

**Notes for Press Conference December 12, 2005 re OPA
Supply Mix Advice – Theresa McClenaghan**

Friday's Supply Mix advice by the Ontario Power Authority was based in part on a "life cycle environmental analysis" that biased the results in favour of nuclear power. This part of the analysis was carried out by SENES: Specialists in Energy, Nuclear and Environmental Services. It is based largely on a "weighting system" that arbitrarily weights one type of environmental impact, greenhouse gases, as twenty times more significant than another type of environmental impact, for example, radioactivity. This is the kind of analysis you would set up if you want nuclear power to appear more environmentally benign than it is.

The report completely failed to capture all of the significant environmental and health impacts and risks that nuclear power presents.

- . The design of the study explicitly excluded severe accident risks.**
- . The study discounted the intractable problem of highly radioactive used fuel that will remain toxic and dangerous for a million years.**
- . It left out ground water impacts which are one of the major environmental risks of uranium mining.**
- . The report left out transportation for all sectors but transport of toxic radioactive used fuel is of huge import.**
- . The report authors decided not to include human health and safety as a separate factor on the basis that it would be captured in air quality impacts. But for the nuclear power life cycle, major health and safety impacts occur in uranium mining, milling, mine tailings, radioactive emissions to air and water of routine nuclear power plant operations, as well as in used fuel handling, storage, and**

transportation over the million year time frame of that spent fuel.

- . Accident risks are left out because of their calculated low probability according to the nuclear engineers but in no other form of electricity generation except nuclear power would a severe accident leave much of the population of southern Ontario looking for another place to live.**
- . The assessment of waste impacts in the study is on the basis of the weight of the used fuel and other wastes; NOT on its toxicity! Furthermore, the Decommissioning study looked only at waste volumes, and not at health and safety issues.**

Ontario environmentalists call on the McGuinty government to reject this biased advice based on an analysis that was guaranteed to give nuclear as the answer.

Ontario environmentalists call on the McGuinty government to be brave enough to have the open and public debate on nuclear power that it promised, in a transparent and democratic forum, with opportunity for true participation by the Ontario public.

The OPA report was not developed in an open, transparent and participatory manner. Giving very little time for submissions in the middle of the summer; not allowing the public to see the submissions that it was considering until the end of its process; not allowing any forum for debate, questioning and response, nor any testing of evidence and assumptions do not amount to an open, democratic process. The OPA's Supply Mix Advice is one report that should be relegated to dust collection status on the nearest shelf and the Ontario government should start over with a real evaluation of Ontario's electricity options. *The Minister*

Should reject this report & go back to square one with a focus on efficiency & renewables.