Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today.

My name is Scott Travers and I am representing the Society of Energy Professionals, a union of engineers, scientists, supervisors and other professionals representing 7,200 people who work in Ontario’s electricity industry.

I am happy to be here in Hamilton today. I obtained my degree in Chemical engineering just down the road, at McMaster University. From there, several of my classmates and I started our professional careers at the Bruce Nuclear Power development. I now live just outside Hamilton’s boundaries but I still have roots here in Hamilton.

As I mentioned, I am here today representing the Society of Energy Professionals. Our members work in all aspects of the industry. Over half of them directly support nuclear generation at Bruce Power and Ontario Power Generation and several hundred of our members work in the various coal-fired generation plants including Nanticoke on Lake Erie.

There are approximately 140 Society members living in the city of Hamilton and hundreds more living in the surrounding communities.

Our union has recently published a document entitled: "Getting It Right: A Real World Vision of Ontario’s Electricity System for 2025”.

You can read the entire plan by going to our website at www.gettingitright2025.ca.

Our plan is the culmination of a years work by many dedicated members of our organization. It’s a real world plan, based upon practical, realistically achievable recommendations for meeting the future electricity needs of our province.
Today, however, I'd like to speak to you about the part of our plan that addresses the need for more nuclear power and the role that we believe that our coal-fired generating stations should play in meeting Ontario's electricity supply needs.

Before we can start a meaningful discussion, I want to share with you the standards by which the Society developed our plan. We believe that advances in the electricity system must be measured against these three standards:

- sustainability, reliability, and affordability

--with the need to respect and conserve our environment as a core concern.

We call it a "Living in the Real World" approach to decision making. It is a plan developed by daily experience designing, building and operating the most advanced and complex electricity system in Canada.

The ultimate test for decisions about choosing the right generation sources for the next century, should be based on three criteria:

1. That they will deliver the power we need when we need it,
2. That they will not foul the air and indeed our planet; and
3. That they are affordable to those who use the power.

Failing to meet any of these tests should take a proposal "off-the-table."

Looking out 20 years, we can only meet that test through a combination of nuclear power, renewable, water and wind generation.
In the short term, we should only use fossil fuel fired power to meet peak demand while covering base load generation through non air-polluting nuclear and renewables.

We must upgrade our existing coal plants using state of the art technology to make coal burning cleaner. Two of our coal burning units at Lambton are already among the cleanest in North America. This technology must be extended to our remaining plants.

And we must prioritize the retrofit of our coal burning stations to use cleaner fuel, such as biomass, to meet peak demand.

Coal has been an obvious target for years but natural gas is also a polluting, non-renewable fossil fuel. It is more and more prohibitively expensive, and there is already not enough available supply to economically run even the few gas burning generation plants we have in Ontario now.

Our plan, “Getting it Right,” lays out the case, the why and the how for doing all of this. We believe it is a way for Ontario to meet its need for reliable, affordable power that does not pollute our air with smog and greenhouse gas.

Make no mistake about it; Ontario faces a serious shortage of electricity in the near future. According to the Independent Electricity System Operator’s data, there was already insufficient reserve capacity as early as 2005.

Today, the IESO’s website says:

“While our immediate power needs are being met, Ontario faces a long-term supply shortfall. By 2014, close to 13,000 MW of Ontario's electricity requirements will need to be met with new supply or demand-side resources.”

(That’s almost as much as four cities the size of Toronto)
The right mix of electricity generation is the one that makes sense because it can actually be done, because it will deliver the supply we need, at affordable prices, and because it protects and enhances our natural environment.

Globally, we are on the verge of a nuclear renaissance. With the commitment to refurbish reactors at Bruce Power in Ontario, and Point LePreau, in New Brunswick, and the recent commitment of Ontario’s government to new-build nuclear generation, Canada appears to be fully part of this international trend.

A number of factors are responsible:

- Nuclear generation is necessary for Canada to meet its Kyoto targets to fight global warming.

- The increasing price and price volatility of natural gas have repositioned the economics of nuclear powered generation.

- Domestic supply concerns with respect to natural gas, in concert with political instability in jurisdictions with ample supply of oil and natural gas, have given rise to renewed concerns about security of energy supply.

In the short run, to meet our twin goals of reliable power and clean air, nuclear generation, not fossil fuels, should supplement Ontario’s run-of-the-river hydro resources to provide Ontario’s base-load generation.

CANDU is a unique, Canadian, nuclear power generation technology. It is the right choice for the addition of new generation capacity. CANDU reactors are amongst the best performing reactors in the world. In 2005 three CANDU units were amongst the top 10 performers in the world (out of 440 nuclear power reactors worldwide).
We need to get on with the decision to build new nuclear power. Site requirements, transmission capacity, and community acceptance have, for some, made Darlington and Bruce “obvious” choices. Other sites have been studied before and should be considered again for future requirements.

While we haven’t performed the studies that would be necessary to qualify Nanticoke and the surrounding area as potential sites for a nuclear power generating station, we believe it should be seriously considered.

It should be noted that the transmission system was designed with generation at Nanticoke in mind and it is essential to keep generation of some type there. The transmission grid without some generation at Nanticoke would be like a table with a leg missing. It just wouldn’t work very well.

On the issue of what kind of generation to have at Nanticoke, any decision to locate a nuclear plant here would require an environmental assessment hearing and significant public consultation. Voting against today’s resolution will in no way limit public debate should a proposal be put forward.

To arbitrarily place a moratorium on the consideration of nuclear power would deny the public their right to be informed about the details and deny them an opportunity to present their views.

Make no mistake about it, our plan needs Ontarians to have confidence in nuclear power and that confidence requires keeping CANDU as our own, proven safe technology and keeping AECL as a publicly owned, and therefore publicly accountable, institution.
It will allow Ontario to have clean air sooner, as it protects our natural environment. And, it will protect homeowners, businesses and services by keeping electricity affordable.

This plan requires courage - courage to accept that Canadian nuclear power is what 40 years experience has proven it to be, clean, reliable and safe.

Ontario relies on nuclear power for over 50% of it’s electrical energy. Half the power you use comes from a CANDU nuclear reactor. I had a look.

“Getting it Right” requires us to face up to the constraints of real world Ontario, including that the supply of natural gas is not sufficient to make it a viable alternative to coal.

It also means accepting that currently available emission control technology can and will turn a liability into an asset, giving us reliable, sustainable and affordable power in the short run even as we stop using coal for base-load, reserve it for meeting peak demand, and then wean ourselves from it, step by step, as we retrofit coal plants to use renewable biomass.
In Summary:

- Ontario needs electricity.
- Nuclear power is clean, safe, reliable, and affordable.
- Nanticoke has an important role in meeting Ontario’s electricity needs.
- If any nuclear plant were to be proposed for the Nanticoke area, there would be an environmental assessment process allowing for a full debate.

For all of the reasons stated above, should you defeat the motion before you.