

Respondent Details	
Name:	Brian Gerrard

My response to the consultation is below. The views expressed are My own, not any organisation.

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	<p>I do not agree with the cap. The waste should be charged at whatever price it costs.</p> <p>The cap, if put in place, should match the cost the Power operators will be charging the public. Otherwise the companies can make a fortune out of waste storage.</p> <p>My electricity bill will contain an amount for waste storage, which the power companies think it will cost.</p> <p>My bill will be in Kilowatt hours. I think the costs should be in Kilowatt hours, instead of cubic metres of ILW waste, or numbers of copper canisters.</p> <p>We have been told nuclear power operators have had years of experience. Therefore, they already know how much things will cost. The processed "high level" waste costs, from current power stations are known, so the unprocessed waste costs from new stations should be less..</p>
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	<p>I disagree with the 30 year period.</p> <p>The public will have to pay for the electricity from day one, so the nuclear people should pay the Government, straight away.</p> <p>I disagree that the nuclear people should get my money straight away, but not pass it on to the Government for 30 years. They can invest it and make a fortune.</p> <p>If there are long delays in building the GDF the power stations could be closed, who will pay then?</p> <p>I do not think the new power stations should be built until a GDF has been</p>

	built that safely stores the waste from current stations. That way the costs will be better known.
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.
Response	<p>Section 3.3.5 shows that NDA got its cost estimates wrong, just three years ago. The cost of copper to make the canisters is bound to increase enormously.</p> <p>Section 3.3.38 considers a second GDF. I think the cost of the second site should fall totally on the power stations. Because the first will have all the Legacy waste, there is no need for the Government to pay towards the second one.</p> <p>I think a large Risk Fee could put companies off building Nuclear power stations. If the Government intends to meet its Global Warming Targets, it will need a lot more nuclear stations. The ten new ones will only replace the current ones, so no reduction in carbon dioxide levels.</p> <p>The building of a GDF now, for the current waste, will give the Government its Maximum price, as the new stations waste will not be as radioactive as current treated waste, therefore their cost will be less. This known Maximum price will give both Government and Power operators certainty.</p> <p>The British Government has had since Calder Hall started in 1956 to build a GDF. The operators of Calder Hall have since 1956, had the extra expense of storing their waste, because the Government has delayed so long, building a GDF.</p>