

**Respondent Details**

Name:	Cumbria County Council
-------	------------------------

**Consultation questions****1**

Do you agree or disagree that the level of the Waste Transfer Price should be subject to a Cap and that in return for setting a Cap the Government should charge a Risk Fee? What are your reasons?

**Response**

The County Council's Nuclear Issues Working Group has considered the revised proposals for Waste Transfer Pricing (WTP). The Working Group agrees that the WTP should be set at a sufficiently high level to ensure safe disposal of radioactive waste from new nuclear power stations without cost to the taxpayer.

The Working Group also agrees that the WTP charged to new nuclear operators should include an additional 'risk fee' to compensate the Government for accepting a small residual risk should future costs exceed a price Cap.

**2**

Do you agree or disagree that the Deferral Period should be set at 30 years after the start of electricity generation, in order to enable uncertainty over waste disposal costs to be reduced? What are your reasons?

**Response**

The Working Group agrees that the period over which setting a price per unit of waste could be deferred, should be increased from 10 years to 30 years. It is understood that this proposal is principally in response to requests from utilities who argued 10 years was too little time to accurately determine a fixed unit price – particularly in view of the early stage of the GDF programme in England and Wales. Better disposal cost data should be available once a site for GDF development is identified and construction/operation is underway. If GDF development does not take place as expected then the County Council agrees that Government will need to clarify how a fixed unit price will be set.

The Working Group also agrees that if a utility wishes to set its fixed unit price within the deferral period, then the final price level should be at the discretion of the SoS (given taxpayers are ultimately carrying the risks).

**3**

Do you have any comments on the updated Waste Transfer Pricing Methodology? Comments are sought in particular on the proposed approach to setting an Expected Price and a Risk Fee.

<b>Response</b>	<p>The Working Group agrees with the proposed methodology for setting the WTP and agrees that it should provide sufficient cost certainty to utilities to allow them to confidently invest in new nuclear build.</p> <p>The County Council still considers, as set out in its response to the Fixed Unit Price (FUP) consultation in March 2010, that an FUP should include an element of 'social premium' (as well as a 'risk premium') so funds could be accumulated for the purpose of assisting a host community with managing local direct and indirect impacts of eventual new build station closure.</p>
-----------------	---

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)
- ☐ Small business (10 to 49 staff)
- ☐ Micro business (up to 9 staff)
- ☐ Trade union or staff association
- ☐ Other (please describe):