From: Gordon Williams
Sent: Sunday, May 04, 2008 7:00 PM
To: Patton, Pat
Subject: My comments re-APM draft Plan and Draft Transparency Policy

Hi Pat,

The following are my comments on the two documents:

(1) Executive Summary first paragrapf, I wonder who will be responsible for ensuring that NWMO meets or exceeds all regulatory requirements.

(2) Paragraph 3, Am I to assume that Aboriginal people are part and partial to the statement about interested Canadians?

(3) Page 5, second paragraph, I would suggest that the word "continue" replace "stretch out"

(4) Page 6 Board members are appointed by nuclear fuel waste owners, 'Who appoints the Advisory Council Members'?

(5)Integrity, I would suggest "do business" instead of deal.

(6)Accountability, NWMO will be accountable to government, nuclear waste producers, Canadians at large or all of them and others who may be interested?

(7)Page 9 Last sentence, APM is embraced by Canadians and the Government of Canada and thus is considered Canada's Plan to address the safe storage of nuclear waste.

(8)Page 11Final sentence of paragrapf 4 insert "each stage of the process" instead of "each step"

(9)Page 12, First Paragraph, replace "further learning" with "learning more"

(10)Page 15,First Paragraph, I would suggest that the words "to surface" be replaced "to respond"

(11)Page 18 First Paragraph, I find it quite confusing and a one sentence paragraph often has that characteristic.

Those are my comments on the first document.

I have only a few on the draft policy;

(1) First bullet of the rationale, I would suggest that you eliminate "all" since you will be responding to the interested orgs. and individuals

(2)Page 3, I would include safety as an integral part of the initial statement.

Pat, I hope these comments are of interest to NWMO. Gord