

Annex 3 - Questions from the public and responses

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
1	Mr. Peter Penchev, Bulgaria	<p>My name is Peter Penchev and in the Court's documents I am registered as Peter Penchev. I would like to propose to Romanian Party to require Decision No11040 dated 22.07.2013 of the Bulgarian Supreme Administrative Court because today our hosts from the University of Craiova have showed me the correspondence between the two Ministries that shows that because of the technical omissions the Court has suspended that report. I would like to bring forward to the Romanian party the year 2013 Bulgarian Supreme Administration Court's Resolution.</p> <p>I won't get into details, I will only try to bring under your attention the fact that within the second argued Resolution of the Court, it is mentioned that the report includes many unjustifiable assertions. Unfortunately, there are many repeated excerpts in there, made with „copy-paste“. I would like to highlight something interesting for our neighbours and hosts from Romania: I would like to show you a study elaborated by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences on the evaluated .sites, analysis made following 30 indicators. Unfortunately, Radiana does not appear amongst the most favourite. For this reason, within the documents that I have requested from the Court I have seen mentioned scientific studies claiming that given the sandy and loamy ground out there and the quite high slope, a risk of landslides is present. Here is another report, made under a PHARE project and evaluated on 13 indicators...because the authors were ironically laughing, I would like to show them dozens of pages elaborated by the Geological Institute of the Science Academy. I would ask you to show these documents to the Mayor of Craiova, in order for them to be attached with this public debate and to be able to submit them in Court.</p>	<p>The Romanian Party –MEWF – Only to the Craiova's Townhall, or to the Ministry of the Environment (MMAE), as well?</p>



No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>Resolution and which isn't accounted for as a technical mistake, but as a principle mistake: the reinforced concrete containers have a 70 years lifetime and you are saying that this repository can last for over 300 years; it's obviously something impossible! Even more than that, within the Court's Resolution was mentioned that the reinforced concrete container's life time is not of 70 years, but 50.</p> <p>Inside the year 2011's report, there are some demographical data on the Dolj County's population variation. That section was also treating the mortality indicator: while the country average was about 11.7%, in Dolj County it was about 13.17%.</p> <p>From the Court's Resolution, there are the same differences regarding the Kozloduy area from Bulgaria. The conclusion is that blood related illnesses are involved, resulting in cancer.</p> <p>However, regarding our Ministry of Environment, I can't see anybody from Bulgaria.</p> <p>Mr.Penchev – Concerning the second report, we have mentioned that there are <i>"Copy-Pasted"</i> excerpts. For instance from the report of the Health Ministry in Bulgaria, where there is data also on long life radioactive waste, which is off the 2a class, going into 2b. According to the regulatory acts, 2b class waste needs to be stored together with the nuclear waste resulted from the nuclear fuel. I expect that both Environmental Ministries will reach the same conclusion as myself.</p> <p>The Executive Director of the State Enterprise Radioactive Waste, Mr.Dilyan Petrov, during a roundtable on radioactive waste on the 16th of February this year in Kozloduy, to a question he received from a worldwide known expert (the Court's Resolution is stating that the human health is overriding the economic benefit), Mr. Dilyan Petrov has worried me with his answer: <i>"In the NW Bulgaria, the population number is decreasing and therefore we are not insisting too much on the health assessment"</i>. I'm living on the other side of the Danube, opposite from Craiova. I know that we are the poorest area in the EU, but given the data I have mentioned earlier on this area's condition, it comes out that</p>	<p>The Romanian Party –MEWF – There is somebody attending.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>the SW Romania should be part of the same category regarding the population's health. Perhaps this 2% difference highlighted by the Court should invite the Romanian party to some deep thinking. And seeing a Mayor like that in here, I'm sure that your voice will be heard.</p> <p>Mr.Panchev – Noi</p> <p>Mr.Panchev – This is a letter from the Environmental Ministry's behalf, sent to the State Enterprise, recommending them to answer the questions that I have presented by now. Not even in the 3rd reply posted on the Company's website I haven't received answer to the point of my questions.</p>	<p>The Romanian Party –MEWF – So I understand there is a stand taking. Mr.Panchev, would you like to take a stand on the Bulgarian party's behalf?</p> <p>The Bulgarian party–The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste' representative – but we would like to!</p> <p>The Romanian Party –MEWF – I am inviting the Bulgarian party to take note of these questions.</p> <p>The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste representative, Ms. Ira Stefanova – I have to tell you that the Supreme Administrative Court's Decision has been translated and sent to the Romanian party. I would not like to comment the ungrounded allegations that the report is "copy-paste" and the quality of the report. I feel sorry to lower myself to Mr.Panchev's level, who is thinking about himself as a bigger expert than the ones from the Nuclear Regulatory Agency and International Atomic Energy Agency and who speaks things which are absolutely contradictory to IAEA. There are two types of radioactive waste. I will not speak about high level waste. Low and intermediate level short lived radioactive waste category 2a and low and intermediate level long lived radioactive waste category 2b. By definition low and intermediate level short lived waste contains certain low quantity of long lived radionuclides below certain limit. We believe that this information could have been learned since year 2009, in order not to manipulate the public opinion presenting false things. Within this waste repository, there can be deposited only 2a class waste.</p> <p>Regarding the Academy of Sciences' study, there's an expert</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
			<p>here able to explain to you.</p> <p>Mr. Donchokarastanev – I'm a professor in the Geology Institute of the Academy of Sciences'. I am actively involved in the site selection and the site characterisation for RAW disposal in Bulgaria, for over 20 years. The area of the Kozloduy's Nuclear Power Plant has been always considered as a potentially suitable site for a construction of low and intermediate level waste disposal.</p> <p>In the low and intermediate level waste site selection process, the zone of Kozloduy NPP was selected amongst the first three ones. Back then, it was called Kozloduy site, later on – the Radiana site.</p> <p>Concerning the designed repository, we are talking about sandy clayey sediments, having a higher than admissible bearing capacity. The analysis made by a Westinghouse consortium experts, highly qualified experts, that we have met, have proven that the bearing capacity of the ground base is much higher and ensures much less than admissible settlement of the engineering structures. Having in mind that the repository will be dug 30 m deep, there is not any probability for loosing the stability of clayey ground base layers. Besides the Westinghouse's designers have approved our proposal the repository to be constructed over a 5 m thick loess-cement cushion. This cushion isn't designed primarily to improve the ground base bearing capacity. The loess-cement cushion increases even more the thickness of the unsaturated zone - zone of aeration (the distance to the groundwater level) and is additional engineering barrier against radionuclides migration.</p> <p>Ms. Manolova – You are absolutely right that the NW Bulgaria's and SW Romania's populations have a steady aging tendency. Also the cardiovascular illnesses (i.e. illnesses of the blood circulation organs – strokes, are the leading causes of mortality among the population. The illnesses caused by radioactivity are split in three groups: 1. Oncological illnesses, 2. Illnesses of blood and blood forming organs and 3. Inborn malformations, deformations and chromosomal aberrations. Regarding the morbidity by oncological illnesses, in Bulgaria</p>



No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
			<p>there is statistical data for morbidity since 30 years ago. In Romania, you have only three regional registries out of which one is children's registry. Therefore, we use mortality, for which there is also available a national data for Romania, as one of the most important indicators.</p> <p>According to the EUROSTAT 2008-2010 data, the two regions in Bulgaria and Romania are the areas with Europe's lowest mortality. As per data of the National statistics institute of Romania, for the period 2010-2013, the mortality caused by oncological illnesses within the Olt and Dolj Counties is smaller than the country's average. There are no cases of death imposed by blood and blood forming organs related illnesses, and the mortality rate caused by inborn malformations, deformations and chromosomal aberrations is quite low – about 2 in 100 000 people. (http://statistici.inse.ro/shop/?lang=en)</p> <p>In this regard we can say that not the radiological factors are responsible for the mortality, but both the people's way of living and the aging of the population.</p> <p>The Romanian Party –MEWF – Ms:Harabor Ana from Craiova is not in the room. If she won't get here, we will start reading her stand.</p>
2	Ms Harabor Ana	<p>The Romanian Party –MEWF – Ms.Harabor Ana from Craiova is not in the room. If she won't get here, we will start reading her stand.</p>	
3	Mr.ChiriacConstantin	<p>I would like to ask you about the guarantee that the Bulgarian Site is going to provide for the concrete. The second question: where is this money coming from, there are different legends out there. The State Authorities need to do their duty.</p>	<p>The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative, Ms. Ira Stefanova – Thank you for your question. I told you that we are within the technical design stage, therefore the objective is designing. The estimate life time of the disposal system is 375 years. We are talking about low and intermediate level short lived radioactive waste. Then, the site will be safe for the population and free from any restrictions. There, people could live their lives, build houses, growing plants, raising animals, anything the population could decide on after these 300 years. We have an intermediate safety assessment during operational period, as well as safety assessment after closure, during institutional control period, after which the site can be</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>Mr.ChiriacConstantin – No, I'm not satisfied with it. They gave me no Bulgarian Site's guarantee. I'm an outsider and I've heard something else.</p> <p>Mr.ChiriacConstantin – Yes, I would like a written answer, which I will pick up from the Environmental Agency.</p>	<p>released for normal use again. I will speak to you about the long term assessments. The individual dose for normal evolution scenario is $0.8 \cdot 10^{-3}$, which is orders of magnitude less than the regulatory limit. We have simulated different scenarios, including accidents as falling of reinforced container, airplane crash, earthquake, dry climate, wet climate, car explosion. However, the population's dose is much lower than the regulatory limit -under 0.1 mSv/year. You need to have in mind that the radiological protection standards, both the Bulgarian and the Romanian, are based on the Basic Safety Standards of IAEA, which are defining a 1 mSv/year for radiation exposure. You see what safety factor we have. You have asked of financing. In Bulgaria, Slovakia and Lithuania, there are funds for decommissioning the shutdown reactor units. This decommissioning funds are being financed mainly from EU and from donating countries.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Mr.Chiriac, are you satisfied with the answer?</p>
4	Mr. Dan Ilincioiu	<p>I feel sorry that I need to start with some assertions about myself, but it is required in order to set the discussion: I'm a specialist, on part of it, not the entire domain, but on most of it. My Ph.D. thesis was in underground constructions. It's not steel, but reinforced concrete, the problem is one of translation, not of essence. I'm an University professor, specialist in materials' resistance and a Ph.D. supervisor, therefore I know what materials and their behaviour in time mean. When we say 370 years we should be frightened if we know what we are talking about. My hand is trembling when required to sign documents guaranteeing for more than 30 years. I'm taking the specialists' assertions guaranteeing for a longer period of time as swearing. In order to stabilise my</p>	<p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Mr.Chiriac, would you like a written answer from the Bulgarian party?</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>position: I have read many materials during my life. This is not a technical report, but a typical document. If I would be a specialist in the Journalism or Communication Technology Faculties, I would use this as an educational example for students, highlighting the misinformation technique. It is a mixture. I'm no specialist in misinformation, but this is a mixture of both data and nice information for the public. I think that the authors of this material have taken lots of money for this, given that is a well-made material for the before mentioned purpose. I am regarding them as mercenaries trying to gain their money. In order to prove this, I would like to ask the geology specialist a question and I'm requesting a short answer, right here and right now, not stories: what were the geological conditions for the repositories from Spain that have been mentioned within this material?</p> <p>Mr. Dan Ilincioiu -They are wasting our time for two hours and a half!</p> <p>Mr. Dan Ilincioiu - How is clay acting in contact with water? How should I know what tectonical movements are there? I would like to stop here, I don't need this...</p>	<p>The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative Mr. Doncho Karastanev - In El Cabril, the ground base is rock, but in France , in Slovenia and in Czech Republic the repositories are founded on a clay formations. Now France is going to build a high level radioactive waste repository in clayey sediments.</p> <p>Mr. Doncho Karastanev – In terms of radionuclide migration, the clayey formations are more suitable than rock because of the much better retardation properties of the clay. The rocks like the rock in El Cabril has cracks that are preferable pathways for radionuclide migration. We are talking about additional stress of about 350-400 kPa, which is entirely normal construction load. I would like to add just the fact that the repository in Romania is planned to be built on a loess formation.</p> <p>Mr. Doncho Karastanev –The main geologic-tectonic processes of the Radiana site terrain had been accomplished more than 650 000 years ago when the Danube River was incised and passed over approximately along the current location. This was proven by respective paleogeomorphological investigations and analyses. The fact that you don't believe it, does not mean that it is not true. Since then to nowadays the terrain on and</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>Mr. Dan Ilincioiu - I would additionally ask: what is the scientific level of the geologist here?</p> <p>Mr. Dan Ilincioiu - Regarding the construction, I won't sign anything that has a length of more than 50 years. It is counting on the idea that the reinforced concrete is deathless. In some conditions, the concrete is being powdered. The conditions of the environment have not been set.</p> <p>Mr. Dan Ilincioiu -Ms., I am being paid for elaborating technical reports, therefore I won't make you a technical report. I will keep it short, because this meeting is being made just in order for the Bulgarian party to check it off.</p> <p>The construction is not in Bulgaria, but in Romania, as an effect: the mountain is behind, where is the outlet? As a plastic conclusion, the project is an abomination and you have my word on that, I'm speaking from a technical point of view. Thank you! I don't require an answer for that because we will waste the people here's time.</p>	<p>around the site was drying and we aren't expecting the ground water level to rise.</p> <p>Mr. Doncho Karastanev – I'm a doctor in engineering geology since 1987 and a professor of engineering geology. The fact that you don't accept the geological dimensions of time does not mean that the corresponding analyses and assessments are not correct. You should know that we have closely collaborated with Romanian researchers that are confirming our conclusions regarding the land's geological development of the region on both sides of the Danube.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Mr. Professor, I would kindly request you to elaborate your scientific position in a written form and send it by e-mail to APM Dolj and MMAP.</p> <p>State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative Mr. Marin Jordanov I think that what I've heard from the Professor here regarding misinformation... I am willing to inform him that our same ancestors: the Thracians, the Mizians and the Dacians have built tombs that we now discover after 2000 years and they have managed to survive in the same form as then. If the Professor will allow me a more technical approach., I want to inform him about this project. We have been used the best techniques based on the modern knowledge and the best professional engineers and specialist in the field, scientific studies and applicable regulatory documents in order to justify and demonstrate the lifetime of the facility of 375 years. We could talk about them, if the Professor has knowledge about them. In addition, all the</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>Mr. Dan Ilincioiu – I would like to know what is the amount that has been paid for these studies, studies through which even I could prove I'm a woman. It's my word against others</p>	<p>factors that you have mentioned: the degradation's effects, corrosion, etc., have been documented with engineering calculations that have been verified and agreed upon through the respective procedures for nuclear facilities quality assuring. These are not empty declarations but technical fact shaped documentary with calculations, drawings, duly signed and stamped by the respective licensed engineers. They are not ashamed to give their signature because they have made their job in a professional manner. I would let the Professor know that 30 years is a too short term, we could continue this discussion but it's useless.</p>
5	<p>Ms.LuminițaSimoiu President of Civic Association for Life , Craiova</p>	<p>I have both a stand and questions. And in order to prove it, I will have questions also for the Romanian authorities. And I would like to show you that these flyers are disclosing us – as Ms. Svetlana Alexievich, a Nobel Prize laureate was recommending within her book: "<i>Chernobyl Prayer: A Chronicle of the Future</i>" that the Chernobil sarcophagus should be visited by the ones looking for hot sensations – the Bulgarian invitation to tourism on the Radiana site. I would like that note should be taken of the fact that this is no real debate, but some marketing information. Therefore, I need to say that this is no information, actually, but a misinformation and manipulation of the Romanian public. Here's one of the proofs: if you will take a look over the placard that has been posted on this concert room's door only five minutes ahead of starting this discussion – breaking any provision of both Espoo and Aarhus Conventions, including the Law 86/2000 through which the Aarhus Convention has been ratified – on this poster is saying that this repository is going to be used for storing the waste that will result from operating the units 5-6, in addition to the one from units 1-4. In this informing material for the Romanian public, we are being told that it is about storing the waste that will result from decommissioning the units 1-4. I have read the 128 pages of this project's Non-technical description, being related there that this repository will store also the waste resulted from the 20 years lifetime extension</p>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>for Kozloduy's units 5-6. There have been no public debates in Romania about this; it is well known that unit 5 is going to end its life time in 2017 and unit 6 in 2019. However, there have been no discussions about this with the Romanian public. Shouldn't we know what is going to be stored in there, in order to make the right calculations? Isn't it normal to be suspicious while on the poster is an information and within the document another one?</p> <p>For the MMAP: as the public debates from Bulgaria have been mentioned here earlier, I will read my questions/comments that I was addressing to MMAP one year ago and have still remained without an answer: The Bulgarian Ministry of Environment has transmitted through the letter no. 67505/29.12.2014 a new notification towards MMAP, registered at the letter with no. 13194/MF/09.01.2015. The notification was referring at resuming the EIA procedures on the Radiana radioactive waste repository. At 06.04.2015, MMAP has received the calendar for the public debates set to take place in Bulgaria, that have been resumed due to winning the litigation in court. This information, along with the one on the calendar and with other documentation of the project, have been published in English at 09.04.2015 on the MMAP website. In conclusion, three months were necessary in order to publish this information. I have received the notification at the faculty in an e-mail, saying that if we are interested on the public debates in Bulgaria, we will be informed about them, according to the schedule, at 22.04.2015. It was never mentioned that the Bulgarian Ministry has declared that if the Romanian public is interested to participate, they should announce it with at least seven days in advance. If you do the calculation, the result is 29. The debates in Bulgaria were ending on the 30th April! Therefore, the delay in informing the Romanian population has prevented the participation of the Romanian public – which was very interested on the debates in Bulgaria. I've sent an inquiry to the MMAP, asking why was the Romanian public informed so late about the debates. I have also asked – the question still being valid, because it hasn't been answered yet</p>	