

Nuclear Free Thunder Bay

2022 Thunder Bay Municipal Electoral Candidates' Responses to two questions:

1. Do you, as a candidate for municipal office in the City of Thunder Bay, oppose the transport of nuclear waste through the City of Thunder Bay?

Yes No Undecided

2. Do you, as a candidate for municipal office in the City of Thunder Bay, support the request to City Council (see deputation Sept. 12, 2022) to ask that the Ontario government adopt the Proximity Principle with regards to nuclear waste management? (The Proximity Principle directs that waste should be managed as close to the point of generation as is technically feasible. The Proximity Principle has been embedded in the European Community's Strategy for Waste Management since the 1990s.)

Yes No Undecided

Responses received:

MAYORAL CANDIDATES

Ken Boshcoff

Yes

Yes

Clinton Harris

[no response received]

Gary Mack

[no response received]

Robert Szczepanski

Undecided for both, I need to do more research on the subjects befor making a decision.

Peng You

[no response received]

COUNCILLOR AT LARGE**Rajni Agarwal**

[no response received]

Rob Barrett

Thank you for the email! You get a strong "Yes" as a response for both questions. Thank you for your tremendous and ongoing advocacy on this very important matter.

Mark Bentz

[no response received]

Shelby Ch'ng

[no response received]

Dan Courtney

[no response received]

Marilyn Jane Cully

yes to number 1
yes to number 2

Kasey (Taylor) Etreni

My answer to question 1 - yes, I oppose shipment through Thunder Bay

My answer to question 2 - yes, I support the request to government

Trevor Giertuga

1, Yes

2, Yes

Robert Girardin

I answer yes to both questions.

James Glavish

[no response received]

Bob Hupka

Yes

Yes

Shane Judge

[no response received]

Iqbal Khan

[no response received]

Tracey McKinnon

1. Yes. Absolutely oppose.

2. Yes. I fully support the Proximity Principal.

Why transport Nuclear waste through NWO?
It just doesn't make any sense

Stephan Margarit

My answer is YES to both questions.

Thank you for all the work your group is doing to keep this issue top of mind!

Jim Mauro

Question 1.....I oppose the transportation of nuclear waste through Thunder Bay

Question 2.....What I have quickly researched is that Finland is moving to deep geological burial of spent fuel and other countries may be following suit. However, I am opposed to this fuel being transported through our city and being buried in our area.

Dino Menei

[no published email address]

Allan Mihalcin

These are good questions, but more information is required to make a fully informed decision.

I am not an advocate for, nor an advocate against the storage of the spent nuclear waste in Ignace, and the transportation of the product across the province – I need far more information to make the informed decision.

Saying that, I have some questions and some comments about your questions.

1. Jurisdiction – does our city council have any authority in the decision regarding storage or transportation of the spent fuel or is this just a feel-good question.
2. If the decision is made that Ignace is the location for the project, does the designation of “City of Thunder Bay” in the question impede the transportation of the product across the province – ie: are we then a roadblock?
3. As you know, the size of European countries are very small compared to Ontario / Canada, and thus the Proximity Principle was written to ensure that the nuclear waste of one country was not stored in another country’s, thereby ensuring that a plan was in place for the safe and on-going storage of the product – a complete circle of responsibility.
 - a. Thus, requesting council to adopt the principle in this case is somewhat a misleading request as the jurisdiction of the storage is w/in the production jurisdiction of the plant.
4. I believe a decision should be made on facts, not emotion or fear of the unknown.

For consideration - I was speaking to some people who are in their 20's, and their view of nuclear energy is far different than someone who is older than 50. They felt that nuclear energy is the most efficient energy means of creating electricity (next to hydroelectric), and that it is an incredibly safe way to create energy and is easier on the environment, far easier than hydroelectric which requires massive dams to be built which flood vast areas of land and habitat. They said, wouldn't it be great if we could buy / receive a “pellet” of nuclear energy, put it into a small reactor to power our home for a year; then recycle the pellet, or repurpose it into a less demanding energy creating environment. It was an interesting perspective and some very creative thinking. This just reaffirmed to me that more data and more perspective is required to make an informed decision.

The one thing I do believe is that if the decision is made to store the nuclear waste in Ignace, we can be assured that the entire province will have divided highways the entire way. This would be a fantastic thing as we all know. Divided highways will save so many lives and ensure any transportation of anything going across the country will be done in far safer conditions.

I hope this answers your questions.

Donnalee Morettin

Question #1: Undecided.

I am not well rehearsed on this topic. I am willing to sit, listen and discuss this important matter to come to a knowledgeable decision.

#2. Undecided. I will have to do my homework on these matters. Forgive me for not knowing and giving an undecided vote.

You can reach me here to set up a meeting and discuss these matters.

Adetunde (Ade) Ogunberu

1. Yes

2. Undecided

Adelina Pecchia

1. ***Yes, of course I oppose the transport of nuclear waste through and throughout the City of Thunder Bay!!***
2. ***I need time to find out who is involved in framing the Proximity Principle. Is it someone or a group from Southern Ontario who often do not know what Proximity means or entails?***

In my brief time in politics, I've learned that often when a group outside of our city boundaries directs or frames policies they have no idea of how large our area of generation is.

Therefore, in theory while I agree that waste should be managed as close to the point of generation the words in the Proximity Principle, "technically feasible", raises concerns for me. What do these words mean? Does it mean that if outlying areas nearby our city that do not have the means technically, nuclear waste is going to be shipped here? So I can't respond with a yes or no and need time to look into this more.

Brian Joseph Phillips**Question 1 Answer**

At this moment I'm undecided.

Do we know if any Nuclear waste is being transported through the Thunder Bay Area To any other destinations.

Question 2. Answer.

I Agree.

Brian Tsubouchi

1. Yes
2. Yes

Matthew Villella

Hello my friends at Nuclear Free Thunder Bay

1. I am a yes to this question, I have had many conversations with your team and I fully agree this is a bad thing. This is something that Thunder Bay and the region doesn't need. The risk is way too high.
2. Once again yes, it's just common sense. The longer you carry this material the more risk you are bringing. We can't risk this. It's just not worth it. Let me know if you have any questions or need to chat some more. Thank you.

CURRENT RIVER WARD**Andrew Foulds**

Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

My answer to both questions is yes.

Duff Stewart

[no response received]

Andy Wolff

Here are my answers:

1. Do you, as a candidate for municipal office in the City of Thunder Bay, oppose the transport of nuclear waste through the City of Thunder Bay?

YES

2. Do you, as a candidate for municipal office in the City of Thunder Bay, support the request to City Council (see deputation Sept. 12, 2022) to ask that the Ontario government adopt the Proximity Principle with regards to nuclear waste management? (The Proximity Principle directs that waste should be managed as close to the point of generation as is technically feasible. The Proximity Principle has been embedded in the European Community's Strategy for Waste Management since the 1990s.)

YES

I'd like to add when this group does a presentation in front of City Council I will forward a motion to declare Thunder Bay a Nuclear Free Zone

MCINTYRE WARD

Albert Aiello

[no published email address]

Brent A. Boyko

Yesx2

MCKELLAR WARD

Cory Bagdon

1. At this time, I have to say that I am undecided. I understand the risk that comes with the transportation of these types of dangerous goods. I also recognize the need to dispose of these types of dangerous goods safely in a properly designed and maintained facility and the long term risks that arise if those steps are not properly taken.
2. I do support asking the Ontario government to adopt the Proximity Principle. I wish there were more that we could do on this instead of just asking them. This makes the most sense when it comes to reducing risk for everyone, particularly as there is a suitable location for a storage facility that is much closer to the source of these dangerous goods.

Stephanie Danylko

Answers to questions:

- 1) Yes I oppose
- 2) Yes

I was at the Nuclear Waste Awareness walk about a month ago that started at P. Hajdu's office and ended on Park St. I spoke at this event as a human being - not as a candidate, (I did not mention that I was a candidate).

Our governments have put legislations in place that do not enforce mandatory accountability for corporations and organizations that create waste. I think that is pretty telling in itself. I believe that it is up to the People to stand up, speak up, and not allow such inaction to continue. I mentioned when I spoke at the walk, that there are (at least) 40 types of fungus that take in chemical waste as energy. Just look at Chernobyl as a prime example. I don't believe the waste should be buried period. There are innovative ways on handling this problem, we just need to take the time to learn about it by looking at what proactive companies and countries are doing..

I believe we are all Stewards of the land, should 'we' choose to step up. Thanks for being that voice of awareness!

Brian Hamilton

[no response received]

Lori Paras

Yes and Yes.

NEEBING WARD**Brad DesRochers**

Thank you for reaching out and I apologize for the late response, I have been trying to dive deeper into this topic to gain a better understanding of what is being proposed/planned. I would still like to do more research on the subject before I come to a conclusion and because of this I will stay "undecided".

Debra Halvorsen

[no response received]

Greg Johnsen

1. Yes. Although I do acknowledge that governments and societies are grappling with this dilemma, I believe the technology to carry this material has yet to meet the demand to transport it safely.
2. Yes.

Shaun Kennedy

[no response received]

Basil Lychowyd

[no response received]

Yuk-Sem Won

Since hearing about this initiative many years ago from your group and the amazing advocates, I have been a supporter and tried to be vocal about this issue in my campaigns and with my connections. Thank you for your continued efforts and I will continue to bring this issue forward should I get elected...and of course, continued support even if I don't.

YES

YES

NORTHWOOD WARD

Bill Dell

I believe nuclear power is necessary. I am undecided on the transportation of nuclear waste.

If we can store nuclear waste near the point of origin, then let's do that.

Syed Kabir

Yes

Yes

Chris Krumpholz

1. Yes
2. Undecided

Mike Maher

[no response received]

Dominic Pasqualino

I oppose the transport of nuclear waste through the City of Thunder Bay and I support the request to City Council to ask that the Ontario government adopt the Proximity Principle with regards to nuclear waste management.

I have toured the Bruce Nuclear plant over 20 years ago. In the tour they said in the future, they were going to ship the nuclear waste to Northwestern Ontario. I spoke up and said they could keep the waste beside the nuclear power plant. We are not their garbage dump.

RED RIVER WARD**Brad Ford**

[no response received]

James Dean Marsh

[no response received]

Martin Rukavina**Responses**

1.) Yes. The transportation of nuclear waste is a threat not only to ourselves and our environment but untenable given the nature of our transportation network.

2.) Yes.

I thank Nuclear Free Thunder Bay for their advocacy on this issue and was pleased to learn more about this group's tireless advocacy to keep Northwestern Ontario free from the hazards of nuclear waste.

Katherine Suutari

Yes to both questions.

There are a couple of alternatives that can be used, we could use a direct disposal of spent fuel (the "once through" fuel cycle) or the "closed" fuel cycle, in which spent fuel is reprocessed into new fuel. The closed fuel cycle could reduce the volume of long-term radioactivity of nuclear waste and potentially postpone the need for permanent disposal. Of course, we may not be prepared to do this but that doesn't mean we couldn't be.

Another alternative is to incinerate nuclear waste and reuse it that way, by incinerating the nuclear waste you can get the uranium and something else, I just can't remember it.

One danger of storing nuclear waste by burying it is called scavenging. This is particularly bad in developing countries, people often go scavenging for abandoned nuclear waste that is still radioactive. In some countries there is a market for these sorts of scavenged goods, which means that people will willingly expose themselves to dangerous levels of radiation in order to make money. Usually, people who scavenge these sorts of materials will end up in the hospital and may even die of problems related to or caused by radioactive materials. Unfortunately, once someone has been exposed to nuclear waste, they can then expose other people who have not. I know that may not happen here but it could as some people will make money somehow.

If one of these accidents does occur, the cost of cleaning everything up and making everything safe once again for people, animals and plants is very high. There is no simple or easy route when trying to clean up spilled radioactive material; instead, it can take years to ensure that an area is safe to live in or even to visit once again. In the case of very serious accidents, it may take many tens of years until things start growing or living normally once again.

Just for the sheer possibility of an accident and the devastation of the damage, I would be totally against transportation and storage in the manner that they want for Thunder Bay and the Northern communities, especially when there are alternatives.

Jason Veltri

[no response received]

Michael Zussino

My answer to both questions is yes. You are tempting fate by transporting nuclear waste that distance. There is also the potential of leakage and contamination of our drinking water and environment.

WESTFORT WARD**John Collins**

[no response received]

Alan D. Corbett

Thank you for reaching out to me, I am 100% opposed to moving waste here or anywhere away from where it is generated.

My answers are: 1) Yes 2) Yes.

Kristen Oliver

- 1. No - there are dangerous goods that travel through Thunder Bay on a daily basis. I have confidence in both the storage containers that are utilized to move products along with the training that first responders have to deal with emergencies.**
- 2. Yes - reducing travel of dangerous goods is a fair request.**

David Tommasini

[no published email address]