

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Dave Martin" <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>
To: "Mark Winfield" <markw@pembina.org>; "Theresa McClenaghan [CELA]" <mcclenat@lao.on.ca>; "Keith Stewart" <keith@torontoenvironment.org>; "paul Gipe" <pgipe@ontario-sea.org>; "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@EXECULINK.COM>; <cco@web.ca>; <christy.ferguson@yto.greenpeace.org>; <farp@sympatico.ca>; <jetchevery@davidsuzuki.org>; <jgibbons@pollutionprobe.org>; <jo.dufay@yto.greenpeace.org>; <mcarter@davidsuzuki.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>; <xboston@davidsuzuki.org>
Cc: "Dave Martin" <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>; "Keith Stewart" <keith@torontoenvironment.org>; "paul Gipe" <pgipe@ontario-sea.org>; "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@EXECULINK.COM>; <cco@web.ca>; <christy.ferguson@yto.greenpeace.org>; <farp@sympatico.ca>; <jetchevery@davidsuzuki.org>; <jgibbons@pollutionprobe.org>; <jo.dufay@yto.greenpeace.org>; <mcarter@davidsuzuki.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>; <xboston@davidsuzuki.org>; <akoehl@sierralegal.org>; <christine.elwell@sympatico.ca>; <tom.adams@nextcity.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2004 10:45 AM
Subject: minutes of nuke meeting

I thought I would send these out just to make sure everybody received them
 - Cheers, Dave M.

Ontario Nukes & Electricity Meeting

Greenpeace Office, Toronto, September 16, 2004

In attendance: Dave Martin GP, Brad Cundiff OCAA, Jack Gibbons OCAA, Keith Stewart TEA, Mark Winfield, Pembina, Christy Ferguson GP (taking notes), Jo Dufay GP (by phone), Brennain Lloyd, Northwatch (by phone), Dale Marshall DSF (by phone), Theresa McClenaghan CELA (belatedly).

1. Review of current activities

Jack: Has produced a new pamphlet that will go out to all Toronto Life subscribers, members, and others; is looking for help on distribution. Is putting a push on Bruce Power by the high cost of nuclear power. He argues that the Bruce deal should be included in the RFP bidding process, with the argument that if the government is going to pay for nukes that decision should be the result of a competitive bidding process in which nuclear power has to compete with gas.

Keith: Has a book about Ontario Hydro coming out. TEA is helping coordinate the Low Income Energy Network; working with CELA, legal aid lawyers, and other groups to argue for conservation programs that target low income people. Is also a member of the Ontario Electricity Coalition, and will try to get that group to denounce the special deal with Bruce.

Mark: Is co-sponsoring a renewable energy forum [details?]

Dave: Has been working on Bill 100. Sent out letters by email to all MPPs, as well as personal letters to McGuinty, Duncan, and Epp. Has met with some committee members. Overall Greenpeace strategy on Energy is still being developed.

2. Discussion of opportunities for action

Dave raised the OEN meeting on November 19/20 as a possible place for an energy meeting [OEN can provide the facilities at the conference (near Milton) on Saturday evening and Sunday for free for the electricity discussion] Dave also suggested the return of the Ontario legislature on October 12 as a possible date for action. Also suggested that the group revisit the statement developed at last year's meeting, and pull it together in time

for mid-October.

Keith said that TEA is going to encourage groups to work at the local level, in their own municipalities on the low income issue.

Brad suggested that a common campaign be developed around the three main holes in the provincial government's argument: 1) that nukes are emissions free (reconstitute nuclear waste as emissions); 2) security of supply; and 3) economics. Suggested that different groups could take on different components of the strategy. Dave suggested that poor nuclear performance be added as a fourth component and that secure supply is not just about gas - renewables and conservation are "secure".

Jo suggested that the different components of the campaign be brought together in mid-October with some sort of public launch. The group expressed concern about how newsworthy that would be if the campaign was made up of the usual suspects, and agreed that we need to develop a 'coalition of the unlikely'. Suggestions for coalition partners included the Council of Canadians, unions, the low income energy coalition, CEP, CAW, and Caccia.

Idea to tear apart the Bruce agreement was raised, to showcase the deal as Liberal backroom dealing. Possibility of a NAFTA Chapter 11 challenge. Highlight that the Bruce deal is exposing rate payers to risks, including further Chapter 11 challenges. Would need one lead organization, and a lawyer with expertise in trade law. Suggestions included Appleton, Michelle Swenarchuck, and Howard Mann. The first step is to get a legal opinion.

3. Next steps

Mark will approach Howard Mann for a legal opinion on the NAFTA challenge.

Dave will work to use the OEN meeting as a place to follow up and release the work started last winter.

Brad will take a first crack at writing a group statement denouncing the Bruce Power lease and the new arrangements as a sweetheart deal. Once that is done, Keith will shop it around with unions and others.

Keith will track down the report of the Ontario Auditor General on the original Bruce agreement.

End

David H. Martin, Energy Co-ordinator, Greenpeace Canada
250 Dundas St. W., Suite 605
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5T 2Z5
TEL 416-597-8408 X 3050 CELL 416-627-5004 FAX 416-597-8422
ICQ 269129334 E-mail dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org
www.greenpeace.ca

CELA/PEMBINA LOGO'S

MEDIA RELEASE

**ONTARIO'S FUTURE ENERGY SUPPLY DOES NOT INCLUDE NUCLEAR
OR
SUSTAINABLE ELECTRICITY IN ONTARIO WITHOUT NUCLEAR
OR
NO NEED FOR NUCLEAR POWER IN ONTARIO'S FUTURE SAY PEMBINA AND
CELA**

March 22, 2004

TORONTO.

The Pembina Institute for Appropriate Development and the Canadian Environmental Law Association today responded to the OPG Review Committee report released March 15, 2004. In that report, John Manley, Jake Epp and Peter Godsoe, the members of the Review Committee, made several comments with which CELA and Pembina agree:

- Ontario must make increased use of renewable power including wind, solar, biomass and small scale hydro
- Ontario should make best use of existing hydro-electric assets
- Conservation is the "cleanest means of filling Ontario's supply gap"
- Diversity of generation is a must

CELA and Pembina also agree that there will have to be increased reliance on natural gas for electricity generation, at least as a "bridge" to a fully sustainable Ontario energy future.

"However, the OPG Review Committee got it wrong when they stated that there is a need for new nuclear plants in Ontario," stated Theresa McClenaghan, counsel with the Canadian Environmental Law Association. "Not only is nuclear hugely expensive and extremely risky, but it's not needed."

"We can reach Ontario's energy needs even after we phase out both coal and nuclear power in the province", stated Mark Winfield, Director, Environmental Governance with the Pembina Institute. "Instead of investing tens of billions of dollars in nuclear power, we must make decisions today to invest in aggressive conservation and renewable power."

CELA and the Pembina Institute are conducting a study to investigate the potential contributions of energy efficiency measures, non-utility co-generation, and low-impact renewable energy sources to Ontario's electricity supply over the next twenty years. The study will take into consideration both technical and economic factors in its assessment of these options. The study is expected to be completed in early April 2004.

“The Ontario government must not let itself be pushed into multi-billion dollar irrevocable decisions by scare-mongering,” said McClenaghan. “The technology to achieve the needed conservation and renewable energy scenario that Ontario needs already exists,” said Winfield.

For further information:

Mark Winfield, Director, Environmental Governance
Pembina Institute for Sustainable Development 416-978-5656

Theresa McClenaghan
Canadian Environmental Law Association 416-960-2284 ext. 218