Dear DECC,

The matter of deferring Fixed Price Unit costings for waste disposal and decommissioning is not acceptable. This, despite all protestations to the contrary is little more than a means of giving a subsidy to the nuclear industry. If the eFUP initially given is less than the final costing, will the difference be made up by the industry, or will (as ever), the government i.e. the public, bear the difference, as usual?

The very fact that the industry cannot (dare not?) forecast actual costings is in line with all its previous forecasting statements that is, hopelessly under the final cost. This looks like a fix-up between the industry and a government too enmeshed with it, too enfeebled to face up to the financial disaster that is the nuclear industry. Giving it this potential handout is nothing less than another hidden means of subsidising nuclear at our expense. FUP is not acceptable under any circumstance. The new government has already found a shortfall of four billion pounds in the decommissioning fund estimates.

Neither is the transfer of high-level waste from the industry to the government (the taxpayer). Why is this necessary? I can answer that. Because not only does the industry not have the faintest idea of what to do with HLW, neither does the government. What the government does have going for it, is an endless supply of taxpayers money, plus the fact that it is not the nuclear industry which is left holding the baby in seeming perpetuity. Before throwing money at nuclear, it is vital to establish a GDF repository. I say this, not believing that one will ever be created. If the nuclear industry has not found a viable solution to this seemingly intractable problem, then new nuclear build cannot go ahead. This mantra of how “a solution will be found” has become wearisome. There is neither a desire by anyone or a sound geological formation sufficient to carry on with this hopeful refrain.

What is allowing the nuclear industry to pay eFUP at its own its own self interested estimate; which can only turn out to be a careful underestimate of the amount required to be invested on the Stock Market, be anything but a subsidy by any other name? By what clairvoyant means are the future returns from the Market to be arrived at? Has the little furore just passed been taken into account? There seems no possible way by which future market trends or rate of return can be assessed in the present world situation. There would seem to be too many unknowns in all of this. All this enormous outlay to save 4% of our present power emissions.

We are speaking of an industry prepared to consider storing HLW in an unknown repository, under unknown future geological happenings, for longer than Homo Sapiens have existed.

Yours faithfully,

J.Fulcher

pp Charles Barnett, Chairman, Shut Down Sizewell Campaign