From: Richard Denton
To: Deep Geologic Repository Project/ Projet de stockage de déchets radioactifs[CEAA\ACEE]
Subject: CEAR, Information Request
Date: March 6, 2017 5:08:13 PM

Dear Sir or Madame:

Deep Geologic Repository Project for Nuclear Waste

I am against having nuclear waste being buried close to the Great Lakes/Lake Huron.

When looking at risk, one must consider not only the incidence (about 1 in 10 years for a nuclear power accident –Three accidents at Chalk River in 1952, Three Mile Island, March 28, 1979, Chernobyl 26 April 1986, Fukushima, 11 March 2011) but also the devastation of an accident. With the latter two, radiation continues to leak from both sites and the area around them is inhabitable. Thus, even if something doesn't happen very often, when it does happen, the consequences are tremendous. Contamination of the some of the Great Lakes is too great to risk.

Accidents do happen and we need to err on the "Precautionary Principle". There have been many nuclear accidents, miscalculations but luckily, other than Chernobyl and Fukushima, nothing has been too great. They have to drink bottled water in Paducah, Kentucky where nuclear waste has poisoned the local drinking water. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) that was to store radioactive waste safely in perpetuity was closed in February 2014 due to two separate accidents. I gather it is set to reopen next month but the fact that this fail safe system for storage failed so soon should be a warning.

It has been stated by the proponent, that low level radiation is not harmful; i.e. if 0.1 radiation is not harmful, then it is like 0 + another incident of 0.1 radiation that is not harmful and therefore is like 0 then the sum of the two are zero. But I would argue that 0.1 + 0.1 = 0.2 which may be harmful. Thus low chronic accumulation can be harmful. As a doctor, the second commonest cause of lung cancer is now radon gas. Having been a doctor and mayor of a mining town, Kirkland Lake, it was one of our miners who did not smoke, got the WSIB to recognize that his lung cancer was due to radioactive radon gas and thus a workers compensation case. Other studies has shown increase incidence of cancers like leukemia to Down's syndrome in children less than 5 years within 5 km of a German nuclear power station (KIKK study 2008). An Indian study showed that in matched control study, a town with a high background of radiation had more children with Down's syndrome compared to an equally matched town that had a "normal" background of radiation. See also comment by Ian Fairlie, "Commentary: childhood cancer near nuclear

power stations". Thus, I believe that chronic low level radiation is harmful and that fetuses, and newborn children, and the blood and nervous systems in particular are at greater risk.

I have also been underground in the salt mine just down the road from the Bruce. That mine goes under Lake Huron and is designed to slowly collapse. Thus, the ground will be unstable. This is near the Bruce.

For these reasons, I believe that we should not be burying nuclear waste near the Bruce Nuclear Power Plant.

Richard Denton ,BSc, MD, MClSc, CCFP, FCFP, FRRM, COE
<personal information removed>

<email address removed>

--
Past President, Physicians for Global Survival

<personal information removed>

Because of our concern for global health, we are committed to the abolition of nuclear weapons, the prevention of war, the promotion of nonviolent means of conflict resolution and social justice in a sustainable world.

<personal information removed>