Comparison of Waste BPEO Attribute Scoring - Workshop and Public

Attribute	Attribute Weighting (%)								Sub-Attribute Weighting (%)						
	Minimum from workshop	Maximum from workshop	Average from workshop	Minimum from public	Maximum from public	Average from public	Sub-Attribute		Minimum from workshop	Maximum from workshop	Average from workshop	Minimum from public	Maximum from public	Average from public	Sub-Attr
1. Human Health and Safety	15	30	25	15	50	35.7	1.1	Routine radiation doses	10	70	38	10	60	35	Impact of routine processes on the radio the public as a result of the implementa received through processing, packaging public, dose may be received through e shine etc.
							1.2	Radiological accident risks	10	60	30	15	60	32	Impact of accident scenarios upon the r to the effective dose received by worker external events, such as earthquake, er addition to the risks from accidents duri
							1.3	Non radioactive hazards and risks	10	70	33	10	70	33	Potential for non-radiological routine ha members of the public associated with i manual handling injuries, electricity, traf
2. Environmental Impact	5	25	19	10	35	20.7	2.1	Air and water quality	20	60	36	15	50	40	 Quantity and frequency of discharges to future site and facility discharges, author and short-term impacts to: air quality due to the emission of dus (excluding transport impacts); surface and groundwater quality due
							2.2	Primary and secondary waste generation (solid)	20	70	39	20	50	29	Overall packaged waste volume requirin associated with option. This includes vo to implement management options.
							2.3	Visual impact	5	20	12	5	30	15	This reflects the disturbance to the affect for example if the option involves the bu
							2.4	Nuisances	5	30	14	5	30	16	This reflects the disturbance to the affect relevant, odours, construction nuisance
3. Financial	10	35	19	5	15	8.6	3.1	Cost	50	90	68	0	50	39	Total costs (discounted and undiscounted and undiscounted through the lifetime of the process.
							3.2	Financeability / affordability	10	50	32	50	100	61	This assesses whether there is sufficier once in place the costs entailed in opera involved. In looking at funding, issues a relevant. Another issue to consider is w term contracts for waste disposal servic and whether these contracts could be re arrangements.
4. Socio-economic	5	60	15	15	45	25	4.1	Public acceptability	30	90	64	30	70	45	Is the option likely to meet with the publ
							4.2	Economic impacts	10	70	36	30	77	55	This assesses the effects of an option of providing business opportunities or adve sources of supply or markets for goods businesses; creation of employment op
5. Technical	10	35	23	10	10	10	5.1	Making best use of existing facilities and expertise	10	60	37	30	65	46	This assesses whether an option makes infrastructure, waste management facili discarding these will be a waste of reso
							5.2	Practical deliverability	20	60	34	20	60	30	This assesses whether it is practically p timescale (Site End State 2025) and she availability of financial resources, availa achieve this, compliance with current le
							5.3	Maturity of technology	20	40	30	10	30	23	This assesses the level of knowledge/e

ribute Description

ological dose received by workers and members of tion of the option. For workers, dose may be and handling of wastes. For members of the exposure to discharges, leachate, air-borne particles,

elease of radioactive material to the environment or rs and the public. Scenarios include extreme rosion, fire, faulty engineering and weather in ng transport.

zards and accident risks to both workers and implementing an option. To consider slips, trips, falls, ffic accidents etc.

air and water and comparison with current and prised limits and notification levels. This covers long-

t, pollutants, ozone depletors, greenhouse gases

to the emission of pollutants.

ng disposal plus volume of secondary waste olumes of decommissioning waste from facilities built

cted population from the visual impact of each option uild of a facility which would alter the skyline. cted population from each option including, where (noise, vibration) and light pollution.

ed) arising from the implementation of any option

nt funding available to implement an option, and that ating and maintaining the system are affordable to all bout the potential for private sector involvement are vhether an option will leave the authorities with longes which could become inappropriate in the future enegotiated such that they fit with the proposed new

lic's approval?

on the local economy. Such effects may include ersely affecting existing businesses; creating new and services; increasing or reducing costs to local portunities.

s good use of existing resources such as current ties, disposal capacity and expertise/skills as urces already committed and available.

possible to implement an option on the required ould consider issues such as planning consents, bility of sufficient skills and personnel or training to gislation etc.

xperience from related technologies/processes.