

Date: Feb 13, 2018

From: Darlene Buckingham

To: Lucia Abellan, Environmental Assessment Officer
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

By email: cncs.ea-ee.ccsn@canada.ca

Subject line: Lucia Abellan - Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Nuclear Power Demonstration Closure Project (CEA Registry Number 80121) CEEA Reference number: 80121

CEAA Reference number: 80121

Comments:

Dear Ms. Abellan:

The public deserves to know exactly what radioactive elements are going to be buried at this site? I have attempted to find an inventory of what is going to be buried at this site and have been unable to find anything that is complete. Full disclosure must take place before any nuclear waste is left on the banks of the Ottawa River and a full accounting of what are the risks of permanently leaving this nuclear waste where it is so close to drinking water.

When the original Chalk River site was built it required the displacement of First Nations people who historically have been marginalized by big industry. In the past 60 years look at the development in this area. How many people will be calling this part of the world home and living with dangerous nuclear waste that cannot be detected through the senses but can only be tested? What habitats will be placed in jeopardy by the decision to bury radioactive waste here? There is a responsibility to the people living in this area as well as to the animals, birds and fish to make sure that all other options are looked at including to move this waste to a more isolated spot are taken.

The public has to know that calling the waste that will be buried at this site "low-level" is misleading as ALL radioactive elements are included in the definition of "low level" waste, even the long-lived and highly radioactive isotopes will be found in this waste. The highly radioactive and long-lived reactor wastes are included in "low-level" waste category along with the much-shorter lived wastes from medical treatment and diagnosis and scientific research.

The volume of waste is misleading as well as there can be dangerous long-lived radioactivity in small volumes and a small concentration in larger volumes. All this has to be taken into consideration and this information shared with the public.

The proponents, CNL, involved in burying this waste have committed to bury only "low-level" radioactive waste but, to determine the impacts to the environment and to public health there has to be acknowledgement that long-lived and highly radioactive materials are included in this mix. Waste hazardous longer than 100 years could be forgotten. Retrievability is essential in this case.

Cement may last for 100 years at the most, so what happens after 100 years? There is a responsibility to the present and to the future to ensure that the best possible solutions for this dangerous problem are looked at. Careful consideration has to be taken and any decision made to deal with this waste not be rushed.

For these reasons it is prudent to reject the draft EIS and halt decommissioning at the site until it is fully understood what is going to be buried there and what is the long-term plan as radioactive elements dangerous for many thousands of years will be buried here. The question that needs to be asked and answered before accepting the draft EIS, Is this too high a risk to be taken and need for more information to be gathered before making such a monumental decision?

Sincerely,

Darlene Buckingham
Tory Hill, ON