

## Response by Wade Allison

Consultation questions	
1	Do you agree or disagree that the draft guidance sets out what an approvable Funded Decommissioning Programme should contain to ensure that operators of new nuclear power stations (i) estimate the potential costs of decommissioning, waste management and waste disposal and (ii) make prudent provision for meeting their liabilities? What are your reasons?
Response	No. Basically because the level of "prudence" expected is based on a lack of understanding of the dangers involved. I have examined the extent, justification and reality of the dangers of nuclear radiation to human life, and set these out in accessible form for general consumption in "Radiation and Reason: the Impact of Science on a Culture of Fear". Current radiation safety levels and regulations are quite unjustifiable and not in the taxpayers' interest - although they are not aware of this. These proposals are unrealistic and would be unnecessarily costly. [I have no vested interest in any green movement, any nuclear business or in the safety industry. However as an academic nuclear and medical physicist I am informed and feel obliged to raise objection. ]
2	Does the draft guidance contain sufficient information to enable operators of new nuclear power stations to understand the matters that their funded decommissioning programmes should contain?
Response	No, I should not think so. Of course the answer will come from them but they are liable to make any positive answer so expensive to the taxpayer that the Govt should realise that proper guidance would reduce costs. The Govt appears mesmerised at the prospect of making a decision about recycling. Heaping ALL risk on others is very expensive. Future generations will blame this Govt if it continues to dither with fear at the expense of the nation, present and future. Recycling should be chosen for cost, for the environment and for the future.