

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%. 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 "Copy-Pasted" 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?</p> <p>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!</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>– what was the criteria that stood before choosing in 2011 only the Bechet Town for organising public debates? I didn't receive any answer! Through the comments that we have submitted on the last year's 8th of May, we have asked – requested by the civil society in Bulgaria – whether the Romanian Government is planning to negotiate with the Bulgarian correspondents to organise the resumed public debates in Bulgaria also in Romania. In order to prove our fairness and non-political affiliation, I need to say that the MMAP's answer was at least unsatisfying, because it was answered only after writing back to them. And it was a proof of lack of professionalism, given that on the first half of page was related the Ministry's legal basis and on the second half – as an answer to the 18 question asked, including also the question on whether the Ministry is considering inviting the Bulgarian Government's representatives to the public debates – we were told that they are still thinking on whether resuming the debates also in Romania is still relevant. We are wondering whether the today's debate – and I repeat: I am not considering it more than an informal meeting – is the debate that we have waited for almost a year now. I am willing to inform the people here on how they were represented by the Romanian environmental authorities. During the last year, we have organised debates with the civil society and invited oncologists, Romanian environmental organisations' representatives, in order to find out what is the state of this objective. We have found out from the disclosed documents that the repository has to start functioning in 2015. Why is our point of view being requested NOW? I am asking you: how could an unwitting public elaborate any relevant comments (as requested) if we don't have a debate first and draw conclusions afterwards? Therefore, the history is repeating as with the last year when requested comments. I would like the Bulgarian Government's representatives to tell us whether they know what guarantees have been requested by the Government for the cases when a nuclear facility is to be built. I know the answer, including the guarantees that are being requested by Germany in these sort</p>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>of situations: unlimited guarantees! In case of an unfortunate nuclear accident (to be honest, I'm not sure what guarantees are requested by the Romanian State for its citizens), the answer is that for its citizens the Bulgarian State is requesting for about 50 million €. This amount has been confirmed to me in a recent conference that I have attended in Prague, between 3-4 April. I would read a journalist's comment, just for the Romanian public: in order to transfer a football player, the guarantees requested are of 300 million €, but for the Bulgarian citizens in case of a nuclear accident only 50 million €.</p> <p>Regarding the health issue: a paediatrics oncology physicist of Dolj's County Hospital, Polixenia Stancu, has informed us during the last year's debates, based on official data, that from all of the registered cancer cases in the Dolj County, 60% of them are registered in Craiova. One of the explanations is the following: lots of young people have left the 23 localities that are being included within the description of both this project and the new nuclear reactor that is going to be built. As far as we know, Westinghouse has pulled away from Unit 7, so what kind of consultant is this anyway? Also we know that many young people have moved to Craiova. Dr. Polixenia Stancu was telling us that the thyroidian cancer in children has a high incidence and the only explanation is based on the high level of radiations. This is our answer for you telling us the area's depopulation is pending: this is happening because our children are dying. As for our friends in Bulgaria: people's life needs to be seen as equal, regardless of the side of the Danube they are living on. We are not Romanian or Bulgarian citizens, but European. And the right to a healthy life and environment is one highlighted by both constitutions.</p> <p>I don't want to make any comments on the technical aspects, because it's not part of my expertise – given I'm a teacher in Physical Chemistry. But reading through the entire documentation, there is one clear conclusion: there is no significant risk involved. The question is: what actually means „significant”? He won't die tomorrow, or the day after. But will he die in one year, or ten? The entire documentation is</p>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>filled with ambiguities. As for your today's presentation: I won't pass students defending such a Bachelor Degree's thesis. It has no data, no references, it's not in line neither with the Espoo Convention, nor with the Aarhus Convention. I am informed on the 26th May and expected to elaborate comments until the 7th of June, as long as everybody here has jobs. The public in Craiova did not have enough time to figure out what's this all about. Even more, I would like to ask the specialists from Bulgaria why is it that the sarcophagus from Chernobyl has cracked after about 30 years? There are funds being raised within the EU, in order to build the biggest movable structure in the world (being involved about 18 000 t of concrete and steel), that should be able to bury the Chernobyl's sarcophagus. Today, we would have liked to see what is the prognosis for the less favourable scenario and what measures will be taken in this situation?</p> <p>Moreover, we are wondering: after Chernobyl's disaster, in order to bury the reactor under concrete there have been used about 700 000 Ukrainian and Russian citizens. Will Bulgaria have the necessary human force to do the same in case of a disaster involving the Kozloduy Power Plant? Within today's presentation it wasn't told that we are living in a extremely unstable environment. Initially, one of the terrorists attacks in Belgium was targeting a NPP. Therefore, we can no longer ignore the international impact, but also the fact that these facilities are not endangering only the present citizens, but the future ones as well.</p> <p>We have raised over 15 000 signatures in order to organise a referendum and being asked about our stand on this project. We have stopped at 15 000 because there was no point in exceeding the legal requirement. Today, we have listened enough, for both the official stand and the stand of the ones opposing the project!</p> <p>Now, I am asking the citizens of Craiova: are they willing to hear more about this, since I've seen that they do not agree? Because this project is clearly unfeasible and keep that in mind: we are clearly opposing this project!</p> <p>Therefore, I am waiting for concrete answers to the following:</p>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>- What are the liability measures that have been requested by the Bulgarian Government against the constructors of this project?</p> <p>- What are the measures guaranteeing us that there will never be a terrorist attack against this site?</p> <p>- What are the technical details that have not been yet disclosed to us, regarding the life time extension for the nuclear units 5 and 6?</p> <p>In addition, the date and hour have been inadequate in order to assure the possibility for the public in Craiova to participate: the active population is at work, the retired did not know about this and even if they would have known, they were in church. And as an answer to the aforementioned comment: during the Thracians' days, there were no NPPs.</p> <p>Ms. Luminița Simoiu – I am not a „laic citizen”. In the first place, I am the president of the Asociația Civică pentru Viață (the Civic Association for Life) and I have coordinated until recently the Grupul Civic de Acțiune (the Civic Action Group) in Craiova, an organisation that managed to mobilise citizens and to participate to public debates, along with hundreds of citizens – not like the one here, with 3, 4, 5 people in the room – and which managed to get the attention of the local</p>	<p>The Bulgarian party-The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative Katya Rusaliyska– We will answer one of the questions raised, regarding the guarantees that have been requested by the Bulgarian Government. For this to happen, however, we want our previous speaker to present the documents she said she has. She mentioned that she has official information on the guarantees provided by the German state and also claims that the Bulgarian government has a guarantee of 50 million, which should also be displayed so that we can formulate a written reply. .</p> <p>Based on this long statement I understood that the Romanian public was informed about the second EIA procedure since January 2015. In the beginning of this meeting, the moderator said that there have been informed no less than 53 NGOs in Romania and that no official statements were received. I can accept the statement of the previous speaker as a personal position.</p> <p>We will send a written answer, if we receive the written questions, supported by documents that lady said she has.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>media and more than 15 000 citizens of Craiova. As I was saying, we have stopped within 15 000 signatures, given that we were needing at least 13 000.</p> <p>Regarding the Anne-Maria Simoiu citizen's laicity: I'm an University professor in the Chemistry Department within the Faculty of Sciences and since 11 years ago a chemical weapon expert within the United Nations' Agency in The Hague, Netherlands.</p> <p>Earlier, I was referring to the today's religious holiday. According with the international conventions' provisions, when you choose a date for the public debates, you are considering all the conditions in order to allow the participation of as many people as possible. Are there many people participating to this debate?! I have asked for a concrete answer: not when, but if the representatives of the Bulgarian Government do know about any guarantees that have been requested by the Bulgarian Government in case of a nuclear accident. I am a foreign citizen. I don't live in Bulgaria, I'm holding an information that may be truth, may be not and its accuracy you need to confirm. I have „Romanian citizen" written on my passport and I'm still thinking whether to request also the Bulgarian citizenship.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	<p>The Bulgarian party-The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative– Let's not abuse on the requested information. I continue to maintain that we will provide a written response if we will receive the information, which was stated in the previous statement as an available official information. With all the respect to the lady here's scientific titles, if she is claiming to be deputizing on the behalf of the concerned public, she would have put efforts towards reading not only the non-technical report, but also the whole detailed report that has been publicly available since March 2015.</p> <p>Regarding the impact that Units 5 and 6 have, this is not the topic of this discussion. I don't think that any questions can be asked in this room regarding the incidents that take place with the Kozloduy NPP. Our today's topic is the construction of the National Radioactive Waste Repository.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>apprehend your name – you have arrived to this debate unprepared, given that you should have had an answer to the question that I have posed. I will send it to you also in a written form and will answer to your before made comments, as well: I said that I've red the non-technical report. This does not mean that I have not red the others. I have red also the English version of the Bulgarian Supreme Court's resolution, that was posted on the Ministry of Environment's website. I am asking you: how many citizens of Craiova do you think that have technical knowledge on this topic and are therefore able to understand the 3 pages that haven't been translated into Romanian?</p> <p>Even more, according to the information received at the Faculty, it was not mentioned to us anywhere what is the legal basis of today's „<i>informal meeting</i>”. If you want details on this, we will sit here discussing all night long. The legal basis of this meeting is not being mentioned, neither who are its participants. In order to find out this information, I needed to request it to APM Craiova (the Environmental Protection Agency in Craiova) over telephone. It seems unprofessional to me to announce such an important meeting and omitting to mention what os the legal basis that stands behind it, who is organising it, who are the participants, etc. Because only then there will be a competent public attending, a public that knows who is dealing with. Also, I have never said that I am representing entire Craiova here, only that I am speaking in their name, because most of them did not know about this informal meeting, or if they knew about it – they weren't able to attend it given that most of the active population is working at this time. Therefore, I consider that continuing in this manner it is highly unprofessional and this informal meeting doesn't have the expected professional character of a real debate – from an expert to another. There is also a different kind of public here: I don't know how competent. In this regard, I would like us to conclude here: this here is not more than an informal meeting, according to the Espoo Convention!</p>	<p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Unfortunately, we are not being able to make a pronouncement on the public here's</p>



No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>Ms. Simoiu Luminița – Please allow us the right to reply. Concerning the fact that we weren't compelled to watch over the Ministry's website, I will start with the following question: how many times are you, madam, reading through the Craiova University's website? How could the population in Craiova – that doesn't know when the informations are being posted on the Ministry of Environment's website – to check out if any new information, that is concerning us – the citizens, is being posted on the Ministry's website? Secondly, you should know that I have spoken entirely serious, without ridiculising this discussion. The procedure is part of this public debate and we are endorsing that these procedures have not been respected. We have been here starting 09:45. The big advertismment was posted on the Philharmonic's door 5 minutes before the debate and the one in A3 format – with not more than an hour in advance. Does this mean „<i>informing the public</i>”?</p>	<p>competency. Utterly anybody could attend a public debate. Regarding the environmental impact assessment for this project – in terms on environmental protection – all of the Espoo Convention's steps have been passed through. Just a little bit of attention would have been necessary in order to effectively spot the moments when the documents have been made publicly available. After the notification, a correspondence followed between the two Environmental Ministries, the Bulgarian Ministry's answer being posted on MMAP's website, along with the Terms of Reference upon which MMAP has asked for clarifications. Also in March 2015, we have received the environmental impact assessment report and the public debate is based on the 8th Par., 3rd Art. of the Espoo Convention.</p> <p>I would like for us to stick to the project, given that this is the purpose of our public debate. In terms of the number of people attending here, we need to understand that this project is not in Romania. In order to understand, we need to listen. We have listened to the Bulgarian party's presentation and afterwards, our public has the chance to ask questions regarding this project. We are trying not to mislead the public and also not to ridiculise this public debate.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Thank you very much! I am passing the word to Ms. Babiac Liliana, position no. 6, the coordinator of the Civic Action Group in Craiova.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
6	<p>Ms. Liliana Babiac President of Civic Action Group Craiova</p>	<p>I'm an electrical engineer. This is a stand. The presentation that took over 4 hours was an insult against most of us. We have been considered being of an intelligence under the average and lacking any critical sense. Every allegation within the presentation was entirely harmless, if not even beneficial. Not the slightest negative effect against our quality of lives. It is absurd! Therefore, we publicly express our point of view of being against this project, which has been presented in a disastrous manner from each and every point of view when looking to show it in a realistic light. I am mentioning that I am part of the Civic Action Group, that has gathered the signatures. Now, as the group's coordinator, I wish to add that the 15 000 people that have signed for organising a referendum, are actually against the project. The number of signatures could have been much bigger, maybe even bigger than the 80% of the population – that was mentioned here by the Mayor. To conclude, Craiova is saying „NO” to this project</p>	<p>The Bulgarian party-The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative Written answer will be provided.</p>
7	<p>Ms. Mariana Barbu</p>	<p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – I am inviting Ms. Barbu Mariana. Is she in the room?...I will read the short content of her observation. So...position no. 7: „If the repository is so ecological and lacking any risks – as it was presented by the Bulgarian party – how is it that they didn't position it in Sofia? Why were there no specialists invited? For some time now we are being suspicious regarding the lack of risks for this project.”</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF I am kindly asking the Bulgarian party to answer her concerns in a written form.</p> <p>Is Ms. Hărăbor Ana in the room? Position no. 1? I would like to read her stand as well, in order not to skip it: „I do not agree with constructing the repository, for the following reasons: it is at an about 60 km away from Craiova – which will need to be classified as a nuclear risk city. Secondly, the lead contained within the repository's walls, the only element that can stop the nuclear radiations, is not being mentioned. Thirdly, the risk of cancer illnesses will increase, the nuclear radiations will be cumulated to reaching the allowed dose.”</p>	<p>The Bulgarian party- The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative Written answer will be provided.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>The Romanian Party -MEWF I am inviting the Bulgarian party to answer in a written form to Ms. Hărăbtor's concerns. We are waiting for a written answer. This aspect will be mentioned within the minute notes. Every question and answers will be part of the form that will be posted on the MMAP's website.</p> <p>Position no. 8, Ms. Soloveanu Doina?...Alright, we will wait a little more.</p> <p>Position no. 9, Ms. Răisceanu Mihaela, please, go on!</p>	
8	Ms Soloveanu Doina	<p>The Romanian Party –MEWF I will read the short content of her observation. So...position no. 8: „The project forecasts of the environment. What happens though if it exceeds the safety limit of radioactivity ? There was a program where this risk ? If YES what measures radiological involves lowering effect ?”</p>	
9	Ms. Mihaela Răisceanu	<p>I have understood that there were more public debates involved. The question is: what were the conclusions for those debates and the opinion of the Romanian population living next to the Danube?</p> <p>Ms. Mihaela Răisceanu – Both in Bulgaria and Romania.</p> <p>Ms. Mihaela Răisceanu – The second question: how will they guarantee that there will be no radiations' emissions and migrations?</p>	<p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – She is referring to the public debates that were going on in Bulgaria during the last year.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – During the last year, there was no debate in Romania concerning this project. There were organised only in 2011.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – I am kindly asking the Bulgarian party to answer.</p> <p>The Bulgarian party – We will answer the second question in a written form.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Regarding the first question, related to the decisions taken following the 2011's public debates, Romania has handed over to the Bulgarian party all the concerns that the Romanian public had. The environmental impact assessment procedure has been carried on by the</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
10	Mr. Ion Lungu	<p>Ms. Mihaela Răisceanu – Yes!</p> <p>I will be as short as possible, given that it's quite late. I am really sorry to participate to such a meeting. I have participated to another one, inside the University, in the Blue Room. I have understood that it was concluded back then that this project will be stopped. This project should have been blocked back then, we, the citizens of Craiova and of Dolj County, cannot afford to risk our lives and our children's lives for a distant future involving a nuclear reactor in Kozloduy. Even if being a waste repository, it's still about radioactive substances that will affect the population both in Bulgaria and Romania. Were the downsides for the population in Dolj County and in the neighbouring area from Bulgaria ever taken into consideration? Who is going to pay in case of a nuclear disaster? I don't want our children's future to be destroyed. The project should be stopped, in my opinion, and the Environmental Ministries in both countries should publicly declare on whether is there any protocol between them. And we, as citizens of Craiova and Dolj County, as long as no referendum has been organised...I was expecting to find here more people, not just 20 people representing an entire county...in my opinion, the project should be stopped and there is no need for a referendum. I am a member of the International Labour Federation and a citizen of Craiova. I</p>	<p>Bulgarian party, taking into consideration all the concerns of our public. In September 2011, a decision has been issued (21/9/2011), which was challenged into Court due to the fact that it did not include all the conditions set by the Romanian party in relation to this project. Romania, through the MMAP, has transmitted its discontentment and renewed its request towards the Bulgarian party in order for those conditions to be included into the project's design. Given that the aforementioned decision was challenged into Court, the Bulgarian authorities were constrained by the Supreme Court's resolution to recommence the procedure. Now we are under the environmental impact assessment procedure. This procedure is not over!</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the answer?</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
11	Mr. Florin Mojoiu	<p>think that the Bulgarian party – which has initiated this project – should draw the conclusions and close the project for good. Thank you for your attention!</p> <p>Firstly, I want to thank everybody, but especially the Association represented by Ms. Simoiu and the people that have helped her raising those signatures. I want to ask three questions, very briefly, and in this respect I'm expecting three very brief answers, with the addition that one of them was already asked by Ms. Simoiu, but the answer was avoided. Or to rephrase it, it shows that there are many of us thinking similarly and Ms. Simoiu is not alone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Referring to the Bulgarian party: during your presentation, you were mentioning that the radioactivity level will be monitored. Therefore, there is a radioactivity level monitoring system that only you know about and only you will administer. Is this monitoring needed to be done only by the Bulgarian State? This question is also available for our State's representative at this debate. I did not understand very clearly whether this monitoring/checks will be made on a regular basis, or in a timely manner. This is my first question. 2. The second question is about what Ms. Simoiu was speaking a bit earlier: the fact that it was not mentioned any scenario on what will happen in case of a nuclear disaster. I am asking this because if this sort of simulation or study does not exist, I don't think that we can objectively talk about a safe power plant or repository. 3. Hypothetically speaking, and I think that this can really happen, in case of radiation leakage, how fast will this information be found out, in order to rapidly intervene? Here I would like the answer of both official parties (Bulgarian and Romanian). 	<p>The Romanian Party - MEWF – Thank you, Mr. Lungu, for finding time in order to attend this public debate!</p> <p>Is Mr. Mojoiu Florin in the room? Mr. Mojoiu Florin, position no. 11?</p>
<p>The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste's representative Mr. Rusian Tsibranski– Good evening, everyone! This meeting has been prolonged very much. I see you have questions, many of them being more like statements. You are not asking</p>			

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
			<p>for explanations, I see that you already have your prejudice and you are not really requesting for any explanations. Anyhow, I will introduce myself: my name is Rusian Tsibranski and I am responsible for the Kozloduy NPP's radiological monitoring. During the numerous public debates that have lately taken place in Bulgaria, I got to very well know both the Bulgarian and the Romanian activists. I wanted to intervene many times, but the questions weren't strictly on radiology. I would like, however, to express my astonishment regarding the not understanding of the people who are asking questions. Given that you are here and assuming that you have red and got to know the project. When Ms. Stefanova was telling you that this is an entirely ecological and green project, it is based on a 5 times protection, which is preventing the radioactivity to leave the „package“.</p> <p>Therefore, you should imagine a box that is very stable and resistant, also waterproof, storing radioactive waste that is in line with all the standards on the 2a category. It is immobilised, fixed and cannot spread around. Apart from this, the containers are being stored within special cells, afterwards burried under the ground and covered with many protection layers. As I've heard, we have here specialists in Chemistry, Physics and other sciences. I would be ashamed to ask „How can it spread around?“, given that there is no gas, no fluid emissions, but only the radiations within the container? And you should also know that the dose is proportionally dropping while increasing the distance. If you are being told that along the fence (right in that area) you will have an 18 µSv yearly dose – which is anyway a lot smaller than the 100 µSv quota, how could anyone conceive any impact on Romania's territory? Concerning the emissions – this is it. Apart from this, when quoting, when referring to data, could you please make some more complete and precise referrences? Anything I say to you, I can also show it, prove it, but I'm not feeling the same against things told by some of you here.</p> <p>The Radiana site is under a 3 years pre-disposal monitoring, this program itself being extremely serious, very detailed, covering all the environmental factors: underground waters,</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>INTERVENTION I</p> <p>Mr. Peter Penchev – In the regard of the 50 years that I was talking about earlier, I am no specialist on this topic, it was a question that was asked back in 2011 by the mayor of Calarasi.</p>	<p>air and so on. The purpose of this program is to have a radiological starting point for this site, given that it's next to the Kozloduy NPP. I am no geologist, but logically speaking: if the NPP's site is in line with all the conditions, the repository should be placed as close to the NPP as possible. I have spoken also with both Mr. Penchev and Mr. Kurjilov: I don't think that the NPP's monitoring is part of today's topic. We should focus on the repository. Therefore, in simple words, we are willing to build a high technology project, that is in line with all the requirements from nowadays, and that will safely isolate the radioactive waste from both the environment and people, for the present time and also for the future.</p> <p>I hope that my answer is satisfactory, but if you wish to talk more on Physics's topics we can go on afterwards, in order not to waste the others' time.</p> <p>And concerning the question that was asked by our colleague here regarding transparency and why are we the ones making the monitoring/checks: the one who owns the licence is responsible for radiological monitoring. This monitoring is being followed closely and verified by both the Bulgarian Nuclear Regulatory Agency, Ministry of Environment and Waters and international institutions, like EURATOM. According to Art. 35 of the EURATOM treaty, each country needs to permanently monitor the environment and to keep the gathered data. Regarding the Aarhus Convention, yes, you are entirely right: the public needs to have access to such information. We have never refused to share this kind of information to anybody. In addition, you should know that since 2012, we are sending monthly reports to the mayors from the neighbouring localities. To answer also to the moderator, that was saying in the beginning that there are some conditions requested by the Romanian party: we are available, we just need to agree upon who to whom to send what. Even more, any citizen could check on the internet what is the radiological status in real time. Therefore we are open, because we too have families and children and we are thinking not only of us, but to you as well. Thank you for your attention!</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>Mr. Peter Pancev – Also the Court has taken this observation into account and I've mentioned this again, earlier.</p> <p>INTERVENTION II</p> <p>Mr. Chiriac Constantin – I would have a few words to add on that, as well, if I may. We could talk for weeks about concrete. I used to work in Cernavoda NPP's „<i>clean room</i>“. I know everything about them and everything that can happen, from a nuclear point of view.</p> <p>Mr. Mojoiu Florin – Yes, concerning the project, I have tried to keep my speech within its lines. My previous speaker's assessments on the fact that we don't know anything or what we are talking about, are undermining his own efforts of giving explanations to a citizen like me willing to be informed by specialists. I'm not sure whether he was targeting me as well, given that he was speaking in a general manner, but if he was referring to me not being informed, it shows a superiority complex against me, personally. If you have seen me going to the microphone and the fact that I'm not being able to walk, it should have made these gentlemen here think again on the effects of an eventual radiological disaster, and more precise on the possibility of disabled or retarded newborn. I'm sure that neither Romania, nor Bulgaria want this. This was my human, not scientific reason – so to speak – to ask whether there were any simulations made on what might happen in case of a disaster, and the answer to this is virtually avoided also the second time!</p> <p>I've also had a question addressed to the moderator: whether</p>	<p>Mr. Rusian Tsibranski – I am no cement expert, but it's a very stable package, in a stable and solid matrix.</p> <p>Mr. Rusian Tsibranski – I am not that sure about that, Mr. Panchev!</p> <p>The Bulgarian party – I will send you a written opinion on the concrete, Mr. Panchev!</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Mr. Mojoiu, if you please, are you satisfied with the answer you have received from the Bulgarian party, on the project?</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF– I have mentioned before the public debate started, in the first part of this meeting, that APM Dolj has taken the necessary steps towards receiving an answer from the Bulgarian party. They were sent to the Bulgarian party as comments to the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and were part of the third set of questions that we have sent to the Bulgarian party. They have answered saying that they are periodically sending reports written in Romanian, informing the townhalls neighbouring the Kozloduy area about the radiological monitoring results. This was</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>is she receiving those reports and where is she receiving them? Is she satisfied about the frequency and steadfastness that is she, well, the institution is receiving them?</p> <p>INTERVENTION III</p> <p>Mr. Simoiu – I would like to say a word, if I may.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – Yes, we are listening!</p> <p>Ms. Simoiu Luminița – We would like that the gentleman here, that has allowed himself to offend a Romanian citizen willing attend this public debate, to publicly apologise. This is unfair!</p> <p>Mr. Mojoiu Florin – I will finish with a last comment, given that I am tired and maybe we are all tired, regardless of our nationality. For the Bulgarian party: there's one more thing I want to tell you, when attending public meetings anywhere, Romania, Bulgaria, choose your words wisely. It's about Communication Science, not Physics! And make a difference between specialists asking you inconvenient questions and a social assistant not too highly instructed in Physics or Chemistry. And for the Romanian party: whenever willing to organise, with all the amiability, such meetings, it should bring along with them a team that should be up to the level required by our neighbours in Bulgaria, in order to avoid situations as such – being unsatisfied of the way we are being treated, or being really offended. Thank you!</p>	<p>verified by APM Dolj, the answers received from the townhalls being negative, unfortunately!</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF– We are willing to thank Mr. Mojoiu for the effort made. Everyone of us have a human side and know about this kind of consequences that appear only in the long run. And perhaps some of us are having this kind of problem at home – so to speak – that we are offering all our support in order to be able to walk and live as it should, in order to be a part of our joy and happiness. And I thank you once more for making that statement saying that you came here as a citizen willing to be informed by specialists on the implementation and results of such a project.</p> <p>The Romanian Party –MEWF Position no. 12, Mr. Cristian Dide?</p> <p>Mr. Rusian Tsibranski – I will answer in respect to that, though I don't think I have offended anybody. We are debating on these aspects for such a long time, that we sometimes feel there is a tendency due to lack of information. If someone is willing to know something, it will also find the way to get to know it. But, nevertheless, you have my respect and apologies.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
12	Mr. Ovidiu Spiridon	<p>I am the next person! I am comming here as a citizen of Craiova. I have recently found out about this public debate. I feel that a radioactive waste repository is a good initiative, as long as it's well done.</p> <p>I have three questions. Forgive me, there's no more time available, unfortunately, I will just address them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would be great to have both Romanian and Bulgarian citizens informed about the materials that will be stored in this repository. To have available all the information there is about the materials that will be used for this project, in order to be able to have a fair referendum. To know exactly what are we voting on! It's useless to talk on things we don't have no information on. This is the question: why aren't we organising a referendum after holding the correct information? 1. Also I wish to say that the Bulgarian party's presentation was very, very brief. We are talking about building a waste repository, for Christ's sake, not an amusement park. 2. Returning to the topic on concrete, members of my family and a few of my friends are Constructions Engineers. The most performant concrete is the ultra-high performance fibers reinforced concrete, which has an increased durability, but not also its resistance in time. Therefore, 375 years is a quite too much. That's why we need some clear information and a presentation saying: these are the materials we are going to use; and this information should be provided 	<p>Mr. Spiridon Ovidiu – Mr. Dide is not here, but he has sent me three more questions. Could you please write them down?</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – – I will invite you to write them and meantime we will move to the next person, in order to gain some time.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>by specialists. You should get this information from specialists and only afterwards we can have a public debate, which can be one in favour of the project, it doesn't need necessary to be against it. If I'm saying that I'm digging it 30 meters deep, casting some concrete in it and we won't have any radiations, would you take my word on it? We made presentations, speak about technical things that we don't know about, but which we can find out. So the question is: we are expecting you to bring clear, technical information, in order to be able to move forward. I have came here in the name of my family, friends and lots of other people that I know, but haven't been able to get here. And I'm sorry to say that it was a really brief presentation, as...a plan. They did not convince me on the project! Honestly, I'm not at all satisfied with what's going on! Maybe the project is good, maybe the repository will be done really well. But I will have to leave this place and tell some people about this project. What am I going to tell them? Because I don't know... They will ask me: „what are those containers made of?”. Well... from some sort of a metal. „Really? You don't say...”</p> <p>Another thing, I did not leave this debate by now in order to see a good repository storing radioactive – not nuclear – waste. But if this is only some sort of a dressing and behind this, the goal is to extend the life time of the Kozloduy NPP, then I'm sorry to say it, but I, my family, my friends, are thinking the same about this and we do not agree with such a thing. Today, one of my colleagues has buried her 30 years old child, due to some lung metastases. You don't get this kind of things at such an age...</p> <p>I will end my speech by wishing you good luck, also mentioning that I would like a written answer to my questions. In addition, I would like to ask them: what is the distance between their families and the Kozloduy NPP and</p>	<p>The Romanian Party -MEWF – – Mr. Spiridon, thank you very much for your questions. We would like you to read also the questions that Mr. Cristian Dide has sent. I am inviting the Bulgarian party to take these questions under consideration and elaborate some written answers to Mr. Spiridon Ovidiu.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
13	<p>Mr. Cristian Dide</p>	<p>On behalf to Cristian Dide Mr. Spiridon Ovidiu – Mr. Cristian Dide's questions are as it follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why there were no Romanian specialists corresponding the Bulgarian ones, participating this public debate? 2. Which are the 53 NGOs that have been announced by this public debate? 3. Were the 5th and 6th reactors upgraded or not? If they were not upgraded, what is their normal lifetime and when are they going to be modernised? 4. Which are the sources for financing this project, with full details, names and percentages? <p>If the repository is so harmless, why aren't we militating for shutting down the NPPs, as long as we have sun and wind? In Europe, we have energy independent countries!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Intervention I</p> <p>Mr. Peter Pancev – Regarding Units 5&6, I could inform you on what's going on putting them out of service, at the</p>	<p>The Bulgarian Party -MoEW – Ms. Silvia Dimitrova</p> <p>– I couldn't answer this question, because I came here with a specific mission: to look at how is the public debate for the project „<i>Constructing the national radioactive waste repository</i>” working out, and not for other projects of the Ministry I am sitting here for. I will inform everybody interested about when we are talking about cross-border projects, that are in the Romanian public's interest as well. For this reason, we are communicating the Romanian Ministry that all the information is being published on our website and we will continue publishing them whenever available, as well as all the administrative papers regarding these procedures – including in English, as well as the EIA report together with all its documentation and correspondence. I could, but I'm not here to answer your questions.</p> <p>The Romanian Party -MEWF– Thank you! I am inviting the Bulgarian Environmental Ministry to take note on these assertions and to inform the Romanian party on this project. Is Mr. Petru Săvescu in the room? Position no. 14?</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>Supreme Administrative Court's level. In a few words, the Ministry of Environment has decided that it's not necessary to make an impact assessment procedure. I think that documents in this regard have been sent to the Romanian Ministry. I have a good knowledge of these details and therefore, I could add that when their lifetime will be extended, also their power will be increased up to 104%.</p>	
14	Mr. Petru Săvescu	<p>To be honest, it is quite late. I was expecting a different kind of setup, given that the questions were gathered also there... I will try to be as subtle as possible, because I need to be informal. This is a project and, as my colleague was saying, it is not a Disneyland project. I need to apologise, including to him, for not being here earlier - because I could have discussed from a physicist's point of view. I will try to be brief. It was mentioned that there won't be any nuclear waste and there will be only low and medium activity waste, being in the 2a activity category. The question is: then why put it next to Kozloduy NPP and where is this already radioactive waste coming from? The lady here said that there won't be any waste received from third parties. Forgive me, but this information has been mentioned within the first presentation. There is a risk present. I have worked as a consultant more than 7 years and currently I am working in inspection, evaluation, certification and accreditation since 2012, therefore I cannot allow myself to play with words. I suppose that the person writing this project knows the meaning of the term „<i>ecologic</i>” and also knows that using it in Romania, especially in a written form, is a felony. I am telling you this as an inspection and certification director in ecological systems. Only after going through a certification system, including specific instructions and procedures, you are able to claim that you are working in an ecological system. Of course, only after you receive your certification. As I was saying, I'm working on International Systems, European and International Regulations.</p>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>In respect to everybody in this room, for our colleagues from both Romania and Bulgaria, when I'm talking about this sort of a project, I'm talking about risk management, in the first place. In every current consolidated management systems, this is the first step.</p> <p>Question: Were the custodians of the Romanian protected areas in the area informed about this project? I am referring especially to the <i>Confluența Jiu-Dunăre</i> național protected area, which is located at a 5.5 km away from this project, a protected area that I have worked on its management system. My former Biologist colleagues have recorded changes in the adaptation capability of the macroinvertebrates. This problem, along with the big number of cases that have been recorded within the onco-pediatrics departments of the nearby hospitals and with the number of ecological certification requests from this Northern Danube area, are just a few of the reasons I am against this kind of a project. Our health and the other vertebrata's is priceless.</p> <p>We were talking here about the regulatory body that was in charge of regulating the safety aspect during the election of this site. Who exactly is this body and what was the standard, European or International Regulations was this safety assessment based on?</p> <p>One more thing, i wouldn't want to be misinterpreted. I'm also a chemical and nuclear weapons military expert and I don't think that there's anybody else in this room to have handled that much radioactive material. We do not need to be nervous, even if we are chemists or physicists. I, myself, am a chemist. If you want an answer, think of the people in Fukushima and the risk assessment that was made there. Even so, look at what happened. And when you are presenting a project, please try to make yourselves understood by everybody in the room. You are not talking just to specialists, but to a wide public. We, the people here, together with our colleagues, parents, children, can be threaten. We are all trying to improve the system, we are not against each other. I've seen different opinions here, Romanians against Romanians, Bulgarians against Bulgarians;</p>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>we did not come here for this. As our colleagues were saying, there's a global threat. At the moment, there are geo-strategical weapons. Think about this! God forbid something bad to happen. We are all threaten. We, the Romanian and the Bulgarian people should join forces. Both the authorities and citizens should make more for us and our countries. Thank you!</p>	<p>The Romanian Party -MEWFMr. Săvescu, do you want an answer now, or in a written form?</p>
15	<p>Mr. Peter Karajilov for Foundation Environment and Agriculture, Bulgaria</p>	<p>Mr. Petru Săvescu – In a written form.</p> <p>Hello ladies and gentlemen. I will be brief and very clear. Firstly, I would like to mention that we are all tired. The situation is like Fukushima NPP employee after the crisis management. I am here in the name of the Foundation for Environment and Agriculture. I have a Ph.D. in Communication at the Sofia University and working in public relations and ecology. I would like to draw your attention over two aspects.</p> <p>The first one: there were many facts and figures mentioned by now on this issue. According to the International Conventions, our today's meeting cannot be called a public debate. There wasn't enough time available in order for the public to elaborate comments, not even for the experts. Also, the discussions we are carrying out here cannot be separated from the other connected projects. Of course, there is an indirect relation between the generated waste and the machines that are generating it (the nuclear reactors) and the intension to continue to build nuclear reactors.</p> <p>One more thing that was not mentioned till now: Ms. Stefanova has underlined many times that this project is about low and intermediate level radioactive waste. Our today's topic is referring to burrying this kind of waste. Do you have any idea on what is the percentage of low and intermediate level waste in the one generated by the Kozloduy NPP? Anybody from the Romanian public?...only 3%. Over 90% of the waste is of high activity. Not the Bulgarian Operator, nor the Romanian one, neither the Bulgarian Government, nor the Romanian one, don't have any idea on how they will deal with the nuclear fuel waste. I will</p>	

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
		<p>give you some clear figures. The first high level waste repository will be built in Finland, and its primary estimated cost is of 3.3 billion €. It is going to be built in solid rock, 400 meters deep. Regarding the French one, on which they are raising money now – given that 25 billion € are needed for it – there are rumours that it will be built inside a clay layer. So please, while we are being accused that we are manipulating the Romanian public, we are asking the ladies and gentlemen representing the State Enterprise Radioactive Waste, to try and answer the following question: how is Bulgaria dealing with the high activity waste?</p>	<p>The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste’s representative Ms. Stefanova – We will answer all these questions in a written form.</p> <p>The Romanian Party –MEWF– Thank you! Is Ms. Dumitrescu Ileana still in the room? Mr. Chirea Constantin, is still here.</p>
16	Ms. Dumitrescu Ileana	<p>The Romanian Party -MEWF I will read the her question So...position no. 16: <i>“Why has not it been popularized more public debate”</i></p>	
17	Mr. Constantin Chirea	<p>I have requested this information meeting’s recordings and also the PowerPoint presentations, given that there are some incongruencies between what the translator and what the Government’s representative were saying.</p> <p>Mr. Chirea Constantin – I would like to receive them through the Dolj’s Environmental Protection Agency. I would like to also make a notification towards the qualified body for this to find out where is the funding for both the repository and reactors is coming from. This is everything I have requested. I have returned from abroad and accidentally found out rumours that the funding has different origins than told here.</p>	<p>The Romanian Party –MEWF– We are kindly asking that the titular’s representative will take note of this request and we are also asking you, Mr. Chirea, to tell us the address where you want to receive the requested materials.</p> <p>The Romanian Party –MEWF– Thank you very much! Position no. 20: Mr. Constantinescu Felix Daniel and Ms. Constantinescu Elena. It seems that they have left the room, but left a contact telephone number. I will start reading their stand: <i>“We are against building this radioactive waste repository in Kozloduy, because it is impacting the population’s health, the agricultural production and the food.”</i> We have reached the end of the 20 stands and questions. The lady from position no. 1 has returned. Please, I have read what you have told me, given that you were not in the room. Position no. 1, Ms. Ana Hărăbor.</p>

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
18	Ms. Ana Hărăbör	<p>I would like to draw your attention on the fact that I have understood from the project that the repository will be built with reinforced concrete. This means that you have in mind the time wise resistance, isn't it? But I did not understand if the waste will be stored within lead containers, because this would really mean that it's safely stored. Also the thickness of the lead layer is important. I have been working on a X-ray diffractometer, that had lead walls for protection. With all this protecting lead, the radioactive dose was 10 times higher than the risk threshold. The device is in the Physics Department of the Craiova's University and was emitting X-rays, having a high penetration power. But here we are talking about nuclear radiations, emitting energies way bigger than that and we need to bear in mind also the halflife that is very big. My question is: will this repository have lead walls, in order to stop these radiations, because we are talking about a radioactive waste repository.</p>	
19	<p>Mr Constantinescu Felix Daniel Ms Constantinescu Elena</p>	<p>The Romanian Party – MEWF Mr. Constantinescu or Ms Constantinescu still in the room? I will read the her opinion So...: <i>"We are against building radioactive landfill from the Kozloduy because it affects population health, agricultural production, food"</i></p>	<p>The Bulgarian party-The State Enterprise Radioactive Waste' representative Ms. Stefanova – We will writtenly answer all of your questions. No repository in the world has lead walls and this one won't have either.</p>