

Thank you for this opportunity to address the CNSC.

Like many citizens who have asked to intervene, I have no formal expertise in nuclear science, and I have never worked in any branch of the nuclear industry. Like many other citizens, I am deeply concerned about what our society is doing to our environment, both in our own lifetimes, and in the lifetimes of our children and grandchildren. With those concerns in mind, I have become a registered supporter of Environmentalists for Nuclear Energy, and I add my voice in support of the important points made by Rod Anderson in his presentation yesterday.

Since having the good fortune to move to Port Hope two years ago, I have been raising a family just a few hundred meters from Cameco's conversion facility.

As a close neighbour of Cameco, I'd like to focus on two issues, which have broad implications here and in many other places as well.

The first is the issue of emissions from Cameco's conversion facility. As one might guess, before I made a decision to buy a house in the neighbourhood of this plant, I did my own research, and satisfied myself that the activities at Cameco would not threaten the health of my family. And if evidence of unsafe emission levels ever emerged, I would certainly expect the CNSC to enforce safety regulations to immediately bring those levels down.

But, I urge the CNSC not to adopt a "zero-emissions" standard for the Cameco plant. I believe a "zero-emissions" standard would be pointless, unfair and unreasonable. Further, I believe a zero-emissions standard for Cameco and Zircotec would most likely result in unintended but serious damage to the environment for future generations.

Regarding uranium, in particular, I have studied with great interest the data about the concentrations of uranium in the air that I breathe, as a close neighbour of Cameco. This data shows that uranium concentrations are far below levels at which any damaging effects have ever been documented, either in humans, or in animals studied in controlled laboratory tests.

To consider just one guideline: the Minimal Risk Level for inhaled uranium, for chronic exposure, is reported by Health Canada to be $.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of air. How does this compare to the air I breathe every day?

There is a monitoring station on Shuter Street, just a block from my home. Over the past two decades this station has measured uranium concentrations at the high end of those measured in the residential areas of Port Hope. And yet these readings are far below the Minimal Risk Levels. For the past five years, they have averaged about $.004 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of air -- 75 times lower than the Minimal Risk Levels.

With these facts in mind, I reach the conclusion that changing to a zero-emissions standard would be of zero benefit to public health and safety. With uranium emissions already just a tiny fraction of Minimal Risk Levels, mandating further reductions would be pointless.

The negative consequences of imposing a zero-emissions standard for the nuclear industry, on the other hand, could be severe.

In the next generation or two, I believe, we will have increasing need for nuclear power. However, the imposition of a zero-emissions standard for Port Hope's nuclear industry might not only hobble the industry here, but it would set a precedent, which would be eagerly

seized upon by anti-nuclear groups around the province and across the country. If such developments impede the switch-over to non-fossil fuel sources of energy, the results will be tragic.

With each passing year, there is more evidence that the safety record of the nuclear power industry is far superior to that of any other major industry. Also with each passing year, there is more evidence of the staggering death toll caused by fossil fuel emissions. (To take just one example, the Ontario Medical Association estimates that smog contributes to the premature deaths of 5,800 people each year, in Ontario alone.) With each passing year, the scientific consensus grows stronger that our fossil-fuel consumption not only damages our own health, but now threatens our children and grandchildren with catastrophic climate change.

So it would be ironic in the extreme, if Cameco were expected to reduce its already safe levels of emissions to zero, while thousands of cars and trucks continue to spew their smog and greenhouse gas emissions in and around Port Hope every day.

I am not suggesting for a minute that Cameco should be allowed to cut corners on emissions. I think Cameco should maintain, and should be required to maintain, their emissions at levels well below the levels at which any health dangers have ever been documented. But let's keep this in perspective: the emissions which are a clear and present danger, and the emissions which must be drastically reduced, are not nuclear industry emissions, but fossil fuel emissions.

Finally, I would like to briefly address the issue of an environmental assessment for the bundling of SEU fuels at Zircatec in Port Hope. There have been calls in recent weeks for this assessment process to be expanded to a full panel review. As a local citizen, a

taxpayer, and an environmentalist, I believe that a full panel review of this project would be a great waste of resources and focus.

In Port Hope, we have already gone through years of public information sessions and public debate on issues around the processing of Slightly Enriched Uranium. Thousands of hours of time, on the part of citizens, private industry, and government regulators, have been devoted to this subject in Port Hope alone. If a full panel review were to be called now, we would devote months or years more to this subject. Another significant improvement in the efficiency of the nuclear industry would be delayed indefinitely, and therefore made more costly, perhaps to the point that the project would be cancelled. Anti-nuclear groups elsewhere would see this as a precedent, and call for full panel reviews every time the nuclear industry proposes to introduce a new or improved process. The major greenhouse-gas-free method of energy production would be impeded. Public attention would be diverted from the urgent priority of our age: the decommissioning of the fossil fuel economy.

The cost to taxpayers of just one panel review might well be in the millions of dollars.

And the cost to Port Hope residents would be that for another year, two or three, far more pressing issues of public health, safety and sustainability would be short-changed.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my concerns.