



**Written submission from
Mary Veltri**

**Mémoire de
Mary Veltri**

In the Matter of the

À l'égard d'

Ontario Power Generation Inc.

Ontario Power Generation Inc.

Application for a licence to construct one BWRX-300 reactor at the Darlington New Nuclear Project Site (DNNP)

Demande visant à construire 1 réacteur BWRX-300 sur le site du projet de nouvelle centrale nucléaire de Darlington (PNCND)

**Commission Public Hearing
Part-2**

**Audience publique de la Commission
Partie-2**

January 8, 2024

8 janvier 2024

Mary Veltri

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Via email: interventions@cnsccsn.gc.ca

To whom it may concern:

Re: Ontario Power Generation's Plan to Build More Nuclear Reactors at Darlington

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal by Ontario Power Generation (OPG) to construct four BWRX-300 reactors at Darlington. I am generally concerned about nuclear safety and radioactive releases and the risk of harm to human health and the environment. The nuclear accidents that occurred at Fukushima and Chernobyl are stark reminders of the significant harm that results from high level radioactive releases when nuclear technology fails.

I also see our society's investment in nuclear reactors as a major distraction from pursuing clean, green and renewable energy alternatives. Not only are alternatives such as wind, solar and geothermal much safer, they have a shorter start up time, enabling us to actually reach our GHG emission reduction targets sooner and they are far less costly. There are frequent cost overruns in nuclear construction which will ultimately be borne by the utility rate payers. Nuclear energy is not an environmentally sustainable source of electricity, particularly when looking at the whole fuel cycle from uranium mining and milling to the disposal of the highly radioactive waste which will create a long-term risk of contaminating earth, air and watersheds for future generations. Why pursue this option when there are far safer options with less of an environmental footprint?

I am especially concerned about the long-term burden of nuclear waste, including the Nuclear Waste Management's (NWMO's) current proposal to transport, process, bury and abandon all of Canada's high-level nuclear waste in a single location, with one option being the Revell site in the heart of Treaty 3. I live in Thunder Bay, close to a highway where nuclear waste may be transported for 50 years, 2-3 times a day. NWMO's proposed deep geological repository has no proven track record. Nowhere in the world is such a repository in operation yet or deemed safe to use. There is considerable opposition to this proposal in Northwestern Ontario, including Thunder Bay and among multiple First Nations in Treaty 3, Robinson Superior and Treaty 9. Finding a storage solution has already taken decades and the NWMO doesn't anticipate the proposed DGR to be in operation for another two decades. The NWMO proposal has already cost us millions of dollars, without even beginning construction, all of which is being paid for by rate payers. Nobody really wants nuclear waste buried in their watershed. The current willing host process is tantamount to bribing a few small communities who get to decide for a whole region whether it is acceptable to bury the waste in our region. Many question the legitimacy of the site selection process which purports to be consent based. Whatever location is chosen for the current DGR will probably result in legal challenges. Without a long-term solution for managing this hazardous waste which remains radioactive for tens of thousands of years, it doesn't make sense to keep creating this

toxic waste, which poses such a great risk to our environment and human health, has huge storage challenges and costs exorbitant amounts of money.

With respect to the OPG's actual application, I understand that they have failed to adequately address a number of items that are an essential requirement for a CNSC licensing application, including the following:

- A technical description of the reactor, including layout and design and design features
- Site characteristics, including exclusion zones, emergency planning, other radiological sources (such as the four CANDU reactors and large nuclear waste facilities on the same site)
- Safety issues and aspects related to the reactor design and operation, including criticality issues, security concerns, reactors safety systems,
- Radioactive waste and hazardous waste treatment systems
- The potential for severe accidents, probabilistic safety assessments
- Radiation sources, monitoring, and protection and radiological impacts
- Environmental monitoring
- Handling of radioactive and hazardous waste, including storage and disposal
- Decommissioning and End of Life Aspects, including financial guarantees

For all the aforementioned reasons, I respectfully submit that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission should refuse to grant OPG's application for a license to construct the BWRX-300 nuclear reactors at Darlington.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Veltri