when it is appropriate. Again having big picture whole site strategy is important because stakeholders do not want to get involved in every decision - there is stakeholder burn up and so stakeholder involvement needs to be managed carefully. Therefore there should be a principle for controlling stakeholder involvement, ensuring that they feel involved at the most appropriate and important levels and in the most important decisions which are either contentious or are big picture/vision making.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	Yes	The guidance needs to identify different categories of stakeholders (e.g. 'internal' stakeholders, statutory regulators/consultees, neighbouring landowners, representatives of NGOs/CBOs, members of public, etc.) and provide general advice on how to involve these different categories at different stages (e.g. strategic vs. technical options assessments).
Mark Hill	DE	Yes	Appropriateness, cost effectiveness, openness. Where land contamination is being dealt with through planning or the contaminated land regime then how far should you go in terms of stakeholder involvement? AT what point do you stop?
			The comments are reflected in the proposals for outline content and also throughout LMGv2. See PSG decisions.
			The comments are reflected in the proposals. Levels of stakeholder involvement are covered in the LMGv2 consultation. See PSG decisions.
			There will be a recognition of different types of stakeholders. See PSG decisions.
			The question of "how far to go" will be addressed in this document and LMGv2. See PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes	Stakeholder consultation is about ensuring that the decision-making process is transparent so that stakeholders understand the basis of the decisions made by the problem holder. The problem holder is accountable for implementation and any consequences. Thus the problem holder has the final say as to whether to reject or accept the option preferred by the stakeholders.	This point is recognised in LMGv2 (beyond scope of options comparison). See PSG decisions.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Yes	Transparency is important but also stakeholders need to understand up front for each particular process where they are merely being asked for an opinion or where they may be asked to become more involved in an optioneering/decision making process. Outlining the stakeholder engagement process itself including the timescales is therefore important.	This point is more relevant to LMGv2, but the need for different levels of stakeholder engagement is recognised. See PSG decisions.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	Yes		Guidance will be included. See PSG decisions.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	Yes	I think the main principle for stakeholder involvement in comparison of options is that each site and situation is different and will dictate the level of involvement and engagement that is appropriate.	This will be recognised as a key factor. See PSG decisions and LMGv2 consultation.
Sean Amos	AWE	Yes		Guidance will be included. See PSG decisions.
A N Other	CBO	Yes	I don't have any in mind but want to allow others to bring in new ideas	Guidance will be included. See PSG decisions.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes		Guidance will be included. See PSG decisions.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	yes	Stakeholder involvement is something that many sites struggle with. Practical guidance as how this can be best achieved (and what the common pitfalls are) would be most welcome.	Guidance will be included and will aim to be realistic and reflect appropriate ranges of involvement. See PSG decisions.
Paul Dorfman	University of Warwick	yes		Guidance will be included. See PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments	Response
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	The existing guidance (end of section 5.4) is dangerously vague on who decides what is an appropriate way for stakeholders to be involved and how the decision is made. My answer to Q 1 is relevant here. This seems to be the nub of the issue as far as stakeholder engagement is concerned, apart from the danger of salami-slicing sites. (This is in the LMGv2 paper, expressed as:- I am particularly leary of any distinctions about large and small sites or significant vs non-significant contamination, and the suggestion that such distinctions affect the need for stakeholder engagement. Not everyone in the industry wants to talk to the public and CBOs and NGOs; if sites can be salami-sliced to save them having to do so then that's what will happen and it will be corrosive.)	The question of "salami-slicing" is an important consideration and will be considered in this guidance and in LMGv2. See PSG decisions.
Question 5a: Do you agree that the document should contain guidance on options comparison for these three types of contaminated land?			
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	No	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Mark Hill	DE	Yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	Yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	No	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Sean Amos	AWE	Yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
A N Other	CBO	yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments	Response
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Paul Dorfman	University of Warwick		Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	yes	Guidance will address these types of contaminated land. See PSG decisions.
Question 5b: Should the same emphasis be given to each type?			
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes	The approach will reflect SAFEGROUNDS and LMGv2 scope (see note on PSG decisions).
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	At this point there should be equal status, until there is experience that shows that there is a problem. Let's examine the detail before launching into some inappropriate prioritising of contamination types.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	No	For consistency with the revised remit of SAFEGROUNDS implied for LMGv2, the focus should be on radioactive contamination (including 'mixed' contamination). There is no reason why SAFEGROUNDS needs to add any more to the existing guidance on assessment of options for purely non-radioactive contamination (regardless of whether radioactive contamination may be present on some other part of a site).
Mark Hill	DE	No	The emphasis should remain focussed on radioactively contaminated land as there is plenty of guidance currently available for the management of non radioactively contaminated land.
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes	The approach will reflect SAFEGROUNDS and LMGv2 scope (see note on PSG decisions).
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	No	I don't think there should be a specific focus on non radiological issues because this moves away from the remit of SAFEGROUNDS and the purpose of the revised documentation. I would sign post the guidance for non radiological issues.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	No	More emphasis is needed on the radioactive contamination than on the non-radioactive, but pointers to regulatory information is necessary.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	No	The approach will reflect SAFEGROUNDS and LMGv2 scope (see note on PSG decisions).

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Sean Amos	AWE	Yes		The approach will reflect SAFEGROUNDS and LMGv2 scope (see note on PSG decisions).
A N Other	CBO	no		The approach will reflect SAFEGROUNDS and LMGv2 scope (see note on PSG decisions).
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	no	Greatest emphasis on RA and mixed contaminated sites. Sign posts in other documents will steer readers with interest in conventional contaminated sites to relevant guidance	Agreed.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	yes	Without inclusion and comparison with non-rad contamination there is a danger that the learning and experience of the contaminated land industry (outside of nuclear sites) will be lost. we should adopt this learning where it is practicable (and it prevents re-work). Apart from that, any problem is unlikely that a problem will exist in isolation, much more likely that it is mixed in nature (rad & non rad).	The guide will seek to recognise the relevant and beneficial aspects of experience with non-rad contaminants, but also highlight potential conflict. The approach taken will reflect the overall SAFEGROUNDS and LMGv2 scope.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick	yes	Depends on extent and toxicity of contaminant. Also must include estimates of potential negative synergy between contaminants (eg radioactive and chemical).	The question of synergy will be recognised in the detailed guide (e.g. In relation to health impact attributes/criteria).
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	yes		The approach will reflect SAFEGROUNDS and LMGv2 scope (see note on PSG decisions).
Question 6: Do you agree that it would be useful to include an appendix describing the technical options that can be considered?				
If yes, what information should be presented?				
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes	Brief summary with signposting to detail and case studies.	This is the approach that will be adopted. See PSG decisions.
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	It would make the guidance more inclusive.	A summary highlighting key features will be included. See PSG decisions.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	Yes	As much as possible of the information needed to score the option (including sign-posting of sources of more detailed information).	The information needed to score the option will be dependent on the particular situation and attributes considered, however the key features recorded and supporting references will be intended to provide the sort of information that is needed.
Mark Hill	DE	Yes	Brief overview of the option, its applicability, relative resource requirement and the pros and cons.	This is the approach that will be adopted. See PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes	General description of the technology, what it does to the contamination (remove, immobilise, contain, which contaminated media is treated). Any obvious limitations eg aftercare requirements, monitoring etc. Waste management issues. Discharge issues. The document should signpost to relevant information (much of which is not in the existing Safegrounds technical options document).	This is the approach that will be adopted. See PSG decisions.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Yes	Yes, but not in a way that either pre-empts a solution or might constrain the problem holder. In other words it should present the range of potential technical solutions without biasing the outcome. It may be useful to link the case studies in here.	This is the approach that will be adopted. See PSG decisions.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	Yes		A summary highlighting key features will be included. See PSG decisions.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	No		A summary highlighting key features will be included. See PSG decisions.
Sean Amos	AWE	No	I believe this could be a huge piece of work and there are a range of other documents including some by CIRIA which can be referenced. Other than some top level information on chemical/physical/biological techniques then this document should concentrate on the comparison aspect.	A summary highlighting key features will be included. See PSG decisions.
A N Other	CBO	Yes		A summary highlighting key features will be included. See PSG decisions.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes	Case studies to demonstrate technical options (as well as do nothing)	Hypothetical case studies will be included, which demonstrate the whole options comparison process. See PSG decisions.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	yes	It should be in a comparable, matrix format. it may be good to consider BPEO type attributes and an indicative (useful for comparison only) cost, so choice between options can be made. There should also be limitations of techniques listed (ie not suitable for clay soil, must have good vehicle access, licence waste treatment process required...etc)	A matrix approach will be adopted, and some suggestions will be made for the "key features" to describe options. See PSG decisions.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick	Yes.	However, there also should be information detailing the potentially negative externalities associated with each technological fix.	Externalities will be considered. See PSG decisions.

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	It seems a good idea.	I don't know the answer to the second question.	A summary highlighting key features will be included. See PSG decisions.
Question 7a: Do you agree with these proposals for the function of the Guide to Options Comparison? If not, please indicate why				
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Mark Hill	DE	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Sean Amos	AWE	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
A N Other	CBO	Yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	yes		The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick			The proposed function will be adopted. See note on PSG decisions.
Richard Bramhall	LLRC		The functions seem very sensible. I'm concerned that the content might be too technical for lay people. It needs to be written with this in mind. I don't know the answer to the second question.	The proposed function will be adopted. There will be effort to make the document accessible by a broad audience. See note on PSG decisions.
Question 7b: Are there any other functions that the Guide to Options Comparison should fulfil?				
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	No		Noted

Name	Org	Comments	Response
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA		Better case studies should be provided than have previously been the case. Better means context and descriptions, up-to-date, provide pertinent and useful information, lessons learnt etc.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	Yes	The guide should contain specific advice on land contamination situations in which the Environment Agencies could reasonably expect BPEO or BPM assessments to be made, and identify any specific matters that a BPEO or BPM assessment would need to pay specific attention to.
Mark Hill	DE	No	
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	No	
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	No	
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	No	
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	No	
Sean Amos	AWE		No, too many functions should be avoided as this can lead to the dilution of the core function.
A N Other	CBO	Yes	see below
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	no	
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	yes	It should be an aide memoir to a knowledgeable practitioner, not aimed at teaching skills to someone new to the industry.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick		I'm rather disappointed by the following statement: 'Moreover, it will seek to be definitive about overall expectations and will therefore refer to existing regulatory guidance and requirements, and note how these might affect the approach adopted'. We have clearly decided that the regulatory structure should not, in the final analysis, determine outcomes. Thus why have you included this important addendum?
Richard Bramhall	LLRC		I don't know the answer to the second question.
Question 8: Do you have a preference for whether options comparison methods should be described in turn, or whether they should be grouped according to the situations in which they might apply?			
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	described _in_turn	The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Grouped	I thought long and hard on this - I chose as more useful but like the logical easily understood in turn approach. Could they not be combined in some way - and in turn high level assessment of the methods, followed by a grouped situation approach? I do not think this would generate twice the work, but it will produce a twice as useful end product.	The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	described _in_turn	It should be for the user of the guide to judge what comparison method to apply.	The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Mark Hill	DE	described in_turn		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	described in_turn		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Grouped		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council	described _in_turn		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	Grouped		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Sean Amos	AWE	Described in turn.		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
A N Other	CBO	described in_turn		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	described in_turn		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	described _in_turn	typical situations' are v. difficult to compare with reality, therefore just describe each option in turn.	The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Paul Dorfman	University of Warwick		Unsure	The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	no		The approach will aim to describe in turn but also indicate grouping at a high level.
Question 9: Is this description of options assessment methods sufficient? If not, what other information would be helpful?				
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions	Yes		This approach is adopted in the outline
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Yes	Looks OK	This approach is adopted in the outline
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	Yes		This approach is adopted in the outline contents.

Name	Org	Comments		Response
Mark Hill	DE	Yes		This approach is adopted in the outline
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Yes		This approach is adopted in the outline
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	No	I think there should be a specific piece of text that explains the merits or otherwise of weighting. This can often be the most contentious aspect of optioneering/decision making as the process owners can be accused of biasing the results. I therefore believe that this theme should be openly discussed.	Weighting is an important issue and will be covered in detail where it is part of a the method.
Susan Crisp	Cumbria County Council			Noted
Alison McKay	BAE Systems	Yes		This approach is adopted in the outline
Sean Amos	AWE			Noted
A N Other	CBO	yes		This approach is adopted in the outline
Jack Armitage	NUKEM Ltd	yes		This approach is adopted in the outline
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	no	Consider also the attributes listed on page 18 in the EA & SEPA guide for the assessment of BPEO on nuclear licensed sites, 'cos ultimately sites are unlikely to carry out 2 option assessment studies & there is an expectation that a BPEO will be undertaken.	The guide will be broader in scope than specific approaches like BPEO but will nevertheless show how the approach can be used to demonstrate BPEO.
Paul Dorfman	Universiry of Warwick	No	Needs fuller discussion of range of interpretations on the risks associated with each	Dealing with differing views on risk will be covered, with reference to the SAFEGROUNDS risk assessment guidance.
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	It seems very sensible.	I don't know the answer to the second question.	Noted
Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposed document structure? Is there anything else that you think should be included in the document?				
Andy Thomas	Future Solutions		No	Noted.
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA		More should be provided on the site context. Case-by-case decisions on a complex site cannot be made in isolation of the whole site vision. The document should take the opportunity to ensure that their is guidance on how options assessment is implemented across a complex nuclear site.	It is recognised that site context is important and will be reflected in relation to the range of situations that can be addressed. See also LMGv2 outline contents.

Name	Org	Comments	Response
Hugh Richards	British Nuclear Group Magnox Electric Ltd	The document should include a 'long list' of attributes for potential use in MADA comparison exercises, with brief descriptions of what they mean and how they relate to each other (including potential for double-counting). A discussion of how the 'long list' can be reduced to a manageable number of attributes for typical land contamination situations would be useful (i.e. omitting attributes that do not usefully discriminate between options).	Clear guidance on attribute selection will be included. Consideration will be given to including a long list, see note on PSG decisions.
Mark Hill	DE	No	Noted.
Mike Pearl	UKAEA	Ensure that issues about dealing with wastes is covered. - Ensure that the options take into consideration the uses and future uses of the site, its end state and the timescale of decommissioning and restoration.	Aspects of end-state etc. will be addressed in discussion of the different types of situations that can be considered. Wastes, as characteristic of options, will be considered.
Peter Booth	Nexia Solutions	Document structure seems fine, but please note comments above under Q9.	Noted.
Sean Amos	AWE	No	Noted.
Janet Young	Magnox (north)	See comments earlier about knowledgeable practitioners rather than a handbook of 'how to...'	See earlier response.
Paul Dorfman	University of Warwick	Need to think more on this	No action.
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	An accessible guide to options comparisons needs to be available (meaning accessible to lay people). I don't think it matters whether it's in the Citizens' Guide or in the Options Comparison Guide but a decision needs to be made. If it goes in the Options Comparison Guide it needs to be signposted from the Citizens' Guide.	The Citizens' Guide will be the primary document, but consistency will be ensured. The guide will also be intended to be "readable" by lay-people as far as possible.
Other comments: Please enter here any other comments on the proposed Guide to Options Comparison or any aspect of the revision of the SAFEGROUNDS guidance.			
Dr Doug Graham	UKAEA	Keep in mind what is going to be useful for those trying to restore complex sites. This is a parochial view, but if you crack that, then the other applications should be easily dealt with. I look forward to seeing draft 1.	The document will throughout aim to encompass the range of situations from complex to simple.
Mark Hill	DE	My main concern is that the guide should not raise expectations unnecessarily over the need for and level/nature of stakeholder involvement.	The broad nature and extent of stakeholder involvement will be discussed in LMGv2.
A N Other	CBO	To all my "yes- see below" I probably mean no, because I don't want to exclude new ideas	Noted

Name	Org	Comments	Response
Richard Bramhall	LLRC	Please note that at the time of responding, I have seen the summaries of other people's responses and have discussed them in the team meeting January 2007. I did raise this issue of privileged access and was urged to make a response	Noted
* Note on PSG decisions is 'Revision of SAFEGROUNDS Guidance, First Consultation on Guide to the Comparison of Land Management Options, Summary of Responses and PSG Decisions'.			