

Respondent Details	
Name:	Pete Wilkinson
Organisation:	Wilkinson Environmental Consulting Ltd

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Business representative organisation/trade body
<input type="checkbox"/>	Central Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Charity or social enterprise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Large business (over 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal representative
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade union or staff association
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe):

The consultation document sets out the Government's proposed approach to the longer term management of the UK's plutonium stocks for public scrutiny and consultation. Comments on any aspect of this issue are welcome, but the key questions posed in this consultation are:

No	Question
Q1	Do you agree that it is not realistic for the Government to wait until fast breeder reactor technology is commercially available before taking a decision on how to manage plutonium stocks?
Response	Yes, it is unrealistic to wait as FBR technology may never become available and to use this notional technology as an excuse to re-use plutonium is disingenuous.
Q2	Do you agree that the Government has got to the point where a strategic sift of the options can be taken?
Response	A strategic sift of options is always available. I don't know what is meant by asking if the government has reached 'the point where' an options sift can be taken. I refer you to seminal work undertaken by the plutonium working group of the BNFL national nuclear dialogue in the 90s which examined a range of plutonium disposition options. The work has already been done and this review is re-inventing the wheel. The point reached today is the same point we were at ten years ago but with more plutonium in the stockpile because of a continued policy of reprocessing and the loss-making and environmental pollution that entails.
Q3	Are the conditions that a preferred option must in due course meet, the right ones?
Response	No. The only option for management of the plutonium which is achievable and deliverable is continued storage. Disposal is unproven and use as a Mox fuel is likewise problematic and unproven. The health, safety and environmental conditions mentioned are likewise inappropriate measures because the standards needed to be achieved to meet them are uncertain: insufficient knowledge exists to create meaningful criteria for ensuring health impacts are not caused by managing the plutonium through any of the means available, safety is likewise an issue for which adequate conditions to prevent a

	<p>breach are impossible to determine with accuracy and environmental impacts are occurring all the time with releases of plutonium to the Irish Sea. So while the conditions set out are ones that we would all agree with, none in fact employ the sorts of yardsticks which can meet the requirements to demonstrate that these conditions are met.</p> <p>As to the condition of value for money and beneficial to the UK, these are lost causes. The material with which you wish to barter a 'benefit' are highly poisonous and carcinogenic. The only condition which should be met is that the material should be as isolated as is technically possible from the biosphere for as long as possible in a monitorable and retrievable fashion. This means long term storage of a known burden to future generations with provision for its safe management from generation to generation – with suitable apologies for having developed this burden for the purposes of undertaking the mass destruction of human beings – in the first place. The corollary to this is that we should undertake not to produce any more plutonium in the future which means ending the ridiculous practice of reprocessing spent nuclear fuel which contradicts all the conditions you set down for managing plutonium – i.e. reprocessing is achievable and deliverable but creates greater health, safety and environmental problems than it solves and it costs the UK dearly in terms of waste management and the inability to meet contractual obligations. Give up plutonium production, give up the idea of using plutonium as a fuel, accept that we made huge mistakes in the past and do our best to remediate the situation for future generations by isolating the plutonium as best we can for as long as we can prior to disposal if that proves safe.</p>
Q4	Is the Government doing the right thing by taking a preliminary policy view and setting out a strategic direction in this area now?
Response	See above.
Q5	Is there any other evidence government should consider in coming to a preliminary view?
Response	Just look around the world and look at Anglo-phobic countries and think of what we in the UK are contributing to political stability in the world and to the availability of nuclear material. That should be evidence enough. Agree a policy of long-term storage followed by deep disposal (deep boreholes as we recommended as one option from CoRWM) should the R and D programme demonstrate that

	<p>disposal is safe.</p> <p>The work carried out by the plutonium working group of the BNFL national nuclear dialogue was considered seminal at the time and looks at a range of disposition options including low-spec mox, different matrices for storage and disposal as well as long term storage.</p>
Q6	Has the Government selected the right preliminary view?
Response	<p>No, no, no. This material has to be isolated from the biosphere. It is highly carcinogenic. It is lethal if inhaled or ingested. How can HMG be serious about re-using such a material and setting it loose in the world in the form of fuel and then spent fuel? Perhaps it is because the re-use option actually provides some sort of financial return when the other options offer only costs. Well, that is the price this and future generations have to pay for the previous generation's determination to be a nuclear power, but that is no excuse for us to try to maximise income from past mistakes using a lethal material. Store it and then bury it deep, should deep disposal be demonstrated as safe. Please demonstrate that this government has more than the cost of things in its mind: value stemming from doing the correct thing also has merit.</p>
Q7	Are there any other high level options that the Government should consider for long-term management of plutonium?
Response	<p>Yes. See the BNFL national nuclear dialogue report from the plutonium working group.</p>