

Feedback Form

Pathways to Decarbonization – February 24, 2022

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Boyd Reimer

Title: Click or tap here to enter text.

Organization: Click or tap here to enter text.

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: March 16, 2022

Following the February 24 engagement webinar, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from stakeholders on the items discussed during the webinar. The webinar presentation and recording can be accessed from the [engagement web page](#).

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by March 16. Please attach research studies or other materials for consideration by the IESO to support your submission.

If you wish to provide confidential feedback, please submit as a separate document, marked "Confidential". Otherwise, to promote transparency, feedback that is not marked "Confidential" will be posted on the engagement webpage.

Policy

Topic	Feedback
Are the assumptions indicated reasonable and comprehensive in terms of scale and timing?	Click or tap here to enter text.

Topic	Feedback
Are there other considerations for the IESO?	Click or tap here to enter text.

Demand

Topic	Feedback
Are the assumptions indicated reasonable and comprehensive in terms of scale and timing?	Click or tap here to enter text.

Topic	Feedback
Are there other considerations for the IESO?	Click or tap here to enter text.

Resources

Topic	Feedback
Are the assumptions indicated reasonable and comprehensive in terms of scale and timing?	Click or tap here to enter text.

Topic	Feedback
Are there additional data sources that we should consider	Click or tap here to enter text.
Are there other considerations for the IESO?	Click or tap here to enter text.

General Comments/Feedback

I support the March 8, 2022 submission by Jack Gibbons, Chair of the Ontario Clean Air Alliance. Also see additional attached document. Thank you.

Choosing Nuclear Power is Needlessly Putting More Tools of Death Into Our Future: Two existential crises and the obvious alternative

“Atomic Accomplice: How Canada deals in deadly deceit” a book written by Paul McKay in 2009 has a foreword by David Suzuki.

One chapter is called, “Plutonium, the immortal outlaw.” (p 129) The word “immortal” refers to the fact that plutonium remains lethal for 250,000 years.

McKay writes, “As a matter of physics, plutonium is created in every nuclear reactor of every make, model, size, purpose, or country of origin or operation...It takes a mere 8 kilograms to make a Nagasaki-scale bomb....”

He continues, “Each year the odds grow worse that some of this accumulating, effectively immortal plutonium will be diverted by pariah states, or sold covertly for cash, or stolen for a bomb or nuclear blackmail. In 2009, the International Atomic Energy Agency disclosed that its data base includes 1,646 reports of trafficking, theft or loss of nuclear materials since 1995, including 18 involving plutonium or highly enriched plutonium.”

If there were that many reports in only 14 years (1995 – 2009), imagine what is likely to happen in the next 250,000 years - the length of time that plutonium remains lethal!

By choosing nuclear power to “keep the lights on,” and thereby creating plutonium, we are choosing to steadily grow a stockpile of new and unprecedentedly dangerous tools of death and suffering to all who live on Earth for the next 250,000 years.

That argument against nuclear power and its waste is stronger than the traditional argument against nuclear waste:

The traditional argument against nuclear waste is that peace loving people will accidentally come into contact with the deadly cancer-causing plutonium. This could happen when our ever-changing Earth’s geology puts that plutonium into our water flows. The Earth’s geology is inherently unstable. (Over the time span that plutonium remains lethal, even entire continents can move considerable distances.) Any unpredicted or uncontrolled variable in our geology in those 250,000 years can act as a destabilizing force, and increase the chances that the deadly cancer-causing plutonium finds its way into our water tables and drinking water, and/or the air we breathe.

Plutonium emits intense alpha radiation and therefore can cause cancer at nano-scopic levels, especially when inhaled as a dust or aerosol. (McKay, pg 132)

That traditional argument does have merit, but it is dwarfed by the much larger probability that some party(s), in the next 250,000 years will **purposely look for plutonium** and unleash its deadly powers on the rest of us, or use it as a threat to further their own ends.

Those party(s) could be a small group of people, or any one of thousands of new geopolitical entities or sub-entities that will inevitably evolve or be formed over the next 250,000 years.

By using nuclear power, and thereby creating plutonium, we are increasing the odds that humanity will cause much death and suffering upon itself, or even destroy itself and cease to exist.

That is nature of the existential crisis that nuclear power and its waste gives us.

And, yes, we also face the existential crises of climate change.

Must we use the existential crisis inherent in nuclear power to steer away from the existential crisis of climate change?

Is it necessary to choose between those two existential crises in order to “keep the lights on?”

Are we damned if we do, and damned if we don't?

No. Renewable energy is the obvious and necessary alternative to both.

NOTE:

The above is found at the below link. Feel free to share.

<https://wearetheboat.blogspot.com/2021/03/choosing-nuclear-power-is-needlessly.html>