

Responses on Pages 2-4

ONTARIO ELECTION 2014 | QUESTIONS FOR PARTY LEADERS

Nuclear Waste Burial

Ontario Power Generation (OPG) is proposing to construct a series of caverns in limestone deep below the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station site and beside Lake Huron to first place and then abandon up to 400,000 cubic metres of radioactive waste¹.

One of their earliest studies showed that a key difference between this and other options was cost, with the Deep Geologic Repository expected to cost significantly more. The 2012 price tag was over \$2 billion for a repository half the size of what OPG is now intending.² These costs can be expected to be significantly higher, given that OPG now intends to double the amount of waste to be buried. OPGs track record of cost overruns on nuclear construction projects also suggests that this \$2 billion-plus cost – which will be passed on to ratepayers - will multiply.³

A federal review panel last year heard expert evidence that OPG had failed to examine alternatives and that there were numerous technical uncertainties, including uncertainty about the volume, types and radioactivity of the wastes and the predictions about how long the proposed repository would contain the radioactivity⁴. The hearing has been extended, and is expected to recommence this fall. Opposition continues to grow both locally and around the Great Lakes, with more than 50 municipalities – their population totaling more than 10 million residents – and 56,000 individuals now having registered their opposition through petitions and resolutions.⁵

U.S. state legislators have also expressed opposition to the project and are asking President Barack Obama, Secretary of State John Kerry, the U.S. Congress and other parties to intervene and stop the proposed Deep Geologic Repository.⁶

Given that it is a nuclear facility, a federal approval is required, but key decisions to proceed - including the allocation of funds – are provincial.

Q. If elected, will you direct OPG to suspend its efforts to bury nuclear waste beneath the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station?

Yes No Undecided

Comment (optional):

Q. Will your government commission an independent examination of alternatives to nuclear waste burial and submit the findings to the Legislature?

Yes No Undecided

Comment (optional):

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME DURING THIS BUSY ELECTION PERIOD TO SHARE YOUR RESPONSES ON THESE IMPORTANT QUESTIONS. FOR MORE INFORMATION EMAIL bruceburial@ontera.net OR CALL 705 497 0373.

This question to party leaders in the Ontario Election 2014 the product of a collaboration of public interest groups who have been active participants in the review of Ontario Power Generation's proposed Deep Geologic Repository of Low and Intermediate Level Radioactive Wastes.



Canadian Environmental Law Association



Greenpeace Canada



Northwatch



Citizens' Clearinghouse on Waste Management



The Inverhuron Committee



Huron Grey Bruce Citizens Committee on Nuclear Waste



Save Our Saugeen Shores

Please return the response email to bruceburial@ontera.net or by fax to 416 960 9392 no later than Monday, June 2nd. For additional information or clarification, please call 705 497 0373.

The following summary presents the responses as received from each of the four main political parties in Ontario to the questions above. The survey was distributed to each of the parties with a request for a response from the party leader on behalf of the Party. All parties responded.

Party / Leader	Green Party / Mike Schreiner	Liberals / Kathleen Wynne	New Democratic Party / Andrea Horwath	Progressive Conservative Party / Tim Hudak
Q 1. If elected, will you direct OPG to suspend its efforts to bury nuclear beneath the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station?				
Response	Yes			
Response / Comment (Optional)	Yes	Ontario Liberals have a strong interest in seeing that nuclear waste is managed in a safe and responsible manner. OPG's proposed Deep Geological Repository (DGR) for low and intermediate-level waste is subject to the most comprehensive form of Environmental Assessment (EA) possible under Canadian legislation. This process is essential to determining the precise details as to the scope and economics of this type of repository relative to other long-term waste management options. No decision by the Wynne government will be made to proceed until there has been an opportunity to thoroughly review and consider the results of the EA, if and when it's approved by the federal Minister of the Environment.	See answer below.	
Q 2. Will your government commission an independent examination of alternatives to nuclear waste burial and submit the findings to the Legislature?				
Response	Yes			
Comment (Optional)		The Ontario Liberal government's first priority is always the safety of Ontarians. The results of the Environmental Assessment, expected in 2015, will determine whether additional processes need to be initiated. As	The Ontario NDP has serious concerns about OPG's proposal to bury nuclear waste in underwater caverns near the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station. It is also certainly true that the federal review panel last	

		<p>mentioned, the process currently underway is the most comprehensive form of EA possible under federal legislation.</p>	<p>year heard expert evidence that OPG had failed to examine alternatives and that there were numerous technical uncertainties, including uncertainty about the volume, types and radioactivity of the wastes and the predictions about how long the proposed repository would contain the radioactivity.</p> <p>As such, an Ontario NDP government would commission an independent examination of alternatives to the proposed nuclear burial site and consult with community groups and experts.</p>	
<p>Other /Additional Comment</p>	<p>As the risks and costs associated with waste management and decommissioning skyrocket, it is unacceptable and irresponsible to place this burden on our children and future generations.</p> <p>It is unacceptable that the nuclear industry has not finalized a comprehensive plan for dealing with nuclear waste while the amount of dangerous nuclear waste continues to grow. Whether the method chosen for long-term storage of waste is deep geological storage or interim storage on site, OPG is unfairly placing the burden to monitor this on taxpayers.</p>			<p>Thank you very much for your letter. We appreciate the opportunity to listen to your priorities for Ontario. We share your commitment to Ontario's future and believe that with more and better jobs, we can do what's necessary to bring about the change Ontario needs.</p> <p>I'm excited about our Million Jobs Plan—a plan to bring jobs back to Ontario, stop overspending, balance the budget and keep our debt from growing. Our plan relies on the notion that government should be smaller, but what it does, it does better. Our priorities for this election can be found at www.millionjobsplan.com</p> <p>We need to face our challenges honestly and compassionately. It</p>

				<p>won't be easy, but it can be done and it will be worth it. I know we can build a previously unimagined Ontario, but it's going to take some courage and a willingness to challenge the failed status quo. That's what our Ontario PC Million Jobs Plan delivers. We are asking government to tighten its belt, the way everyday Ontarians have, so that one million men and women out of work will have a shot at solid, good-paying jobs. We've got a job to do. It's time to get Ontario working better.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

REFERENCES

- ¹ Section 1.2.3 of the 2009 Environmental Impact Statement provided an estimate of 200,000 cubic metres radioactive wastes. In response to Information Request 12-512 in April 2014 Ontario Power Generation indicated that they had also assessed the feasibility of an expansion of the DGR to a capacity of 400,000 cubic metres. OPG has stated an intention to double the original proposed volume by adding decommissioning waste to the repository.
- ² OPG responded to the Joint Review Panel Information Request EIS-05-224 with a cost estimate of over \$2 billion. An earlier cost estimate of \$1 billion included in OPG DGR Environmental Impact Statement, 2009, Volume 1, Section 1.2.5 including only the early stages of the project. Both cost estimates are based on an estimated volume of 200,000 cubic metres. The revised volume estimate, including decommissioning wastes, is 400,000 cubic metres.
- ³ For example, see "Canadian Press: "Darlington price tag rises to \$14.4 billion", *The Toronto Star*, March 4, 1993 or Ontario Clean Air Alliance at http://www.cleanairalliance.org/files/active/0/NuclearHandout_v5.pdf
- ⁴ See the hearing record, including transcripts and filed documents on the public registry at www.ceaa.gc.ca/050/documents-eng.cfm?evaluation=17520
- ⁵ As of May 2014, postings at www.stopthegreatlakesnucleardump.com
- ⁶ "Michigan lawmakers ask Canada to scrap plans for nuclear waste dump on Lake Huron", *The Voice News*, Michigan, 22 May 2014, as posted at www.voicenews.com/articles/2014/05/22/news/doc537e1f40e370f008737408.txt