
From: Trista Dube <email address removed>
Sent: Sunday, February 1, 2026 8:19 PM
To: Nuclear Waste / Déchets Nucléaires (IAAC/AEIC)
Subject: Comments and concerns

Good evening,

I am writing to express my concern about the Nuclear Waste Management Organization's proposed deep geological repository for nuclear fuel waste which the NWMO is proposing to construct and operate between Ignace and Dryden in northwestern Ontario.

While I have many concerns about the project itself and the NWMO's method of selecting the site and their site selection, my comments are on the Impact Assessment review process.

I own one of the few privately owned properties nearby (lot 1 concession 1 revell township) just across the highway from the project site and I currently have a 400ft deep well and use the property for personal use.

My concerns are mainly regarding long term safety as my property, which is very close to the proposed site, is near and dear to my heart as it was purchased using funds from my grandfather's passing with the intent of farming and it is currently undergoing some massive changes for the wasigan transmission line, some tree clearing and when spring comes we are building foundations. I want to ensure our long term use of the property, that it remains safe for myself, my children and future generations. I want at the very least to participate in measurable and documented safety measures to ensure our water and lands remain safe. I am very concerned about groundwater health, soil health and our overall health.

I am also concerned about the financial and logistical impacts on the surrounding region. I know that this project brings large financial incentives for the towns and wabigoon first nations and that is their decision, and I'm happy for them. But my land is nearby and we want to be there long term and we not have received, nor will we most likely ever receive, any financial benefits. I'm concerned about the safety of us using this land for farming long term. And I am concerned about the impacts on Ignace and Dryden whose infrastructure most likely will be unable to sustain a population increase without any outside supports. There are minimal rental options nearby and the housing market is limited in the area. In addition, while Dryden may have a few grocery stores there isn't much in the way of keeping/attracting people to this area as we have been struggling for a long time. I want to see these communities, the places I have been apart of for nearly my whole life, thrive, but this project doesn't seem to support the community growth and development that it was touted to support. I want measurable goals and timelines, I want community involvement and increased housing and financial supports that feel worthwhile. I want a safe environment. I want to see our communities improve and grow and thrive from this development. If that is not the case, and this creates a minor boom that has long term backlash I would rather not have this project happen at all.

I am also concerned about the safety of the transportation on our dangerous highways. There needs to be plans for inclement weather, proper cleanup plans, and emergency responses should there be any issues. Ones that are realistic in our Northern and rural environment.

I also strongly feel that the 30-day comment period is too short, as I was only made aware a few days before the deadline. Many other people who are concerned about this project, including the transportation of the radioactive waste to the site, will not have even heard about the comment period and for those of us who were alerted to the comment period it is a very short period of time to comment on the initial project description. This is an important project that will have impacts far, far into the future. The review process must be thorough and allow public participation, and a 30-day comment period works against that.

Thank you,
Trista