

Feb 4, 2026

Impact Assessment Agency

Re: NWMO Proposal for Deep Geological Repository (NGR) for used nuclear fuel waste, Ignace

This letter is to advise your agency that I, as a resident of Ontario and raised in northern Ontario, am against the proposal of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization. I am deeply concerned on the state of Ontario and Canada with ongoing climate warming and the resulting disasters. I have no faith that our current Ontario legislature will act proactively and responsibly after they have removed many protections for the environment.

After listening to a video produced by Dr. Gordon Edwards, Ph. D, President of the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility (1), I am better aware of the process of producing nuclear energy and the facts regarding nuclear fuel waste. These are my main concerns:

Concern #1: There is no proven safe long-term storage of nuclear waste.

Nuclear waste will take over 10 million years before it is reduced. Canada has been working with radioactive materials since 1938 and producing nuclear energy for the last 50 years, yet scientists advise there is no known safe storage or disposal of spent nuclear fuel.

In 1976, the state of California banned any new nuclear reactors to be built until safe disposal is found. The law is still in place 50 years later.

I understand that concurrent placement of wastes will be in the underground chambers during construction. We cannot discuss safe long-term storage until all nuclear waste is stopped. That will incentivise the nuclear power companies including Ontario Power Generation (OPG) to develop safer storage than abandonment 2000 feet underground.

Concern #2: Deep geographical long-term storage is abandonment and is not ethical. Out of sight means out of minds.

The US Academy of Scientists proposed a Rolling Stewardship concept to safeguard toxic materials – to ensure awareness, knowledge, resources and authority are passed onto future generations. It does not mean to pass the problem to our children, grandchildren, great-great grandchildren.

Concern #3 – Transportation. The proposal has not included the details, yet it is one of the most important criteria.

Each transport vehicle is proposed to deliver 20 tons of nuclear waste in storage containers of 140 tons. With estimated 165 shipments per year, that is 3,300 tons of nuclear waste transported about 1,700 km. Is a dedicated highway going to be built? Will highways be closed? Will bridges support this traffic load?

Premier Ford has boasted this facility will accept nuclear waste from the east coast and Quebec. The NWMO is proposing nuclear waste from across Canada. Have all the provinces and communities along the transport route approved of this? Have emergency response agencies been advised? Will an emergency response team follow each shipment? A logistical nightmare, and a scene that should only be in a movie.

Concern #4: No radioactive materials released during transportation, repackaging, storage.

What fail safes are in place to ensure no radioactive materials are released during the various handling stages? What are the water cooling and management practices? What if there is a leak that affects underground, aquifers and surface water? There is no easy “undo” button. Any leak will be an environmental disaster and cannot easily be remediated. Will mandatory funds be set aside to pay for remediation work 50, 100 years, 200 years in the future? Germany is spending billions on remediation of a deep geological nuclear waste storage facility, the Asse II, former salt mine.

Concern #5: Relocating to a First Nations area is ethically wrong

If the communities accept this, is it due to needing jobs and income? Equivalent of urban garbage being dumped into rural areas, only this is worse. Northern Ontario, especially Ingenious lands, is the last of our great natural resources and must be fiercely protected from pollution of any kind, including the most toxic material made by man.

Concern #6 – the NWMO is not an independent agency. It is comprised of the companies supplying or supporting the nuclear energy industry in Ontario.

Can NWMO’s proposal be considered all-inclusive and non-biased? All studies, testing, documentation should be conducted by an independent agency that does not consist of the nuclear power industry or government and held to the highest standards and accountability. Will the Impact Assessment Agency ensure a full-impact assessment and public hearing are done?

Thank you for your time addressing and documenting my concerns.

Sincerely,

Judie Garbo,

<personal information removed>

(1) Notes: Dr. Gordon Edwards, Ph. D, President Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility www.ccnr.org <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s6xbvOqkpEk>