Response from Barry Cunningham

Sir,

I would like to take part in the ‘ABWR Regulatory Justification Application ‘, consultation.

The answers below, are My personal views. They are not the views of Merseyside CND.

Consultation Question

Chapter 1 (The Secretary of State’s Proposed Decision) sets out the Secretary of State’s proposed decision that the class or type of practice is justified by its benefits in relation to the health detriment it may cause. Do you agree or disagree with the Secretary of State’s proposed decision?

Chapter 4 (Carbon Reduction) sets out the evidence on the potential benefit through carbon reduction arising from the class or type of practice. It also sets out the Secretary of State’s current views based on that information. Do you agree or disagree with the views presently held by the Secretary of State on these matters?

I disagree with the Secretary of State’s Proposed Decision, regarding chapter 1 and chapter 4.

Paragraph 1.11 says carbon reduction is based on 1990 levels. Back in 1990 the U.K. had 14,808 Mega watts (or 14.8 Giga watts) of nuclear power. ------- [according to Nuclear Engineering (International) --- ‘World Nuclear Industry Handbook 1991’]

This means ‘not a single ton’ of Carbon Dioxide will have been saved by nuclear power, until Britain has more than the 14.8 Giga watts of nuclear power, it had in 1990.

A European Directive requires the U.K. to shut its polluting fossil fuel power stations, by 2015. This means that when the new nuclear power stations are built, only clean gas powered stations will be operating. Therefore, for these new nuclear power stations to replace the amount of carbon dioxide, that the old nuclear power stations did in 1990, the U.K. needs more than 16 Giga watts of nuclear power.

Consultation Question

Chapter 5 (Security of Supply and other Economic Effects) sets out the evidence on the potential benefit through security of supply and other economic factors arising from the class or type of practice. It also sets out the Secretary of State’s current views based on that information. Do you agree or disagree with the views presently held by the Secretary of State on these matters?

I disagree with the Secretary of State, on his economic and supply, reasons.

The new nuclear power stations require double the amount of natural Uranium, that the current nuclear stations, use. This means the cost of natural Uranium is doubled. The cost of 'Enriching' the Uranium doubles. The amount of depleted Uranium doubles.

The Secretary of State said he is not interested in 'MOX' (mixed oxide fuel). Some nuclear operators have hinted that MOX is to expensive to use, and they want the Government to subsidise the fuel, before they will use it.

This leaves the problem of where the depleted Uranium and the 112 tons of stockpiled Plutonium, are stored. Since the new nuclear power stations produce double the depleted Uranium, the problem of depleted Uranium will grow quickly. Clearly, this would increase the volume needed, and the cost of a GDF.

In paragraph 5.7, it says Japanese load factors fell to 45 %. The U.K. nuclear load factor fell to 49.4% in 2008 according to DUKES (Digest of United Kingdom Energy Statistics, 2009), for the same reasons as Japan.

Consultation Question

Chapter 6 (Radiological Health Detriment) sets out the evidence on the potential radiological health detriment arising from the class or type of practice. It also sets out the Secretary of State's current views based on that information. Do you agree or disagree with the views presently held by the Secretary of State on these matters?

I disagree with the Secretary of State.

Paragraph 6.76 says ….. the regulators have raised a number of questions about the design with Hitachi-GE,……..

I agree with the regulators.

I think the control rods needing power to control the reactor in an emergency, is wrong. They should be gravity operated.

I also think the Interim Store being inside the reactor building, is wrong. As I understand it, the Interim Store lasts over 100 years, but the power station only lasts 60 years. This method stops the nuclear power station being dismantled, until the Interim store is emptied.

Consultation Question

Chapter 9 (Safety, Security and Safeguards) sets out the evidence on the potential impact of the class or type of practice in terms of safety and security. It also sets out

the Secretary of State's current views based on that information. Do you agree or disagree with the views presently held by the Secretary of State on these matters?

I disagree with the Secretary of State.

The new power stations will use ENRICHED Uranium, which is twice the enrichment of current power stations.

On the 4th April 2014, I found a picture on the Internet, showing a lorry 'supposedly' carrying ENRICHED URANIUM HEXAFLUORIDE, on its way to Preston.

Most members of the public have never heard of Uranium Hexafluoride. So how did this person know what the lorry was carrying. The radioactive symbol does not tell the public what's in the lorry.

The picture raises security questions, over the transportation of nuclear material. The film accompanying the picture, showed the lorry was followed for some distance, without Civil Nuclear Constabulary, stopping the person.

The person with the camera, could easily have been a Muslim with a grenade launcher. The lorry, then, could have become a dirty nuclear weapon. The lorry passed close to five schools and a church.

Finally, the Government wants to reduce transport carbon dioxide, by replacing petrol cars with electric cars. This will require more power stations. Therefore, even more nuclear power stations would be needed, just to stay at 1990 levels of carbon dioxide. The Government's 16 Giga watts plan, is too little, too late.