

PMD 13-P1.99

File / dossier : 8.01.07
Date: 2013-08-13
Edocs: 4184719

**Oral Statement from
Jacques Boucher**

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

**Présentation orale par
Jacques Boucher**

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

Du 16 septembre au 12 octobre 2013

DGR Joint Review Panel Hearing Written Submission in Support of an Oral Statement

To those people interested in the deep geological repository,

I live in a small town close to Montreal. I've been troubled by the news about this repository, because I came to gatherings at the Ojibway Cape Croker Reservation Campgrounds near Wiarton in the late '90s and I was so impressed by the beauty of nature in the area, red-yellow limestone cliffs and, needless to say, Lake Huron, an inland sea of clear unsalted water. I just had to make a statement, at least put my drop in the ocean.

I'm aware of the energy situation in Ontario. There aren't as much hydroelectric resources as there are in Quebec. The needs are enormous for electricity in the large regions and cities of Ontario. Even though there are enormous dangers associated with this kind of energy generation, it has been decided to rely on nuclear power, and Bruce nuclear station is one of the largest in the world. I'm convinced that OPG and all the nuclear people are doing their best to fulfill the needs of the Ontario people, and that they want to be as careful as they can for the security of their co-citizens. We know the Bruce station has now been producing electricity for decades.

But, here we're dealing with dangerous materials that can harm human and non-human life in the area and beyond for hundreds of thousands of years. Already the Bruce nuclear station, as all CANDU reactors, emits large quantities of tritium in the environment surrounding its site. Moreover large quantities of highly irradiated fuel are on site, due to the daily functioning of the station's reactors, and currently, the low and intermediate level wastes produced as a result of the operation of all OPG's nuclear reactors are stored centrally at OPG's Western Waste Management Facility (WWMF) located on the Bruce nuclear site. The problem is not so much for low level wastes which aren't so radioactive. It is not the same for intermediate level wastes. Some of these wastes are quite radioactive: I read that it does include "refurbishment wastes"-- thousands of tubes and pipes that have become "activated" or "contaminated" and therefore must be treated as radioactive waste material -- as well as contaminated equipment such as the dozens of 100-tonne "steam generators".

Also included are "ion-exchange resins", filters that get clogged up with all sorts of radioactive materials that escape from defective fuel bundles over long periods of time. These resins become highly radioactive as they contain such dangerous radioactive materials as cesium-137, strontium-90 and plutonium-239 and lots more.

There is no dispute over the fact that many of these wastes will remain potentially dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years, much longer than the span of recorded human history (the ancient pyramids of Egypt are only about 5000 years old). And it should not be considered that I personally am not threatened and concerned by these dangers. Bruce, as well as Pickering and Darlington are upwind and upstream from the St. Lawrence River and Montreal. Millions of people have their lives and health at stake.

So these intermediate level wastes add up to the threat and making a permanent repository at the Bruce site add significantly to the perils of being so close to the Great Lakes system. Shouldn't these intermediate level wastes be considered as high level wastes and treated as such? To think that these wastes, from all of Ontario's nuclear stations, will permanently be dumped at about 680 metres below the surface at approximately 650 metres of the eastern shore of Lake Huron, in limestone and shale rocks is not reassuring. The Nuclear Waste Management Organisation is probably looking for areas at least far from major waterways, composed of granite rock up north for the burial of high level nuclear wastes. Shouldn't these more radioactive intermediate level wastes be included in the search for permanent burial? It's obvious that it's easier to build a burial site on property already owned by OPG. But wouldn't wisdom suggest to keep such a sensitive and uncertain site for exclusively low-level wastes?

Native people have a tradition to take their decisions in such a manner that it will be beneficial for seven generations to come. In the Environmental Impact Statement, it is expected that the liability of the proposed repository will last for at least a million years.

Well, please do believe that I want to be absolutely assured that the different initiating events that could trigger malfunctions and accidents will never occur and not just be "unlikely" or "non-credible" for more than a million years to come, as it is expected in the Environmental Impact Statement... Unfortunately, I'm not God and I just can't predict it will never happen, and, on the same level, I also don't think anyone in the nuclear industry could make that kind of prediction.

Thank you.

Jacques Boucher