

From: Karen Templin
Sent Date: Wed Feb 11 23:49:12 2026
To: Wesleyville Nuclear Integrated Assessment / Évaluation Intégrée Wesleyville Nucléaire (IAAC/AEIC)
CC:
Subject: Comments for the proposed nuclear plant at Port Hope Ontario

Good evening Federal Decision Makers,

Thank you for receiving my comments on the plan to build a large nuclear plant in Ontario in Wesleyville in Port Hope.

I believe as many others do, that we could best meet Ontario's electricity needs, as many other countries in the world are now doing, faster, at lower cost and with less risk than building another large nuclear plant.

First, I submit that the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada needs to order a full impact assessment and hold public hearings with respect to Ontario Power Generation's proposal to build a new nuclear station in Port Hope and secondly consider the lower cost, lower risk, safer and more secure and faster to build energy alternatives to new nuclear projects.

The cost of electricity generated from new nuclear reactors is 2 to 8 times greater than wind and solar energy and battery storage.

Every new nuclear project in Ontario's history has gone massively over budget. In fact, on a global basis the average cost overruns for nuclear projects are 120% compared to averages for solar and wind which are 1% and 13% respectively. The plant at Darlington cost 4.5 times its budgeted cost and now some of the plants such as this one are currently being refurbished at further great cost before the full cost of constructing them in the first place has been paid off.

These cost overruns virtually bankrupted the former Ontario Hydro and consequently Ontario Hydro was broken into five separate companies and the \$20.9 billion of stranded nuclear debt was transferred to the Ontario Financial Corporation. For many years there was a nuclear debt retirement charge on our electricity bills to pay off this stranded debt. The taxpayers of Ontario are expected to cover these costs on their energy bills which are now increasing, but the actual cost is so excessive that much of these costs are now absorbed into the provincial debt for which all Ontario taxpayers are responsible. Such money should be better spent on services such as health and education which are in desperate need of improved funding.

According to a report released by the IESO in August 2025, wind and solar combined with batteries can meet at least 99.5% of Ontario's electricity needs under all weather scenarios.

Furthermore, according to the IESO report, wind, solar and batteries can provide baseload power at 14 to 29% lower cost than new nuclear. And they can provide peak power at 80 to 84% lower cost. For example, OPG and its partners, Six Nations of the Grand River Development Corporation and the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation built a large solar farm with nearly 200,000 panels on the site of the former coal-fired Nanticoke Generating Station on Lake Erie.

With Canada's largest battery storage project nearby in Jarvis Ontario this region is positioned to become a clean energy powerhouse. OPG could triple the size of its Nanticoke Solar Station and develop solar across the rest of this site to supply enough additional power for another 15,300 homes. Clean energy technologies are evolving and improving rapidly every year.

For example, tidal turbines are in the experimental stage now to generate energy using the reliable movement of ocean tides. This suggests a new energy source from tidal movement in

James Bay which could help generate energy cheaply for the people living in the Northern regions of the province.

The actual cost effectiveness of wind and batteries and solar and batteries to meet our electricity needs compared to new nuclear is probably even greater than the IESO's estimates. Such projects including offshore wind can be built quickly in 6 to 24 months and are much faster options to phase out imported American gas power to meet our climate objectives and reduce our dependence on energy imports from the U.S. which represent over 70% of Ontario gas used in the province.

OPG is considering building American-designed nuclear reactors at Port Hope which would require Ontario to import enriched uranium from the U.S. to fuel them; imports which could be cut off at any time by the current U.S. government. Alternatively, Great Lakes offshore wind power could meet more than 100% of Ontario's electrical needs and produce as much electricity as the proposed Port Hope Nuclear Station. OPG's Wesleyville site could be used to connect a Lake Ontario wind farm to Hydro One's transmission grid. A Solar Farm on this site could produce enough electricity to power every home in Port Hope.

Further, a Great Lakes wind farm built with consideration to bat and bird migration patterns, can protect the natural world as well as stabilize our climate and lower our electricity bills.

Finally, any proposal for new nuclear reactors must consider the extra costs of Nuclear Reactor decommissioning and storage of Nuclear Waste. These high costs need to be included in the total cost of a new nuclear plant by the IACC. The IACC must also consider the very high safety risks which nuclear reactors present. Radioactive wastes must be fully isolated from people and the environment for one million years or more. Most communities are not in favour of hosting the storage of nuclear waste. Some of the proposed sites for the waste implicate water sheds which run into the neighbouring province of Manitoba which does not welcome it.

Transportation and storage of nuclear waste entail high safety risks to people and the environment as do threats to the plants themselves from geological events such as earthquakes, floods, fires, etc. as examples from around the world have demonstrated.

Thank you for receiving my comments and considering them in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Karen Templin

<personal information removed>