

Community concerns

The EIS and its Socio-economic Environment Technical Support Document refer frequently to community, as, for example:

- p. 41 of the TSD: *Within the Municipality of Kincardine, the community of Inverhuron has a distinctive character as a cottage area with several hundred dwellings;* and later,
- p. 50: *This host community agreement with the municipality was recognition of their willingness to host the DGR.*
- In another context, the EIS refers to the Saugeen First Nation, also a part of the community, when it asks: 2-18 *“Is the proposed DGR the best site?”*, and *“What other sites have been considered?”*. These questions asked by the Saugeen Ojibwa Nation do not appear to have been answered.
- It relies on random public surveys to state: *vii) Public surveys have indicated strong overall support for the projects from the community and its leaders.*
- On another occasion, while recognising that the State of Michigan and its residents are part of the affected community by making repeated presentations to this community (2.3), it summarily dismisses the concerns of this immediately contiguous neighbour: 1-18 *The Macomb County Water Board and Michigan State do not have regulatory jurisdiction in Canada or the Province of Ontario. Finally, neither the Michigan Act 204 nor its resolutions have been endorsed by authorities in Canada.*
- It recognises the important role that community plays for this proposed project: 3-1 *The two attributes essential to the success [of the DGR]: technical suitability ...; and an informed and willing host community.*
- But it cannot correctly account even for its immediate neighbours: *All of the four residential site neighbours surveyed do not have any children living at that residence, as indicated in Table 5.7.2-12.* p 126 when one of these four residents has two school-age children living at home.

Because community and our understanding of its role appears to play a critical part in the decision to host these nuclear wastes, as, for example: 2-78 *Experience in other countries has shown that success in siting a waste disposal facility is greatly improved in situations where the community supports the proposal*, community is nowhere defined. Nor are grounds given when community interests are denied, as with the Saugeen First Nations and the concerns of the State of Michigan. The immediate host community, while recognised as such in the opening statement of the Socio-Economic TSD, is not specifically consulted nor separately canvassed.

How is “community” defined for the purposes of this EIS? Where do boundaries begin and end? Why is the host community itself not separately canvassed for its views even as the EIS identifies the potential for the greatest economic damages, as evidenced by the Property Value Protection Plan?