

Dear Sir / Madam

ABWR Justification DECC

Re consultation by the Department of Energy and Climate Change on the Justification of the Advanced Boiling Water Reactor Hitachi wants to build at Wylfa.

After Fukushima, how can any government morally back Nuclear Power?

Recently there has been much discussion about the waste and most political parties in Wales have stated that waste is not required here. Further, I am not sure that a concrete or convincing plan re the waste has been put forward. Simply, No nuclear power = no nuclear waste; no nuclear waste = no nuclear power. No Nuclear Power (x4) Thank you.

I am a lay person and am thoroughly opposed to nuclear power because the devastation it has brought in many countries over the years. I am not convinced that nuclear power is not required by governments for the uranium – and we all know what that is used for. A nuclear (power) free world will lead to a more likely peaceful world.

I am not able to explain better than my colleague (Dr Carl Iwan Clowes FFPH OBE) all the reasons why I am opposed to nuclear power but I agree with him, thus reiterate the importance of the world ridding nuclear power:

“1. None of the 4 ABWRs in Japan are currently operational. When they were in service, their performance was not impressive. Between 2006 and 2010, the four ABWRs managed a load factor of under 45%. These reactors are priced on 80-90% load factor so the ABWR, having performed poorly in Japan, has proven to be a highly expensive investment with poor returns. Curiously, the Nuclear Industry Association don't mention the problems with the Japanese ABWR.

2. Meta-analysis, considering data from UK, France, Germany and Switzerland, has found a statistically significant 37% increase in leukaemias for children under 5 years of age living near nuclear power stations. . An increase of 28% in solid cancers was also seen.

3. Nuclear power is one of the slowest and most expensive methods of reducing carbon emissions. The operation of the UK Government's Levy Control Framework means that allocated funds will be diverted to new nuclear reactors, thus crowding out renewables and energy efficiency. Investment in nuclear power will, as a result, worsen climate change because each pound we spend is buying less solution than, for example, if spent on energy efficiency.

4. The idea that the UK needs nuclear power to provide baseload electricity is obsolete as sophisticated grids emerge.

5. Hitachi will no doubt be looking for a generous strike price guaranteed over 35 years as is the case with EDF's agreement with DECC for Hinkley C. We as consumers will pay inflated electricity bills to pay for this strike price. This creates a real danger we will be hit through our taxes to subsidise even further the genuine market failure that is nuclear power.

6. There are other distinct and unique detriments from siting two ABWRs at Wylfa. Of all the nuclear sites in Britain, Wylfa is unique in being situated on an island off the mainland. In the event of a serious accident at Wylfa and a serious release of radioactivity into the atmosphere, how would the island's population be evacuated over two bridges which are already congested daily at rush hours, and even more regularly during the summer months with increased traffic levels ?

7. Ynys Môn has the second highest percentage of Welsh speakers of any county in Wales with 58% of the island's population speaking the language. We saw how the influx of workers to build Wylfa A had a huge negative impact on the linguistic profile of the area and the influx of 6000 construction workers to build Wylfa Newydd will have a similar and further diluting impact on the number of Welsh speakers in the island's communities. Hitachi/Horizon have already publicly admitted that at least 75% of the building workforce would come from outside the local area, i.e the whole of North Wales to Cheshire and Merseyside. Much evidence is now placed on the importance of a sustainable environment but that response should be mindful of not just the physical but also the economic, social and cultural environments. These proposals ignore this agenda and, in this day and age, the kind of cultural vandalism being proposed is wholly unacceptable.

8. Legacy radioactive waste remains a substantive and real problem for Britain and the rest of the world. Creating new and even `hotter` waste as proposed is hugely irresponsible. For the proposed new reactors even more enriched uranium would produce very high burnup spent fuel. This gets more output, but increases the danger of radioactive releases as the fuel cladding gets thinner. The increased risk persists throughout the storage and disposal of the spent fuel. Unbelievably, the new reactors that the Government wants to build will use fuel up to 62,000 MWdays/tonne whilst burnups of 45,000 MWdays/tonne in the USA have shown evidence of higher than expected rates of oxidation of fuel cladding.”

Nuclear power is madness.

Yours sincerely

Jan Underwood