



CMD 25-H2.51

Date: 2025-05-08

**Written Submission from
Mary Veltri**

**Mémoire de
Mary Veltri**

In the matter of the

À l'égard d'

Ontario Power Generation Inc.

Application to renew power reactor
operating licence for the Darlington
Nuclear Generating Station

Ontario Power Generation Inc.

Demande concernant le renouvellement
du permis d'exploitation d'un réacteur de
puissance pour la centrale nucléaire de
Darlington

**Commission Public Hearing
Part-2**

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

June 24-26, 2025

24-26 juin 2025

Mary Veltri
Thunder Bay, On

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

May 8, 2025

Dear Commissioners:

RE: Ontario Power Generation's Application to Renew Darlington Nuclear Generating Station's License for 30 years

I am writing to express my opposition to an application by Ontario Power Generation (OPG) to renew its operating license at the Darlington Nuclear Station for 30 years. I reside in Thunder Bay, Ontario and am one of thousands of people who are opposing the proposal to bury and abandon Canada's high level nuclear waste in Northwestern Ontario, as evidenced by numerous petitions to the federal and provincial governments. I am generally concerned about nuclear safety, radioactive releases and the risk of harm to human health and the environment.

I am concerned about the unprecedented length of time being proposed by OPG for its operating license at the Darlington Nuclear Generating Station. To commit to continued nuclear power with its inherent risks for such a long time will divert attention and public resources from developing safer, cleaner and sustainable forms of energy which use renewable sources like wind and solar. 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. Rather than prolonging the use of nuclear energy, we should be phasing it out for health, safety and environmental reasons.

The ever-increasing volume of accumulated high level nuclear waste without a socially acceptable and proven-to-be safe solution for its long-term storage will become even more problematic if nuclear reactors are allowed to continue operating for such a long time. 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 am especially concerned about the long-term burden of nuclear waste, including the Nuclear Waste Management's (NWMO's) current decision to transport, process, bury and abandon all of Canada's high-level nuclear waste in a single location, namely the Revell site in the heart of Treaty 3. My home is located 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 in 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. Many question the legitimacy of the site selection process which purports to be consent based by designating two small communities as “willing hosts” and then paying them millions of dollars to secure their compliance. The site selection decision is already subject to a legal challenge from Eagle Lake First Nation and there will likely be more legal challenges. Without a long-term solution for disposing of high-level nuclear waste, which remains radioactive for tens of thousands of years, it doesn’t make sense to keep creating this extremely toxic waste. It will continue to pose 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 for a license renewal, I am opposed to the request that the license be granted for 30 years. I understand that Darlington’s last operating license was granted for 10 years which represented a significant lengthening of its previous license period which had been granted for 6 years. Licensing hearings provide an opportunity for environmental organizations, health experts and the public to engage in a process where expert knowledge, diverse perspectives and public concerns can be taken into consideration by the CNSC in its decision. The OPG argues that there are mid-term meetings that suffice for the CNSC to review operations but it is not the Commission’s practice to amend licensing requirements at these meetings. In addition, the only funding available for intervenors is at licensing hearings. Thirty years is a very long period during which time climate, ecological and species changes can be significant. In light of the rapidly increasing impacts of climate change, the decline in biodiversity and species loss, the conditions and factors that were relevant to the decision this year are likely to be drastically different in 30 years. In addition, technological advances may provide far more sustainable, safer and economical means of producing energy.

For the aforementioned reasons I respectfully submit that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission should refuse to grant OPG a renewal of their operating license at the Darlington Nuclear Generating Station. In the alternative the license should be granted for a much shorter time period in the range of 5 to 10 years.

Thank you for taking this submission into consideration.

Yours truly,

Mary Veltri