Respondent Details	
Name:	Brian Gerrard

Please select the category below which best describes who you are responding on behalf of.

☐	Business representative organisation/trade body
☐	Central Government
☐	Charity or social enterprise
☑	Individual
☐	Large business (over 250 staff)
☐	Legal representative
☐	Local Government
☐	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
☐	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
☐	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
☐	Trade union or staff association
☐	Other (please describe):

The consultation document sets out the Government's proposed approach to the longer term management of the UK's plutonium stocks for public scrutiny and consultation. Comments on any aspect of this issue are welcome, but the key questions posed in this consultation are:

No	Question
Q1	Do you agree that it is not realistic for the Government to wait until fast breeder reactor technology is commercially available before taking a decision on how to manage plutonium stocks?
Response	I agree that it is not realistic to wait for fast breeder reactors. Fast breeders do not solve the Plutonium problem. Its like having a rabbit problem, and solving it by putting the rabbits together to breed. You are making the problem worse, not better. Fast reactors convert the Uranium 238, in the MOX, into more Plutonium.
Q2	Do you agree that the Government has got to the point where a strategic sift of the options can be taken?
Response	I disagree. I think the option of using a "Pebble Bed" reactor, based at Sellafield, used especially to "burn-up" the Plutonium, should be considered.(I think it is a South African design). It would be the Nuclear equivalent of a Waste incinerator.
Q3	Are the conditions that a preferred option must in due course meet, the right ones?

Response	I think the Isotopes of Plutonium should be a condition. Pu246 has a 11 day Half Life, whereas Pu244 has an 80 Million year Half Life. Obviously it would cost more for a storage site for 80 million years, than one for 11 days. The conditions require the Plutonium to be difficult for terrorists to get at, and Non-Proliferation provable. We need to know that Plutonium and not Coca Cola tins, has been buried at the Geological site. Having Plutonium mixed with cement, or concrete, would meet the requirement. Terrorists are not going to steel one thousand tons of cement, then use a road drill to smash it open, to get to the Plutonium, then make a bomb. Glass and ceramics are more easier for terrorists to break, than cement. It would be easier for terrorists, to use MOX fuel, as a dirty bomb, instead of a nuclear bomb.
Q4	Is the Government doing the right thing by taking a preliminary policy view and setting out a strategic direction in this area now?
Response	The UK Government should take into consideration the recent Japanese Nuclear problems, before it decides. Using the Plutonium as MOX fuel, means it would need storing in cooling ponds, for a long time. Terrorists are probably planning , after the Japanese nuclear incident, to find ways of destroying the cooling water, to the spent fuel rods. Destroying the cooling ponds inside the reactor building, would make the reactor too radioactive to carry on using it.
Q5	Is there any other evidence government should consider in coming to a preliminary view?

Response	If terrorists destroy the cooling MOX fuel rods, and the power station is too contaminated to carry on working. Would the Government compensate the power company, by building them a new reactor? Would the Government own the fuel, while it was in the reactor, or the power company? Would the new European limit on nuclear compensation, apply to the MOX fuel? Cement embedding does not have this expensive problem.
Q6	Has the Government selected the right preliminary view?
Response	I disagree. The Government should consider building a small Pebble Bed reactor on the Sellafield site, to burn the MOX fuel, so if anything goes wrong, no commercial power stations will be affected.
Q7	##Are there any other high level options that the Government should consider for long-term management of plutonium?

Response	Yes. The Government mentioned that military Plutonium needs processing, to remove pollutants, before it can be used as civilian MOX. Adding these pollutants to civil Plutonium, would make it unsuitable for terrorists. Hence no need for MOX fuel. Embedding the polluted Plutonium into ceramics or cement, would make a cheap solution, to the Plutonium problem. There wouldn't be an expensive MOX factory built, or expensive cooling of MOX fuel rods, for years. I think the Government should consider converting the Plutonium into MOX, then embedding it in cement. As the MOX fuel has not been into a reactor, (as in chapter 6, section 6.7), it is less radioactive, therefore less cement is needed to embed it. This MOX fuel can have a larger proportion of depleted Uranium added to it. There is around 100,000 tons of depleted Uranium, and 112 tons of Plutonium. This option solves the Plutonium and depleted Uranium problem, in one step. I live near a Uranium factory, that is why I prefer this option.