PMD 13-P1.48

File / dossier : 8.01.07
Date: 2013-08-06
Edocs: 4181971

Oral intervention from

Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump Inc.

In the Matter of

Ontario Power Generation Inc.

Proposed Environmental Impact Statement for OPG's Deep Geological Repository (DGR) Project for Low and Intermediate Level Waste

Joint Review Panel

September 16 to October 12, 2013

Intervention orale par

Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump Inc.

À l'égard de

Ontario Power Generation Inc.

Étude proposée pour l'énoncé des incidences environnementales pour l'Installation de stockage de déchets radioactifs à faible et moyenne activité dans des couches géologiques profondes

Commission d'examen conjoint

16 septembre au 12 octobre 2013

Canada

Deep Geologic Repository Joint Review Panel

Written Submission in Support of an Oral Intervention by

Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump Inc.

In the Matter of

Ontario Power Generation Inc.

Proposed Environmental Impact Statement
for OPG's Deep Geological Repository
(DGR) Project for Low and Intermediate
Level Waste

Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump Inc.
3-304 Stone Road West, #185
Guelph, Ontario N1G 4W4

Website: http://www.stopthegreatlakesnucleardump.com/
Email: info@stopthegreatlakesnucleardump.com

August 7, 2013

INTRODUCTION

1. Good morning members of the Joint Review Panel. My name is Beverly Fernandez, and I am the spokesperson for Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump Inc.

2. Thank you for granting our group the opportunity to address the panel on this matter of national and international importance.

3. Our group, Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump Inc. or STGLND for short, is a non-profit organization whose purpose is supported by more than 20,000 petition signers plus an ever increasing number of Canadians and Americans. STGLND is deeply concerned about Ontario Power Generation's (OPG's) proposal to build a Deep Geological Repository or DGR, to bury all of Ontario's low and intermediate radioactive nuclear waste, approximately 1 kilometre from the shore of Lake Huron.

4. Burying radioactive nuclear waste 1 kilometre from the shore of the Great Lakes, and the largest body of fresh water IN THE WORLD, and the supply of drinking water for 40 million people in two countries, defies common sense.

5. To begin, it is imperative that we understand the profound importance, absolute necessity and sanctity of fresh water. Fresh drinkable water is required for life on this planet. Without it, life cannot exist. Water is life; it is that simple. The availability of fresh drinking water has been decreasing in recent years. In some countries of the world, people die each and every day simply because they do not have clean water to drink. Water is the most important and most precious natural resource. Without it we will perish.

6. The waters of the Great Lakes are important for people, animals, plants, and aquatic life. These waters supply us with food, irrigate our farmlands, and are vital for shipping, tourism, commerce and recreation for millions of people in the cities that surround the Great Lakes. The clean waters of the Great Lakes are North America's greatest asset. They are an irreplaceable treasure.

7. Enter Ontario Power Generation (OPG). OPG wants to place the waters of the Great Lakes at risk. They want to bury underground the most toxic, lethal, dangerous, and long lasting poisonous material humans have ever created, right beside the life giving waters of the Great Lakes. OPG wants to create a nuclear waste dump to bury radioactive nuclear waste that remains radioactive

for over 100,000 years right beside our Great Lakes. And they cannot and will not provide ANY guarantee that this nuclear waste dump will not leak, and contaminate the Great Lakes.

8. Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump believes that it is our duty, our profound and unwavering responsibility - to be responsible stewards of the most precious natural resource in North America – the Great Lakes. We believe that all Canadians and Americans, as stewards of these Great Lakes, have a DUTY to their fellow citizens, to their countries, to stand up to protect the Great Lakes being, 95% of North America's drinking water. To that end, we believe that radioactive nuclear waste should not be buried underground in a DGR anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin. To permit the burial of radioactive nuclear waste right beside the Great Lakes is, in our view a crime against humanity, a crime against the earth; a crime against future generations.

9. Today I stand before you, not as the voice of one person, but with the voices and support of 20,000 concerned citizens standing behind me… 20,000 citizens who have signed the Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump petition… 20,000 concerned citizens who are opposed to OPG's plan to bury nuclear waste beside Lake Huron… 20,000 concerned citizens all calling for The Honourable Leona Aglukkaq, Minister of the Environment, to reject OPG's application to build this underground Deep Geological Repository for radioactive nuclear waste within the Municipality of Kincardine on the shores of Lake Huron… 20,000 citizens all in agreement that no DGR should be constructed anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin.

10. On May 13, 2013 STGLND submitted a comprehensive written brief to the Joint Review Panel that outlined our concerns with OPG's plan. Since we only have 30 minutes today, we would like to focus on 3 key areas of concern, identified in our May 13th submission, namely: Site Selection, Public Consultation and Alleged Opposition.

SITE SELECTION

11. We believe that Ontario Power Generations' selection of the proposed DGR site 1 km from the shore of Lake Huron is highly controversial and should be a major source of concern for the governments and citizens of Canada and the United States as well as the Joint Review Panel (JRP).

12. It is an undisputed confirmed fact that OPG did not consider any other sites. OPG's Environmental Impact Statement submission, written responses to information requests from the Joint Review Panel and statements by OPG officials in the press, all confirm that no other sites was considered.

13. OPG's Environmental Impact Statement document contains 3,432 pages. Written justification for choosing this proposed site is contained in the equivalent of one single page. OPG's comment on achievability and acceptability of an alternative site option is reported in a single word:

"Unknown". This Panel, and anyone, can conclude from this acknowledgement that OPG has no idea whether an alternate site would be an environmentally safer choice and a less risky choice for millions of people.

14. We find this fact, and logically anyone would find this fact, to be a shocking admission. OPG failed to perform the most basic alternate site selection due diligence. The siting of a garbage dump in Canada requires that numerous sites be considered and that the most suitable site be chosen. In comparison, OPG is proposing a single site beside North America's greatest fresh water supply, without investigating any other options. Even though this dump will contain the most lethal and long lasting poison ever created by humans, OPG did no homework, no other site investigation, no due diligence of other locations. Does that sound responsible?

15. As the panel members are well aware, the EIS Guidelines direct the proponent to consider the siting of the DGR in a location outside the existing site as an alternative mean.

16. This is why the JRP asked OPG to "Provide further information on the location, salient features, evaluation criteria used, and a summary presentation of the comparison and selection process for alternative locations considered for the DGR."

17. A review of OPG's response to this information request is telling.

18. OPG's response speaks in vague terms about considering other sites at a "conceptual level" but in the end is forced to admit that "OPG did not actively solicit other potential host communities or undertake geoscientific studies at other sites."

19. And OPG officials confirm this in the press:

20. On November 30, 2012 Kevin Powers, director of nuclear corporate relations is quoted in the Observer as saying "OPG hasn't considered other sites." And in this same article, Gord Sullivan, OPG's DGR manager states "We have a willing host with Kincardine. If that wasn't there, the OPG would do a lot more site investigation work"

21. 87% of Ontario's land mass is Crown land. This is land under direct ownership and control of the Province of Ontario. The Province of Ontario is the sole owner of Ontario Power Generation. 100% of the waste OPG is seeking to bury in the DGR is Ontario nuclear waste.

22. WHY did OPG not consider alternative sites on available crown land? Why did the Ontario Government not direct OPG to investigate other sites on available crown land far from inhabited

communities and people and far from this vital source of water? Just because Kincardine offered up its town doesn't mean that OPG had to accept. Why did OPG not undertake an exhaustive site selection process to identify suitable sites? And why did OPG not establish siting criteria that would disqualify sites located in the Great Lakes Basin? These are very reasonable and very important questions. In our view, it is not reasonable or acceptable for OPG to simply say "unknown" to the question of the availability and acceptability of alternative sites. Answers to these questions should and must be known. "Unknown" simply doesn't cut it.

23. The people of Ontario, the people living in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Region, the 40 million people who drink the life sustaining waters of the Great Lakes, and all Canadians and Americans NEED TO KNOW AND DEMAND TO KNOW that OPG's site selection process carefully and diligently considered all available alternatives. That it did not means that OPG's site selection process must be judged to be incomplete, faulty and unacceptable to the Joint Review Panel, the Ontario Government, OPG's owner, and to the Canadian Federal Government, the ultimate decision maker in this matter.

    There was no process to find alternate sites. OPG has failed to provide this Panel with any comparative evidence of the suitability of this site.

24. We urge the JRP to recommend to the federal Minster of the Environment that OPG's plan is fatally flawed and fundamentally deficient and therefore must be rejected.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

25. I wish to now turn to the issue of Public Consultation.

26. Although the Environmental Assessment Review process and framework provides opportunities for public input, very few Canadians and Americans have had the opportunity to know about this matter.

27. To be clear, under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and the Nuclear Safety and Control Act, OPG has a legal responsibility to engage the public in a meaningful way. This doesn't just mean informing people about the project, it means actually inquiring and listening to their views on the matter. It means having a two way dialogue. Meaningful public participation also means ensuring that citizens, governments and environmental groups are notified well in advance so that they have time to properly investigate and provide comments on the matter. Letting people know about this issue at the 11th hour does not constitute meaningful public consultation.

28. Examining OPG's communication program, it is clear that the bulk of OPG's outreach was in the local communities in Bruce County. Of course, many of the people that OPG is reaching in local communities are OPG, NWMO or Bruce Power employees and retirees. This means they have an economic tie to receive a salary or pension from the nuclear industry. This places them in a conflict of interest position.

29. OPG contacted elected officials in Kincardine and adjacent communities. These same communities are receiving millions of dollars from OPG under a hosting agreement that requires them to express their support for OPG's DGR in exchange for the financial payments. Is this consistent with free and independent consultation with communities by OPG? We know that if the communities fail to show their support for the DGR, these payments could be cutoff.

30. OPG engaged in some limited outreach in Michigan. OPG has indicated that engagement activities have been conducted with Michigan elected representatives, the Macomb County Board of Commissioners, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, and NGO groups. OPG has acknowledged that comments received from these Michigan based stakeholders "noted concern with the DGR Project because of its proximity to Lake Huron and the perceived risk of potential contamination of the Great Lakes."

31. To this we say, what about the 40 million people who rely upon the Great Lakes for their drinking water? Who did OPG reach out to in the Great Lakes region? Who did they consult with in New York, in Ohio, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Minnesota, and Indiana? What about Quebec? And what of the other communities in Ontario outside of Bruce County? We can't find evidence anywhere in OPG's submission that would demonstrate that OPG engaged in meaningful public participation with individuals, organizations, government officials and agencies, OR ANYONE, in any of these Great Lake communities or States. In other words, essentially no one outside of Bruce County. Yet it is clear and should have been fundamentally and easily clear to OPG and should be clear to the Panel that all of these parties have a stake in the outcome of this proposal and these parties are stakeholders that should have been consulted.

32. Under Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, it is the responsibility of the Joint Review Panel (and not OPG) to determine who is an "interested party".

33. We submit that it is logical, reasonable, and responsible that when considering burying man's most dangerous substance in close proximity to perhaps North America's most vital water resource that the JRP must exercise its authority and make a positive determination that the relevant interested parties have NOT been consulted in this case. The list of interested parties" should have included (i) all of the municipalities situated on Lake Huron, and other Great Lakes, representing many of the 40 million Canadian and American citizens who rely on the Great Lakes for their drinking water; (ii)

all First Nations people living in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River region, (iii) the appropriate governments of the 8 Great Lakes states; and Provincial Governments, and (iv) the public.

34. Given the interconnectedness of the Great Lakes it is not difficult to imagine that all Great Lakes states would be concerned about any proposal that may create potential risk to their water. Of course if you don't contact them and tell them about the proposal, they won't know anything about it and won't have an opportunity to provide their views.

35. However, as awareness of the proposed DGR grows in the Great Lakes region, opposition to this short sighted and dangerous plan is building.

36. We wish to alert the panel that formal resolutions have been passed or are being considered in the State of Michigan (population 9.9 million people) opposing the construction of the DGR. Resolutions have been passed by the Michigan Senate, which unanimously approved resolution 58. Resolutions have been passed in Macomb County (population 843,000) by the Macomb County Board of Commissioners, the City of St Clair Shores in Macomb County (population 60,000). The Village of Leamington Michigan has also passed a resolution. A resolution has also recently been introduced in the Michigan House of Representatives.

37. In Ontario, Essex County (population 393,000) has taken a leadership role, and was the first government in Canada to pass a resolution opposing OPG's plan and indeed opposing the construction of a DGR anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin. The Town of Kingsville has subsequently passed a resolution opposing the construction of a DGR anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin.

38. In the coming days, we expect more municipalities in Canada and the US will follow suit and oppose the DGR as they become aware of OPG's proposal.

39. In the Great Lakes Region, there is a group called the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative. This is a group of 106 mayors representing 16 million people living in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Region. This important group formed over a decade ago.

40. Here is what it says on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative (GLSLCI) website:

41. "The Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative is a coalition of U.S. and Canadian mayors and other local officials working to advance the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River. By integrating their environmental, economic and social agendas, local governments are helping to sustain a resource that represents approximately 20 percent of the

world's surface freshwater supply, provides drinking water for 40 million people, and is the foundation upon which a strong regional economy is based."

42. Any reasonable person would view this group as an interested stakeholder in any proposal for the siting of a nuclear waste dump on the Great Lakes.

43. What we have learned is that this Mayors group was only made aware of the DGR through a US environmental organization in late 2012, not by OPG.

44. How is this possible? We have to ask, if OPG was truly interested in engaging in meaningful public participation with key stakeholders, how is it possible that OPG failed to meaningfully engage with this important group early on in the process?

45. OPG provided a briefing and a tour of the Western Waste Management Facility to this Mayors group only recently in May of 2013.

46. We note that effective public participation requires both informing and seeking input. It is clear to us that this important group was "informed" at the 11th hour and was not given an adequate amount of time to provide input. OPG had 7 years to consult in a meaningful way with this important Great Lakes group and failed to do so.

47. This is incomprehensible to us. In fact, we see this as clear evidence of a deficient and fatally flawed consultation process when one considers the following: (i) the mandate of the Mayors group is focused on advancing the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, (ii) the Mayors group includes two of Canada's largest cities (Toronto and Montreal), (iii) the Mayors group includes the third most populous city in the United States (Chicago) whose gross domestic product is the fourth-largest in the world, (iv) the Mayors group has been in existence throughout the 7 years that OPG has been engaged in so called consultation with interest based stakeholders.

48. Here is what this important Great Lakes group had to say in their May 24th brief to the Joint Review Panel:

    - "The Cities Initiative greatly appreciates the efforts OPG has put forth to help inform representatives of the organization on the DGR project, and recognizes all the work that has gone into the proposal. However, the limited time to review the record and prepare comments, the limited outreach to the broader Great Lakes and St. Lawrence community,

and the consideration of only one site that is one kilometer from Lake Huron leads us to conclude that the project should not move forward at this time."

49. Members of the Joint Review Panel, we would urge you to pay heed to these words written by this very important Great Lakes group representing 16 million people. Their words are well thought out, clear and very direct. Quite simply, they are opposed to OPG's plan.

50. In summary, we submit that OPG's stakeholder consultation has failed to meet the guidelines for meaningful public participation as required under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. OPG's communication program is fundamentally deficient and fatally flawed and we urge the JRP to reject OPG claims of an effective consultation program.

ALLEGED OPPOSITION

51. I would now like to turn to the issue of Alleged Opposition.

52. OPG written evidence presented to the panel includes the following statements:

    - "Much of the input from the general public and key stakeholders post-submission continues to reflect strong, consistent support for the DGR Project. Stakeholder opposition to the DGR Project, which has existed in isolated pockets from the initiation of the project, has become much more vocal and several new local NGO groups have formed."

    - "Many stakeholders continue to provide encouraging comments" and that opposition to the DGR is being voiced by "small pockets of local individuals, NGOs and national NGOs."

53. STGLND simply cannot allow these statements to go unchallenged, because quite frankly they are, inaccurate, and inconsistent with the facts before us.

54. I am here today to let the panel know that opposition to OPG's plan is not, as claimed by OPG, contained in "small pockets". The facts are that opposition is broad based, spans from coast to coast to coast in two nations and outside their borders, and continues to grow daily.

55. First, I would like to share with the panel, information about the Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump petition.

56. Our petition is directed at the Federal Minister of the Environment and states:

- "We call on you to refuse Ontario Power Generation's application to build an underground Deep Geological Repository for radioactive nuclear waste within the Municipality of Kincardine on the shores of Lake Huron that would threaten the drinking water of 40 million Canadians and Americans.

  We stand with concerned citizens in opposition to the building of an underground nuclear waste dump anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin."

57. On May 13, 2013 when we made our original submission to the panel, about 10,000 citizens had signed the petition. Since then, signatures have more than doubled.

58. So who are these people that have signed the petition?

59. Signatories include citizens from every Canadian Province and Territory. Citizens from over 1,300 Canadian communities. Citizens from Victoria, Burnaby, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Brandon, Portage La Prairie, Toronto, Hamilton, Kitchener, Mississauga, Montreal, Rimouski, Shawinigan, Fredericton, Moncton, Halifax, Dartmouth, Charlottetown, Summerside, Cornerbrook, Gander, just to name a few. And in the far north, citizens in Iqaluit, Yellowknife and Whitehorse.

60. Signatories also include citizens in all 50 U.S. States… AND they include citizens from 96 countries around the globe. ALL of these citizens share a concern for the protection of the waters of the Great Lakes. ALL are saying no to OPG's plan and to the building of a nuclear waste dump anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin.

61. The more than 20,000 individuals who have signed the Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump petition are not "small pockets" of local individuals as OPG would have you believe.

62. They are First Nations Chiefs and Peoples, prominent and distinguished Canadians (Companions, Officers and Members of the Order of Canada), doctors, scientists, geologists, professors, lawyers, teachers, a former Assistant Deputy Attorney General (Ontario) and Deputy Minister of the Environment (Ontario), church leaders, a former member of the Seaborn Panel, members of Canada's armed forces, Canadian and U.S. politicians, and citizens of Canada and the United States and of other countries of the world.

63. Some notable petition signatories thus far include:

- Hoon-Yung Hopgood, Michigan State Senator

- Sarah Roberts, member of Michigan State House of Representatives
- The Very Reverend The Honourable Lois Wilson, a Companion of the Order of Canada, 1985 recipient of the Pearson Medal of Peace, member of the Order of Ontario, retired Canadian Senator, retired moderator of the United Church of Canada (and a former member of the Seaborn Panel that spent 10 years studying the burial of nuclear waste in the Canadian Shield)
- Farley Mowat, Canadian author, environmentalist and Officer of the Order of Canada
- Robert Bateman, Canadian artist, environmentalist and Officer of the Order of Canada
- Lorraine Monk, retired Executive Producer of the Still Photography Division at the National Film Board of Canada, Officer of the Order of Canada and Member of the Order of Ontario
- Freeman Patterson, Canadian photographer, environmentalist and Member of the Order of Canada
- Rod Macleod, QC, former Assistant Deputy Attorney General (Ontario) and former Deputy Minister, Environment (Ontario)
- Dr. Amy Dean, President of the American Academy of Environmental Medicine
- Gideon Foreman, Executive Director of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment (recipient of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee medal for his environmental protection work)
- Mike Farrell, American actor (formerly of M*A*S*H), environmentalist

64. Our petitioners include more than 425 doctors – some of the most learned and well respected members of our society.

65. Secondly, the panel should know that a growing number of Canadian and American towns, cities and municipalities have formally passed resolutions opposing OPG's plan. The combined population of citizens living in those communities is over 1 million people.

66. Thirdly, the May 24, 2013 submission to the Joint Review Panel by the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative, a group of 106 mayors representing 16 million people living in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River region, unequivocally opposes OPG's plan.

67. In light of all of this growing opposition, we ask, does this sound like small and isolated pockets?

68. The over 1 million people living in communities that have passed formal resolutions opposing OPG's plan are not small pockets. The 16 million represented by the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative mayors are not small pockets; indeed in number they represent about 50% of the entire population of Canada. They are very large pockets. And the 20,000 citizens from across North American and from around the world that have signed our petition are not small pockets of opposition.

69. In stark contrast the 4,067 individuals in the Municipality of Kincardine who apparently indicated support to the question posed to them, is itself a small pocket. A more accurate description would be that support for the DGR is being voiced by a "small pocket" of very local municipalities who are receiving financial payments for their support.

70. Fully 1/3 of citizens who have signed our petition have also provided comments. Of the 20,000 citizens who have signed our petition, about 6,800 have left comments uniformly, eloquently, passionately and thoughtfully agreeing that burying the most toxic and lethal substance that humans have ever created within 1 km of the drinking water supply of 40 million people in two countries defies common sense and should not be permitted..

71. We urge the JRP, and the government of Canada to consider the Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump petition comments of doctors, professors, lawyers, teachers, First Nations Chiefs, all very learned and highly respected citizens in society, and all directly contradicting statements made by OPG to the JRP that "much of the input from the general public and key stakeholders post-submission continues to reflect strong, consistent support for the DGR Project."

72. I would like to read to you a selection of these comments so you can appreciate what these learned and highly respected citizens are saying.

- Petitioner #6563, Dr. Janet Christie-Seely, MD, MSc, FCFP, Director of Professional Services for the Satir Learning Centre of Ottawa and Professor of Family Medicine at the University of Ottawa:

  "Humanity is in a pathological state of denial regarding the "safe" disposal of nuclear waste. It's high time we woke up!"

- Petitioner #16,052, Dr. Amy Dean, President of the American Academy of Environmental Medicine:

"*The health and wellness of citizens in the United States and Canada depends on clean water, air and food. Placing a nuclear waste repository on the shore of Lake Huron puts all our health at risk."*

- Petitioner #3621, Dr. David Maxwell, retired professor of Family Medicine and Emergency Medicine at Dalhousie University:

  "I find it incomprehensible that we should need to point out the sheer stupidity of burying radioactive garbage in the immediate proximity to the drinking water supply for 40 million people."

- Petitioner #2744, Dr. John Millman *M.D., C.C.F.P., F.C.B.O.M. Occupational Physician:*

  "a proposal that needs to be determined by experts and authorities much more educated in the environmental issues than local municipal politicians who have only short term community interests at heart."

- Petitioner #1655, Dr. Erica Fischer, Family Doctor:

  "There is simply no way to guarantee the nuclear waste will not get into the land and Great Lakes water. The risk of such a project is too high."

- Petitioner #1566, Dr. Suzanne Sorkin, an assistant professor and associate director of the Sparrow/Family Medicine Residency:

  "As a family physician I worry about the safety of the Great Lakes water supply for my current and future patients. A serious accident with these dangerous wastes could contaminate Great Lakes drinking water and fisheries far into the future."

- Petitioner #1699, Mr. David Wood, Town Councillor, South Bruce

  "As a councilor with South Bruce, a community involved for selection of the high level waste dgr, I continue to critically oppose any such project within the Great Lakes basin. Regardless of how much money they are throwing at us."

- Petitioner #7673, Dr. D.W. Stephan, Professor of Chemistry, University of Toronto

  "The solubility of limestone in water means that this will ultimately leach the waste into the lake. This together with the proximity of the proposed waste site to the lake and our fresh water supply is of grave concern to me. "

- Petitioner #7339, Dr. William Neal, Emeritus Professor of Geology, Grand Valley State University

  "As a geologist I am very aware that the proposed site threatens a vital water resource. As a citizen who lives only 15 miles from a Great Lake from which our water supply is derived, I am extremely concerned, and cannot fathom that anyone would consider this."

- Petitioner #3608, Gracia Janes, former teacher and School Board Trustee, recipient of the Ontario Medal for Citizenship, the Canada 125 Medal and the Queens Golden Jubilee Medal and VP Environment Provincial Council of Women of Ontario

  "Dear Minister Kent,

  What a travesty it would be if the Federal government allowed a nuclear waste dump so close to the shores of one of our treasured Great Lakes, Lake Huron. Even if the dump is planned for low and medium non-fuel nuclear waste, should there be accidental releases these radio-nuclides last many thousands of years. And, no doubt if this dump is allowed NWMO will attempt to expand its mandate to include a high level nuclear waste -something we saw coming when NWMO expanded its search from the northern Precambrian shield area to south western Ontario Ordovician shale formations.

  These formations can experience "a sudden irreversible alteration, with low or moderate changes in temperature or stress" (J.F. Sykes, U of Waterloo #4 Science and Environment 2003- for NWMO). If this happens, the consequences will drastically affect the lives and natural surroundings of millions of residents on both sides of the Canada/USA border for many generations.

  Gracia Janes, on behalf of the Provincial Council of Women of Ontario, backed by the National Council of Women of Canada, both of which have strong precautionary policies on nuclear issues."

- Petitioner #4201, Dr. Dorothy Goldin Rosenberg, MES, PhD, holds a Masters in Environmental Studies (York University) and a PhD (University of Toronto).

  "Common knowledge says this is a dangerous consideration."

- Petitioner #3362, Dr. Mary Shannan McNair, Associate Professor Department: Human Development and Child Studies, Oakland University

  "The Great Lakes need our care and attention - this is not responsible."

- Petitioner #960, Rod McLeod QC, former Chief Crown Prosecutor (Ontario) and former Deputy Minister of the Environment (Ontario)

  "As a former Deputy Minister Environment (Ontario) I think the OPG proposal is very unwise."

- Petitioner #7166, Chief Louise Hillier, Caldwell First Nation

  "Nuclear waste has no business being dumped/hidden anywhere near waterways or where the waste could leach into the surrounding ground or the water tables underground. With all of OPG's money you just know they have the means to do research and to find an environmentally safe way to deal with the waste they manufactured."

SUMMARY

73. In conclusion, the Great Lakes are a cherished and precious natural resource – a resource that it is every Canadian's and every American's duty to protect. Any risk of contamination of the Great Lakes from a leak from a DGR containing lethal radioactive nuclear waste is too great a risk to take, and should never be taken. We believe it our patriotic duty to protect the Great Lakes.

74. Members of the Joint Review Panel, in the coming days you will have the opportunity to demonstrate responsible leadership, and responsible stewardship… to lead the way, with wisdom, and concern, and to be remembered for doing so, as responsible leaders, as responsible citizens, as concerned scientists, as responsible Canadians… to speak for the protection of our precious natural resource, the Great Lakes… to show your concern and act in the best interests of society… to ensure that the process is fair, legitimate and protects the interests and lives of the 40 million people and their descendents for the next 7,000 generations, who depend and will depend upon the sustenance of the water of the Great Lakes.

75. Recognize that OPG's proposal to bury nuclear waste on the shores of Lake Huron failed to apply precautionary principles, failed to adhere to even the basic principles of due diligence, and poses unacceptable risks to 40 million people that can and must be avoided. Recognize that "*not likely to result in any significant residual adverse effects to human health or the environment, including Lake Huron and the Great Lakes" is not good enough*. Recognize that this matter demands the involvement of all Great Lake stakeholders in Canada and the United States and that OPG's efforts to identify, inform, seek input and secure acceptance from the Canadian and American public are deficient, fatally flawed, fail to fully comply with statutory requirements under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and fail to fully uphold Canada's obligations under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Declare that another solution must be found. Recognize as well that there was no process involving the section of any other site.

76. The safety and sanctity of the fresh water of the Great Lakes must not be compromised for the sake of convenience or profit or exposed to avoidable risks based upon promises that cannot be fulfilled and assurances that cannot be proven. The burial of nuclear waste beside the Great Lakes simply will not be accepted by the Canadian and American public. The sanctity of the Great Lakes and their precious waters are of monumental importance; they MUST COME FIRST.

77. The Joint Review Panel has a moral, ethical, societal, and patriotic DUTY to protect this precious, irreplaceable, natural resource, the life-sustaining waters of the Great Lakes. We urge the JRP to pay heed to the voices of elected officials representing millions of citizens who are now speaking out against OPG's plan. We urge the JRP to pay heed to the impassioned pleas of the 20,000 citizens who have signed the Stop The Great Lakes Nuclear Dump petition. We urge the JRP to pay heed to the words of the Great Lakes Mayors group, representing 16 million people. We urge the JRP to pay heed to the words of some of our most highly educated and respected members of society.

78. To permit the burial of radioactive nuclear waste right beside the Great Lakes is a crime against humanity, a crime against the earth; a crime against future generations. We urge the JRP to do the right thing and recommend against OPG's very shortsighted plan to construct a DGR on the site of the Bruce Nuclear Plant in the Municipality of Kincardine. We urge the JRP to state that NO DGR should be permitted anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin.