

---

**From:** <personal information removed>, <email address removed>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 3, 2026 4:35 PM  
**To:** Nuclear Waste / Déchets Nucléaires (IAAC/AEIC)  
**Subject:** Public comment on the NWMO proposed DGR Project

I am a Canadian citizen and First Nation member of Grand Council Treaty Three. I have been following the process of the NWMO proposed DGR for years and I feel that no matter how many benefits are being promised, this project would not benefit Northwestern Ontario. Many communities and First Nations across Canada have already refused this project on their own territories because of the countless and unforeseeable risks.

At a children's cultural camp in my First Nation, an employee from NWMO, during a very unprofessional DGR promotional tour, had extremely trivialized highly radioactive nuclear waste and promoted the DGR as a great future employment opportunity for Treaty #3 children. I feel that with the sustainable solutions available today, our communities and children should not have to bear the risk of potential radioactive contamination from an experimental project and have the right to live and grow up in a healthy environment. I believe it does not create trust and is very questionable when NWMO does not include input from all citizens that may be affected, cannot answer and evades many legitimate questions and constantly trivializes the risks although there are many negative examples worldwide regarding the disposal of nuclear waste with DGRs. The only existing example worldwide, Finland, which is trying to start such a DGR facility, is only a few kilometres from the point of their nuclear power production. Why is NWMO willing to put so much extra risk on the thousands of kilometres of potential transportation routes? What also comes foremost to my mind is the failed repository site in Gorleben, Germany, where the project was unfortunately quickly pushed through because of political pressure.

I feel the NWMO has provided too little information about the entire project. I feel there was not enough information on long-term safety, emergency response, potential accidents, overall health concerns for the workers and for residents in the area, climate considerations and impacts from radioactive releases from on-site repackaging of the estimated 5.9 million used nuclear bundles, possible contamination of downstream headwaters, connecting waterways, groundwaters, traditional medicinal plants and food sources.

A 30-day comment period on such a major topic which includes 50 years of transportation, 160 years of operations and a million years of high radioactive risk? In all respect, this is much too short a time frame. A fair process should have included all potentially affected citizens, communities and First Nations downstream and along the transportation routes. We owe it to our future generations to find less invasive ways for nuclear waste disposal and more sustainable solutions for creating renewable energy. I do not support this project and I am requesting that NWMO should be required to provide feasible alternatives to this project and maybe in the foreseeable future independent scientists are able to create real and safe solutions. I feel any technology that produces such high hazardous waste is neither green nor sustainable.

Miigwetch,

Daphne Pellarin-Skead

