

From: Virtue,Robyn-Lynne [CEAA] **On Behalf Of** DGR Review / Examen DFGP [CEAA]
Sent: May 2, 2013 12:05 PM
To: Ulrich Pieplow
Cc: DGR Review / Examen DFGP [CEAA]
Subject: RE: filtration of submissions to the Joint Review Panel -DGR

Mr. Pieplow,

For your information, the Panel Secretariat's response to John Mann's e-mail of April 28, 2013 has been provided to you. As well, we wanted to confirm that all of your past submissions to the Panel have been posted on the Registry within days of their receipt.

Thank you for your participation in the process,

DGR Secretariat

From: DGR Review / Examen DFGP [CEAA]
Sent: May 1, 2013 1:41 PM
To: John Mann
Subject: RE: URGENT: Citizens must make submissions by May 24, 2013.

Mr. Mann,

1. As you have been assured, all submissions to the DGR Joint Review Panel are provided to and considered by the Panel and they are posted on the public registry. We have confirmed that all of your submissions from the dates below are on the registry:
 - July 6, 9, 10 and 16, 2012
 - August 2, 5, 13, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23 and 31, 2012
 - October 25 and 28, 2012
 - November 1, 6, 11, 13, 19 and 27, 2012
 - December 11 and 31, 2012
 - January 15, 2013
 - February 2, 5, 15, 16, 19, 21 and 23, 2013
 - March 4, 15 and 28, 2013
 - April 5, 9, 11, 19, and 21, 2013

The posting of your correspondence of April 28 (below) and April 29, 2013 is pending.

If you believe that you have made submissions that are not listed above, please send a message to the DGR mailbox as soon as possible so that we can investigate and correct the situation.

2. All correspondence addressed to dgr.review@ceaa-acee.gc.ca goes directly to that inbox. There is no redirection of incoming messages to a "SPAM FOLDER" or to any other folder. A DGR "SPAM FOLDER" does not exist.

The ***SPAM*** notation that you see in the subject line of some messages is a label added to those messages by a Government of Canada application. I understand that this label is added to messages

that have certain characteristics to warn the recipient that the message may be SPAM. The addition of this label is for the protection of recipients and does not affect the delivery of the message in any way. This should be evident since the messages that you have sent to the DGR mailbox have been received and posted on the registry even when they are tagged with ***SPAM***.

It is possible that the wide distribution list on your messages are responsible for those messages being labeled as SPAM. I again suggest that you send your messages directly to the Joint Review Panel and will add that copies can be provided to other addresses in a separate message.

3. Please revisit the Panel Secretariat's messages to you of February 11, 2013 ([Doc #880](#)) and April 22, 2013 ([Doc #972](#)) for further information and guidance.

Debra Myles

DGR Joint Review Panel Co-Manager
C/O Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
160 Elgin Street, 22nd floor
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3
Tel.: 613-957-0626 or 1-866-582-1884
DGR.Review@ceaa-acee.gc.ca

From: Ulrich Pieplow <personal information removed>
Sent: April 29, 2013 10:56 AM
To: DGR Review / Examen DFGP [CEAA]; John Mann
Subject: filtration of submissions to the Joint Review Panel -DGR

Dear Debra, dear Panel:

I am vastly disturbed by reading that your Panel prevents submissions from being made public. It is your mandate to review and consider! At least one concerned citizen (John Mann, <personal information removed>) send you legitimate concerns about the DGR process and I do share his arguments (i.e.: cost and economics and increased risk resulting from two versus just one DGR). I hear and can read that your panel directed his written concerns into a spam filter and therefore his written submissions were not posted. Please take position, in writing, immediately. Also, your response must include issues raised in this email further down. Further, please provide sufficient time in your response to these issues, that will allow me to post my response before closing date of May 24. I tried before to post my concerns and I also experienced reluctance on your side to facilitate my voicing.

At that time I wanted to create awareness about a DGR (www.bfs.de, AsseII) that found use in Germany in the late seventies and is filled with 225,000 barrels of radioactive material (about 22,000mT). At that time we were told the material was low radiation only, but today's government admits that this is not true. Currently, the German government, at tax payers expense tries to bring all of these materials back to surface at an estimated cost of Euro\$4.7Billion (Can\$6.2Billion). Time is of essence during this very complicated process as the underground caverns started to crumble and collapse. Water is seeping into the underground repository causing corrosion to the steel containers and radioactive seepage. When the underground storage facility was decommissioned in the late 80's/early 90's concrete was used to finalize long term

storage. Somehow these barriers need to be removed, before access to the nuclear waste becomes even possible. Very bothersome to me is the fact that official literature from the 70's touted the "240Million year old rock formation" to be safe for long term storage. Today, we are told similar by the NWMO. Are you assuming that German Engineers are less capable of designing and managing a DGR? What gives Canadian Engineers the assurance that the DGR in Kincardine Township will not leak within the next 100,000 years, while German science and technology failed after 40years? Considering that the US pulled the plug on burying nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain: why are you in such a great haste to bury rags and shirts beside the largest fresh water reservoir in the world while other DGR's on our planet are either on hold or failed? John Mann described these concerns in much more detailed and addressed them to you, but because you directed his mails into Spam we can not read them publicly. I quote out of your mandate of the "Agreement to Establish a Joint Review Panel for the DGR", Section 1.1: you are asked to look at the ..."cumulative adverse and effects of the project..." The question of one versus two DGR's within the watershed of the Great Lake Basin requires certainly consideration under your due diligence. Sending information material in re of that matter into a spam folder is simply not acceptable and breach of your mandate and democratic rights.

Respectfully,

Ulrich Pieplow

<personal information removed>