

SUBMISSION TO NWMO RE APM
FROM TOM LAWSON
DEC.10, 2008

My name is Tom Lawson. I am a lifelong resident of Port Hope, and have been immersed in nuclear issues since our 1995 "Crazy Caverns" crisis.

That scheme was to bury a million tonnes of radioactive and toxic waste right under our waterfront. I initiated the citizens coalition that challenged and defeated it. Having learned nothing from their humiliation, the same people are now planning to build a similar Caverns complex twice the size near Kincardine on the Bruce Peninsula!

The present plan is to concentrate all Port Hope's waste just west of town on a wetland! Meanwhile the Cameco Corporation, whose facility has dominated, defaced, and contaminated not only our waterfront, but the whole community for 60 years, is planning further expansion, including the highly dangerous processing of SEU (enriched uranium).

Our town is tragically divided. Everyone on both sides knows that an urban centre is no place for such a facility. The problem is that no other community wants it.

Perhaps the above will enable you to understand the following.

I have four fundamental objections to your plans for long range storage of nuclear waste:
i) Feasibility, ii) Ethics, iii) Safety, and iv) Cost.

- i) **FEASIBILITY:** In purely engineering terms, APM strikes me as no more likely to work than were the Crazy Caverns. There are simply too many "ifs" involved, and the notion that deep rock "disposal" (an oxymoron) can ever be foolproof seems to me to Alice-in-Wonderland dreaming. We are no closer than we were 40 years ago to a solution for nuclear waste. Since there is no such thing as permanent disposal of anything in creation, the most permanent jobs anywhere will be for those managing and monitoring nuclear waste. Surely the only responsible farsighted policy is to stop producing the stuff.
- ii) **ETHICS:** The prospect of finding a willing host strikes me as unrealistic. Your excessive focus on bribing an aboriginal community to abandon its traditional sense of the sanctity of the Earth is essentially unethical. It reminds me of the French Government conducting its nuclear tests among the inhabitants of the Pacific Islands.
- iii) **SAFETY:** I understand that nothing in the engineering world can be guaranteed beyond 500 years. When you consider that human civilization covers 10,000 years, 500 years is a really a very short time. We need at least the aboriginal Seventh Generation perspective.

- iv) COSTS: The costs of nuclear schemes have always proved far above the industry's estimates. They promise to drain off the bulk of funds desperately needed to develop cleaner, greener, more efficient technologies.

Throughout your massive, meticulously prepared, impressively professional literature, you seem to me so focused on PROCESS that you can't see the woods for the trees. What is the source of the problem? Can anything be done about THAT? Where is there room for genuine farsightedness? I have a button that says "If you can't change your mind, are you sure you still have one?"

Are we capable of changing the WAY we think (and the way we act), or are we in a straitjacket, condemned to trying to solve our problems by the very thinking that created those problems?

Nuclear Waste Management Organization
Moving Forward Together: Designing the Process for Selecting a Site

1. Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?

NO

2. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?

WE CAN'T

3. From what models and experience should we draw in designing the process?

None exist to do the job responsibly

4. Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?

Those who select such a site should be personally liable for the implications of what they decide. Ideally the site should be where they live & not imposed on others.

5. What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?

They would have to be sufficient to rob me of farsightedness, and of my ability to think clearly.

6. What else needs to be considered?

You really need to consider the impossibility of what you are undertaking, & to look again at the future of the nuclear industry & its part in the collapse of industrial civilization.

Please return to:

Nuclear Waste Management Organization
22 St. Clair Avenue East, 6th Floor
Toronto, ON M4T 2S3

Attention: Dr. Anda Kalvins
Fax: 647.259.3007

- ☒ Please check this box if you agree to your submission being posted on our website.
☐ No, I do not wish to have my submission posted.

Dear NWMO + Alvin Kalving -

Most of my 75 yrs. in Port Hope has been spent on nuclear waste; not your kind but sufficiently damaging to health + home that millions of \$ have already been spent by us taxpayers.

My most encouraging exercise to try + reach reasonable decisions was during the Siting Task Force process when a group of us representing the industry, the workers the 3 municipalities involved at that time, + others sat down together, listened to each other + came to some conclusions in the kind of open, transparent process you advocate. At that time we were classified as 'Host Communities.'

All this work was overturned by a newly appointed Sec. General who refused to follow the procedures described in the Siting Task Force constitution + then went on to initiate "the Caverns" scheme.

I would be happy to document/describe this but I only do the phone + you don't pay

attention to it. History is important.
We have files in the Port Hope Library.

Yours sincerely,

Patricia Lawson

Nuclear Waste Management Organization
Moving Forward Together: Designing the Process for Selecting a Site

1. Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?

NO
How can we advertise we have a process based on a sound foundation + ethical principles that does not address the future ie more fuel rods? I have children + grandchildren.

2. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?

It should be as close to the majority of users of the electricity as is deemed technically safe.

3. From what models and experience should we draw in designing the process?

The fuel rods are toxic to all life forever. The information we have now is what does not work ie the high sea, the caves in Europe. I am not confident there can ever be a forever solution. The contamination of ground water in Port Hope proves disastrous to the lake + land by the day.

4. Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?

The people + especially the mothers as well as the political leaders - from every area under consideration. It seems you have managed this, well.

5. What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?

Regular Conference calls in order to hear other points of view + other experience. We cannot meet without financial help

6. What else needs to be considered?

involvement in projected
inventories of fuel rods: new fuel rods from refurbished
& new Reactors.

Please return to:

Nuclear Waste Management Organization
22 St. Clair Avenue East, 6th Floor
Toronto, ON M4T 2S3

Attention: Dr. Anda Kalvins
Fax: 647.259.3007

- ☒ Please check this box if you agree to your submission being posted on our website.
☐ No, I do not wish to have my submission posted.