

NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase IV: Panel Five

NWMO SR-2008-24

September 2008

Navigator Ltd.

nwmo

NUCLEAR WASTE
MANAGEMENT
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION
DES DÉCHETS
NUCLÉAIRES



Nuclear Waste Management Organization
22 St. Clair Avenue East, 6th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 2S3
Canada

Tel: 416-934-9814
Web: www.nwmo.ca

Nuclear Waste Management Organization

The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) was established in 2002 by Ontario Power Generation Inc., Hydro- Québec and New Brunswick Power Corporation in accordance with the *Nuclear Fuel Waste Act (NFWA)* to assume responsibility for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel.

NWMO's first mandate was to study options for the long-term management of used nuclear fuel. On June 14, 2007, the Government of Canada selected the NWMO's recommendation for Adaptive Phased Management (APM). The NWMO now has the mandate to implement the Government's decision.

Technically, Adaptive Phased Management (APM) has as its end-point the isolation and containment of used nuclear fuel in a deep repository constructed in a suitable rock formation. Collaboration, continuous learning and adaptability will underpin our implementation of the plan which will unfold over many decades, subject to extensive oversight and regulatory approvals.

NWMO Social Research

The objective of the social research program is to assist the NWMO, and interested citizens and organizations, in exploring and understanding the social issues and concerns associated with the implementation of Adaptive Phased Management. The program is also intended to support the adoption of appropriate processes and techniques to engage potentially affected citizens in decision-making.

The social research program is intended to be a support to NWMO's ongoing dialogue and collaboration activities, including work to engage potentially affected citizens in near term visioning of the implementation process going forward, long term visioning and the development of decision-making processes to be used into the future. The program includes work to learn from the experience of others through examination of case studies and conversation with those involved in similar processes both in Canada and abroad. NWMO's social research is expected to engage a wide variety of specialists and explore a variety of perspectives on key issues of concern. The nature and conduct of this work is expected to change over time, as best practices evolve and as interested citizens and organizations identify the issues of most interest and concern throughout the implementation of Adaptive Phased Management.

Disclaimer:

This report does not necessarily reflect the views or position of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization, its directors, officers, employees and agents (the "NWMO") and unless otherwise specifically stated, is made available to the public by the NWMO for information only. The contents of this report reflect the views of the author(s) who are solely responsible for the text and its conclusions as well as the accuracy of any data used in its creation. The NWMO does not make any warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information disclosed, or represent that the use of any information would not infringe privately owned rights. Any reference to a specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or preference by NWMO.



NAVIGATOR

NWMO Citizen Panel Report Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION
SAULT STE. MARIE PHASE FOUR CITIZEN PANEL
SEPTEMBER 2008

WHAT ARE CITIZEN PANELS?

Building on previous qualitative research studies, the NWMO contracted Navigator to initiate Citizen Panels in 8 cities across Canada. The goal of the Citizen Panel project was to further explore the feelings, attitudes and perceptions of Canadians toward the long-term storage of Canada's used nuclear fuel.

The Citizen Panel project is markedly different from the qualitative research projects that have preceded it. The intent of the Citizen Panel format used in this project is to allow for the discussion to be formed and driven by the views of the individual Panelists. These Panelists have had a brief introduction to the NWMO and are aware of rudimentary facts surrounding Canada's used nuclear fuel such that an informed discussion can occur.

Phase Four of the Citizen Panel project occurred in June 2008.

WHAT IS NAVIGATOR?

Navigator is a research-based public affairs firm that works with companies, organizations and governments involved in the public policy field.

Navigator has grown to become a diverse firm with consultants from a variety of backgrounds who have excelled in the fields of journalism, public opinion research, politics, marketing and law.

Our strategic approach can be summed up as: *“Research. Strategy. Results.”*

PANEL REPORT OUTLINE

1. NWMO Citizen Panel Background

- a. Citizen Panel
- b. Panelist profiles
- c. Panel methodology

2. Panelist Dialogue

- a. Overview
- b. Panel Notes
 - i. Disclaimer

Appendices

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Backgrounder 1: Selecting a Site
- iv. Backgrounder 2: Framing the Discussion
- v. Backgrounder 3: Learning from Others

I. NWMO CITIZEN PANEL BACKGROUND

a. Citizen Panel

The Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario Phase Four Citizen Panel was held on June 12, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Sault Ste. Marie.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 14 Panelists in attendance. Jaime Watt, a Navigator research professional, acted as Discussion Leader.

A general outline of discussion objectives, as well as a discussion document intended to guide the work of the Panel were prepared in advance of the Citizen Panel. Reproductions of the documents shown to the Panel can be found at the end of this report as appendices.















b. Panelist Profile

In order to ensure that Panelists speak openly and freely over the course of this research, the individual identities of Panelists will remain protected and not revealed to the NWMO at any point of the project. Contact with Panelists is managed exclusively by a dedicated Panel Manager and each Panelist has been given an identifier code to ensure anonymity in all accessible Panel documents. All personal information and contact reports are stored separately and controlled by the Panel Manager.

While verbatim comments are used through this report, the identification will be only by Panel or by unique Panelist identifier code, but never by name.

Panelists have agreed to offer additional information, including their gender and one additional fact about their lives to make the Panel reporting richer for the reader.

Below are the profiles of the Sault Ste. Marie Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

 Panelist: SSM-1A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 35-44 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, Algoma Steel	 Panelist: SSM-2A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Part-time cook and homecare
 Panelist: SSM-3A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Part-time cook	 Panelist: SSM-4A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Homemaker
 Panelist: SSM-5A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, pharmacy technician	 Panelist: SSM-6A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, call center
 Panelist: SSM-8A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Self-employed	 Panelist: SSM-10A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Unemployed
 Panelist: SSM-11A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, finance manager	 Panelist: SSM-13A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Retired probation officer
 Panelist: SSM-14A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, forest health consultant	 Panelist: SSM-15A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Retired
 Panelist: SSM-16A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Retired	 Panelist: SSM-17A	City: Sault Ste. Marie Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Retired

c. Panel Methodology

These Citizen Panels have been designed, as much as possible, as collaborative discussions facilitated by a Discussion Leader. They are separate and apart from focus groups in that they empower individual Panelists to raise questions and introduce new topics. The role of the Discussion Leader, in this format, is merely to introduce new topics of discussion and lead the Panel through a number of discussion exercises.

As well, additional measures were incorporated into this Citizen Panel format to empower individual Panelists. Each Panelist was made aware of their independence and responsibilities to both contribute to, and lead, the Panel discussion. A transcriber, traditionally taking contemporaneous notes behind one-way glass or in another room, was, in this case, placed inside the discussion room. Panelists were empowered to direct him or her to take special note of elements of the Panel discussion they felt were important, or ask him or her to recap any part of the discussion upon request. A commitment was made by the Discussion Leader that the notes taken would be sent to Panelists for review, possible revision and approval, to give Panelists faith that they are in control of the proceedings and ensure their contribution is reflected accurately.

Potential Panelists were originally selected through random digit dialling among a general population sample in the wide area in which each Panel was held. Individuals called underwent a standard research screening survey in which they indicated that they were interested and able to participate in a discussion about a general public policy issue with no advance notice of the specific topic. Individuals were screened to include community-engaged opinion leaders in at least one of these topics: community, environment, and/or public/social issues. Those that passed the screening process were asked to participate in a traditional focus group on the perceived trust and credibility of the NWMO, which allowed an introduction to the topic of used nuclear fuel and topics such as Adaptive Phased Management. The discussions were neutral in tone and did not presuppose any outcome on issues such as nuclear power generation and siting for used nuclear fuel.

At the end of this research study, participants were asked if they would be willing to continue in discussions on the topic of used nuclear fuel. Those that expressed interest were placed on a “short list” of potential Panelists for the four-phased Citizen Panel project. Research professionals at Navigator subsequently used this pool to select Panelists that would ensure a diversity of age, gender and experience in the Panels. Only participants who demonstrated both a willingness and ability to contribute to group discussions and complete exercises were included in the pool. The content of each participant’s contribution in the focus groups was not reviewed by Navigator professionals. Rather, the only qualifiers were those individuals who could speak clearly and were able to grasp concepts introduced to them at a basic level.

A target Panel population of 18 was determined for each location in the interest of ensuring the long-term viability of each Panel over the course of four discussions.

Phase One Citizen Panels occurred in late Fall 2007. Although successful in terms of the richness of data collected in all 8 Panel locations, it was clear upon completion of the Panels that it would be necessary to hold Supplementary Citizen Panels in four locations (Toronto, Montreal, Regina and Sault Ste. Marie) due to smaller than expected Panel populations, as well as a difficulty experienced by some Panelists to honour their commitment to attend, as was confirmed on the day of the Panel.

Supplementary Citizen Panels occurred in early January 2008 and consisted of 6 new recruits, selected by random digit dialling, to replicate the experience by which all other Panelists had been selected. New recruits were sent a reading package in advance and then had a one hour “lobby” session immediately prior to the Supplementary Citizen Panel. This session replicated a condensed version of the Preparatory Phase research and allowed for any questions Panelists might have had about the NWMO. Following the “lobby” session, the Supplementary Citizen Panel continued, adding Panelists who had confirmed but, for a myriad of reasons, could not participate in the Phase One Citizen Panels.

Following the completion of the Supplementary Citizen Panels, those that demonstrated a willingness and ability to continue were added to the pool for Phase Two Citizen Panels.

Phase Two Panels occurred in mid- to late January, 2008. The Panel discussion began with the Discussion Leader asking Panelists if they had thought any more about the NWMO since the last Panel, or if they had just gone back to their daily routines and not given the organization much additional thought. The Discussion Leader then distributed a document for discussion, the Executive Summary of the NWMO’s study *Choosing a Way Forward: The Future Management of Canada’s Used Nuclear Fuel*. The document was given both individual consideration, as well as collective consideration. Individually, Panelists were asked to mark the documents with red and green pens, green indicating they felt a certain point was helpful to their understanding and red indicating that they did not find the point helpful. The intent of the individual document review was to serve as a launching point for further collective consideration and discussion of the more complex strategic objectives of the NWMO. The Panel discussion concluded with Panelists reviewing the answers provided by the NWMO to the questions Panelists had posted in the Parking Lot in Phase One.

Again, Panels were successful in the richness of the data gathered. Furthermore, Panelists have begun to demonstrate a higher degree of ownership in the process with impressive attendance, commitment to the discussion and, in some cases, engaging in extra work, such as assembling their thoughts on paper and seeking out additional information.

Phase Three Panels occurred in late April and early May 2008. Unlike previous Panels, Phase Three Panels were divided into two parts: a discussion portion and a question and answer portion with a technical representative from the NWMO.

The discussion portion of the Panel began with a general discussion on Panelists’ thoughts, if any, on the NWMO since the last Panel session and then turned to the Draft Implementation Plan that had been distributed to Panelists upon their arrival. Similar to

Phase Two, the document was not reviewed by Panelists but, rather, used to inform Panel discussion on the NWMO's strategic objectives. Although Panelists were given an opportunity to comment on all objectives, as well as the document as a whole, they were asked to concentrate specifically on four of the seven NWMO strategic objectives: Building Relationships; Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research; Review, Adjust and Validate Plans; and Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process. These objectives were rated by Panelists in Phase One as highly appropriate and important for the NWMO. For each strategic objective, Panelists were given a summary that outlined items the NWMO plans to implement over the next five years (2008-2012) and asked for their feedback; specifically whether they felt the NWMO was moving in the right direction with these plans and whether they felt that anything important had been overlooked.

Phase Four of the NWMO Citizen Panels took place in June 2008. The Panel discussions primarily gathered input and explored Panelist reaction to the design of a process for selecting a site, and used five questions as a foundation for research:

1. Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?
2. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?
3. From what models and experience should we draw in designing the process?
4. Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?
5. What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?

These five questions also served as the organizing principle for the discussion leader's guide. A general outline of discussion objectives, as well as materials intended to guide the work of the Panel, were prepared in advance of the Citizen Panel. Reproductions of discussion materials shown to the Panel can be found at the end of this report in Appendices iii, iv, and v.

This Panel Report is, to the best of Navigator's abilities, a faithful rendering of the discussion held in Sault Ste. Marie and stands alone as a record of the Citizen Panel discussion on June 12, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this phase of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Toronto, Scarborough, Saskatoon, Regina, Saint John, and Montreal has also been submitted to the NWMO.

II. PANELIST DIALOGUE

a. Overview

The Phase Four Citizen Panel discussion of June 12, 2008 took place in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. Unlike Phase Three of this project, Panelists were not given any material to review in advance. Instead, they were asked a series of five discussion questions throughout their three-hour discussion using three “backgrounder” sheets for reference. The five questions were listed in Section I of this document.

The discussion of the first question produced noteworthy dialogue about what some Panelists considered to be a backward approach to finding a suitable site. This particular Panelist suggested that a shortlist of locations should be created based on geological suitability:

What strikes me is that now they've identified a large swath of the country, is to say, to mayors, councillors, etc., "here's what we're looking for and here are the potential benefits to your community if you are chosen as the host." You have to be open about the risks that are inherent but also the possible benefits.

While other Panelists in other locations also mentioned a preference for this order of events, this Panelist's idea is different from the others is because they specifically mentioned the importance of using established local governance as the channel for offering and accepting “bids” to host a site.

A fellow Panelist immediately jumped on board with this idea, noting that it was akin to a request for proposal (RFP) process that a business might undertake. The Panelist who suggested the process above explained that in their opinion a town should be able to apply without having to commit right away, allowing them to simply express their interest in the earlier stages.

The second question also lent itself to a fulsome discussion in Sault Ste. Marie. A few Panelists expressed surface-level disagreements with some of the wording in what they were reading. One concerned the term “used nuclear fuel” which this Panelist felt to be a subtle euphemism for “nuclear waste.” They wondered why the term “nuclear waste” was seemingly avoided in the literature:

I just think it falls away from their point of open and consistent about it. It looks sneaky and like they're trying to be “public relations” about it.

Another Panelist perceived that the discussion of “harm” might be frightening to some readers and undermine to the overall emphasis on safety:

*I didn't understand the part that says "harm that is unavoidable"
... I thought the whole process was supposed to avoid people
getting hurt.*

Other Panelists in other groups said that they appreciated the honesty of the backgrounder's language for the same reason. Other Panelists raised points more germane to the substance of the NWMO's questions. This Panelist succinctly framed what they perceived to be the danger in transportation:

*... One of the things that we will have to discuss is how far we will
truck that stuff. For every kilometre the risk increases.*

Another Panelist engaged in a dialogue with the Discussion Leader about credibility and trust. The Discussion Leader asked how one could know that proponents were speaking objectively about the project. In response, one Panelist said that they believed a scientific background was indicative of objectivity. Another cited "experience" as a desirable quality:

*When we had the guy here last time, knowing how much
experience he had... there was something reassuring in that. If we
had credible people coming to present at forums in these towns,
that would be helpful.*

The same Panelist, however, continued their comments by emphasizing the positive benefits for a community accepting the project. Another Panelist thought that to host a repository site would necessarily involve a degree of reciprocity:

*The fact of the matter is if you're asking people to take this risk
on then why shouldn't those people have some benefits from it?
Who in their right mind would agree to this and not get any
benefits out of it? A library, a hospital, schools, something.*

This Panelist framed their comments in a pragmatic light, implying that they believed a project would not be well-received without accompanying benefits. This Panelist prefaced their comments with an acknowledgement of the robust framework of ethical considerations created by the NWMO and the research they have done.

*One thing I like about this is that there's such a heavy, heavy
emphasis on the social aspects. One is a scientific approach, the
other is about communities. They will be better off. Go forward to
the people and say: "folks, we're not shoving this down anyone's
throat, you have to want it in your area."*

The Panelist emphasized the importance of a "willing" community at the end of their comments, affirming the NWMO's principle of needing a voluntary host location for the repository site.

Sault Ste. Marie Panelists were a highly participatory group. In particular, they excelled at drawing comparisons to large-scale development projects that they have, as northerners, witnessed over the years.

b. Panel Notes

i. Disclaimer

The attached are contemporaneous notes of the general Panel discussion, as well as the discussion on the three backgrounder documents provided by the NWMO. The notes were taken by a transcriber positioned in the room with the Panelists. The transcriber was taking direction from the Citizen Panel on specific points of interest. The following is not an official transcript, but a best effort to capture the sense of discussion with some granularity.

The transcriber for this Panel was Lanny Cardow, a Navigator research professional.

General Discussion

Due to time constraints, the General Discussion portion of the session was limited to re-introductions only.

Discussion Leader:

One of the things we've been talking about staying away from is the whole idea of choosing a site. There will be one location. We know that. The second thing we know is that it will be in a deep geological repository somewhere. There are 2 considerations there. One is that it will be the right type of rock. The second is that it will be in a place where the place or communities are both informed and willing to accept it. With that in mind, the organization will decide a process. What we're going to try to do tonight is give the NWMO some guidance as to what you think will be important to include in the process. If you think about people who are going to go to work designing this process, what kind of information do we need to give them to ensure they are getting this right?

SSM-6A:

The only thing I didn't get was "the used fuel will be used to... until the decision will be made to close the site." I just don't understand why they're talking about closing a site they haven't even built yet.

SSM-10A:

The way I understood it was that they'll need a new site eventually.

Discussion Leader:

When it's full, at some point, we'll come to the point where we can find another one.

SSM-6A: Well, are they just going to leave that stuff in the ground indefinitely? Unmonitored?

Discussion Leader: When people feel comfortable enough.

SSM-3A: But there will be another one eventually?

Discussion Leader: At some point in the future we'll be able to close it up and seal it.

SSM-6A: And we'll leave that in the ground, and seal it?

SSM-15A: Unless we find a use for it.

SSM-10A: With everything that's going on with all the wars, are people going to know where it is? If North Korea throws a nuclear bomb on it, will it be able to penetrate it? Will it spread the radiation?

Discussion Leader: If a bomb is able to reach it that far down, the least of our problems will be the nuclear waste!

SSM-17A: 500-1000 meters...half a kilometre to a kilometre sounds a little more secure to me.

SSM-6A: Will it be common knowledge where it is?

SSM-14A: It says hazardous to humans ... how hazardous is it? Are we talking skin radiation or long-term death?

Discussion Leader: What we're trying to do tonight is give them some advice. Wherever it goes it has to meet three conditions. It has to be geologically suitable rock, you have to agree to it, and we should look at one of the provinces involved in producing the nuclear waste, at least at first glance. But that's all they've said so far.

SSM-8A: So they've identified specific areas conducive to storage? Where it could be?

Discussion Leader: Specific geological areas, yes.

SSM-8A: A committee would have to look at these areas.

SSM-3A: Could they have a referendum?

Discussion Leader: A referendum would solve part of the problem.

SSM-17A: What strikes me is that now they've identified a large swath of the country, they have to say to mayors and councilors 'here's what we're looking for and here are the potential benefits to your community if you are chosen as the host'. You have to be open about the risks that are inherent but also the possible benefits.

Discussion Leader: What some people have told me is that you could draw a map of the country, and shade in the areas with suitable rock.

SSM-17A: That's right, very general.

Discussion Leader: And then they could accept bids from the coloured area.

SSM-17A: That's it, exactly. No commitment, but if you're interested...

SSM-14A: Request for proposal.

SSM-17A: I just want to say that you can just express an interest. You're not committing, even if you express an interest. They'll have to come into your area to see if you can be in the running for it.

Discussion Leader: SSM-15A has an idea of their own for the second part: referendums. So now we've taken the whole country, and decided where it could go within that, next we could have a referendum to see who actually wants it.

SSM-13A: You can rest assured Sault Ste. Marie won't be one of them, because even if it was ideal, we don't even have fluoridation in this city.

Discussion Leader: In Bruce, they want to be the next site in Ontario to get one. It just shows you different communities are able to make different decisions.

SSM-8A: Before we even get that way, we should be using that brochure we're talking about here so that a lot of the questions get answered ahead of time.

Discussion Leader: As a practical matter, there needs to be a process to whittle down the areas that have expressed an interest. That's what these 2 backgrounders I've handed out to you are trying to do.

SSM-17A: I think that this idea, the referendum, the other thing that you emphasized, is that this is not a discussion about whether we're going to expand nuclear energy. Even if there's no expansion, we'll still have a pile of waste to deal with. I mean everything looks really open and transparent but I'm still surprised that, for an organizations that has 'waste' in its name, on these sheets it refers to "used fuel" over nine times and not once does it mention waste. It just makes it look like they're hiding something. I just think it falls away from their point of open and consistent about it. It looks sneaky and like they're trying to be "public relations" about it.

Discussion Leader: I take your point completely. Is there anything else?

SSM-4A: I didn't understand the part that says "harm that is unavoidable". I thought the whole process was supposed to avoid people getting hurt?

Discussion Leader: Yes, but there is always some damage that will be unavoidable. For example, trees getting cut down.

SSM-4A: Oh, right. Okay that's different.

SSM-10A: It's like cooking bacon. Sooner or later you're going to get splashed with hot grease.

SSM-17A: I'm glad that's in there, but one of the things that we will have to discuss is how far we will truck that stuff. For every kilometre, the risk increases.

Discussion Leader: In Pickering, we have this stuff stored near a lot of people. Every kilometre we truck it is a kilometre of risk, but it's also a kilometre away from risk.

SSM-8A: Why are they trying to mention the concerns of aboriginals separate from the concerns of other Canadians?

Discussion Leader: The reason the First Nations are singled out is that we have different relationships with First Nations'

peoples, in law, in treaty, in land claims. Whether we like that or not, it's not the same.

SSM-8A: What about the Inuit people?

Discussion Leader: It's not likely in this case that this would go near those people.

SSM-16A: That's a long way to transport it, anyway.

Discussion Leader: You guys have given me tons and tons of input. We've heard from Canadians from coast to coast. But the time has come to put a process on this. How are we going to choose? Our technical representative talked to us about how Sweden decided between two places who wanted to host it. How are we going to be sure about a process to decide on a location?

SSM-8A: If you're talking about the process you have to talk about the people involved. You don't need bias from political minds in one area or another.

Discussion Leader: How would you know it had been objective?

SSM-8A: I don't know, it's a difficult thing.

SSM-15A: When we had the guy here last time, knowing how much experience he had, there was something reassuring in that. If we had credible people coming to present at forums in these towns, that would be helpful.

SSM-4A: Do we want scientific credibility or someone who served on school boards?

SSM-1A: No, no, scientific.

Many agree.

SSM-4A: But what about someone who's served on a bank?

Some agree.

SSM-15A: But to me it wouldn't be a convincing factor.

SSM-17A: I agree with SSM-4A that the science is one part of it. The infrastructure has got to be there.

SSM-4A: You need someone there who will understand the above-ground building, engineers for the translation.

SSM-1A: I agree with you. I don't care what it's going to cost, it has to be safe.

Discussion Leader: What are the kinds of things you would want to see?

SSM-13A: When you're trying to convince people, the stuff I've read with regard to any sort of a referendum, there always seems to be, for lack of a better word, "crazies" and nothing seems to convince them. Elliott Lake is where that uranium came from, for instance, and yet you have people down there who would never allow anything radioactive to go back there, ever.

SSM-1A: A mining community would be one to start with. They're the ones to start with. They've been experiencing the bad and the good.

SSM-13A: How do you avoid the fanatics?

Discussion Leader: The smartest answer is that the process deals with that.

SSM-13A: I mean, there are people who don't even want a bike path.

SSM-8A: I don't even want it in my area.

Discussion Leader: Getting back on track, do these objectives seem right? Something left out to you?

SSM-17A: I think it's really well thought out. Especially the second last point [on the Green backgrounder] I think it's a really good list. I think it's been missing in some places in the past, but it's great now.

SSM-1A: I understood it all. I had no problem with it.

SSM-17A: They're changing with it, it's good.

Discussion Leader: Are they getting better with the materials?

Most agree that the NWMO is listening to their comments.

SSM-10A: On the personal gain and bias, how do we know they're not going to grease someone's pocket? Sooner or later, some politician is going to get a little bit of cash out of it.

Discussion Leader: I guess what they're saying is that they're committing not to do that.

SSM-10A: But how do we know?

SSM-17A: Just to come back to what I was talking about earlier, putting an RFP to the public. Chambers of commerce might get involved. You said in Sweden they compete. I can see that happening here. A lot of communities will be divided.

SSM-13A: The only way is if it is in the middle of nowhere. And the nearest reserve is 500 kilometres away.

SSM-13A: You're going to need to develop a new community for this, a place that can be isolated.

SSM-10A: If you create a new community it's going to have to be in the middle of nowhere.

SSM-17A: Pardon me, I just found a reference to nuclear waste.

Discussion Leader: You've criticized us in the past for a lot of lawyer talk. So how are we doing now?

SSM-1A: It's getting better.

SSM-5A: I've been more and more impressed. I think they're on the right track. There is a more positive attitude.

SSM-16A: I think that maybe we're learning more each time we come, but it's easier to read, easier to understand.

Discussion Leader: On the right track?

SSM-16A: I think they're beginning to talk in our terms.

Discussion Leader:

When I was in Saint John, New Brunswick, they had just been through a process to locate a natural gas facility, so they were able to be quite helpful about what not to do. During that process they booted out the Mayor and all of Council. Have there been any other things that are similar? The dump has to be somewhere, the penitentiary has to go somewhere, do you have any examples you can think of?

SSM-17A:

Adam's mine

Some nod.

Discussion Leader:

What about that process is helpful for the NWMO?

SSM-17A:

We did have a community there that was split right down the middle. The impact on the ecology all around would be immense. I don't remember it too well but it warrants some study.

SSM-13A:

I got the impression that the community of Kirkland Lake was in favour of it, but the objections came all the way from Toronto up to about ten miles away in terms of transportation.

SSM-8A:

I thought the Council was in favour of it but not the people who lived there?

Discussion Leader:

Any examples from here in the Sault?

SSM-15A:

At Algoma Steel, that issue with the people feeling like they're houses are always dusty?

Discussion Leader:

I don't know, can someone explain this to me?

SSM-1A:

With all the dust and pollution, people are always complaining about it and, believe it or not, it doesn't come from the production at the factory. It's from the transportation traffic.

SSM-6A:

I believe it.

SSM-1A:

It's all the gravel and dirt roads. The part people complain about didn't bother people for 30 years, before there was so much traffic. It's a bad deal, the

chemicals leak in transport. Most of the pollution problems are pretty good outside the building, it's just once you get inside the building. They're installing filters.

Discussion Leader:

The community wants these filters?

SSM-1A:

I'm sure everybody wants them, they are very good.

SSM-15A:

Well ever since Algoma has been taken over by the company from India, there's been concern.

SSM-1A:

The last time the community went through something like this, where everyone got involved as a community, was when we got a casino here.

Discussion Leader:

You had a referendum on that?

SSM-17A:

Yes. That's an example of the Council being proactive. People wanted it and they went to the province to go get it.

Discussion Leader:

Was that well done?

SSM-17A:

Well the Casino's here! It was 53-47 vote or something. A majority but not a giant majority. After the casino was here for many years, people agree that a lot of the concerns we had – hookers, other problems – never happened.

Discussion Leader:

Anyone else have any examples?

SSM-8A:

There are all kinds of examples.

Discussion Leader:

This is a big deal. This is going to be the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars by the time it's done and they want to get it right. The NWMO takes your concerns very seriously.

SSM-8A:

One thing you were talking about is that after all this, they could all of a sudden have a potential for ten sites and need a way to narrowing it down. Once they narrow it down, then they come out and talk to the public.

Discussion Leader:

That's what I've been trying to say all night. What are the processes they're going to use? That's

what's important. Are some missing? Are the ethical considerations they've listed here the right ones? That's on the green sheet.

SSM-14A: Is it possible to tender it out to different consulting companies to get their input too?

Discussion Leader: When the NWMO technical representative was here he mentioned that. They have research agreements with 12 universities.

SSM-1A: We should look at mining communities. They've already tested everywhere with core samples and that would give them a better idea of where to consider.

SSM-8A: I don't think it should go to consulting sites at all. If I were doing this, I'd go to selected universities and give this to them as a business proposal. You'd say "we're going to design a site". You wouldn't say 'we're trying to hide dangerous things in Canada'.

SSM-17A: One thing I like about this is that there's a heavy emphasis on the social aspects. One is a scientific approach, the other is about communities. They will be better off. Go forward to the people and say, 'folks, we're not shoving this down anyone's throat, you have to want it in your area'. The fact of the matter is if you're asking people to take on this risk, then why shouldn't those people have some benefits from it? Who in their right mind would agree to this and not get any benefits out of it?

SSM-3A: It'd be nice if you got extra doctors.

Discussion Leader: What is the difference between a benefit and bribe to the town?

SSM-4A: Same thing. One is supposed to be a cleaner word.

Discussion Leader: Is a bribe a special interest group benefiting?

Many agree.

Discussion Leader: But if everyone in the town got the same, then that's a benefit?

Most agree.

SSM-13A: In terms of the layout of this thing, when they draw this map, is there any possibility of suitable locations in being found in southern Ontario?

SSM-13A: Off the top of my head nothing south of Sudbury would be suitable.

Discussion Leader: On that, what our technical representative said was they want places where blasting hasn't happened yet.

SSM-13A: You're not going to find a place in Ontario without a water source.

APPENDICES

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Backgrounder 1: Selecting a Site
- iv. Backgrounder 2: Framing the Discussion
- v. Backgrounder 3: Learning from Others

I. NAVIGATOR PERSONNEL

JAMES STEWART WATT, SENIOR DISCUSSION LEADER

Jaime Watt is Chair of Navigator, a Toronto-based research consulting firm that specializes in public opinion research, strategy and public policy development.

Prior to relocating to Toronto, he was, for ten years, Chair of Thomas Watt Advertising, a leading regional advertising agency and communications consulting firm based in London, Ontario.

A specialist in complex communications issues, Jaime has served clients in the corporate, professional services, not-for-profit and government sectors and has worked in every province in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Central America, Korea and Kosovo.

He currently serves as Chair of Casey House, Canada's pioneer AIDS hospice, as well as Casey House Foundation and is a Vice President of the Albany Club. He is a director of the Dominion Institute, Woodrow Wilson Center's Canada Institute, TD Canada Trust's Private Giving Foundation, The Canadian Club of Toronto and The Clean Water Foundation. As well, he is a member of the President's Advisory Council for the Canadian Red Cross and is a member of the Executive Committee of Canadians for Equal Marriage. He was a founding Trustee and Co-chair of the Canadian Human Rights Trust and the Canadian Human Rights Campaign.

CHAD A. ROGERS, SUPPORTING DISCUSSION LEADER

Chad Rogers is a Consultant at Navigator providing strategic planning and public opinion research advice to government, corporate and not-for-profit clients.

He has recently returned to Canada after working abroad with the Washington, DC based National Democratic Institute as director of their programs in Kosovo and Armenia respectively. Chad oversaw multi-million dollar democracy and governance assistance programs directed at political parties, parliaments and civil society organizations in newly democratic nations. He conducted high-level training with the political leadership of Armenia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Moldova and Serbia.

Having previously worked on Parliament Hill as both a legislative and communications assistant to Members of Parliament and Senators, he has an in-depth knowledge of Canada's Parliament and its committees, caucuses and procedures.

He is a board member of the Kosova Democratic Institute and is a member in good standing of the Public Affairs Association of Canada (PAAC) and the Market Research & Intelligence Association (MRIA). Chad has trained at the RIVA Qualitative Research Training Institute.

LANNY A. CARDOW, PROJECT MANAGER

Lanny Cardow is a consultant performing research-based strategic communications work on projects for Navigator's corporate and not-for-profit clients.

Lanny most recently served in the Office of the Prime Minister as the Executive Assistant to the PM's Chief of Staff, having previously worked in the Office of the Leader of the Opposition in various capacities, including Manager of Outreach (Operations).

Lanny graduated with a master's degree from The George Washington University's Graduate School of Political Management in 2006, specializing in both Campaign Management and Polling course concentrations.

While completing his degree, Lanny performed research at GWU's Institute for Politics, Democracy and the Internet, contributing to numerous studies and events that explored the crossroads of online technology and advanced campaigning techniques.

Lanny earned his bachelor's degree in Political Studies at Queen's University in 2002.

JOSEPH LAVOIE, PANEL MANAGER (FRANCOPHONE)

Prior to joining Navigator, Joseph Lavoie worked at Citigroup Global Transaction Services where he improved communications within the Transfer Agency Systems department. Joseph achieved this objective via Web 2.0 technologies, which he previously leveraged in developing Santa's Journal, a successful viral marketing campaign that introduced Santa Claus to the world of blogging and podcasting.

Joseph has been active in numerous provincial and federal election campaigns; has provided political commentary for various websites and television/radio programs; and has served as the recruitment director for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Youth Association. In March 2007, Joseph was selected *Canada's Next Great Prime Minister* by Canadians as part of a scholarship program sponsored by Magna International, the Dominion Institute, and the Canada-US Fulbright Program. He currently serves on the Public Affairs/Marketing Team for the Toronto Symphony Volunteer Committee.

AMY LONEY, PANEL MANAGER (ANGLOPHONE)

Prior to joining Navigator, Amy attended Queen's University where she graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in Political Science. Amy has also completed intensive Explore French Language Bursary Programs at Université de Montréal and Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières respectively.

Amy is head Panel Manager and plays a vital role in the management and organization of the Citizen Panel project.

II. DISCUSSION LEADERS GUIDE

PHASE FOUR CITIZEN PANELS

DISCUSSION LEADER'S GUIDE

1. OPENING OF PANEL SESSION (0:00 – 0:03)

- Welcome back
- Explanation of NWMO disclosure of proceedings
- Re-introduction of Transcriber
- Re-introduction of Parking lot
- Re-introduction of Panel Managers

2. PRE-DISCUSSION EXERCISE (0:03-0:15)

‘Creating an Information Package’ Exercise

- Brainstorming about what an information package should look like.
- Will revisit suggestions later in the Panel discussion.

3. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA FOR SESSION (0:15 – 0:17)

4. RE-INTRODUCTIONS (0:17 – 0:21)

5. GENERAL DISCUSSION (0:21 – 0:25)

- Read, seen or heard anything about NWMO in the media since our last discussion?

6. BROAD DISCUSSION OF SITING PROCESS (0:25 – 0:30)

7. DISCUSSION OF BACKGROUNDERS 1 AND 2: BACKGROUND – ‘SELECTING A SITE’ AND ‘FRAMING THE DISCUSSION’ (0:30 – 1:10)

- **Q1: Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?**
 - Do you think this ethical framework will be good for the siting process?
 - Do you feel this framework covers all of the important aspects?
 - Do you feel that anything is missing?

- **Q2: How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?**
 - How, in your view, could fairness be best assured in and by the process for selecting a site?
 - How should the process for selecting a site take into account the needs of both this generation and future generations - so that costs, benefits, risks and responsibilities are distributed fairly across generations?
 - Are there other geographical considerations which should be taken into account for the process to be fair?
 - The NWMO has committed to only choosing a site in a location that is informed and willing. How might the design of the process ensure that this happens?

8. DISCUSSION OF BACKGROUNDER 3: 'LEARNING FROM OTHERS' (1:10 – 1:40)

- **Q3: From what models and experience should the NWMO draw in designing a siting process?**
 - From your perspective, what experience and models do you think would be particularly relevant to consider and draw from in designing the process for selecting a site?
 - What other decisions/processes might we learn from or are comparable? Are there events which have happened in the past which you are aware of which we should look back on for lessons?
- **Q4: Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?**
 - What are your views on who should be involved in selecting a site? What would you count on them to bring to the process?
 - Would you expect each of these individuals and groups to play a different role in selecting a site, or have different responsibilities in the process? What role or responsibilities?

9. DISCUSSION OF 'COMMUNICATIONS' GROUP WORK (1:40 – 2:10)

- **Q5: What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?**
 - What information and tools do you think would help Canadians participate constructively in the siting process?
 - What about reporting: things like documents and publications?

- Do any of the questions raised today strike you as more important than the others? Less important?
- Do you have any suggestions for what remains to be considered?

10. REVIEW “PROJECT DESCRIPTION” AND “WHO WE ARE” AND OTHER DOCUMENTS (2:10 – 2:50)

- Do you think something like this would help explain the project to larger audiences?
- If you didn’t know what you now know about the NWMO’s project, would a document like this answer your questions, or perhaps help you ask some better ones?
- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve this document?

[Distribute ‘Who we are’ document and give Panelists a few minutes to review]

- If you didn’t know about the NWMO or the role it plays, would a document like this answer your questions, or perhaps help you ask some better ones?
- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve this document?

[Distribute ‘Security and Safeguards’, ‘Transportation of Used Nuclear Fuel’, and ‘Monitoring and Retrievability’ documents and give Panelists a few minutes to review]

- And what do you think about these ones?
- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve these documents?

11. WRAP-UP (2:50 – 3:00)

- As we end our session does anyone have any remaining issues to discuss or questions to raise about our discussions here?
- Panel Management issues
- Adjourn

III. BACKGROUNDER 1: SELECTING A SITE

Background - Selecting a site

Canadians have been using electricity generated by nuclear power reactors for about four decades. Canada currently has 20 operating commercial reactors at 5 nuclear generating stations located in New Brunswick, Québec and Ontario. These reactors are fueled by uranium formed into bundles. Once used, the bundles are hazardous to humans and the environment, essentially indefinitely. They must be managed properly.

Canada has about two million used fuel bundles and is generating about 85,000 more each year. We can expect to produce about 3.6 million used fuel bundles if each of the current electricity generating reactors operates for its anticipated average life-span of about 40 years.

Currently, the used fuel bundles are safely stored at licensed facilities located at the reactor sites in Canada. The communities hosting these facilities understand this to be temporary, and that the used fuel has always been destined for long-term management at a specially-designed facility.

Through Adaptive Phased Management, the used fuel bundles will ultimately be packaged into long-lived strongly built containers, transported to the selected site and placed in the deep geological repository.

While technical studies suggest that large geographic portions of Canada have rock formations potentially suitable for the deep geological repository, scientific, technical, social, ethical, economic, and environmental factors also have to be weighed in selecting a site.

That site will occupy a surface area of about 2 kilometres by 3 kilometres. Underground, the repository will be about 1.8 square kilometres in area. It will consist of a network of horizontal tunnels and rooms excavated in stable rock at a depth between 500 to 1,000 metres. Once there, the used fuel will be monitored to confirm the safety and performance of the repository until a decision is made to close the site. It will remain retrievable until such time as a future society decides on final closure and on the appropriate form and duration of post-closure monitoring.

People will be keenly interested in where the site is located, in how the used fuel will get there, and in how safety and security will be assured. Communities considering hosting the site will want to know how their well-being could be affected

including what risks they might face, how they might benefit, and what commitments they will have to make.

Communities will also want to have updated information about the used fuel to be managed. We will regularly publish inventory information on the current and future potential used fuel inventories. Recognizing the potential for industry to make decisions that may affect the amount and characteristics of the used fuel to be managed in future, we will continually monitor, review and invite broad discussion about new developments so that our plans may be adjusted as required.

Selecting the site thus requires dialogue and careful thinking. We expect that the design of the selection process will need to have many features including:

- The objectives of the siting process and the principles that would apply.
- The major steps in the siting process.
- The factors and criteria that will be applied in making siting decisions.
- How Aboriginal insights and traditional knowledge will be respected.
- How information will be communicated and shared.
- The studies required at each step.
- How to work collaboratively throughout the process.

IV. BACKGROUND 2: FRAMING THE DISCUSSION

Framing the discussion

In conversations with Canadians during the study phase of our work, we heard that the approach for managing Canada's used nuclear fuel must respond to a *framework* of objectives and characteristics. This framework will help shape the process for selecting a site and to help guide implementation.

Objectives

The process for selecting a site should help Adaptive Phased Management achieve the objectives set for it by citizens:

Fairness – To ensure fairness (in substance and process) in the distribution of costs, benefits, risks and responsibilities, within this generation and across generations.

Public Health and Safety – To protect public health from the risk of exposure to radioactive or other hazardous materials and from the threat of injuries or deaths due to accidents.

Worker Health and Safety – To protect workers and minimize hazards associated with managing used nuclear fuel.

Community Well-being – To ensure the well-being of all communities with a shared interest.

Security – To ensure the security of facilities, materials and infrastructure.

Environmental Integrity – To ensure that environmental integrity is maintained over the long term.

Economic Viability – To ensure the economic viability of the waste management system, while simultaneously contributing positively to the local economy.

Adaptability – To ensure a capacity to adapt to changing knowledge and conditions over time.

Of these objectives, people consider safety, security and fairness to be paramount: the management approach must ensure *safety and security* for people, communities and the environment, and it must be seen to be safe and secure from the perspective of current and future generations.

Characteristics

The process for selecting a site should also be responsive to the characteristics which Canadians said would be important for any siting process:

- Be open, inclusive and fair to all parties, giving everyone with an interest an opportunity to have their views heard and taken into account.
- Ensure that groups most likely to be affected by the facility, including through transportation, are given full opportunity to have their views heard and taken into account, and are provided with the forms of assistance they require to present their case effectively.
- Respect all Aboriginal rights, treaties and land claims.
- Be free from conflict of interest, personal gain or bias among those making the decision and/or formulating recommendations.
- Be informed by the best knowledge — from the natural and social sciences, Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge, ethics and technology development — relevant to making a decision and/or formulating a recommendation.
- Be in accord with the precautionary principle, which seeks to avoid harm and the risk of harm, and which demands ethical justification for such harm that is unavoidable.

- Ensure that those who could be exposed to harm or risk of harm, or other losses or limitations, are fully consulted and are willing to accept what is proposed for them.
- Take into consideration the possible costs, harms, risks, and benefits of the siting decision, including financial, physical, biological, social, cultural, and ethical costs.
- Ensure that those who benefited most from nuclear power (past, present and perhaps future) bear the costs and risks of managing used fuel and other materials.
- Address scientific and technical factors that may help ensure safety.

Implementation of the approach will respect the social, cultural and economic aspirations of affected communities.

A matter of ethics:

The process for selecting a site should strive to:

- Respect life in all its forms, including minimization of harm to human beings and other sentient creatures.
- Respect future generations of human beings, other species, and the biosphere as a whole.
- Respect peoples and cultures.
- Promote justice across groups, regions, and generations.
- Be fair to everyone affected, particularly to minorities and marginalized groups.
- Respect the values and interpretations that different individuals and groups bring to dialogue and other means of collaboration.

Canadians told the NWMO they want to be sure, above all, that the site for the deep geological repository is safe and secure. The process for choosing that site must be grounded in values and objectives that Canadians hold important. The process must be open, transparent, fair and inclusive. And the NWMO believes it must be designed in a way that citizens across this country are confident meets the highest scientific, professional and ethical standards.

The NWMO makes commitments as to how such a process must work:

1. The decision by a community to host the site must be informed and made willingly.
2. The site selected must meet strict, scientifically-determined safety requirements.
3. In the interest of fairness, the process should focus on the provinces directly involved in the nuclear fuel cycle: New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario and Saskatchewan. Communities in other regions that express an interest will also be considered.
4. Communities that decide to engage in the process for selecting a site, as potential hosts, shall have the right to withdraw consistent with any agreements between themselves and the NWMO

V. BACKGROUNDER 3: LEARNING FROM OTHERS

Learning from others

In beginning to think about the design of a process for selecting a site for Canada's used nuclear fuel, we take the view that a process for Canada needs to be designed by Canadians. In the study phase of our work, citizens told us a great deal about their concerns and expectations.

At the same time, siting experiences here and abroad— involving nuclear waste and other hazardous substances, as well as comparable decision-making processes—offer insight about what might be challenging and about what might work well. Overall, these experiences seem to confirm the merit of a site-selection process for Canada that seeks an informed and willing host community, that is collaborative and that considers technical, social, environmental and social factors together.

The following are some challenges and opportunities that may be important to consider:

Being inclusive

Canadians told us that the success of the process for selecting a site hinges on open and fair collaboration with all potential host communities and other interested people and organizations at every step. At some point, the process will need to focus on candidate host communities and ultimately on the selected community. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site involves the right people at the right times without leaving anyone out unfairly? Participation also carries important responsibilities for all participants. We seek the advice of Canadians in identifying those responsibilities and ensuring they are shared and applied fairly.

Defining 'community'

We want to ensure that people and communities can participate in all aspects of the site selection decision that affect them. It will be important to identify what constitutes a 'community' and who can best speak on its behalf. Should a community be defined narrowly and by political boundaries, such as the confines of a town, or should it be based on patterns of economic activity and include the surrounding area?

Measuring community acceptance

We believe that any community which eventually hosts the nuclear waste management facility must be willing to do so. It will be important to identify how we might gauge the willingness of any community that expresses an interest. In what ways might potential host communities demonstrate they have the permission and trust of their residents to explore hosting the facility? And how might we consider the needs of future generations in considering expressions of interest?

Demonstrating fairness

Fairness demands that any community expressing willingness to host a facility do so in a way which is free and informed. This means that the community has the information it needs to assess how it might be affected by the decision, and that it is not under undue influence of economic considerations. Key decisions must be taken

through full and deliberate engagement. How can this be best accomplished?

Balancing social acceptability with other factors

If more than one community wishes to host the site, how might we decide between them? Each site is likely to have its own but different strengths. One site may be closer to where used fuels are currently stored, but require more engineering to make sure the facility is safe. Another community may have more support among residents but require more technical research to ascertain whether the physical characteristics of the site are appropriate.

Strengthening community capacity

People and communities must have the wherewithal to take part in the process. Different groups will have their own requirements, ideas and way of doing things. Particularly important are the time and resources that potential host communities will require to make informed choices. We need to understand the requirements of participants and seek tools that can aid their involvement. What suggestions do you have for ensuring that people are equipped to take part?

Partnership

Experience suggests that the building of long-term relationships and partnerships is vital to the success of the process for selecting a site. This takes time and effort, but the benefits can range from sharing information and resources to building trust and improving communication. What are the essential ingredients for building real and lasting relationships and partnerships? What kinds of agreements should be forged?

Ensuring community well-being

We are committed to ensuring that any community that decides to host the facility will be better off for having done so. The well-being of a community might be affected in a broad range of ways, from traditional use of land to economic development and socio-cultural cohesion. It will be important to understand how a community might be affected by its decision and to ensure this is weighed appropriately before proceeding. What processes need to be put in place to ensure that the community continues to benefit from the facility well in to the future? How do we resolve potential conflicts and differences in perspective?

RESEARCH | STRATEGY | RESULTS™

