

**BRUCE BEACH COTTAGERS' ASSOCIATION
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL SURVEY, 2019**

WRITTEN COMMENTS



Open-ended comments

The survey of Bruce Beach residents asked, “What is your main reason for supporting or not supporting the construction of a high-level nuclear waste facility in Huron-Kinloss?”

Answers to this question are unedited, except for minor spelling corrections and to remove information that would identify individual respondents.

- Strongly do not support. Too close to Lake Huron. Any accidents will have a major impact on the quality of water. That will have catastrophic impact on thousands of people in both Ontario and in the USA.
- Unsure of safe long-term storage
- Too close to Lake Huron regardless of safeguards.

The community will grow exponentially and there is no assurance that the support services for this enlarged population will be funded.

The tomb is too risky - I would prefer to handle it locally and hope for future new developments in methods for dealing with the waste that are better and do not pose a burden on future generations.

- Potential of it affecting the lake system.
- This landscape is one of the most beautiful in Ontario. To consider defiling it with this type of industry and to continue to support nuclear power as a significant source of power anywhere is ridiculous and extremely short-sighted. We should be focusing on sustainable and low impact fuel sources across Ontario.
- H-K has received huge benefits from the Bruce Nuclear plant over the decades, therefore it makes sense for waste to be stored here if feasible. Right now the waste is stored at the plant, safe long term underground storage is better than having it accumulate there.

I support having the waste storage facility in H-K.

- THE BULK OF THE WASTE IS CREATED LOCALLY AND WE SHOULD TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR OUR OWN WASTE.
TRANSFERING WASTE FROM OTHER SITES IS QUESTIONABLE.
- This is a terrible idea for the sake of residents health and also property values. We have owned our cottage for over 100 years and hope it to stay in the family for many generations to come. I do not feel safe raising a family near a nuclear waste site.

There is for more uninhabited land in Canada that does not negatively effect thousands of people. I cannot say how strongly I feel about NOT having Huron-Kinloss as a waste site. I only hope that our voices are heard that this is not something that in the end will benefit the people and isn't that the number one priority?

- Concerned about negative impact on a place treasured by generations of residents and tourists. Negative impact could be harming a beautiful area, lower property values, lower perception of safety and perhaps actual safety. Wondering if there is a better, more remote/less populated area to locate this facility.
- I do not support this. It is too close to large populations of people and way too close to the Great Lake!
And if something goes wrong it will affect people and lake and USA. Put it far far away from large populations of people and lake!
- I have not seen enough data to support the practice as being safe for the environment and the residents of Huron-Kinloss. And what data does exist is an incredibly small sample size when compared to the lifespan of the radioactivity of the spent rods.
- Millions of people depend on Lake Huron water for a variety of purposes. To expose that many people to any risk of failure of the facility is an unacceptable and unnecessary risk where other options in less populated areas are available. This proposal in this location is insanity.
- The location, beside the Lake and in an agricultural, populated area, is not appropriate for a nuclear dump.
- Fear of potential leak, environmental impacts, property values
- Nuclear waste must be stored safely. The best methods involved the use of deep geological repositories. The geology in the H-K area is ideal and the proximity to Bruce Nuclear and the availability of an informed and expert local population are crucial advantages. The proximity to Bruce considerably reduces the need for long-range transportation. The construction of the facility in H-K will cause temporary inconveniences, but will provide many excellent jobs, while the long-term operation will create long-term jobs (but fewer than during construction). This will be a huge economic benefit to H-K Township. I regard myself as expert in the nuclear and nuclear waste disposal area. I believe that the NWMO has undertaken a very thorough study of the costs, benefits and potential hazards of a high-level waste management facility. I further believe that the risks are minimal, while the benefits are huge. I wholly support the construction and operation of the facility and am certain it will bring additional long-term prosperity to the area. In an era of global climate change, nuclear power is essential and safe storage forms an integral part of any plan to provide energy without concomitant effects on climate. H-K's careful

consideration of acting as a host community is wise and shows leadership and a sense of responsibility in the service of Ontario and the whole of Canada.

- Bruce Power should look after their own waste and not convince other locations to accept their waste.
- With a decision that will have an impact for 10,000+ years, it's almost impossible for humans with a lifespan of only 100 to understand how this will affect the region, population, environment in the years to come.

I would like to hear more from scientific experts on the likelihood of the waste leaking, how the earth could potentially shift with climate change and rupture the holding area as well as what health effects we could see in the future.

- See comment earlier. H-K is the most appropriate site geologically and geographically. Ontario is the most significant user of nuclear energy and producer of consequent waste. It is time to implement a long term safe solution. Otherwise stop using 60% of electricity or replace it by covering Ontario with 100,000 unreliable, grossly expensive, unrecyclable wind turbines and solar panels with at most 20 year lifetimes. Leaving the waste above ground is not a sound solution. Further, the argument that radiation could get into the lake is ludicrous. The site is about 800 meters underground and below the lake bottom and about 16,000 meters away from the lake. The last I heard water doesn't run uphill. The argument that it should be left above ground so that some brilliant future person will find a solution to reuse the waste is specious. Put it underground away from surface disruption and interference. If the waste is needed in the future, that same brilliant person can find a way to reuse that waste. Get on with it and stop wasting time resources money and oxygen on this. Otherwise unplug your iPhones, AC, TVs, electric cars, etc. and stop using electricity and go back to the 1930's.
- Bruce Nuclear is close to Huron-Kinloss and minimizing transportation of high level nuclear waste would be good. Putting it near the lake could be distress in the event of a disaster, a leak or a terrorist attack.. so putting it at the eastern boundaries of Huron-Kinloss would mitigate the potential for a nuclear disaster associated with waste. Ideally find a way to reuse it and make it less harmful would be a positive step before burying it.
- already store it here and have one of the biggest reactors on Ontario here so percentage wise a lot is already here
- Health and safety concerns and contamination
Of water in Great Lakes
- I feel strongly that we have not investigated safer, scientifically proven alternatives to the proposed storage method of high level waste in Canada.

- Nuclear waste has to go somewhere, might as well be here. I trust the engineers to ensure it's safely stored.
- The used fuel we have benefitted from needs to be dealt with, not left for future generations.

I am familiar with the regulatory and operational controls in place for the safe storage of used fuel and have confidence similar controls will be established for disposal of that same fuel.

I am well informed of the safety case studies and engineering performed to date.

- We need to do something. And from all the study and unemotional science; this is a good idea. It is better than just leaving it in the parking lot. We have studied enough. We should get on with it. This should be a positive for Huron-Kinloss and maybe even lower our taxes. Let's hope the council doesn't just pave more roads with all the money. We need to encourage them to pass some of the benefit directly to the tax base. We would see a serious reduction if they did. If the new hires also build locally the tax base from higher priced homes would also have the effect of putting less pressure for revenue from the lakefront group. So this too could be beneficial.
- Nuclear waste should not be stored near the largest bodies of fresh water namely the Great Lakes. What an environmental catastrophe if and when there is a leak. We have been coming to this area for over 50 years and our families, with young children would like to continue this tradition. There are such few areas of unspoiled nature left. Please do not endanger what is left.
- Presently not sure. I'd prefer it elsewhere, however it is Ontario that should deal with it so if no other alternative location is found then I would support it here.
- It would be better to have nuclear waste stored safely underground than on the surface. For that reason, I see it as a net positive for the environment. So long as the facility is well sited, away from tourist/vacation areas, I'm probably OK with it.
- Too many uncertainties regarding safety and impact.
- Canada is a very large country and as noted nuclear waste is a federal issue. Why locate nuclear waste under the great lakes? Seems like the last logical place to put it. Putting waste under Kincardine will make it's name be held in places such as Yucca Mountain (which was a good location -- nobody there, no fresh water), Chernobyl, 3 mile Island etc.
- There is a need to dispose of the waste from nuclear power stations. Nuclear power is the only major generator of electricity which does NOT generate CO2. it is important therefore that an area is chosen where the waste can be stored permanently and safely. H-K is such an area as the geology supports this.

Information on the progress of the proposal is a bigger issue than can be dealt with by the BBKA. It should be left to the NWMO or the government to communicate with H-K residents. The BBKA only represents a tiny fraction of H-K residents and should be neutral.

- Everybody is fine using the cheap clean power produced by nuclear generating stations and yet no one is willing to take responsibility for the by-products. Bruce county houses some of the best and brightest folks in the nuclear industry to support this initiative and possesses a favourable geological formation that would be ideal to build the site on. It is time we take responsibility and show the country (and the world) that we are leaders in the use of nuclear power.
- This lovely tourist community already is facing wind turbines that are dangerous to health with their magnetic fields, massive costs to build in minerals needed, destroying birds, life of only 20 years max.

Why should Huron-Kinloss be the dumping area for heavy nuclear waste from a plant that has doubled its size supplying 40% of Ontario's power??? Trucks carting the waste can have accidents and we note they can use spent waste until it is sealed,.... meaning they can retrieve it from the waste pit!!!!

We are against it here when the province can send it elsewhere; not proximate to the nuclear plant.

Is this why HYDRO wants to double or add 50% to our electric usage????

- I do not support the construction of a high-level nuclear waste facility in Huron-Kinloss. While the probability of some form of nuclear exposure from the waste facility is likely low, I believe that we should select a remote site, away from Lake Huron and significant populations, to minimize any impact in the event of nuclear exposure.
- I understand that the facility needs to be built somewhere, but I think placing it directly on the shores of Canada's largest fresh water source sets a dangerous precedent.
- My concerns are two fold, safety and health of future generations. We have a family cottage on the shores of Lake Huron and 3 female family members have contracted breast cancer over the last 10 years. Not sure if it's related to the Bruce Nuclear power plant but it seems like a very high ratio. Adding nuclear waste in an area that is in close proximity of the largest fresh water system in the world is concerning to me for future generations and it appears to be a business decision based on reducing transportation costs from the largest nuclear facility on the globe. A more prudent choice would be hundreds of miles from a large population centre and Canada has

thousands of miles of unpopulated land, why choose Huron-Kinloss which is next to the Great Lakes water system and a sizable population. I say find an alternative.

- It's a ticking time bomb to place this so close to a great lake, it should be far away from any major waterway that provides drinking water to millions of people. If you can't safely dispose of this waste, you should stop producing nuclear power.
- I am on record with Ontario for being disappointed that there was no waste disposal plan before the nuclear industry was started here. Not then or now (yet).

Quebec's competing James Bay Project is now on stream producing clean hydro electricity.

I am concerned about nuclear storage in moderate population areas such as ours with large populations downstream from H-K.

- Nothing is ever 100% safe and I think it unwise to bury it near one of the largest fresh water bodies in the world. It should go to crown land in a sparsely populated area
- I grew up just two miles away from a nuclear research facility. It's never been clear whether or not our groundwater was a bit contaminated from the lab, and that's not talking nuclear waste. But just on an emotional level it was creepy, and often material for unsettling jokes about the region, and I grew up wondering if my health would suffer as a result of my Dad's job.

I am not completely opposed to nuclear power, however, I am completely against locating any kind of serious environmental hazard (fuel rods, windmills in the water) within dangerous proximity to the largest bodies of fresh water on our planet. Already, Lake Huron is seriously compromised by excess nitrogen creating algae blooms. This year my kids are seeing a lot more dead fish than usual, and I suspect it's because of the heavy rain pulling down more nitrogen from the fields. Adding to that a risk of lethal contamination to the whole Great Lakes region just seems unthinkable.

As far as real estate value goes, an industrial appearance would certainly pull down the tourism value in terms of owned property (if not rentals) - just think of other Great Lakes regions which one immediately associates with unaesthetic industry - Sault Ste. Marie, Lake Erie, the channel underneath the Blue Water Bridge, Lake Michigan's west shore near its larger towns, Lake Ontario going toward Niagara - those are places I would never want to have a cottage. And even Pt. Clark is dubious, because we keep hearing about the water being dirtier there than further up the beach.

I'm not sure where the waste should be located, but my hunch is either some place that NOBODY goes, or outer space - if it really can't be reprocessed.

(Note: I have eaten an incredibly large catfish as a result of fishing near the Bruce plant's outflow, when I was a kid. Yikes, the fish had about a half-inch of fat all around its body. Pretty tasty, though, if you don't mind grease. But I would never do that again!)

- I do not support it as I don't feel it will be a safe environment for people or nature. I don't approve of it being so close to beautiful Lake Huron which supplies water to many communities and cities and provides passage for many ships carrying goods to other parts of Canada and the USA.
- NIMBY but I think for good reasons. It will likely bring increased economic activity but I don't want that as will spoil small town and natural environment it currently has. Increased development, population, etc. is a negative in my eyes as I do not want to see any more urbanization or industrialization. Its proximity to the Great Lakes and Huron particularly concerns me as I think too great a risk (even as small as it is or may be) to take with drinking water for millions.
- I am very concerned about the environment and the welfare of the residence of Huron-Kinloss. The area has great value due to the proximity of the lake Huron and the beauty of the beaches and forest. It does not seem prudent or safe To bury nuclear waste so close to the lake. I'm concerned about the detrimental impact on property values.
- It is too close to the major water system of the Great Lakes.
- Not enough information provided. Will negatively impact the area in several ways including; economy, environment, and property values.
- I do not agree with the burial of waste from all nuclear facilities in this one location. It does not seem like a safe option environmentally and could have potential catastrophic health impacts on all forms of life in the area.
- This is a piece of heaven up here. We've been coming here for over 35 yrs. with the family. Putting something that close to us will only have negative impacts to our land and people. Let's do the right thing and send it elsewhere.
- Do not support. Site is too close to the largest fresh water system in the world that millions of people depend on for water. Regardless of the stability of the rock formations and the various blocking systems to isolate the waste (clay, concrete, steel canisters, etc.) from the surrounding environment I still feel it is better to store the waste in a less populated area further away from significant water sources. A lot of work has been done to foresee any potential issues...but the freshwater is our most valuable asset as a country - we need to protect it at all costs.

- We spend our summers up here at our family cottage. I worry about the future of our children and their children if we have a nuclear waste facility in our backyard. Please consider other options so that we can continue to make memories with our family in this special place.
- I do not support this project since I think the potential for some accidental spill is high during transport of the used fuel to this site from other nuclear power plants, no matter if this is done by road or rail. Transport to Huron-Kinloss would necessitate travel through highly populated areas.
- The transportation of the nuclear waste to this facility seems to me the riskiest part of this plan. It scares me and needs to be discussed as a part of this plan.
- Possible radiation contamination years from now.
- I know the waste needs to go somewhere but it seems a less populated area would be more appropriate.
- This area is where many families live or visit year round. While the facility will probably will be built with the best practice for containment in mind, the possible negative impacts of this facility far outweigh the positives. If this facility were to break or a leak were to happen it could ruin an area that families have been coming for 100 years and some even longer.
- I worry about leaks into the environment, therefore do not support the construction.
- Concern over the potential for future radioactive mistakes not now known or modeled.
- It has to go somewhere so close to The Bruce makes sense.
- Proximity to the water supply for millions of people who live on or near the Great Lakes.
- I worry about the transportation of the spent fuel to the waste facility. I also am concerned about the negative impact of associating Huron-Kinloss with the depository.

I support a deep depository as the best solution for the spent waste. I worry about the proximity to the Great Lakes and the drinking water for many communities.

- I don't feel confident that the long-term side-effects of having nuclear waste buried so closely to a community of residents is fully understood. I understand research has been done, however, it's been less than 100 years since the start of disposing of nuclear waste-not enough time has passed for us to actually understand the long-term implications of these actions. I'm not willing to be a guinea pig.

- Too dangerous to have anywhere near the Great Lakes.
- My main concern of this proposed option for Huron-Kinloss is burying this waste in a populated area and near Lake Huron. This would have a negative impact for future generations. We would see a decline in families building a home and future here. Property value would definitely decline.
- I don't support the construction of a high nuclear waste facility in Huron-Kinloss because it would have a tremendous negative impact on our environment, future generations, decrease value of our properties and quality of life.
- Environmental reasons and risk of exposure to radiation be it trucks driving to the site or waste getting into the ground, also the construction is bad for the environment
- High level of employment with no real risk to residences.
- Limestone is such a porous material, the proximity to Lake Huron, all the Great Lakes are connected and provide a huge fresh water source for the United States and Canada, The ever present possibility of human error all make this proposal a VERY BAD IDEA.
- It is already being stored on site and the experts have indicated that bring it is the best alternative.
- This location is too close to a main water supply for millions of people. It is also a major farming community where crops/livestock that humans consume could be affected if there is a leak of any kind. The recreation value would be significantly reduced as people generally would not want to vacation near a highly toxic nuclear waste facility.
- There is a knee-jerk reaction to depositing nuclear waste in any community.

An argument also exists that says we should view this waste as the responsibility of our generation and our community, not a problem to send elsewhere to someone else's backyard.

Another argument might say that, considering the risks of this waste, it is better to have it under the care of the best people with the best training and facilities. Oddly enough, after I looked it up, Bruce nuclear is actually the second largest nuclear facility in the world. It has repeatedly bested American facilities in both security and safety evaluations over the last fifteen years.

People are afraid of importing waste. I was shocked to learn that the nuclear rods seem to be already stored here, above ground, next to Bruce in the WWMF. I was already down the lake from a nuclear waste facility for decades! My skin has not

turned green yet.

I am as hesitant as anyone about endangering themselves and others with this level of radioactive waste. But when I consider sending to a repository far north, near Thunder Bay for example, I have less faith that the best and brightest talent will be willing to work there, or as caring to prevent a leak.

Here in Bruce, 3 hours from Toronto, in some ways it may actually be the safest place, by virtue of the talent pool of specialists available and willing to work here. I believe human error is the greatest risk factor when it comes to nuclear accidents, so in a sense, keeping it here might actually be a burden that we are best-suited to handle.

I know the other arguments about our safety, our real estate, and even our traffic. It is not difficult to stoke flames of nuclear paranoia. I would offer perhaps this argument above, simply because you do not hear it often: pushing the waste away from Bruce risks putting this waste under the care of less competent hands.

- The town and water is beautiful. Destroying that and people's homes would be devastating!

We have a family cottage on Bruce beach that has been around for over 30 years. With children and great grand children. That means families like ours wouldn't be able to enjoy the water, summers up at Huron-Kinloss. Please reconsider. This is so sad and harmful in so many ways.

- Don't want this facility in our cottage area.
- It would strengthen the economy and provide jobs, tax benefits and (I expect) a significant community financial dividend (like Kincardine and Port Elgin received) in relation to the building of the Bruce. These funds would more than offset the minor construction disruption.
- The science supports burying it in this location as an extremely safe location and will be an economic stimulus to the community. As well, nuclear power is a very cost effective method of generating electricity (second only to hydro generation) and assuming best practice protocols in place, is safe and green friendly.

One always has to consider the risk that if every municipality has an NIMBY attitude when, in fact, there are several areas in Ontario - one being the Bruce bedrock - which would be the safest and most cost effective options presenting the lowest risks on a province-wise basis.

- The fact that it will most likely fail in the future and leak radiation which would completely destroy the area and the water of lake Huron not to mention what it would do to the residents of this beautiful region
- I do not support it because of it's proximity to the great lakes and what seems to be an unclear plan for monitoring for waste leakage for the indefinite future.
- I do not support the construction of a high-level nuclear waste facility in Huron-Kinloss due to the proximity of the radioactive waste and one of the largest natural fresh water lakes. The risk of radioactive contamination to the lake is a risk that cannot be justified through economic gain potentially generated from such a project.
- Over the years, I have been lead to believe that the facility at Bruce, was to bury level one waste. I am not sure that all of the information sent, or if it is my interpretation of that information is very accurate. I missed completely the jump from level 1 to level 3. I have supported level 1 depository, I do not support level 3 depository. We can find a better location, away from the Great Lakes.
- I believe that we need to take responsibility for disposing of the nuclear waste produced. I believe the facility will be safe, and is a safer option than transporting the waste to another area.
- Building this type of facility seems to be the best option with the information we have now and I personally know of no better process. I do think the farther from civilization and the more secure the natural base i.e. rock base safely away from the water table is the best choice but again I have little knowledge of what is needed.

At some point we have to begin to trust and not continually request further delays which will increase the costs of doing anything and end up leaving us more vulnerable in the future. Of course no one wants it "in their back yard" and hence my personal thought but I do believe they are doing all in their power and with their present knowledge to make any facility secure.

Thank you for working diligently to keep Bruce Beachers informed on this matter.

- We should not be doing this with nuclear waste. We need to find a solution that is good for all, not one that just buries the problem. This is not a solution it solves nothing and actually poses more of a problem that future generations are going to have fix. That is not ok in my book.
- As long as due diligence is conducted, we should bury the waste in a safe manner here. We need to rectify the problem in our own backyard and not burden other communities...plus this will help with the local economy.
- Not convinced of its safety during construction.

- The danger of an accident to the site that causes release of radiation into the air and lake.
- Ideally, I would like all nuclear power generating stations in Canada to be shut down. I think it is environmentally irresponsible to generate waste that future generations will have to deal with. However, even in the event of a complete closure of all nuclear generating stations, the existing nuclear waste must be dealt with somehow and burying it does seem like the most reasonable strategy. But, I do not like the idea of shipping waste long distances - accidents during transport would have terrible consequences. I would favour individual storage sites near each of the major generating stations. I realize this would place one storage site in Huron-Kinloss to be close to the Bruce Nuclear Power Station but that would be a sacrifice I'd be willing to make to avoid shipping across the country thereby exposing far more areas to the risk of environmental damage in the event of a transportation accident. If it is not logistically feasible to have multiple storage sites closer to the individual reactors, then one waste storage site that is farther away than Huron-Kinloss from population centres and fertile farmland would be better. If the waste will be shipped regardless, then the waste from Bruce Nuclear can also be shipped farther away.
- I do not support the location of the facility here because it will negatively impact on my life and that of future generations. We need to find alternative solutions to the nuclear waste and not bury it close to the Great Lakes where it could contaminate the water of millions of people.
- Based on the geological strata of the Huron-Kinloss area. It is projected to be one of the safest sites for nuclear waste disposal.
- Burying nuclear waste next to the Great Lakes is insane. At some point down the road there will be an issue with nuclear waste contaminating the water.
- I don't know that this is the only solution and I feel that something that is supposed to be safe for millions of year, has been adequately designed. I don't feel confident that it would be safe for the residents or the environment.
- I do not support locating this facility in Huron-Kinloss, in a populated rural area with widespread agricultural land use potentially disrupted or negatively affected. Location to be chosen for project should be in a remote, unpopulated and non-agricultural area that meets the safety requirements of the nearest willing host community.
- In the unknown but not zero likelihood of a leak we would all have to get away from our properties as fast as possible and never return. People would die. Our properties would become absolutely worthless in an instant.

- Millions of people and water supplies should not be exposed to this. Bury it at a remote location. Also the US experience in New Mexico indicates that despite all the planning and research can still result in unplanned accidents.
- More research is needed to discover how to minimize nuclear waste by repurposing or developing safer forms of energy generation.
- At some point it will poison the local community and environment. There will be accidents and leaks and they will devastate this area
- To take a beautiful, pristine, family-oriented small town area and subject it to a program such as the nuclear waste proposition would totally destroy the area and the community's opinion of it. There are far too many unincorporated and uninhabited areas that would be better suited for this purpose, and I am strongly against this even being a suggestion.
- Safety of nearby residents.
- While understanding that those living in Metro Toronto don't want their energy waste in their back yard, and while not wanting in all put in 'our' back yard either, the underlying issues is the "WHERE".

I would prefer a northern Ontario location to minimize impact on a region suitable for population to live, farm, work and recreate. If the waste is so well-sealed, then there should be minimal transport risk.

If it were to be in this Township, then where? I would prefer it as far away from the Lakeshore as possible. What input do Township residents have on 'where' in the Township?

It is not clear to me whether such a facility would decrease cottage values; a more robust economy in the region might increase demand for prime waterfront; that has certainly been a factor in value increases in recent decades.

- I don't trust NWMO or the township to fully and clearly articulate all the risks which may be presented to current and future residents of and visitors to the region. I don't believe claims that engineering can safely contain nuclear waste for tens of thousands of years, as there is no precedent for any human-built structure to have remained intact for such a period. I don't believe that that geological strata in which the nuclear waste would be deposited can be reasonably predicted to be safely fault-free for the radioactive period of the buried waste.
- I worry about the long term risks for the area, especially because of the proximity to Lake Huron, the water quality, and it's ability to support the wildlife that depends on it. This is a valuable resource in a number of ways and I would hate to put it at

greater risk than currently threatens it through human impact and pollution in the environment.

- I realize that this waste needs to be disposed of in a secure manner. However, I believe that the site needs to be at a distance as far as possible away from the great lakes, in this case, Lake Huron. Because the great lakes supply a significant amount of available fresh water to our planet, it is irresponsible to take this risk. As indicated in the previous sections, the impact on the quality of life, value of property, etc. is an unknown at this time, and while it is a potential concern, it is not a "main reason" for lack of support.
- I don't feel like I have enough information to have a personal opinion. I think an independent assessment should be done so that the township can make a decision based on best known practices and possible outcomes / adverse effects.
- I do not support the construction of the nuclear waste facility in Huron-Kinloss due to its proximity to Lake Huron which is part of the Great Lakes Basin providing water to tens of millions of people.
- No matter how safe something like this is, there is always a risk. Although a much more remote site and the transportation related to that option would also have its own risks, in my opinion, the overall risk would be less and there would be fewer people impacted should there be even a minor issue.
- The health risks and constant fear of a leak.
- Long term (multiple generations) ramifications
- Long-term costs to humankind.
Dangers inherent in transport.
- My main concern is not the burying of the waste its the scope of the build for the facility.
- I think Canada must deal with this waste. Leaving it at the nuclear sites is not a long term solution. If Huron-Kinloss is the best location for overall safety then I support it.
- I have read much information about how the sub strata here is suitable for such a facility, but not much about conditions at other possible locations. From the beginning, with the low-medium facility, it was clear that the NWMO favoured this area and our thinking has been directed that way. The same strategy seems to be in effect for the high level waste facility.
- The economy and way of life in Huron-Kinloss has depended since earliest times on good soil and clean water. Both are needed to support agriculture and lakefront activities. A multi-billion-dollar radioactive waste site could be detrimental to both agriculture and waterfront activities. It will certainly harm the reputation of both. A

leak of radiation from the sit or during transport, even if unlikely, would be catastrophic to both agriculture and lakefront activities. The risk outweighs the reward. A new enterprise should not jeopardize existing businesses and activities.

- We do not have sufficient information to make an informed decision. There has been no independent formal risk assessment covering areas such as risk to the reputation of the community, operational risks due to increased traffic, nuclear waste transportation, impacts on property taxes, quality of life, impacts to smaller businesses such as contractors (ability to find qualified tradesman) etc. We do not have any details on who will pay for the ongoing road maintenance, building of schools, recreation centres etc.

The township must hire an independent company well versed in municipal affairs to conduct an assessment. The results must be made public. The mayor of Huron-Kinloss must recuse himself from any involvement in this project especially in the risk assessment and communication thereof as he stands to gain significantly if the project is approved.

Until we have significantly more detailed information, I cannot decide whether to support this project.

- Burying and sealing a large amount of high-level nuclear waste so close to Lake Huron is a terrible idea. Even the smallest possibility of leakage should be enough for not burying the waste in Huron-Kinloss or South Bruce.
- Environmental risk and consequence to high.
Due to the long term project development the time to repurpose the nuclear waste would probably come to fruition....
- It is our mess, we have to clean it up. Let's do our best.
- Exploration of other options may be developed over the next 5 or 10 years that may have less risk in terms of environmental, health, cost to develop and maintain. Advances in technology may help solve with the issues of decontamination.
- Don't put nuclear waste under one of the largest reserves of fresh water.
- The impact on our present generation might not be that bad, although being the area of storage of nuclear waste certainly will not attract future positive development in this area. Do we want to be known as the Chernobyl of Canada? Even if we can safely store the waste for the next few generations, can we be so arrogant as to think that we cannot be endangering one of the largest sources of fresh water in the world? Find a storage area far from any of the Great Lakes!
- As things stand secure storage is necessary now and into the future.

- No convincing evidence of long term or future risk.
- There is no way Nuclear waste should be stored anywhere near one of the Great Lakes. If there is ever a leak, we may be exposing the Great Lakes, the largest supply of fresh water in the world to contamination. Not worth the risk.
- I love Bruce Beach!
- Nuclear waste facilities are not compatible with the identity of Huron-Kinloss.
- Do not support. Not interested in increasing the local population or having to deal with the problems of such as increase. i.e., traffic
- Too many unknowns at this time.
- Why would you take the risk of burying nuclear waste near one of the largest sources of clean water in the world? How can you be sure there will not be a natural disaster (earthquake) or man-made disaster (see Chernobyl, the latest Russia nuclear issue). Why would you not bury the nuclear waste away from the Great Lakes, population, and as remotely as possible?
- The health and welfare of future generations.
- It is far too close to the Great Lakes system. Fresh water is going to become more and more important. If the water in the Great Lakes becomes contaminated, it would have devastating economic impacts (tourism, sport fishing, boating.. anything connected to the water). This is the same reason it's worrisome they're currently stored on site at the Bruce.

More information is required on the potential health impacts of trucking high-level radio active materials through communities and farms that grow food. What measures are in place should there be a traffic accident?

Also, is this in addition to the low level waste facility that was being proposed... or has the proposal changed? Two facilities in the area would compound health and safety concerns.

- I do not support construction of the facility, primarily because of water safety and proximity to the great lakes. While characterized as low probability, there are several unacceptable risks associated with long-term storage (e.g., undetected faults, failure of seals, inadvertent or intentional human intrusion [war]), which would be significantly mitigated if the facility were located in a remote area far away from large bodies of water.
- Lake Huron is an important resource for Ontario in so many ways. The long term risk to that resource greatly outweighs any short term economic benefits. Also,

transporting nuclear waste into the region could result in radioactive spills due to accidents or could become a target for acts of terrorism.

- To solve the problem of having the waste stored above ground.
- I think the waste should be buried rather than sitting above ground.
- I am absolutely against burying nuclear waste along the shores of the great lakes. The great lakes contain 20% of the world's fresh water, and 90% of North America's fresh water. If anything happened to the nuclear waste, what impact would it have on such an essential and valuable resource? I don't care how careful the NWMO tries to be, we cannot know what will happen to a burial site over such a long period of time. It is an unprecedented experiment and we cannot therefore predict what will happen. There have been countless assurances that various projects relating to energy sources are safe, only to wind up with environmental and health catastrophes (e.g., Fukushima, Deep Water Horizon oil spill). Not only did catastrophes occur, but we have been unable to stop or control these catastrophes quickly, sometimes ever, as in the case of Fukushima. I recognize the need to deal with nuclear waste, but it should not be located anywhere close to a resource as valuable as the freshwater of the great lakes.
- There is technology available to exploit this 'spent' fuel in other types of reactors. But this technology is not being developed in Canada. The reprocessed fuel is much less radioactive when spent, and has a markedly reduced half-life. Why are we not exploring this option? And exploring the cost/benefit for this 'free' fuel.

Can we exploit the current spent fuel once it has been stored into the ground? Or is it stuck there forever? If it remains available for new and better technologies, I have no problem with the current option of storing it for now. We need a safe repository.

- This is something that should have been figured out before the building of the nuclear power plant. More information is required to the way the waste is buried. Also the thought of nuclear waste being transported from other sites is very dangerous. Imagine a truck spill, it happens whether with other chemicals or animals, or whatever the transport truck is carrying.
- Environmental concerns.
- Nuclear waste should not be buried beside Lake Huron. Unintended consequences could be catastrophic.
- Do not support this plan.
- Economic benefit to the region with no reasonable scientific risk. There were far worse fears that our lives and cottage values would be destroyed when Bruce Nuclear was built. Instead we have a vibrant Kincardine.

- Strongly oppose to this proposal. Our future generations will be greatly affected, no one will want to reside here other than those profiting financially, the health of the Great Lakes are at stake and human error is always a risk. Our cottages will no longer have the appeal of the little town of Kincardine where we escape to the beach for family time. Our reputation will be a place to avoid due to the dump site.
- Not supportive - Burying nuclear waste anywhere close to the largest fresh water source is irresponsible and short-sighted. Long term impacts aren't known and it is not worth the risk.
- Worried for the future if a leakage should occur!! Tens of thousands of years? We are gambling our future.

Also our cottage property value will most likely go down.

- In previous meetings, high level waste was NEVER discussed. It was always low level, then became low and intermediate which is still unacceptable to me. I do not understand why you would put the Great Lakes and a populated community at even the smallest form of risk of contamination due to a breach in the disposal facility. Regardless of how competent your scientists are, they cannot predict all environmental changes which could impact safety, such as an earthquake. They cannot predict world changes, such as terrorist attacks. In my opinion, no matter how much money Huron-Kinloss is going to make on this deal, it is not worth the risk.
- Construction would decrease property values on Bruce Beach.
- We will be known not as the charming town of Kincardine but the radioactive dump site of the nation. We are not looking to our future generations & the health of our Great Lakes at all with this decision. Our cottages will no longer have the appeal of our families gathering spot at our favorite beach. Nothing is free from human error and this one is a risk that we do not want to take a chance on! Short sightedness to look at it for financial gain to Huron-Kinloss!
- I don't want it that close to my cottage.
- I would support the initiative if there are multiple reviews by independent and non-partisan organizations that can objectively quantify the risks and benefits to the local municipality that the site is located in as well as the ecological factors that could affect the great lakes.

To compensate the local municipality for taking on the long term risk, there should be some kind of tax break funded by the regional benefactors of the waste management.

- Unknown impact on agriculture, wanting to preserve agricultural land. Negative impacts of traffic.
- If we are prepared to have the economic benefits of the nuclear plant, we should be prepared to deal with all aspects of the operation. Whether burying it or not is a complicated issue that requires the world's brightest minds to solve.

We cannot expect to fully understand the risks. We have to count on the experts. We have to count on our elected officials to do the right thing. That is the bigger risk.

- Trucks on the roads!!!
- I do not support it because it so close to the lakes and human population. It should be disposed in a highly remote area not matter the method of disposal.
- It does make any sense to me to bury high-level nuclear waste near the Great Lakes.
- Burying nuclear waste on the shores of Lake Huron is ridiculous when Canada has vast areas far from population and from fresh water supplies that could become burial sites. The push to do this in Kincardine is from short-sighted economic interest and lack of vision in municipal planning. Do you really think other industries or employers will consider Kincardine as a possible home when it becomes known as a nuclear graveyard?!
- I don't support waste facility in Huron-Kinloss because of our proximity to Lake Huron, part of the Great Lakes water supply for millions of people. I wish we would hear more about the other possible locations to the facility.
- Not a main reason, but why would we be starting Canada-wide and not just locally? Start with a smaller local facility to see what issues there might be. If these are truly insurmountable, those rods which were disposed of here may in fact need to be moved to a storage facility elsewhere in the province or country.
- An underground waste facility that has been completely entombed is much safer than rods just sitting in pools at the individual facilities. However I would hope if in the very far future they come up with the ability to use / dispose of this material, that they will remove it from this facility.
- The bedrock and proximity to the Great Lakes make Huron-Kinloss a poor location for long term Nuclear Waste storage. I believe that Ignace, Manitouwadge, and Hornpayne would be a better solution considering the environmental, ecological, and economical impacts.
- It does make any sense to me to bury high-level nuclear waste near the Great Lakes.
- The permanent burial of used nuclear fuel is a short-sighted solution to what is essentially a short-term challenge, but the most significant reason for opposing the

idea of disposing of this highly radioactive product in a populated region is a social one, based on human behavior.

No amount of assurance of safety will ever be sufficient to overcome the general population's fear of nuclear waste. As a consequence, once selected as a disposal site, no municipality will be able to avoid being principally identified as a nuclear dump site. Few will be willing to work there. Most will refuse to see it as a place to live and play, or to raise a family. As such, its social and economic decline and collapse will be assured. Future generations will be unable to appreciate why the locality was once considered so attractive, or how it was that its demise could not have been prevented.

- I think there are too many negative results to bury it in this area.
- In my opinion, an underground storage facility with proper security will be a much safer long term storage option for spent fuel rods than continuing the current on site storage indefinitely.
- Too close to Great Lakes and dense population.
- Human thinking is more readily influenced by immediate consequences than long term consequences. Nuclear power plants should be replaced by electric generation created by applying Tesla's atmospheric research. This would be far less dangerous for life on this planet.

Those who support nuclear power plants are those who gain the most power and wealth from blocking approaches that could replace their sources of power and wealth.

- Negative impact to property values (cottages in our case) and related, a potentially negative stigma for the area.
- I am concerned about potential leaking into the lake. I am concerned about spent fuel rods from other locations being transported to the site.
- It has to go somewhere, and we've been dealing with it for fifty (50) years already.
- Potential for accidents to poison the Great Lakes and affect the area which relies on farming and tourism.
- The benefits are soft spoken about in the media and not the risk and negative impacts so much.

I strongly disagree to nuclear waste being close to populated area. The negative impacts are big and need to be considered.

- This a complete disgrace to a beautiful community. Go some place else, don't ruin our land!
- I feel that all Nuclear facilities need to make a long term commitment to nuclear waste disposal. If this were developed here, Huron-Kinloss would be a world leader in nuclear waste disposal. I believe it is safe just as I believe the Nuclear plants themselves are safe. I worked at the Bruce plants for years with no ill affects. We need to think of future generations and storing it above ground is a temporary solution.
- The risk of a disaster is too high.
- Burying nuclear waste in an area that is the source of fresh drinking water for future generations is myopic.
- Concern for the health of residents today and in the future.
- I think this is an enormous risk to the economy and environment of the area, and is a terrible burden and danger to current and future generations.
- For starters, the high level waste will be stored in metal, rust "resistant " containers?? Are you joking? That's the concern you have for the general population and the next generation and generations to come? Come on now, show some stewardship!!!!
- I have no idea why the concept of burying nuclear waste beside 1/6 of our earth's fresh water supply is even being considered. I can only hope that common sense will outweigh the temptation of common currency.
- Need to understand what the best way to dispose of high-level nuclear waste is overall. Already have a nuclear plant within sight of the cottage so there is already a risk of "disaster" every day. There has to be some way to safely "store" waste from the past, present and future and everyone has to participate in that decision. It has to be stored somewhere and there will be "risks" wherever that is but we already have risks with all current nuclear plants and the current waste. Cannot "wait forever" to figure out the "perfect solution". The best solution might be to store waste where each plant is and that should have already been figured out when the plants were first built. If that is not "adequate" then all waste might have to be stored in one "safe as possible" site. Then "safe" transport will have to be figured out from everywhere else.
- I want to preserve our community as a safe place to live and swim.
- Proximity to a larger population based in SW Ontario compared the northern options.
- We live near one of the largest fresh water supplies in the world. Why anyone would consider jeopardizing this natural resource is beyond understanding.

- We do not know nearly enough about the disposal of spent nuclear fuel. Coming decades may well see better options than permanent burial. So any burial plan at this time should be temporary, not permanent.
- The waste should go to a supportive community if one can be found where the geological case can be made for the millennia-long storage process. I do not think there is a high risk of leaks or impact to the water system or surrounding environment since the storage solution is some 250 meters below the ground water. I also do not think there will be significant impacts on property values since the proximity to the Bruce Nuclear Plant is currently deterrent enough for people sensitive to potential radiation leaks. I would rather see the waste properly stored sooner rather than later as currently the waste is sitting at the Bruce and is much more likely to have a leak that would affect the environment and water system. I also do not think the choice should be based on the cost/benefit to a community; priority number 1 should be finding bedrock that will be undisturbed for thousands of years.
- The waste site needs to be situated in a remote area that is a totally unpopulated such as Northern Ontario so as to minimize any potential risks over time.

The waste site should NOT be within 100 Km of a great lake or populated area or agricultural area.

Huron-Kinloss is an agricultural and recreational area Having a nuclear waste site in this area would be devastating for future generations.

- It needs to be in a less populated area and far from the Great Lakes.
- I believe that I am informed on the science of the geology for why this location would be a very low to no risk site. Nothing ever has no risk and so no one will be able to say that any solution or location will be risk free. We need to take responsibility for the cost of dealing with the spent fuel that comes with nuclear power, and that cost means finding a practical and safe location to store spent fuel. Unfortunately, some people look at digging a hole and burying household garbage is the same as a planned and researched nuclear waste facility. A lot of smart people with academic and practical experience have weighed in on why this location would be a good solution.

The bottom line is that a decision needs to be made. Doing nothing or basing a decision on hope that someone else will find a better solution elsewhere is irresponsible. Making an informed controversial decision takes courage. As citizens within our community and country, we can do better than that. If we think that we can help support an informed valid solution that could be a high-level waste facility in

Huron-Kinloss, then that is our obligation to our community, our children, and our future generations.

- I don't believe that high level waste should be buried in close proximity to the great lakes

I don't believe that the storage facility will generate enough local revenue (construction and ongoing operating revenue) for the township to offset negative environmental image damage.

I believe neighbouring townships will benefit as much or more than Huron-Kinloss and I believe all will suffer the same negative environmental image from hosting the site.

I believe the construction and operation of the facility will be similar to that of the windmills – lots of outside of the township workers, staying outside of the township while working and when completed leaving the township with a very small revenue stream.

- It is insane to endanger that much of the world's fresh water in this way. No amount of redundant precautions makes this palatable. I understand we do need to do something with them, but this is definitely not the right solution.
- We are already essentially a 'nuclear community' with Bruce Nuclear in our neighbourhood so hopefully there won't be negative impact on cottage value or nationwide perception of our area.

Bigger concern is the truck transportation no matter where the burial site is located. I don't think the survey should have asked for a cottage #. Could have asked for an area on the beach, ie Touts, McCosh etc. ...

- I don't believe nuclear waste should be stored this closely to our precious and very important natural resource. "Fresh drinking water". There are many and many more suitable locations that are not close to water...
- Huron-Kinloss is adjacent to a major body of water, Lake Huron, which is the second largest Great Lake and the fifth largest lake in the world. Since there is currently no scientifically proven way to safely deposit highly radioactive nuclear waste, I cannot support something like this which could potentially be of great risk to our environment, human life and this significant body of fresh water. Huron-Kinloss is also an area of significant farm land with crops and livestock which would be at risk should there be any leakage. More work needs to be done to explore alternative

ways to reuse the high-level nuclear waste. Other deep repositories have experienced problems of late which is worrisome. More work needs to be done to ensure that the proposed method, i.e., this type of deep repository is the right answer. There are other proposed sites which are more sparsely populated and not as close to a major body of water which might prove to be less of a potential risk to human life and the environment.

- I worry about the negative impact the nuclear waste facility in Huron-Kinloss would have on my children and grandchildren who love to spend time at our cottage at Bruce Beach. Our cottage was purchased by a relative in 1900! There is so much heritage in this cottage. I also worry about the negative impact on the value of our cottage.
- I am worried about the environmental health of the area and its impact on the health of our generation and generations to follow.
- Please refer to the last screen. Every answer to the question was "negative impact". I fear for everything about this proposal.
- It's a short-sighted solution. Economic impact may be positive short-term, but the long-term identification of Huron-Kinloss as the national nuclear waste dump would be devastating. I'm also unsure that permanent disposal of the waste at this time is a good idea - that technology won't ever be available to make use of this spent fuel, or that another, better solution to permanent burying can't or won't soon be found.
- It seems like a high risk hazard to human, plant, and animal life. We do not know the long term consequences (decades, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of years down the road). Until we understand, it seems premature to just bury and seal it up in the ground "forever."
- High-level nuclear waste should not be stored near the great lakes and populated areas.
- Potential impact on the surrounding bodies of water and under ground water.
- Not at all comfortable with this repository being situated on a Great lake!

Impacts aquatic life, wild life, agriculture and nearby residential and business communities in an overall negative way.

- In my view, the burial of waste should occur far, far away from the Great Lakes.
- The long term and unknown potential of risk with buried waste is far too risky for our future generations. The potential of contamination of water for a huge number of residents around the Great Lakes should be of primary concern.

- The Great Lakes waters support a very large portion of the world's drinkable fresh water. Storing radioactive materials with a half-life of tens of thousands of years is inherently hazardous and dangerous to a large percentage of the world's creatures of all types. This outweighs considerations such as finances and profits... another solution, one less hazardous to the world's life should be found and implemented.
- The DGR is based only on NWMO's computer modelled studies, there is no precedent with which it can be compared. There is no guarantee it is 'safe'. Radioactive waste in such a huge cumulative amount is a potential toxic contaminate of the earth and water and an irreversible risk for future generations. Will the DGR at some time also accept US radioactive waste, under trade agreements?

The DGR operation will leave a huge imprint on community, forever change the dynamics of our area. DGR money has already greatly infiltrated Huron-Kinloss and influenced politicians and citizens.

Lake Huron is our responsibility to protect. The proposed mining operation and burial of nuclear waste is abusive to our Mother earth.

It is time to wake up to what we are doing...and stop doing it.

We need to have alternative views about the DGR presented to us in Huron-Kinloss.

- The fact that it will be a heavy industry which, regardless of radiation issues, will change the face of the area.
- I don't believe that the storage of such material will be a threat given that it is done properly according to the advise of the most informed experts. One can always worst case something but that happens seldom and we just need to accept that someday there will be a problem. We will just have to believe that the people involved at that time will come up with an acceptable solution.
- The waste storage issue is not a problem if done correctly.
- I don't know of anyone who wants the dangers associated with nuclear waste in their backyard. It is already uncomfortable enough to have the plant so close.
- IT IS TOO RISKY. I DO NOT SUPPORT IT.
- Possible future leaks that would affect the health of residents, plus the lowering of property values.
- If it can demonstrate security of water supply, the economic benefits worth the risk! I am not sure they can provide this security.
What happens if they drill and hit water? Will they back off?

- Limestone is porous. Too close to Lake Huron. A mine in the Canadian Shield in igneous/metamorphic rock would be better. Northern Ontario would benefit economically. I do not support the H/K initiative.
- It is imbecilic to place such a project in Huron-Kinloss. For one thing, we're already dealing with the stigma of the Bruce plant - for another, whatever potential "economic benefits" that come associated with building/running a high-level facility and storage are vastly outweighed by the threats to the physical + mental health of surrounding communities, the existing livelihoods of people in surrounding communities, the habitats of numerous wildlife populations, and the future of young people growing up and coming of age in the area. I could go on, but that's my capsule response.
- I believe the facility should be far from any population centres and far from the Great Lakes which provide drinking water for millions. Any form of accident or long term deterioration would be catastrophic for all of Southern Ontario.
- Don't know enough about what they do with the waste right now.
- I believe transporting from the Bruce site to a location in northern Ontario is better, especially because of the MB and QC inbound traffic. Bruce is too populated, this site should be in a remote location.
- As a member of a family that has had a cottage on Bruce Beach since 1934, I am strongly opposed to the construction of a high-level nuclear waste facility in Huron-Kinloss for several reasons:

-Danger to health from leaks during transport and/or storage.

-Destruction of a huge area of natural environment/habitat through the construction of the facility.

-Massive increase in the stigma suffered by Huron-Kinloss communities. The area already suffers from this stigma because of the nuclear power plant. It would be significantly magnified by the addition of a waste facility.

-The stigma and general nuclear-related concerns and fears would have serious negative economic repercussions for Huron-Kinloss communities, driving people away from living in or visiting these communities. Tourism is a crucial, key aspect of the H-K economy -- a waste facility would likely cripple it.

I could go on. There is a huge number of reasons to oppose such a dangerous plan being carried out in Huron-Kinloss. If nuclear waste needs to be buried -- and this method is in itself questionable -- it should be buried very far from any human communities that would be physically or economically affected.

- Stop messing up the environment for future generations, there is enough damage to it already without throwing nuclear waste into the great lakes. Even if it is only a possibility, it is too great a risk to widespread environmental damage.
- Our cottage has been on Bruce Beach for over 100 years. The impact will ruin the Great Lakes along with the shore line and the property value. Another plan to dispose needs to be evaluated.
- Insufficient information about risk management. The township needs to do an analysis of what specific risks are being incurred, and what will be done to mitigate them. Until this information is available, I cannot be in favour of proceeding with the project. We need to know specific risk information before there is any vote in the township about whether to proceed.
- I appreciate the information provided at the outset of the survey, however it is hard to take a stance on such a complex issue on the basis of that information alone. I assume that there is a rationale as to why Huron-Kinloss is being considered vs somewhere else further away (e.g., risks of transporting the fuel). I also assume that while no one would like the idea of having a nuclear waste storage facility anywhere near them, this may be the most sensible option given the limits of reality (e.g., that this fuel already exists and some of it is already being stored in Huron-Kinloss). While I am not strictly opposed to the option of storing waste in Huron-Kinloss I do believe that it could 'rebrand' the area negatively and could decrease property values. I think an independent risk and benefit assessment would be valuable and any info in this regard this should be communicated by the BBCA to cottagers. This is obviously a sensitive and multi-faceted issue and I appreciate the efforts of the BBCA to keep people informed and solicit input so actively from the membership.
- I think a remote northern Ontario site (less population and away from the Great Lakes) would make a better location.
If there will be specially designed trucks to transport than take is further away from the bulk of the population.
It would also have a positive impact on the economy in an area of the province that needs it more.
- The best solution is to bury this material in a safe place. Thinking that the handling of the waste will be done properly and safely here is a positive
- Environmental concerns. This project needs an independent technical review of long term safety concerns.
- Nuclear waste is dangerous but fossil fuels are destroying our planet.
- It will provide jobs and revenue opportunities for Huron-Kinloss. Building a facility will show others across Canada that this community takes responsibility for energy it has

used and enjoyed for decades. Huron-Kinloss will be respected for not being a "Not In My Back Yard" (NIMBY) community.

- Burying the spent rods from all over Canada in Huron-Kinloss will have tremendous negative effects on the environment of our municipality and the climate overall. This is because the transportation of rods from places like Nova Scotia and Quebec will cause very high amounts of CO2 to be released into the atmosphere. This CO2 will only add to the already overwhelming amounts produced daily. Therefore it is not ideal. Also, the thought of there being a threat to the livelihood of the farmers in this county is another thing to consider.
- I don't really know what to think. I would like to see an independent assessment of the environmental and other impacts on Huron-Kinloss.
- There is so much more research that should be done before considering burying nuclear waste as the best option for high-level radioactive waste that I can't support the construction of a DGR in Huron-Kinloss.
- I am neutral and need to learn more about the project including the impact to the area during the construction phase as well as the "depositing phase". Yes, the project may create jobs but what happens during the project with 50 acres of gravel (where does that go?), more people, waste, services needed?

What happens after the construction and such is complete after the town and services were "built up" to support the construction phase? What is the long term sustain-and-maintain plan for the site, monitoring, etc?

- I find the idea to be way too risky.
- The possibility of a failure and the contamination of the great lakes.
- Too close to people. Take it up North. There is soooooo much of Canada available - why so close to people, water, recreational areas?
- I believe the other suggested sites are more suitable although further for transportation.
- Concern that the positive economic impact to municipal coffers will outweigh the potential danger in the future of radiation leaks to the environment including the lake.
- I am not supportive of nuclear power to begin with. Rock on, solar, wind, hydro etc.
- It seems reckless to bury radioactive material so close to Lake Huron, a 'great lake'. I am greatly concerned about the negative impact of all the traffic shipping the radioactive waste. I worry about potential terrorism on the moving vehicles carrying

the waste. I am also concerned for the farmland & farmers. So I am opposed to it being buried in Huron-Kinloss site.

- Very concerned about the long term impact and potential pollution/poisoning of Lake Huron and other great lakes.
- Risks and adverse impacts on economy and quality of life in the area, particularly due to transfer in of materials from elsewhere and risks of leaks during transport.
- Very high, long-term risk to community in the event of unforeseen adverse events.
- The waste should go back to where it was taken/mined from the earth. I also do not trust the federal or provincial governments to do this correctly.
- The potential negative impact on the environment.
- Selection of an appropriate, safe site greatly reduces the risk to our community, the environment and future generations, especially given the global warming impacts and very unpredictable political crisis in America, Russia, China, Brazil, North Korea, and Great Britain. The very volatile situations leave the current locations far too exposed for future generations.
- If there were ever an earthquake, what would the result be - would it get into the Great Lakes and our fresh water supply?
- I am concerned about the effect on future generations and their fresh water supply.
- The limestone geology is not right. Huron-Kinloss is only on the list because it is a willing community. It was determined long ago (1970s) that the best locations are in the Canadian shield in northern Ontario in rock formations called "plutons". However, northern communities were strongly opposed at the time.
- Do not like the idea of storing high level nuclear waste so close to Lake Huron and thus do not support the construction of such a facility in Huron-Kinloss.
- Not thrilled with having all of Canada's high-level nuclear waste being transported into our backyard and so close to the Great Lakes.
- I think it is not wise to deposit this type of radioactive waste material in areas where people live.
- "Spent waste" is a current concept subject to revision as technology and techniques evolve. The "waste" is certainly not inert, so there is potential to harvest some of the energy it will be emitting "for tens of thousands of years". What is the need to decide now on a "permanent solution", at our current level of technology, when the current rate of production of "waste" will surely increase? What is the need at this time, to develop a "solution" intended to last for "tens of thousands of years"? What is the value in concentrating all nuclear waste (from all of Canada?) into one location? Is

the risk of a critical failure and its impact increased or decreased by having a single site? Will a time come when Canada decides to take in the waste from other countries - sell our Canadian Shield? The answers to all of these questions, and so many more, is limited by the level of knowledge available at the time they are answered, and the knowledge of those people answering. Against that time-frame and uncertainty, the transient economic benefit of a large construction project becomes extremely limited.

- The nuclear waste has to be stored somewhere and I think the proposal is safe and Huron-Kinloss could reap a lot of economic benefits. I also believe it is safer to transport it by road as opposed to transporting it over the water to another facility.
- I am concerned about potential contamination of the Great Lakes and of the area of Huron-Kinloss.
- We have to be responsible in managing our nuclear waste. It is a key technology that we will rely on combat global warming. It will likely be a bitter nuclear footprint in future.

This can be done in a safer way than we currently deal with this waste. We should take advantage of the economic benefits and spin-offs that can fund social and community programs...healthcare, education, supporting the aging population.

- Concerns regarding the negative impact that this may have for Huron-Kinloss and for the effect that it may have on the environment and for future generations.
- Burying the waste anywhere (especially near such a large and critical source of water like Lake Huron) is a short-sighted and environmentally detrimental choice.
- Agriculture, tourism and cottagers drive the Huron-Kinloss economy. Placing a nuclear waste facility in the middle of this environment places all three at risk.

Consumers may be apprehensive about buying products grown near a high-level nuclear waste facility. (Should Huron-Kinloss embrace the slogan, 'Good things glow in Ontario'?)

Tourists may seek other places to visit.

And the presence of the facility risks driving down property values on cottages, which would have a negative effect on the Huron-Kinloss tax base.

While construction jobs and payments for land acquisition may at first provide a positive economic benefit to Huron-Kinloss over the short term, the region may suffer irreparable damage over the long term for the reasons outlined above. Once the site is in place, it will be too late to turn back.

- Don't permanently live in area.
- We have a nuclear plant in our area and benefit from it. We should look after our own waste.
- Visit our cottage at least once every year.
- There will be negative environmental impacts imposed by the creation/construction of a deep repository and the removal or relocation of the material.

Once constructed and in use, the waste itself poses a risk, as does its transport. If there are no leaks, a big if, as science on this is still relatively young, there may not be health concerns for residents, fish/wildlife, or Great Lakes water. However, if there is a problem, or leak during transit of materials, the outcomes could, and likely would, be catastrophic and last generations. Creating a repository so close to the bi-national Great Lakes is too risky, in my opinion, given that even small leaks can have devastating impacts. The freshwater resources, such as the fish and wildlife that create a healthy Great Lakes basin ecosystem are resilient, but not in the face of nuclear contamination. These resources are relied upon and stimulate the economy, not only for recreational beach, sailing, water sport uses, but they also conservatively support billions of dollars annually in drinking water; commercial, recreational and indigenous fisheries, shipping, and other industry uses. These are inextricably linked to a healthy basin ecosystem and the ramifications and cumulative effects will impact all 5 lakes and connecting waters.

The economy may initially benefit with skilled and unskilled workers moving to the area, however it is likely to come at a cost of reduced tourism, etc. to the area which would likely last longer than the construction phase. This is less of a concern, in my opinion, compared with the environmental risks.

- Storing it on the surface is the best option where it can be monitored as is done now.
- I do not sure support this at Huron-Kinloss due to effects of the community and environment.

The limited perceived risks would be a catastrophic is there was ever a leak or accident. It would impact the most densely populated area of Canada and the location directly under one of the great lakes would impact a major water network that would reach a very large area.

- Cannot have an opinion until the final report is in. Anyone who does is being premature.

- It seems as though no matter how many precautions are taken, the risk is simply not known. Further, this may have effects well into the future that we simply don't know about or can't even contemplate.
- I am very concerned about nuclear waste being stored on land beside the lake. The risks are extraordinary and carry many of the same impacts as DGR. I also don't think burying the problem out of sight and mind is an acceptable risk given the proximity of the Great Lakes.

A complete independent assessment of the issue from experts outside of the vested interests is required. Any group, including political, receiving money to educate, participate or inform, cause public scepticism and the appearance of lobbying for the wrong reasons.

- I believe that the location is too close to one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world, without knowing the impact.

I believe that the population is too dense close by, when there are other potential locations far from settlement.

I believe that the 6 Billion dollar project will not maintain a sizeable number of jobs on an ongoing basis, but the 6 Billion refers to building, material, and transportation costs.

Because Huron-Kinloss has not yet decided how the 'willingness' will be determined, I suggest being very careful with the information that we share with them. If our results are resoundingly against the site being Huron-Kinloss, I fear that knowledge of that fact would cause them to make the 'willingness' determination a job of the Council.

- Any risk of nuclear leak or accident, especially in such close proximity to Lake Huron would have a dire outcome.
- Too close to the Great Lakes; potential leakage into Great Lakes could be disastrous.

Other options for disposal, re-using waste products should be explored.

- We have (Canadians have) the best record in the world when it comes to nuclear reactors, energy distribution, safety and management. I trust that the people involved in making these decisions are doing so with utmost concern and integrity.
- The proximity to the Great Lakes is a concern.
- There is an obvious lack of clarity in the facts/numbers that have been delivered to community members about the potential burial, and this inconsistency needs to be

resolved before further consideration. Decisions cannot be made before the facts are clarified.

- Technology is moving so quickly, and government projects move so slowly, that I'm certain by the time they even finish burying the waste there will be a new and better technology discovered to deal with it.
- The risk of transporting to another location is far greater than burying it nearby.
- I support it being here. Some area has to do it. A large percentage of spent fuel bundles comes from this area. I would rather have the largest percentage of it off the road. I believe in energy produced from nuclear methods since it has a low impact on CO2 emissions and is far more efficient than either wind mills which I oppose or solar which I agree with.
- I hope that research and technological advances will find a better alternative to burying the waste.
- I am hoping that new technologies developed in the future will allow for the re-use of spent fuel.

I am also afraid that (a little like Brexit) local residents may be underestimating the upheaval that this project will create. I am afraid that precious farm land will be turned into an industrial wasteland.