

SAFE ENERGY E-JOURNAL No.45

March 2009

<http://www.no2nuclearpower.org.uk>

The content of this e-journal was for the most part originally prepared for Nuclear Free Local Authorities and is reproduced, as adapted, with their permission but without liability for its contents.

1.0 Paying for waste and decommissioning

1.1 The Office for Nuclear Development is publishing a set of three pre-consultation discussion papers on the development of estimates of the costs of decommissioning and waste management. These estimates will help the Nuclear Liabilities Financing Assurance Board (NLFAB) assess operators' own estimates.

1.2 The first paper is about determining how the fixed costs of building a geological disposal facility should be apportioned to and shared between operators of new reactors.¹ The second is about establishing an indicative fixed unit price for the disposal of intermediate level waste and spent fuel from new reactors.² The third will be about “the DECC cost model, with updated estimates for the total cost of waste management, disposal and decommissioning”. A formal consultation is expected to take place in spring 2009 (probably May).

1.3 The Nuclear White Paper said utilities will be expected to meet “*the full costs of decommissioning and their full share of waste management costs*”.³ But industry needs certainty, so the system proposed is one in which utilities pay a fixed-price into a fund in return for the Government taking the waste, and absorbing all the risks of handling nuclear waste.⁴

1.4 Despite the fact that the Government has stated there will be no subsidies, there is huge scepticism about whether this will be possible, and the funding of waste and decommissioning costs offer opportunities for the Government to hide any subsidies. *The Spectator*, for example, said there is every risk that the public will end up footing the bill. The Government says in ‘extreme circumstances’ it is prepared to help meet the massive decommissioning and waste costs — knowing full well that such extreme circumstances almost always attend decommissioning and waste disposal.⁵

1.5 The Government has indicated the ‘fair share’ for waste ‘disposal’ will be calculated as the proportion of space nuclear operators’ radioactive waste takes up in any repository. Nuclear Economist Ian Jackson says that foreign utility companies with Sellafield reprocessing contracts appear to be paying about £201,000/m³ for the ‘disposal’ of intermediate-level waste. Commercially speaking it would be hard to justify charging British utilities a lower price and

¹ Pre-consultation discussion paper No.1. Office for Nuclear Development, October 2008.

<http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file48571.pdf>

² Pre-consultation discussion paper No.2. Office for Nuclear Development, January 2009.

<http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49168.pdf>

³ BERR Press Release 10th Jan 2008

<http://nds.coi.gov.uk/environment/fullDetail.asp?ReleaseID=343892&NewsAreaID=2&NavigatedFromDepartment=True>

⁴ Times 28th January 2008

http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/utilities/article3261571.ece

⁵ Spectator 12th March 2008

http://www.spectator.co.uk/the-magazine/features/553546/part_3/go-nuclear-but-keep-your-hand-on-your-wallet.thtml

would risk accusations of illegal state aid. The problem is that if UK utilities are forced to pay this fully commercial price it would cost around £820 million per reactor - 41% of each reactor's expected £2 billion capital cost - far too expensive, killing the prospects of any new reactors.⁶ In other words, new reactors will not be built unless the government fixes the market.⁷

2.0 Nuclear Siting

2.1 The Government has published its response to the Strategic Siting Assessment Consultation and the finalised criteria against which potential sites will be assessed. It has now given the nuclear industry two months to the end of March to nominate sites. A list of nominated sites will then be issued around the middle of this year as part of a consultation on the National Policy Statement on nuclear power. The criteria include conditions that new sites should not be near major population centres or certain types of military activity.⁸ But a ban on locating reactors in areas susceptible to earthquakes has been lifted.⁹

2.2 The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, which as recently as last August said it would lose its 'social licence to operate' if it supported new reactors, will nominate four sites. Its plan to sell land for new build to 'maximise its assets' was already stretching the point, but nominating sites is not what might be expected from a neutral organization.¹⁰ The sites are Bradwell, Oldbury, Wylfa and Sellafield. It might have been expected that nuclear operators would nominate these sites once the NDA had sold the land, but there has been speculation that doing it that way might have cut out Sellafield, because few of the utilities are interested in building at the controversial Cumbrian site.

2.3 EdF announced its intention to nominate: Hinkley Point in Somerset; Sizewell in Suffolk; Heysham in Lancashire; Hartlepool on Teesside; and Dungeness in Kent.¹¹

2.4 Professor Andrew Blowers, writing in the Town and Country Planning Association's (TCPA) journal,¹² says power, profit and pragmatism are dictating the siting criteria and a return to the 'decide-announce-defend' approach to decision-making. The criteria amount to nothing less than a means of trying to justify putting a new generation of mega power stations and spent fuel waste stores on existing coastal sites most of which are likely to become submerged during the next century under the impact of sea level rise and storm surges.¹³

2.5 The consultation document said so-called 'Credible Nuclear Power Operators' (CNPO) that want to nominate potential sites must be able to demonstrate they "*have taken steps to engage local communities living in the vicinity of the nominated site.*"¹⁴ But, in the final document this seems to have been downgraded to "*must be able to demonstrate they have raised awareness of the nomination with the local community*".¹⁵

⁶ Buried Costs, by Ian Jackson, Nuclear Engineering International, 27th March 2008.

<http://www.neimagazine.com/story.asp?storyCode=2049209>

⁷ Greenpeace 27th March 2008 <http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/media/press-releases/taxpayers-facing-nuclear-missile>

⁸ DECC Press Release 27th Jan 2009

<http://nds.coi.gov.uk/environment/fullDetail.asp?ReleaseID=390875&NewsAreaID=2&NavigatedFromDepartment=False>

⁹ BBC 27th Jan 2009 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/7854431.stm

¹⁰ NDA 23rd Jan 2009 <http://www.nda.gov.uk/news/land-and-new-nuclear.cfm>

¹¹ EDF Press Release 27th Jan 2009 http://www.edfenergy.com/media-centre/press-news/EDF_Energy_welcomes_Government_announcement_on_nuclear_sites.shtml

¹² TCPA Press Release 27th Jan 2009

http://www.tcpa.org.uk/press_files/pressreleases_2009/20090127_SitingNPP.doc

¹³ Blowers, A. Why Dump on Us? TCPA, Jan 2009

http://www.no2nuclearpower.org.uk/reports/Nucl_Siting3.pdf

¹⁴ Condition 2, page 9 of the Consultation Document. <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file47136.pdf>

¹⁵ Final document page 21. <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49865.pdf>

2.6 EdF, the new owner of British Energy, is planning to build two new reactors at Hinkley and two at Sizewell. But it will also have to dispose of one or two possible sites for building a new nuclear power station, possibly Heysham in Lancashire or Dungeness in Kent.¹⁶

2.7 Two German companies Eon and RWE, which jointly operate three nuclear stations in Germany, announced they were teaming up. They are expected to propose building at Wylfa, on Anglesey, where RWE has recently been granted approval to connect up to three new reactors¹⁷ to the National Grid, and at Oldbury, in Gloucestershire, where Eon has obtained similar permission. The joint venture will also explore the possibility of building reactors on other sites such as Bradwell and Dungeness.¹⁸

2.8 Scottish & Southern Energy, and Iberdrola (owners of Scottish Power) have also formed a joint venture "to secure sites suitable for nuclear power stations" with GDF Suez of France. They will be submitting joint bids for land at three NDA sites.¹⁹

2.9 This latest spate of activity, therefore, adds Heysham and Hartlepool to the list of possible sites which is: Sizewell, Hinkley, Dungeness, Bradwell, Wylfa, and Oldbury.²⁰

3.0 Facilitative Actions

3.1 Once again EDF has been complaining about the UK Government's 'facilitative actions' moving too slowly. It says the finalised National Policy Statement (NPS) on nuclear power must be released by the end of this year if it is to get new reactors up and running by 2017. The Government currently plans to release the NPS in early 2010.²¹ EDF wants further streamlining of the safety and planning processes.²²

3.2 The Government has been concerned its plans for new reactors could be put at risk by a shortage of nuclear inspectors.²³ So in January 2008, it asked Dr Tim Stone to conduct a review of nuclear regulation. He has now reported his findings, and the Government has published the Summary Recommendations and its Response to the review.²⁴

3.3 Sedgemoor District Council in Somerset asked British Energy and EDF for a payment of £750,000 in July even though it will play a major role in granting planning approval for the project. The two companies want to build a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point. The proposed site is in West Somerset District Council but the project will have a major impact on Sedgemoor. The funding will pay for a planning officer and legal advice. Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council have formed an organisation called the Somerset Nuclear Energy Group (SNEG) to deal with the proposal from British Energy and EDF.

¹⁶ Daily Express 23rd Dec 2008 <http://www.dailypress.co.uk/posts/view/76986>

¹⁷ Guardian 30th Dec 2008 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2008/dec/30/utilities-nuclear-power>

¹⁸ Times 15th Jan 2009

http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/utilities/article5519752.ece

¹⁹ FT 21st Jan 2009 <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/1ba8c75a-e75d-11dd-ae2-0000779fd2ac.html>

²⁰ Morecambe Visitor 29th Dec 2009. <http://www.thevisitor.co.uk/morecambe-news/New-nuclear-plant-plan-4828441.jp>

²¹ FT 6th Jan 2009 <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/a87e4eba-db92-11dd-be53-000077b07658.html>

²² FT 6th Jan 2009 <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/17b83a90-db91-11dd-be53-000077b07658.html>

²³ Safety & Health Practitioner, 30th Jan 2009

http://www.shponline.co.uk/article.asp?pagename=news&article_id=8395

²⁴ <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49849.pdf>

The dilemma the councils find themselves in is that they will have to find the money from somewhere, whether it be from the nuclear industry, government or local council tax payers.²⁵

4.0 Justification Consultation

4.1 The Nuclear Free Local Authorities (NFLA) Steering Committee has produced a briefing to encourage its members to respond to the Government's Justification Consultation. The NFLA is unequivocal in its criticism of plans for new reactors – the opportunity cost is too high. Nuclear investment will damage the nascent local energy revolution which local authorities should be at the centre of, and thus damage efforts to tackle climate change. Nuclear power's capital costs are out of control and recent studies have cast "significant doubt" over the official risk attached to radiation doses received by people living near nuclear reactors.

The Government's Consultation on the Justification for Building New Nuclear Power Stations. New Nuclear Monitor No.15 <http://www.nuclearpolicy.info/docs/nuclearmonitor/NNM15.pdf>

4.2 The Nuclear Consultation Group, a group of academics with specialist knowledge on nuclear power and energy have called for the Government to hold an inquiry on Justification, and is asking other consultees to do the same. The hurried and unsynchronised timeline for various nuclear consultations does not allow for full discussion of all relevant issues, and once finalised the justification process may foreclose on any future discussion of issues crucial to nuclear power. Nor does the group believe it is appropriate for the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to be the Justifying Authority as he has already expressed clear support for new nuclear reactors.

5.0 Nuclear Costs and Finances

5.1 Widespread doubts about the ability of nuclear power companies to build new reactors on time and budget have been raised following the news that EDF's new European Pressurised Reactor (EPR) being built at Flamanville in France is already 20% over budget, while delays continue to plague the Finnish EPR. EDF said Flamanville will cost €4bn (£3.5bn) instead of €3.3bn, blaming "higher raw material costs and the impact of technical and regulatory evolutions".²⁶

5.2 Areva, the French nuclear plant designer, has now become embroiled in a war of words with the Finnish utility over delays at Olkiluoto. Areva has told the utility, TVO, the reactor will be three years late – it will not be ready until 2012. This will worry ministers in London who are trying to convince sceptics that nuclear can deliver quickly and efficiently to meet the looming energy "crunch" after 2015. TVO attacked Areva and its German consortium partner Siemens for suggesting the embarrassing problems had been caused by the Finns, and totally rejects the consortium's accusations that TVO has any responsibility for the delay.²⁷

5.3 The fall in the value of sterling has added over 40% to the cost of constructing new reactors. The €5.2bn prospective cost of the Finnish reactor now implies a price in UK£ of about £5bn rather than £3.5bn. This raises the prospective cost of electricity generated by the nuclear power station to around £70 per megawatt hour, or over £20 more than the current wholesale price. To be clear, at today's electricity prices and exchange rates the operator of a nuclear power station built for the same price as the Finnish plant would lose £20 per megawatt hour. No rational electricity company

²⁵ Spinwatch 20th Jan 2009 <http://www.spinwatch.org/-articles-by-category-mainmenu-8/67-nuclear/5240-in-the-nuclear-pocket>

²⁶ Guardian 5th Dec 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/dec/05/nuclear-power-sexy-edf-reactor>

²⁷ Guardian 14th Jan 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/jan/14/areva-nuclear-finland-olkiluoto>

intent on making a profit would contemplate making an investment in a nuclear station if these conditions persist.²⁸

5.4 The implications of the three year delay and 50% increase in cost of the Finnish reactor reach far beyond its borders. More than 100 new reactors are being built or planned around the world. In the United States, there are thirty-five reactors on the drawing board. But most, if not all, of the seventeen companies with applications for new reactors before the NRC are counting on federal loan guarantees.²⁹ *"We concentrated so much on nuclear that we lost sight of everything else,"* says Oras Tynkynnen, a climate policy adviser to the Finnish prime minister. *"And nuclear has failed to deliver. It has turned out to be a costly gamble for Finland, and for the planet."*³⁰

5.5 A new study by a leading expert in power plant costs has estimated the costs of electricity from new nuclear plants in the US at 25 to 30 cents/kWh — triple current U.S. electricity rates!³¹ *Time Magazine* says the capital costs of new reactors are "out of control."³²

6.0 Nuclear Safety

6.1 An expert advisory committee has been quietly scrapped after it warned the future safety of Britain's ageing nuclear plants was being put at risk by poor performance, delays and budget cuts. The Nuclear Safety Advisory Committee (NuSAC), which has been offering critical advice to Britain's health and safety watchdog for nearly 50 years, was disbanded without any public announcement. Former members of NuSAC are now worried about the lack of independent safety advice at a time when the government is embarking on a major expansion and clean-up of nuclear power.³³

7.0 Alternatives

7.1 Europe's largest low carbon zone could be created in Wales' Heads of the Valleys (HoV) region. The HoV Low Carbon programme would see 40,000 microgeneration units or their equivalent installed in the area over the course of 15 years; 65,000 homes would have their energy efficiency measured with 39,000 energy reduction measures implemented. The project is expected to reduce energy bills in the area by £1.7 million, and help alleviate fuel poverty.³⁴

7.2 A scheme in Kirklees allows homeowners to have solar panels or windmills attached to their homes for a share in the capital value of the house. Kirklees has more homes producing renewable energy than anywhere else in the UK and more insulation provided in one year than the total number of London homes which have benefited from the UK government's scheme. The Kirklees

²⁸ Guardian 5th Jan 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/jan/05/nuclear-energy-rising-cost>

²⁹ Washington Monthly Jan/Feb 2008 <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2009/0901.blakeSB.html>

³⁰ Washington Monthly Jan/Feb 2009 <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2009/0901.blake.html>

³¹ Exclusive Analysis Part 1: The Staggering Cost of New Nuclear Power, Climate Progress 5th January 2009. <http://climateprogress.org/2009/01/05/study-cost-risks-new-nuclear-power-plants/>

³² Grunwald, M. Nuclear's Comeback Still No Energy Panacea, Time, December 31, 2008. <http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,1869203,00.html>

³³ Guardian 17th February 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/feb/16/nuclear-safety>

³⁴ Largest Low Carbon Zone Proposed for Wales, Low Carbon Economy, December 22, 2008 http://www.lowcarboneyconomy.com/community_content/low_carbon_news/3758

Warm Zone is one of the biggest and most comprehensive energy efficiency programmes in the UK. Every home in Kirklees which is suitable for loft and cavity wall insulation will receive this work for free. It will be introduced on a house by house basis.³⁵

7.3 The "Great British Refurb" will fit every home in need of insulation in the roof or walls by 2015. By 2030 every home will be offered a "whole house" green refurbishment, including fitting renewable heat technologies like ground source heat pumps and solar panels. Environmentalists welcomed the package but criticised the delay that means most of the initiatives will not begin until 2012. It is not yet clear how the scheme will be paid for, but it is likely to involve another levy on energy bills. The Local Government Association said consumers should not have to pay.³⁶

8.0 NDA Waste Storage Review

8.1 CoRWM recommended in July 2006 a major research and development programme on robust radioactive waste storage, including on their security to see if they could survive a terrorist attack.³⁷ Interim storage will be needed for at least 100 years, even if an underground nuclear dump is built. A year later, the then CoRWM chair, Gordon Mackerron reported little progress in this area.³⁸

8.2 The NDA's March 2006 Strategy made a clear commitment to hazard and risk reduction by ensuring that radioactive waste is managed and converted into a passively safe form and placed into interim storage. Within the strategy, NDA also made a commitment to review interim storage opportunities within the UK.

8.3 The NDA has now finally started reviewing storage regimes for Intermediate and High Level Waste across the UK at both NDA and non-NDA sites. Spent fuel and other nuclear materials which have not been declared as waste (such as plutonium) are not considered, but a separate review will address these.

8.4 The Scottish Government does not support deep geological disposal and is, according to the NDA, developing a policy of long term interim storage for higher activity wastes. The NDA says it will work with the Scottish Government in developing its policy and will take account of the implications of the policy for our long term storage requirements.

8.5 Following the UK Radioactive Waste Storage Review Stakeholder Workshop held in October 2008,³⁹ the NDA has now published a draft of its Waste Storage Review.⁴⁰ The review is mainly focused on ILW and other reviews are planned. Stakeholder engagement will form an important

³⁵ Kirklees Council Renewable Energy Projects,

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/community/environment/renewable/renewable-projects.shtml>

Kirklees Warm Zone, December 2008

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/community/environment/energyconservation/warmzone/warmzone.shtml>

³⁶ Telegraph 13th Feb 2009

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/4605386/Energy-experts-to-visit-every-home-to-help-them-go-green.html>

³⁷ Managing our Radioactive Waste Safely: CoRWM's recommendations to Government, CoRWM,

July 2006. <http://www.corwm.org.uk/Pages/Current%20Publications/700%20-%20CoRWM%20July%202006%20Recommendations%20to%20Government.pdf>

³⁸ Future R&D Needs, by Gordon MacKerron, CoRWM, June 2007.

[http://www.corwm.org.uk/Pages/Archived%20Publications/Tier%202%20\(4\)%20-%20Making%20decisions/Tier%203%20-%20Scoring%20and%20sensitivity%20testing/2209%20-%20Future%20RandD%20needs.doc](http://www.corwm.org.uk/Pages/Archived%20Publications/Tier%202%20(4)%20-%20Making%20decisions/Tier%203%20-%20Scoring%20and%20sensitivity%20testing/2209%20-%20Future%20RandD%20needs.doc)

³⁹ A review of the October Workshop is available here:

<http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/upload/NDA-UK-Radioactive-Waste-Storage-Review-Stakeholder-Workshop-Report-October-2008.pdf>

⁴⁰ UK Radioactive Waste Storage Review, Draft. January 2009

<http://www.nirex.co.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=27276>

part of the work and plans are already underway to facilitate this. In addition, NDA is engaging with the reconstituted CoRWM including a specific working group on interim storage. The NDA says it wants comments on this draft version of the Review and another stakeholder workshop will be held in February 2009 to seek further views before final publication on 31 March 2009.

8.6 CoRWM has also been working on an interim storage report which it intends to publish in March 2009. It has been seeking comments on its outline report.⁴¹

8.7 Another document - the Strategy Management System - Stakeholder Issues Baseline Document - exposes the thinking of some non-NDA organisations and their views on waste management, for example the suggestion that some wastes might be disposed of on site.⁴²

9.0 NDA Plutonium Options

9.1 The future of the UK's stockpile of over 100 tonnes of plutonium will be decided by the Government during 2009. The NDA began consultations on this in August 2008,⁴³ with the publication of a plutonium options study.⁴⁴ The Nuclear Free Local Authorities has produced a new briefing on options for dealing with plutonium stockpiles available here:

<http://www.nuclearpolicy.info/docs/radwaste/RWB18.pdf>

9.2 The NDA's finalized "Credible Options Paper" (redacted slightly) has now been published and formally presented to the Government.⁴⁵ Responses to the consultation document⁴⁶ and workshop reports⁴⁷ are also available. A final strategy is unlikely to be ready much before 2012 or 2013.

9.3 The Credible Options (Technical Analysis)⁴⁸ reveals that the £470m Sellafield MoX Plant looks set for closure. The NDA is examining the closure because the plant has performed badly since it opened 10 years ago. The demise of the long-troubled Sellafield Mox plant (SMP) would be an embarrassment for ministers at a time when they are trying to persuade sceptics that a new generation of atomic plants can be delivered on time and on budget.⁴⁹

10.0 Managing Radioactive Waste Safely

10.1 Cumbria County Council has now agreed to make an "expression of interest" for those parts of the County covered by Copeland Borough Council and Allerdale Borough Council.⁵⁰

⁴¹ Outline of CoRWM Interim Storage Report (March 2009). December 2008 Version.

<http://www.corwm.org.uk/Pages/Involving%20People/2500%20-%20CoRWM%20Interim%20Storage%20Report%20Outline.%2019%20December%2008.pdf>

⁴² Strategy Management System; Stakeholder Issues Baseline Document

<http://www.nirex.co.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=25290>

⁴³ Times 18th August 2008

http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/utilities/article4553489.ece

⁴⁴ <http://www.nda.gov.uk/stakeholders/newsletter/plut-options-study.cfm>

⁴⁵ <http://www.nda.gov.uk/stakeholders/newsletter/plut-credible-options.cfm>

⁴⁶ <http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=26498>

⁴⁷ See Workshop Reports: <http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/upload/Plutonium-Options-Stakeholder-Workshops-Report-October-and-November-2008.pdf> AND NDA response to the October Workshop. <http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/upload/NDA-Response-to-Plutonium-Workshop-Report-Executive-Summary-October-2008.pdf>

⁴⁸ <http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=27419>

⁴⁹ Guardian 17th Feb 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/feb/17/sellafield-plant-closure>

⁵⁰ Guardian 10th December 2008 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/dec/10/lake-district-nuclear-waste-dump> Whitehaven News 10th December 2009 <http://www.whitehaven-news.co.uk/news/business/1.282959>

10.2 Bob Loux, the former director of the Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects, appeared on local radio to tell Cumbrians in no uncertain terms what he thought about Cumbria's plan to volunteer for a high-level nuclear waste dump. The State Government in Nevada has been campaigning against the Yucca Mountain nuclear dump.⁵¹

10.3 The decision to turn down the invitation to store nuclear waste in Cornwall was questioned by some county councillors. Cornwall County Council's executive voted narrowly in support of a recommendation that no expression of interest should be submitted for the geological disposal facility for nuclear waste in December. Councillors were attracted by the substantial financial benefits package on offer.⁵² However, plans to re-open the subject had to be scrapped. Opponents claimed it was a victory for people power. One of the leading campaigners against the nuclear waste plans said that the dozens of comments left by readers on the local newspaper's website played a part in forcing a u-turn by councillors.⁵³

10.4 Former Labour cabinet minister Chris Smith, now Lord Smith of Finsbury, who was appointed as the new chairman of the Environment Agency in May 2008, says the long-term storage and disposal of high-level nuclear waste is the “*great unsolved issue*” of nuclear fission. “*It is an absolute necessity if a new nuclear programme goes ahead that the issue of high-level waste is properly resolved.*”⁵⁴

11.0 Low-Level Waste

11.1 Drigg and Carleton parish – population around 600 – have received £50,000 thanks to having the country's only radioactive low-level nuclear waste disposal site on its doorstep. The parish will receive the windfall every year for the next 60 years because it bears the greatest impact through having the repository as its near neighbour. It comes out of the massive cash injections Copeland will share as a whole for supporting the long-term operations of the LLWR site on the outskirts of the village. The formal setting up of The Copeland Benefit Fund now enables the first money to be released.⁵⁵

11.2 It has now been announced that another £30,000 a year is to flow into Copeland, directly from the operation of the low-level repository in addition to the annual £1.5 million under an agreement with the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA). The funding is linked to Vault 9, a massive £20 million project now under construction.⁵⁶

11.3 Management at the Low Level Waste Repository near Drigg have advertised in the Whitehaven News for former workers to help them find out what's in there. They have employed a team of consultants to interview ex-employees who worked at the site in 1960s, 70s and 80s. The aim is to build up a picture of what was stored there, how it was buried and to prove or disprove some famous myths about the place. At the same time, they hope to create an 'oral history' of the facility.⁵⁷

⁵¹ See Radiation Free Lakeland.

<http://web.mac.com/mariannebirkby1/iWeb/Radiation%20Free%20Lakeland/Dump%20Diary/80EF1570-C615-4A76-B1B6-83F459C4B337.html>

⁵² West Briton 6th Jan 2009 <http://www.thisiscornwall.co.uk/westbriton/Councillors-decision-nuclear-waste/article-589760-detail/article.html>

⁵³ West Briton 12th Jan 2009

<http://www.thisiscornwall.co.uk/westbriton/Nuclear-waste-invitation-scrapped-thisiscornwall-uk-direct-influence/article-606858-detail/article.html>

⁵⁴ Making Local Connections on a Global Threat, Publicservice.co.uk, October 20, 2008 http://www.publicservice.co.uk/feature_story.asp?id=10661&topic=

⁵⁵ Whitehaven News 17th Dec 2008 <http://www.whitehaven-news.co.uk/news/1.285939>

⁵⁶ Whitehaven News 21st Jan 2009 <http://www.whitehaven-news.co.uk/news/1.502226>

⁵⁷ Whitehaven News 13th Feb 2009 <http://www.whitehaven-news.co.uk/1.513354>

11.4 Plans for a £110m low level waste dump near the village of Buldoo, next to Dounreay, have been conditionally approved by Highland Council. Dounreay Site Restoration Ltd (DSRL) plans to build a series of disposal vaults.⁵⁸

12.0 Radioactive Discharges

12.1 Magnox Electric Ltd **was found guilty of unlawfully** allowing radioactive waste to seep from a decontamination unit at Bradwell in Essex for 14 years, at Chelmsford Crown Court.⁵⁹ Waste leaked into the ground between 1990 and 2004. The Environment Agency, told the jury that leaks were caused by a combination of poor design and a lack of checks and maintenance.⁶⁰ The leak was not discovered until the twin reactors were decommissioned five years ago.⁶¹

12.2 Following the court case, Mike Weightman, chief inspector at the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate, defended the nuclear regulator, saying it was not possible to "inspect or check every feature of a complex plant". But as soon as the leak was discovered the NII did all it could to ensure the cause of was identified and dealt with.⁶²

13.0 Sellafield

13.1 A government decision to rush through a scheme to indemnify the consortium which took over Sellafield from any liability for a nuclear accident is to be investigated, by the Speaker of the Commons.⁶³ A complaint was made by Paul Flynn MP that former energy minister Malcolm Wicks had not properly consulted MPs when he granted the consortium an indemnity. Wicks used emergency procedures – and informed two select committee chairmen just before the parliamentary summer recess – because he said it was urgent to sign the deal. The consortium had threatened to walk away unless Britain waived its rights to charge companies the first £140m for the costs of any accident.⁶⁴ There are, of course, concerns that this will set a precedent and companies planning to build new reactors in the UK will also want an indemnity for the cost of accidents.

13.2 The Prime Minister welcomed the confirmation of potential locations for new nuclear power stations by the NDA while on a visit to Sellafield on 23rd January.⁶⁵ Norwegian TV reported that there was a radioactive leak from a ventilation pipe in the old (Magnox) part of Sellafield on the same day, but it took 5 days before Norway was informed by the UK.⁶⁶

⁵⁸ BBC 14th Jan 2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/7828278.stm>

⁵⁹ Guardian 7th Feb 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/feb/06/bradwell-operator-guilty>

⁶⁰ Independent 7th Jan 2009

<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/green-living/nuclear-power-station-owners-allowed-leaks-1230047.html>

⁶¹ This is Total Essex 8th Jan 2009

<http://www.thisistotalessex.co.uk/news/BRADWELL-Radioactive-leak-nuclear-plant/article-596452-detail/article.html>

⁶² Guardian 2nd Feb 2009

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/feb/02/nuclear-power-leak>

⁶³ Guardian 23rd January 2009. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2009/jan/22/sellafield>

⁶⁴ Independent on Sunday 4th Jan 2009

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/ios-investigation-officials-plotted-sellafield-coverage-1224473.html>

⁶⁵ eGov Monitor 27th Jan 2009 <http://www.egovmonitor.com/node/23205>

⁶⁶ Norwegian TV news 28th Jan 2009 <http://www.nrk.no/nyheter/utenriks/1.6454647>

13.3 A transport of MOX fuel from France to Japan is being prepared. It will be transported on an NDA ship.⁶⁷

14.0 Waste from new reactors

14.1 The French EPR reactor – the type most likely to be built in the UK – will be more powerful than any other reactor in commercial use – but will use about 15% less uranium and produce 30% less waste. But information obtained by Greenpeace suggests it will be more radioactive by a factor of seven because more uranium is burned up. That will make it more expensive to handle and store safely. It will pose greater dangers to workers from higher radiation doses during transfer and storage and will need to be stored for longer in areas above ground, where it is potentially exposed to terrorists.⁶⁸

14.2 Spent nuclear fuel contains most of the radioactivity from the new reactors, but neither government nor its regulators have assessed its "disposability", or the health effects of managing it. The Nuclear Industry Association says a repository dealing with legacy wastes could readily accommodate the smaller volumes of easier-to-handle wastes from the new nuclear plants. But because the spent fuel from EDF's planned reactors in England will be hotter and more radioactive than waste from existing reactors, there are serious doubts about its disposability.⁶⁹ Yet the NDA is keeping its assessments of this new waste secret.

15.0 Scottish News

15.1 The First Minister's Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) published their First Annual Report in December.⁷⁰ Amongst its recommendations was one calling on the Scottish Government to commission an independent assessment of the full economic costs and abatement potential of the various energy options open to Scotland. The CEA said achieving an 80% reduction in carbon emissions by 2050 will be difficult, and if Torness and Hunterston are not replaced alternative non-fossil or low-fossil forms of power generation or Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) will be required to contribute more than would otherwise be the case.

15.2 Apparently the CEA was divided on the nuclear issue so the request for an independent study, including an assessment of whether nuclear is necessary, was a compromise.⁷¹

15.3 The Scottish Government's response in January⁷² accepted the recommendation to commission a study. It said it would also provide a paper setting out the Government's current energy policy for the Council to consider. The results of the study and the paper will be considered

⁶⁷ Areva Press Release 28th Jan 2009

<http://www.lahague.aveva-nc.fr/scripts/aveva-nc/publigen/content/templates/Show.asp?P=8317&L=EN>

⁶⁸ Greenpeace UK 2nd Feb 2009

<http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/media/press-releases/planned-nuclear-reactors-will-produce-seven-times-more-hazardous-waste-20090202>

Independent on Sunday 8th Feb 2009

<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/green-living/new-nuclear-plants-will-produce-far-more-radiation-1604051.html>

⁶⁹ Guardian 3rd Feb 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/feb/03/1>

⁷⁰ <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/252027/0073770.pdf>

⁷¹ Times 14th Dec 2008. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/scotland/article5342388.ece>

⁷² Scottish Government Press Release 15th Jan 2009

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Releases/2009/01/15135203>

by the Council during 2009.⁷³ Alex Salmond was confident the independent study would vindicate his position.⁷⁴

15.4 Disagreements have emerged between Scottish Labour MPs and MSPs over whether the Scottish Government should be stripped of some of its powers. Chief among MPs concerns are planning powers which give Scottish ministers control over the construction of new energy projects. The SNP Government has declared it will use the powers, enshrined in the Electricity Act, to ensure no new nuclear power stations can be built. But Labour MPs are warning of the threat to Scotland's future energy security after Torness and Hunterston, are decommissioned. The disagreements have surfaced as the Party puts together its submission to the Calman Commission.⁷⁵

15.5 The Labour MP acting as secretary to the Westminster group is John Robertson - chair of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Nuclear Energy in the House of Commons.⁷⁶ Writing in the Scotsman Robertson says planning over energy should be brought back to the UK level. The issue should not be painted as taking power from Holyrood, says Robertson. It is about shoring up the devolution settlement and making sure we get the right decisions on energy for Scotland's future.⁷⁷ Labour MSPs, on the other hand, say removing powers from Holyrood is 'bad politics'.

15.6 Mike O'Brien, the Energy Minister, told a conference in Edinburgh in February the UK Government has no plans to change constitutional laws in order to allow nuclear power stations to be built in Scotland, pulling the rug from under the feet of the Labour MPs who have been arguing for amendments to the Scotland Act.⁷⁸ It also renders pointless a division of opinion within the Scottish Labour Party over whether to recommend to the Calman Commission that decision-making over provision of power stations should revert to London.

15.7 A Scottish Council for Development and Industry report says new nuclear power plants should be considered to ensure energy security for Scotland. The report – The Future of Electricity Generation in Scotland⁷⁹ - by consultants Wood Mackenzie - concludes that Scotland can meet its target of generating 50% of its electricity from renewables by 2020 and continue to export electricity to England and Northern Ireland.⁸⁰ But this would require a five-fold increase in the number of wind farms.

15.8 Director of WWF Scotland, Dr Richard Dixon, said he thought the report exaggerated the role of onshore wind. He envisaged more of a mix of renewables, including offshore wind, wave and tidal power, to meet the 2020 targets. He questioned the stance of the SCDI, which he said was historically "very close to the nuclear industry", and suggested they were using "scare tactics" in their predictions of extra wind farms.⁸¹ He said "Any proposals [for new reactors] would be a huge financial distraction from developing the renewables."

⁷³ Scottish Government Response to the First Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisors. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/257232/0076373.pdf>

⁷⁴ Scotsman 16th Jan 2009

<http://news.scotsman.com/politics/Independent-study-on-nuclear-power.4883378.jp>

⁷⁵ Scotland on Sunday 8th Feb 2009 <http://news.scotsman.com/scotland/Labour--split-as-MPs.4958481.jp>

⁷⁶ <http://www.allparty-nuclear.org.uk/>

⁷⁷ Scotsman 10th Feb 2009

<http://thescotsmanscotsmans.com/opinion/We-need-nuclear-power.4962555.jp>

⁷⁸ Times 11th Feb 2009 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/scotland/article5704932.ece>

⁷⁹ The Future of Electricity Generation in Scotland, by Woods Mackenzie, SCDI, 9th Dec 2008 http://www.scdi.org.uk/energy/SCDI_Future_of_Electricity_Generation_in_Scotland.pdf

⁸⁰ SCDI Press Release 9th Dec 2009. <http://www.scdi.org.uk/mg/pr/PR091208.pdf>

⁸¹ Scotsman 9th Dec 2008. <http://thescotsmanscotsmans.com/latestnews/-Scotland-39will-have-to.4773213.jp>

15.9 Liberal Democrat energy spokesman Liam McArthur said he was "disappointed" at the nuclear recommendation. "This would be the cuckoo in the nest," he said. "It would draw vital investment away from genuine renewables, while leaving Scotland with a longer and costlier legacy of waste disposal." Labour's energy spokesman Lewis Macdonald said "Beyond 2020, the report is clear that new baseload will be needed, and says that new nuclear should be considered as a potential part of the longer term generation base in Scotland. To rule out nuclear as the SNP wish to do is therefore clearly to reduce the chances of Scotland being able to meet its future energy needs." ⁸²

16.0 Nuclear Power and Jobs

16.1 The nuclear debate in Scotland has hinged recently on the issue of jobs rather than climate change or energy security. UK energy minister Mike O'Brien said Scotland is "turning up its nose" at thousands of highly paid high-skilled jobs. He claimed each new reactor would create around 9,000 jobs during construction. ⁸³

16.2 Mike O'Brien was in Edinburgh for a conference organized by Peter Hughes, chief executive of the manufacturers' group Scottish Engineering and Derek Simpson, joint general secretary of the Unite trade union. Scottish Enterprise Minister, Jim Mather refused to attend the Powering Scotland conference. Mike Farley, of Doosan Babcock Energy, and Bill Coley, chief executive of British Energy, were among the industrialists attending. Hughes said "*someone has to stand up and say [the Scottish Government] policy is nonsense. Can you imagine the number of jobs that would be created if we backed nuclear and coal? We need a replacement for Torness and Hunterston. One would be a step in the right direction*". ⁸⁴

16.3 John Robertson MP also claimed the announcement of preferred sites for new reactors in England and Wales already shows Scotland is paying for its anti-nuclear policy because investment in skills, jobs and infrastructure is going south of the border. ⁸⁵

16.4 The Scottish Government, on the other hand, said: "*Scotland has vast clean, green and renewable energy potential. Estimates suggest that generating power from our natural resources can create at least 16,000 green jobs over the next decade. It would be foolish, misguided and plain wrong to turn our back on those possibilities or sacrifice them in pursuit of dangerous and unnecessary new nuclear power stations, a view backed by parliament as a whole on behalf of the people of Scotland.*" ⁸⁶ During First Minister's questions at the beginning of February Alex Salmond said: "*Anything you invest - and it will be billions in nuclear power - is billions taken away from clean technology and in renewable technology.*"

17.0 Nuclear Spin Doctors

17.1 Attacks on the Scottish Government's policy continued with a speech by Secretary of State for Scotland, Jim Murphy at a conference of nuclear communicators held in Edinburgh on 16th and 17th February. He accused Scottish ministers of failing to come up with a sophisticated argument for their opposition to nuclear power.

⁸² BBC 9th Dec 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/7771304.stm>

⁸³ Scotsman 10th February 2009

<http://news.scotsman.com/latestnews/39Axing-nuclear-will-force-out.4962650.jp>

⁸⁴ Scotland on Sunday 8th Feb 2009 <http://scotlandonsunday.scotsman.com/energyutilities/Salmond-told--to-grasp.4958218.jp>

⁸⁵ Scotsman 10th Feb 2009 <http://thescotsmanscotsmans.com/opinion/We-need-nuclear-power.4962555.jp>

⁸⁶ Scotsman 10th Feb 2009 <http://thescotsmanscotsmans.com/comment/Burning-Issue.4962605.jp>

17.2 By 2025 all but one of Britain's nuclear stations will have ended service and without new nuclear plant Scotland may depend on electricity imported from across the border in peak periods. "*Scottish self-reliance without new nuclear generation is imaginary*," said Mr Murphy. Ministers in London had been "convinced" by the evidence for a new generation of power stations, better designed and more efficient than those they replaced. He went on to claim there are early signs that greater realism is entering the debate in Scotland and that in a changing world where some countries use energy as a tool of geo-politics nuclear has to be part of the low carbon mix.⁸⁷

17.3 Deputy First Minister Nicola Sturgeon said Jim Murphy was just plain wrong for backing nuclear power. The contrast couldn't be clearer, while Jim Murphy was speaking to a conference of nuclear spin doctors in Edinburgh, Alex Salmond was opening the new offices of a marine renewable company - the latest renewable company to base its operations in Scotland.⁸⁸

17.4 Martin O'Neil, now chair of the Nuclear Industry Association, told the conference that latest opinion polls showed that 40% of Scottish citizens were in favour of nuclear energy, but only 24% against.⁸⁹

17.5 Several commentators were questioning why the UK Government has taken it upon itself to attack the Scottish Government on its nuclear policy. After all, there are plenty of sites in England for new reactors without having to build any in Scotland. It seems that the nuclear industry and the UK Government cannot tolerate a Scottish Government prepared to hold out against nuclear expansion plans,⁹⁰ perhaps because of a fear that Scotland may be able to provide an example of how to develop a non-nuclear energy strategy. Richard Dixon, Director of WWF Scotland said Labour has decided nuclear is something it can use to ridicule the SNP. He pointed out it was ironic that Jim Murphy made his nuclear rallying call on the same day that 10 offshore wind power sites were announced which at peak output will produce three times the capacity of Scotland's nuclear stations, enough to meet all of Scotland's electricity demand.⁹¹

18.0 Companies

18.1 GDF-Suez, a company 35 per cent-owned by the French Government, which is made up of the Belgian nuclear utility, and the French gas company, has formed a partnership with Iberdrola, the Spanish owner of Scottish Power and Scottish & Southern Energy (SSE). Together, they plan to build at least two new reactors in the UK on existing nuclear sites that are due to be sold by the Government. GDF-Suez and Iberdrola are expected to each control a 40 per cent stake in the venture. Scottish & Southern Energy (SSE) is expected to join as junior partner, with 20 per cent. Vatenfall, the Swedish utility group, is in talks with GDF-Suez and Iberdrola about entering alongside SSE as a junior equity partner.⁹²

⁸⁷ Herald 16th Feb 2009

http://www.theherald.co.uk/news/news/display.var.2489572.0.Jim_Murphy_SNP_has_no_argument_against_nuclear_power.php

⁸⁸ Press and Journal 16th Feb 2009

<http://www.pressandjournal.co.uk/Article.aspx/1079694?UserKey=>

⁸⁹ UK Government to underline its support for new nuclear at Scottish Conference, Foratom and NIA Press Release, February 10, 2009.

http://www.foratom.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3091&Itemid=66

⁹⁰ Rob Edwards 15th Feb 2009 <http://www.robbedwards.com/2009/02/cool-welcome-for-nuclear-spin-doctors.html#more>

⁹¹ Scotsman 18th Feb 2009 <http://news.scotsman.com/scotland/QA-Dr-Richard-Dixon-on.4989965.jp>

⁹² Scotsman 5th Feb 2009

<http://business.scotsman.com/business/French-giant-joins-SSE-in.4948439.jp>

18.2 Now that there are no Scottish utilities left not involved in producing or planning to produce yet more nuclear waste it is recommended that householders switch supplier. Good Energy, which already provides 100% renewable electricity, will soon be providing a dual fuel tariff that promotes renewable energy use, and a new renewable heat incentive. Good Energy will use money it makes from its gas customers to reward people who are reducing their use of fossil fuels by heating their water with solar panels, and eventually other forms of renewable heat.⁹³

19.0 Chapelcross

19.1 Fifty workers at the Chapelcross nuclear site are to be made redundant over the next 15 months. But 100 staff have had their jobs secured for an extra year after changes to the UK defuelling programme for nuclear sites. De-fuelling of Chapelcross's Magnox reactor was due to be completed this April, which would have meant 150 employees being laid off by April 2010. The date has now been shunted back to 2011, meaning 50 staff will go in the next 15 months and the other 100 a year later.⁹⁴

19.2 A £2.5m investment to help tackle the economic impact of the closure of Chapelcross has been announced. The majority of the funding from the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) will create an industrial park on land near the site. Decommissioning work is currently under way at Chapelcross near Annan in Dumfries and Galloway. The grants are designed to support economic regeneration projects in the Gretna, Lockerbie and Annan area.⁹⁵

20.0 Dounreay

20.1 Dounreay's detailed emergency planning zone has been reduced from 5km to 1.15km. Dounreay Site Restoration Ltd says the change reflects the lowering of the radiological hazard at Dounreay because of decommissioning. The reduction brings the number of affected households down from over 200 to just 5. The justification for a smaller planning zone has been accepted by the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate of the Health and Safety Executive, which has formally notified Highland Council as the body responsible for all emergency planning in the region.⁹⁶

21.0 Scottish Alternatives

21.1 Nearly four out five homes in Scotland are in need of repair, with one in four households in fuel poverty, according to official data. The Scottish House Condition Survey 2007, published by Scotland's chief statistician, found 79% of homes should have some work done, with 49% of these in urgent need. Elizabeth Leighton, of environmental group WWF Scotland, called for urgent action and greater investment to tackle fuel poverty, saying it "is unacceptable in our modern society".⁹⁷

21.2 Unfortunately the Scottish Government's Energy Efficiency Action Plan has been delayed. It won't now be published until late in 2009 – it had previously been promised in 2008. This is the fourth time since the plan was originally proposed four years ago that it has been delayed.⁹⁸

⁹³ <http://www.goodenergy.co.uk/how-to-go-100-green/good-energy-gas-heat/>

⁹⁴ Cumbria Business Gazette 15th Jan 2009 <http://www.businessgazette.co.uk/1.406293>

⁹⁵ BBC 6th Feb 2009 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/south_of_scotland/7874146.stm

⁹⁶ Dounreay Site Restoration Ltd. 8th Jan 2009 <http://www.dounreay.com/news/2009-01-08/emergency-planning-zone-shrinks-to-115km>

⁹⁷ Herald 28th Nov 2008
http://www.theherald.co.uk/news/news/display.var.2471329.0.Half_of_the_homes_in_Scotland_are_in_need_of_urgent_repairs.php

⁹⁸ Sunday Herald, 14 December 2008
http://www.sundayherald.com/news/heraldnews/display.var.2475095.0.anger_at_fourth_delay_to_energypower_plan.php

21.3 Scottish Government plans for a massive expansion in green energy employment were cautiously welcomed yesterday by environmental groups. Finance Secretary John Swinney announced the move, saying it would help Scotland through the recession and provide a sustainable economy for the future. At a conference in Glasgow he announced plans to invest in renewable technology to help create up to 16,000 jobs over the next 10 years. He said the Scottish Government will be implementing their Renewable Energy Action Plan which is hoped to boost production and deliver cost savings for consumers. Plans to increase power from wave wind and water technology to lower carbon emissions and reduce reliance on fossil fuels will, he said, put Scotland at the forefront of a global renewables industry.⁹⁹

21.4 The reason for the muted response from environment groups was probably due to the small amount of money in the final budget for energy efficiency schemes. Duncan McLaren, chief executive of Friends of the Earth Scotland, said: "Lord Nicholas Stern has suggested 0.8% of GDP, equivalent to £650m for Scotland, is urgently needed."

21.5 The Green Party's two MSPs had been campaigning for the budget to include an ambitious 10-year scheme to provide free insulation for every home in Scotland. They say that by spending £100m a year to do the job, this investment would be repaid many times over not just in terms of savings per household, particularly those facing fuel poverty, but in the contribution to the country's carbon emissions target.¹⁰⁰

21.6 In the event, the final budget included only £15m over the next year to insulate up to 100,000 homes - well short of what is needed, with two million Scottish homes requiring action.

21.7 One of the main disagreements between the Government and the Greens was over the provision of free insulation to every household – even those not on a low income. The Finance Secretary made clear he had no intention of supporting such a scheme, and proposed instead additional money for a means-testing approach. The Greens' idea was based on the successes of a scheme in Kirklees which is successfully delivering free, area-by-area and door-to-door insulation. They claim means testing has failed across the UK. The National Audit Office published a report setting out the major failures of this approach as applied in England and Wales.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Herald 3rd Feb 2009

http://www.theherald.co.uk/politics/news/display.var.2486510.0.Swinney_announces_plans_to_create_16_000_green_jobs.php

¹⁰⁰ <http://www.warmscotland.org>

Herald 12th Jan 2009

http://www.theherald.co.uk/politics/news/display.var.2480895.0.Greens_insulation_plan_would_save_782m_per_year.php

¹⁰¹ Guardian 4th Feb 2009 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2009/feb/04/fuel-grants-household-bills>