To: The Plutonium Management Team DECC

Dear Sirs

I am responding to this consultation as an individual physicist and former scientific adviser in the CEVR.

Background

What is a 'significant' quantity, and does 'UK owned' exclude anything owned by foreigners? What about 'UK owned' but not actually in the UK?

I am delighted that re-use is the 'preferred option', but MOX is not the only one...

Justification: 'Justification' is the wrong word. If safety guidelines or regulations are what is meant, say so. There must be no artificial limitation on the re-use of plutonium. The nuclear industry already has standard procedures, so what is new?

I am tired of pussy-footing about 'exposure risks'. Not every woman wants a child and many have already had enough, so stop setting rules for the most vulnerable. Many men have already sired enough too, and should also be free of 'genetic risk' paranoia. Rather, as an older woman I would be glad for a job sorting out Chernobyl or Fukushima - I speak both Russian and Japanese.

Paragraph 16 did not define 'new or existing' classes or types of practice; I am particularly interested in research possibilities which may not yet have been discussed.

Paragraph 20: I am keen to challenge the current limits, but glad to see the authors have heard of background radiation.

I suggest three classes of life at risk: (a) The general population, all pets, farming livestock and wild fauna (b) Workers in the nuclear industry who are likely to procreate, (c) Workers in the industry (plus certain volunteers) who are NOT going to produce offspring. Different levels of radiation over different time periods are applicable for each class.

Paragraph 23: I have ideas on 'other benefits'...

Paragraph 24: Nuclear power does NOT need 'justification' but implementation, in Britain, by British companies, starting ten years ago. There is not justification for NOT having nuclear power.

Question 1: Not really. The industry already has its own procedures but if in the light of later knowledge some changes might be applicable, then they could simply be added.

Paragraph 29: Only technical experts should hold sway. I am terrified that 'interested parties' will include anti-nukes and ignorant politicians, (I managed to get into a meeting of these ignoramuses in Portcullis House but the chairman, only allowed me 30 seconds in which to refute the hour of rubbish i had just heard.)

Question 2: No, they are not clear and I fear they may be too prescriptive.

Question 3: The information in Table 3 seems comprehensive enough, with the exception of 'environmental'. While there are no controls over immigration into this over-crowded country (putting excess demands on our water and imported food) I see no reason to be so draconian over nuclear power. I would rather have a nuclear waste dump in my back garden than see another river run dry because of excess water abstraction.

Question 4: Only by running it in parallel with the action or proposal to which it relates.

* * * * *

I do not give a fig for the Data Protection Act and anything I say do or write may be reported in any media or format provided it is accurate. No animals were harmed during the compilation of this letter and it does not contain nuts.

Yours faithfully

H A Prowse BSc (Miss)