

Differences between the EIS and its source document

Volume 1 of the Environmental Impact Statement makes claims that are not supported by facts.

For example, it states: *v) All options were assessed in terms of environmental impacts, economic benefits, public attitude and tourism, with favourable conclusions;* and, a few lines later: *A poll was conducted in early 2005 targeting all Kincardine permanent (by telephone) and seasonal (by mail) residents eighteen years* In each case, the Golder Independent Assessment Study is cited as the source of this information.

However, this document says something entirely different about business and tourist operator support. In discussing the concerns of these businesses, it makes the following statements:

- *p 45 The deep rock vaults would have the greatest negative effect on the attitudes and security of community members of any of the four options being considered in this report.*
- *p 46 For those who believe there may be an effect, it was generally felt that the deep rock vaults would have the largest negative effect in the community as a place to live and operate a business; as well, one quarter of those surveyed felt that the surface concrete vault option would also have a significant negative effect. 60% denied that the overall effects on business would be positive.*
- *p 49 Deep rock vaults would have the largest negative effects on tourism to the region.*

With respect to the 2005 poll, although this claims that all residents were contacted either by phone or mail, this is simply untrue. We have been residents here since 1974 and neither we nor any of our three businesses were contacted either by telephone or by mail.

This EIS continues by asserting that it is this evidence of community support that legitimises the development of this deep geological repository, once again citing the Independent Assessment Study as its authority: *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. ... No other sites volunteered to participate in the feasibility studies or to host the facility. (Section 3.4.2);* and, later: *3-1 The two attributes essential to the success [of the DGR]: technical suitability ...; and an informed and willing host community.*

The Independent Assessment Study, however, addressed only short-lived, low-level radionuclides with a half-life of less than 300 years: *p 9 Current designs and cost estimates [in this report] are for low-level wastes only and not for intermediate-level wastes. Therefore, the half-life characteristics represent just those of low-level wastes.*

This was the information presented to Municipal Council at the time and this was the basis for the polling conducted in 2005.

How does this Environmental Impact Statement reconcile these apparently contradictory

statements of fact?