

From: Tanya Keefe
To: [Deep Geologic Repository Project/ Projet de stockage de déchets radioactifs\[CEAA/VACEE\]](#)
Subject: Spelling Errors Corrected on Earlier Comment
Date: March 7, 2017 12:38:41 AM

I'm not sure if you have discretion to substitute a version of my earlier comment with the spelling errors corrected. I thought this version would be much easier for the review team to read.

Thanks so much for your time on this :)

Warm Wishes,

Tanya Keefe
Board Chair
Great Lakes Environmental Alliance

*****UPDATED TEXT FOLLOWS*****

To the Esteemed Review Panel,

I write today to express the deep concerns of both myself, and the Great Lakes Environmental Alliance, an organization with which I am affiliated. You have a difficult job ahead of you which requires you to weigh facts, evidence, and economy but more importantly to weigh the worth of the very lives of current & future generations of humans. Not many jobs carry such a heavy weight. It is the position of many in the community that OPG's response to Minister McKenna was woefully inadequate and seemed to thumb it's nose at the governmental inquiry rather than answer the very insightful questions posed by same.

First of all, we find the company's position that key scientific details and processes will essentially be "worked out later" dangerous. Indeed, the whole problem of nuclear waste is one that began with such an assertion, and decades later, science has still produced no truly safe way to contain these dangerous wastes over their foreseeable lifetime.

Minister McKenna asked OPG to provide detailed analysis of alternate locations for the proposed dump. Her meaning was quite clear. However, in its response, the company essentially takes the early-grade-school tactic of insisting that it can redefine a word to mean something different and thereby get away on what it imagines to be a technicality. OPG has repeatedly ignored the requests of the Minister and others to provide such detailed analysis of alternate locations, choosing to either ignore the requests outright or, in this instance, pull a grade school "Nah-uh... It means what ever I say it means, so I win.." This conduct towards not only the Minister but other boards that have made similar requests to the company is blatantly dismissive and says a lot about what kind of thoroughness and integrity we can expect from a company that would literally hold the lives of millions of people in its hands if this request is approved.

We recognize with scientific certainty that processes and resource use must be sustainable to be successful. (a business with unsustainable practices would soon close its doors). OPG has failed to show any proof of sustainability either environmentally or in a responsible waste management plan. Abandoning dangerous wastes and leaving them to fate is not a responsible waste management plan. It is in fact the opposite of a plan, unless you plan on having no plan.. you see the problem. OPG must be a responsible community member in exercising its business practices and needs to provide a body of scientific evidence to support the concept that this project would be safe and sustainable essentially into perpetuity. As the company has no plan for this, it is our feeling that the plan should be rejected outright.

The Environmental Assessment Review has many issues that should be of deep concern to a reasoned individual and its response shows both a tendency toward slipshod science and a lack of integrity. We simply cannot entrust this company with the lives and well being of 40 million people. This plan must be rejected.

Thank you for your time,

Tanya Keefe
Board Chair
Great Lakes Environmental Alliance