



CMD 25-H2.20

Date: 2025-05-05

**Written Submission from  
Kelly Clune**

**Mémoire de  
Kelly Clune**

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

---

**From:** Kelly Clune  
**Sent:** Monday, May 5, 2025 3:33 PM  
**To:** Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN); Prime Minister/Premier Ministre  
**Cc:** Federal Green Caucus; Steven.Guilbeault@parl.gc.ca; Speaker.president@parl.gc.ca; monique.pauze@parl.gc.ca; Yves-Francois.Blanchet@parl.gc.ca; patty.hajdu@parl.gc.ca; chrystia.freeland@parl.gc.ca; mark.holland@parl.gc.ca; jonathan.wilkinson@parl.gc.ca; gary.anand@parl.gc.ca; info@anishinabec.ca; Info@Anishinabec.ca; Kebaowek@Kebaowek.ca  
**Subject:** Re: OPG request for 30-year license to expand nuclear reactors.

---

EXTERNAL EMAIL – USE CAUTION / COURRIEL EXTERNE – FAITES PREUVE DE PRUDENCE

---

To: CNSC Members and Leaders of Canada,

Please resist the temptation to throw good public money after bad into nuclear energy. Renewable energy options promise a safer, more affordable future for Canada. Supercharging renewable energy now will improve energy security by providing uninterrupted, affordable energy in the immediate future.

Most people agree that energy sources must be clean, affordable, sustainable, and protective of future generations. Now is the time for Canadian leaders to redirect finances from overpriced nuclear projects to a healthy mix of renewable energy options.

Please reject OPG's request for a 30-year license. This would result in unnecessary financial and environmental hardship now and for future generations.

For decades, the nuclear industry has pushed dangerous, costly nuclear energy under the guise of "clean energy" and "job creation". The industry has promised economic value, energy security, and strong relations with Indigenous Peoples. Sadly, some politicians have fallen for the rhetoric.

Nuclear is not "clean energy" since toxic chemicals are released in production and disposal. Studies show that renewable energy is one of the fastest-growing job sectors in North America, with Solar creating six times as many jobs as nuclear. It is a stretch for the industry to promise economic value and energy security when public subsidies extend into multi-billions to the nuclear industry, when nuclear generates only a small fraction of energy in Canada. Finally, it is disingenuous to promise "strong relationships with Indigenous Peoples", when the ultimate goal of the nuclear industry is to secure acceptance to bury nuclear waste on native lands.

Let's be honest, when people have facts about nuclear energy, they are concerned about costs, risks, or both. The truth is, no one wants nuclear waste buried in their community. Can a "host" community be found? Of course, but not without nefarious strategies, i.e. bribes, influence, deception, etc. E.g. South Bruce was promised \$8M for participating in consultations and expressing a willingness to be a "host community".

Of course, nature has no boundaries, so when one community becomes a "host", that dumping ground negatively impacts others. A "host community" venture is just a devious scheme developed to secure compliance for a project. It is unacceptable that our federal government allows the industry-funded Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) to lobby communities, make promises, and pit neighbours against one another.

Thank you in advance for your reply to the 21 questions that follow.

Awaiting your reply,

Kelly Clune

1. What will it cost Ontario taxpayers to build the 4 nuclear reactors, proposed by the Ford government for Durham's Darlington Nuclear Facility?
2. Why does Canada continue to hold the public hostage to nuclear energy when numerous studies reveal that it is the most expensive form of energy?
3. Is it true that the nuclear industry has been in decline, due to high costs and mistakes, and in order to sustain itself, the industry is banking on securing more public funds for small modular reactors (SMR)'s, which have failed to date?
4. How much did the public pay to finance the now bankrupt Ultra Safe Nuclear Corporation, which was involved in the SMR project at Chalk River Laboratories?
5. Radioactive nuclear waste from over 8 decades of operations at Chalk River Laboratories, and hazardous waste imported from other domestic and international sites, is consider "intermediate-level waste" by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and required to be placed underground, so how is it possible that a Near Surface Disposal Facility (NSDF) could be approved?
6. 140 municipalities in Quebec and Ontario opposed or expressed concerns about nuclear waste being dumped into a NSDF, and the City of Ottawa specifically asked waste imports to be stopped. Why was the request disregarded?
7. The Anishinaabe community opposed the NSDF, disposing of nuclear waste along the Kitchissippi River and their traditional territory, where Chalk River flows. How can Canada claim to respect Indigenous People without their full consent?
8. The Kebaowek First Nation wrote to Canada's Minister of Environment and Climate Change, in January 2024, to ask that a permit be denied to clearcut the NSDF land in order to protect biodiversity, endangered species, active bear dens and threatened wolves. What consideration did the Minister give to these concerns and what was the response to this request?
9. Why is the CNSC pursuing Chalk River NSDF when there is public outrage for this proposal? Is the CNSC private or public?
10. Why is the CNSC moving forward with a NSDF when 141 municipalities have said no, Ottawa has said no, Indigenous nations say no, everyone informed person consulted says no? Who is ultimately in charge?
11. Why is the nuclear industry allowed to produce more nuclear waste when there is no safe, affordable, sustainable program to deal with existing nuclear waste?
12. The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) had two sites for its proposed \$26B nuclear waste disposal site. South Bruce became a "willing host" with 51% of 3,138 votes. How can this process be serious, when a small number of people decide the fate of a highly dangerous, controversial plan with a \$26B cost to taxpayers?
13. It was reported that South Bruce received \$8M for its "participation in consultations and willingness to host" and that a "confidential agreement" was made with Saugeen Ojibway Nation to "work out something similar". (<https://thenarwhal.ca/ontario-nuclear-waste-ignace-decision/>) What promises were made to Ignace and Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation? Why are confidential agreements being made with public funds? Shouldn't the public be privy to details?
14. A majority has opposed nuclear expansion and waste sites, (i.e. 36 of 41 said no). Why then is our government siding with the nuclear lobbyists and ignoring the public? Do elected officials or bureaucrats, or both, have a vested interest?

15. What are the financial risks incurred by government (the public), as a result of its strategy of partnering with the private industry sector on nuclear projects?
16. How is our government ensuring a “polluter pay” principle, in public/private partnerships, so corporate polluters (i.e. nuclear industry), are responsible to cleanup nuclear projects and waste, instead of the public financing these costs?
17. The public is ultimately paying a high price consortium to manage nuclear facilities. How will the federal government ensure transparency in contracts?
18. If Canadian taxpayers paid \$8M, in 2015, to a multinational consortium called “Canadian National Energy Alliance”, contracted by the Harper government to manage Chalk River site and clean up radioactive waste there and at other federally owned facilities, why did costs to Canadian taxpayers at Canada’s nuclear labs increase from \$336M per year to over \$1.5B per year? Since this consortium took over Texas-based Fluor Corporation was paid \$4M? Please explain allegations of financial fraud related to the nuclear waste and if/how it was “cleaned up”.
19. Apparently, those previously associated with government Ministers now campaign for the nuclear industry (i.e. Former candidates, advisors to Ministry of Justice, Environment, Indigenous Affairs, etc.). A former Commissioner was recently in Europe lobbying for her company, and the Speaker of a Ministerial Advisory Committee, appointed Chair of the Commission, also owns a nuclear company - Lou Riccoboni, listed on the Canadian Nuclear Laboratories website as VP of Corporate Affairs and Business Development? Is he paid from public funds to lobby ministers? As a partner at Prospectus Associates, he has reportedly boasted about assisting with federal procurement captures in nuclear sectors, and, as President of Nexus government services, assists with international contracts. How will the government address the disturbing pattern of overlap between the roles of government, the private sector, and lobbyists?
20. How much public money has been paid to salaries of private industry executives to lobby for public funds? Do they declare it to the lobbyist registry?
21. Is it true that nuclear energy lobbyists go through the Privy Council Office to make recommendations to cabinet to reduce regulations (similar to oil and gas industry strategies), in order to seek exemptions from impact assessments under the act, because the industry wants reactors to be exempt to eliminate constraints on development and installation of nuclear reactors?