Respondent Details	
Name:	Lesley Grahame Member of Green Group of Norwich City Councillors

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	The base case proposed is a good idea - ie. that operators are required to produce fully costed estimates for de-commissioning with technology used today. However I noticed that there was provision for discounting of the FDP : It is assumed that for an FDP submitted for approval the cost estimates will be calculated on a money of year basis (escalation and/or discounting terms will be applied post the initial cost assessment. I have absolutely no confidence in this not being used to somehow massage the figures post submission. The initial cost should be the bottom line - ie . only subject to increase due to unforeseen circumstances Fixed final price offers certainty where there is none, so taxpayer takes risk. Also 30 year deferment looks like interest free loan. Operators 'must make prudent provision', what happens if they can't/won't pay? My residents can't get a mortgage Final price cannot be set in relation to actual data, there is none!!! Operator chooses to gamble – today's fixed price paid now or uncertain amount in 30 years, - when directors likely to be retired. Cap on fixed price claims to take account of risk – data is that accidents of various proportions happen, and this must be taken into account. Operator can choose to fix Final Price at cap level at any time – risk of inside knowledge being misused. Niave at best, to assume otherwise. No account is taken of the effects of climate change or coastal erosion, both of which have potential to add enormously to the final sum. 1.34 I have no confidence in any government's ability to enforce its poolicy of making operators pay full cost of decomsissionning, but am impressed by the creative accounting.

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	I fail to see how Lump sum payment for future costs minimises risk to taxpayer. I agree that Government is better placed than operators to manage major projects in the national interest, and should not be allowing other interests to operate them
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	This is a gamble for operator, shareholder and taxpayer alike, on both known and unknown unknowns, and potentially on the scale of the banking crisis. As a taxpayer I am not happy to take this risk or allow it to be imposed on my residentsI represent a socially mixed ward on the east of Norwich, 50 miles from Sizewell, and seriously hit by spending cuts. I visit my residents regularly to discover their concerns and act on them where I can. As well as very local issues, recurring themes are about: Money – how can I stay in my home when I loose my job/housing benefit etc? How can I continue to care for my disabled parent/spouse/child when the day centre/respite facility/youth support service closes? The environnment – why is the government not recognising that unsustainable consumption will, by definition, end? Why are we heaping financial and environmental debts on unborn generations who no voice or choice in the matter? Fairness – Why is there always money for big projects that cost the taxpayer an arm and a leg, and hardly ever deliver the benefits promised on time, on budget – or at all? Why are they turning the clock back on hard won rights etc. I could continue, but my point is that my residents will be very angry to see government money channelled away from the needs they see daily, towards an industry that is only viable when subsidised by government, ie their, money, however indirectly, or however well concealed. Many are enthusiastic about alternatives, including demand reduction, and innovative but proven technologies, and those who will benefit would commend the Feed in Tarriff as part of the mix. All of these are rendered less feasible by the siphoning of vast sums towards the nuclear industry away from other options, which most regard as safer, more reliable, job creating and locally controllable. I accept the government view that dealing with the long term problem of nuclear waste is best done at national level. However I'd like to know what

	has led the government to this decision, as I believe that the generation of nuclear power would fit similar criteria as a task which REQUIRES democratic accountability and local/national loyalty.

Please select the category below which best describes who you are responding on behalf of.

- ☐ Business representative organisation/trade body
- ☐ Central Government
- ☐ Charity or social enterprise
- ☐ Individual
- ☐ Large business (over 250 staff)
- ☐ Legal representative
- ☒ Local Government
- ☐ Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
- ☐ Small business (10 to 49 staff)
- ☐ Micro business (up to 9 staff)
- ☐ Trade union or staff association
- ☒ Other (please describe):