



**Written submission from
Andrew Philip Jobes
and Sarah Jean Crane**

**Mémoire de
Andrew Philip Jobes et
Sarah Jean Crane**

In the Matter of the

À l'égard de

**BWXT Nuclear Energy Canada Inc.,
Toronto and Peterborough Facilities**

**BWXT Nuclear Energy Canada Inc.,
installations de Toronto et Peterborough**

Application for the renewal of the licence for
Toronto and Peterborough facilities

Demande de renouvellement du permis pour les
installations de Toronto et Peterborough

Commission Public Hearing

Audience publique de la Commission

March 2 to 6, 2020

Du 2 au 6 mars 2020

*This page was intentionally
left blank*

*Cette page a été intentionnellement
laissée en blanc*

January 27, 2020

Senior Tribunal Officer, Secretariat
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
280 Slater Street, P.O. Box 1046, Station B
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5S9

Sent by email to cns.interventions.ccsn@canada.ca

RE: Intervention by Andrew Philip Jobes and Sarah Jean Crane for the BWXT Licence Renewal (Hearing Ref. 2020 - H - 01)

To whom it may concern:

We (Andrew Philip Jobes and Sarah Jean Crane) are writing to express our opposition to BWXT's move towards starting uranium pelleting in Peterborough, Ontario. We request that the regulator deny this part of BWXT's application and deny or limit its overall licence renewal. We oppose uranium pelleting for the following reasons:

1. **Health:** There is no safe level of exposure to uranium. Uranium pelleting will increase the amount of uranium dust released into the Peterborough airspace and is likely at some point in time to increase radiation levels in local waterways, as well (GE-Hitachi has had releases in the past, as has the BWXT facility in Toronto). The ALARA approach used to regulate emissions is a situation such as this is inadequate to the potential health risks that pelleting presents to us, our 7-year-old son, our friends, neighbours, and the broader Peterborough community.
2. **Potential numbers of people exposed to risk:** The proposal is for a facility that is centred in a residential area and across the road from Prince of Wales Public School. Our son (and about 400 other children) attends Queen Mary Public School, which is only 1.1 kilometres from the proposed site. It has been suggested that uranium dust would affect the area within a 2-kilometre radius of the site. This is a 12.5-square-kilometre area. We (and thousands of others) live within this area. GE-Hitachi has had breaches in the past, resulting from both human and natural (flooding) causes.

The building is 125 years old and is likely ill-equipped to contain What about any of this makes uranium pelleting seem like a wise or reasonable choice?

3. **Property Value:** Our home lies within the 2-kilometre radius of the BWXT facility, and we are concerned that if uranium pelleting occurs there, the market value of our house will be negatively affected.

4. **Environmental health and long-term energy sustainability:** We recognize that nuclear power generation is currently a provincial priority in terms its overall electrical power production strategy, especially with the elimination in Ontario of coal-fired electrical production in recent years. This is a highly toxic means of producing electricity, from extraction to refinement to waste disposal) with impacts that persist for hundreds, if not thousands, of years. The direction that electrical production must take in the long-term is to increase the expansion of existing renewable energy sources, such as solar, wind, hydro, and the research and development of emerging renewable energy production technologies. For this reason, we also recognize that there may be a demand for uranium pellets, but strongly oppose its introduction anywhere, but especially at the proposed location.

Sincerely,

Andrew Philip Jobes & Sarah Jean Crane
[REDACTED] Peterborough, Ontario