

NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase IV: Panel Six

NWMO SR-2008-25

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 Scarborough, Ontario

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION
SCARBOROUGH 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 Scarborough, Ontario Phase Four Citizen Panel was held on June 16, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Scarborough.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 13 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 Scarborough Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

	City: Scarborough Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Retired nurse
Panelist: S-1A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, real estate
Panelist: S-3A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed part-time, painter
Panelist: S-6A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Unemployed
Panelist: S-9A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part-time, educational
Panelist: S-12A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Student
Panelist: S-14A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, print buyer
Panelist: S-17A	

	City: Scarborough Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, health and nutritionist
Panelist: S-2A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part-time, daycare provider
Panelist: S-4A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed part-time, grocery store
Panelist: S-8A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part-time, teacher
Panelist: S-11A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Self-employed, teacher
Panelist: S-13A	
	City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, BMO
Panelist: S-15A	

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 Scarborough and stands alone as a record of the Citizen Panel discussion on June 16, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this phase of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Toronto, Sault Ste. Marie, Saskatoon, Regina, Saint John, and Montreal has also been submitted to the NWMO.

II. PANELIST DIALOGUE

a. Overview

The Phase Four Citizen Panel discussion on June 16, 2008 took place in Scarborough, 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 and given three “backgrounder” sheets to use for reference. The five questions are listed in Section I of the document.

During a general discussion at the start of the session, one Panelist recalled news about Ontario’s plan to build new nuclear reactors in the coming years:

As a matter of fact today it came up because there was some stuff in the news about Ontario building more reactors. So now you’re going to have to go back to stage one because you’ll have so much more waste to handle from these facilities.

The Panelist’s comment is particularly noteworthy because it drew a direct causal link between new nuclear generation and increased production of used nuclear fuel. This correlation has not always been evident in past Panelist comments.

The Discussion Leader initiated discussion on the first backgrounder by asking questions about whether the NWMO had provided a good foundation of principles, or if they were they off on the wrong track. This Panelist replied that they were, on the whole, satisfied with the NWMO’s efforts:

They have taken each point into consideration. I think it’s very up to date. I think whatever I read, and we have been here 3-4 sessions before, [is] very good.

In addition to being encouraged by what they read, the Panelist was pleased by what they have seen from the NWMO on the basis of what they’ve seen so far. Some Panelists were also confident in the NWMO going forward:

Panelist: How would it affect the people in terms of health, and exposure?

Discussion Leader: Knowing the organization, do you think they have a plan?

Panelist: I think they would have something in place, but I didn’t see anything pinpointing that.

In this case, the Panelist was confident that the NWMO had already considered their concern about radiation exposure, even though they did not see it listed on the backgrounder being reviewed at the time.

A new development in some Phase Four locations was that a handful of Panelists mentioned that they appreciated the reference to Adaptive Phased Management:

... I think it was very well-written and well-articulated, especially the introduction of “Adaptive Phased Management.” It gives you a clear insight as to what we are going to be talking about.

That some Panelists, at least in Scarborough, recognized and employed the concept of APM is a new finding. In previous Phases, APM has been difficult to explain. Another Panelist confirmed that there was some broader recognition of the APM principles with their comments:

The whole APM makes more sense in the context of this.

In Scarborough, at least one Panelist attempted to determine if the NWMO would need a second repository site sooner than expected:

Do they have any idea of a timeline for when they will choose a site? If we choose a site, and then in 60 years we’re at the same place again. We’re falling back from countries that we’ve seen. We’re doing a lot of research but something needs to start.

While this Panelist’s comments could be interpreted as impatience, it was not uncommon in Phase Four for Panelists to ask if a second site would be needed as soon as the first was filled.

Later on, the Discussion Leader asked Scarborough Panelists what would be needed to convince them that a site selection process was fair. One Panelist suggested that the NWMO was on the right track already:

Most of the stuff that we’ve talked about already ... an agreement with the people that are living there, instead of [a repository] being imposed.

The Panelist continued their comments by explaining that the reaction in the community in question was ultimately the best judge of acceptability. As it gets passed along, they said, support will become evident:

There’d have to be some sort of a town meeting or a community meeting. There’s always somebody that’s going to attend and pass it on to their neighbours. That’s how you tell if it’s acceptable to a community.

A key theme arising from discussion of the second backgrounder and the framework of principles for Scarborough Panelists was that of accountability. As this Panelist noted,

accountability is needed whether the process occurs at arms-length from government or not:

I think we need to have government involved... because if it looks too much like a private sector thing, people will worry about accountability. You could have a joint task force. You don't want the upper echelon of government involved... but you have to have a check and balance in it.

When the third question was raised, Scarborough Panelists engaged in a thorough discussion using the example of the Mirabel airport in Montreal. Many considered that to be a case study for how siting should not occur. This Panelist recalled the Mirabel case and explained the conundrum for host communities:

The thing is that the community even going back then was not too much in favour. It was sort of pushed on them. If a community says they want to be a host, and it's an acceptable host, we're talking about reality being 60-70 years down the road. Will that host community still have the same feelings?

When the Discussion Leader pressed the Panelist for more thoughts about why Mirabel was a good or bad model, that Panelist continued:

There was a willingness in one sector of society to do something there. The government. But the people never had any interest there. There was no public support at all.

Instead of focusing on failed case studies, this Panelist offered some perspective on inclusivity and the need to attain real, broad-based support from a community. They made special reference to the traditionally disenfranchised:

I think they need to ask a lot of people in a community and not just narrow it down, especially if it's going to be a long-term decision. I've noticed that community decisions have not necessarily meant the community making the decision but just the people who think of themselves as the leaders of the community. Not leaving out the marginalized... people who might not stand out as people able to make a decision. If waste is going to come from all different ways, it has to include a lot of people.

Scarborough Panelists had a robust discussion over the role of government and elected officials. In addition, they were able to offer the NWMO a great deal historical advice based on their learning from large-scale projects 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:

Discussion Leader:

Let's just have a quick discussion to start. Since we were last together, has anyone read anything in the news?

S-14A:

I mentioned to some of my friends that I participate in these Citizens Panels, then a few weeks later they mentioned that they heard about the NWMO in the news and wanted to talk.

Discussion Leader:

That's a good reminder for us that this is a transparent process and we expect you to talk about it.

S-2A:

As a matter of fact, today it came up because there was some stuff in the news about Ontario building more reactors. So now you're going to have to go back to stage one because you'll have so much more waste to handle from these facilities.

S-8A:

I talked about it. Someone said something incorrect about nuclear waste, so I corrected them.

S-9A:

Nobody I've spoken to knew about this...there's a huge educational void in all our lives.

Discussion Leader:

Tonight we're going to talk a little bit about the process through which the organization will select a site. What the NWMO would like some help with tonight is making sure that the process is fair, ethical, and effective. They told us some things about that site. One is that above all it must be safe

and secure. The second thing is that it must go somewhere in which the hosts involved are informed and willing. And we should first look in a province that has benefited from nuclear. This summer people will be preparing a process for choosing this site. We're going to try to give them some advice on that.

Discussion Leader:

The objective of the NWMO is to find a site that is safe and secure in a location that is informed and willing. Do the objectives, principles, requirements that are discussed in this document provide a good foundation? A sound one? Are they off on the wrong track?

S-4A:

I think it's very up to date. They have taken each point into consideration. I think whatever I read, and we have been here 3-4 sessions before, it's very good.

S-3A:

When this process is taking place, and they're moving this [used nuclear fuel] all over the place, do they have any plan for any unforeseen disaster? Do they have a plan in place? Anything could happen when they are transporting this. I didn't see anything about that.

Discussion Leader:

What are you imagining?

S-3A:

How would it affect the people in terms of health and exposure?

Discussion Leader:

Knowing the organization, do you think they have a plan?

S-3A:

I think they would have something in place, but I didn't see anything pinpointing that.

S-11A:

It's the order. The important ones should go first. The safety section should be before 'willing community' and I'm not sure 'community well-being' should be farther down the list. It's the order.

S-14A:

I agree. On the first page, I think it was very well-written and well-articulated, especially the introduction of 'Adaptive Phased Management'. It

gives you a clear insight as to what we are going to be talking about.

S-6A: The whole APM makes more sense in this context.

Discussion Leader: How much is because they've made more sense, and how much is because you're better at it now?

S-6A: The fact that I recognize what we're talking about helps. But it makes sense as it is now as well.

S-14A: I want to say that their writing has improved.

S-2A: Looking at this, I have no major objections. It reads nicely, but there is no major detail. Pick one thing here, let's say security. Nobody's going to disagree with that sentence. But by what mechanism? By what means? You can't disagree with this! These objectives, for the most part, are reasonable. I really think that it's in the detail. It's not something standing out that's missing.

S-9A: On the first page, it doesn't mention Saskatchewan there. Also, listing the mode of transportation – train, trucks – it might give people of a sense of security in how it's being transported.

Discussion Leader: Is that something they don't know until they've picked the site?

S-9A: That's true that it is coming from places like Pickering. So it'd have to come through a city.

S-8A: Whenever they refer to the deep geological repository, I'm baffled that there's never an idea of the size of it. Will there need to be a second? I'm sure they have some idea of the scale. Something like the hockey rink analogy? Also, they have a lot of points in the objectives that stress "environmental integrity, safety, economic, etc." I'm a bit confused because we've all been told that a shovel doesn't hit the ground for 60 years. If you run a greater risk of having it in the more populous areas that have the power [plants], then you run the risk of destroying Canada's economic infrastructure. There is a need to have more power.

So if it's a case of economic need, maybe it's a case of a more remote location.

Discussion Leader:

How would you know that when they choose a site, that that decision was the result of a process that was fair and scientifically sound?

S-13A:

While they can't give you a timeframe, the places that they started looking at may have changed into other things. Do they have any idea of a timeline for when they will choose a site? What if we choose a site and then in 60 years we're at the same place again? We're falling back from the countries that we've seen. We're doing a lot of research but something needs to start.

Discussion Leader:

They're trying to design the process. That's why we're here.

S-1A:

I think the most important task of all the ones that are outlined here is discerning which areas of the four different provinces would be most well-suited for the repository, taking into considering environmental and geological criteria. After they have a shortlist of all these different places, then they go back to the people of all the places that could host these and get their feedback. You can't really go out and ask people first if they would be willing because they may say 'sure, build it in my backyard', but then it won't be suitable, geologically speaking.

Discussion Leader:

A large number of places would qualify. Any idea how the organization could to narrow those down?

S-1A:

A lot would have to do with how accessible they are to transportation corridors, and weather. They've already identified these places, so obviously they're not in earthquake-prone zones. They have to make a list, go through them, and eliminate the ones least likely to be acceptable.

S-15A:

We need to be thinking proactively for the future. They say 2 kilometres by 3 kilometres. If we need to expand it to 10 x 5, can we do that? Let's be proactive so we have space to grow.

S-8A: Yeah, if you decide you need to expand it, it might be easier to knock the walls down.

S-1A: Can we handle this stuff when it's down there? Unless they find something else to do with this...

S-8A: The shelf life is something like over 3000 years underground.

Discussion Leader: At this point it has to be stored indefinitely. While people can imagine that the rate of scientific discovery is such that we might have something to do with it, we can't see it now. The advice the experts give us today is that it will have to be stored indefinitely.

S-2A: One of the things that should be in there is education. This third paragraph on the first page is not necessarily one that most people in Pickering would be aware of, where it talks about [reactor] communities and hosting. I would venture that people like ourselves who have had the advantage of learning about this facility. When a reactor goes down, for whatever reason, it's a little blip in the news. People just gloss over it... The thing that you said about communications is extremely important. The majority of people don't have clue.

Discussion Leader: What would the NWMO have to do to convince you that the process was fair?

S-12A: Most of the stuff that we've talked about already, such as there was an agreement with the people that are living there, instead of it being imposed.

Discussion Leader: How would you know that you had that agreement?

S-12A: There would have to be some sort of a town meeting or a community meeting. There's always somebody that's going to attend and pass it on to their neighbours. That's how you tell if it's acceptable to a community.

S-11A: Were they able to contact the other countries who have already done it?

Discussion Leader: Is that something you think would be useful?

S-11A: Yes, even more than asking us. It'd be better to consult the other countries that have done this process. Look at their paperwork and how they did it from scratch. And then ask how could this apply to Canadian culture, or if something needs to change or be added, but using this as a base.

S-1A: You're looking at four provinces who now house nuclear waste. People in Canada know this process is starting. Put the cards on the table for everyone who is interested. The four provinces that are now using nuclear power and have nuclear waste must be involved. This is a wakeup call. The people at this meeting are privileged to know a lot of this information that we didn't know before. You need to bring it to people in those four provinces. Without that, you're not going to find a host.

Discussion Leader: Finding the willing host is one task, but the other is choosing amongst those communities. There will need to be a process to choose. Do you think they've got it right?

S-17A: It's very good, very positive. But they don't talk much about the risks. At some point you have to be honest about those, also. What are the potential harms or risks? I'm not sure how forthcoming it appears they are at this point on any risks that could happen.

S-15A: I was thinking more of a two-tiered approach. Once we are sure the risks are at a minimum we might want to focus less on the risk and more on the economic benefits of the site to the community. We may be able to eliminate that process if we have the best geologists say it's the best site, the risks are minimal.

S-8A: The one thing I noticed that wasn't in here was what we talked about last time, the case in Sweden when two sites volunteered for it. Hearing that one volunteered for it was, 'OK, they just meet the minimum', but two volunteered for it. Instead of the NWMO outlining all the economic benefits, which can seem like they might be telling you what you want to hear, if you hear from those

communities about why they both wanted it, that would be something beneficial.

S-9A: Part of what they're doing this summer, is that what they're doing to inform the communities? How are they finding a willing host if nobody knows what they're doing?

Discussion Leader: Well that's part of it too. Our technical representative told us last time that there are lots of places this could go. Now the organization has to figure out how to choose. Have they got the balance right?

S-1A: If that's the case, then I think the citizens of Canada need a heads up. I think the NWMO should make a documentary, maybe one hour that would run on CBC in prime time. It could be about what they're trying to do and how it would benefit Canadians.

Discussion Leader: You could find lots and lots of places. The recommendation that the government made is to have one site. The concern, of course, is that the process isn't a good one, and people won't have confidence in the choice.

S-1A: I think it should be in the least-habited place they can find, because the more people you have around, the more chance you have people getting together and saying "not in my backyard".

Discussion Leader: Some people tell me that. The other thing people say is that they worry about transportation. Every kilometre is a kilometre of risk for travel.

S-1A: But we have miles and miles of wilderness that train tracks go through in Northern Ontario.

S-8A: I think people are really afraid of it getting on highways. In New Brunswick, for instance, I'm not sure how much land space there is, and it doesn't make sense shipping it from one end of the country to the other.

S-1A: I can't see it going on the highways.

- S-11A: I agree it has to be somewhere that is the least habited. And if people want to move down there to work in the area, they can. I wouldn't be so concerned about the transportation because we have lots of things that need to be transported even on the highways here. I think the train is a good idea.
- S-2A: The Government of Canada owns a lot of land. A lot of it is uninhabited and a lot of it would qualify for the geology needed. There wouldn't be a need for as consultative process if there is nobody living in that area. I imagine there will be a whole industry built up around this, but it will be by choice that people are moving there.
- S-6A: There's no requirement that says it has to be near a community of people. I think the key should be to look at places with no population at all, and then develop an industry there.
- S-11A: But you still have to ask. There still has to be a citizen panel for that province.
- S-2A: How wide does the circle go? If the site is here, how far out do you go consulting?
- Discussion Leader:** If the organization was to design a process that accommodates all these ideas, what would it look like? How would you know that it took into consideration the kinds of things mentioned here?
- S-3A: They should list all the objectives here, the 100 things they have to think about. Then start an elimination process. Go down the list and see which works. I'm sure that would come down to, say, 20 spots, and then decide on a radius of 100 kilometres and talk to people there.
- Discussion Leader:** Any sense on what this would look like?
- S-6A: There has to be formal process.
- S-9A: Would they print an annual report or a semi-annual report and list all the things that have been done, and need to be done?

S-2A: From the beginning we've talked about transparency in all of this. But how do you get it so people can see it and realize the transparency? That's a prime objective. It's alright for people to say they're transparent, but if nobody sees it...

S-15A: It will come down to media. That's what society perceives as transparent. Have it televised. You could record it; you could do it once a year. Give it a lot of coverage and make sure people know when it's on.

Discussion Leader: Before we get on to how to communicate, what advice am I going to give to the people who have to design the process?

S-13A: Keep politics out of it. It has to be separate from the ministry, from the government. That's what gives people a lot of mistrust. Continue as a body of your own. People will find that more trustworthy than the government.

S-6A: I'm thinking of a fair process like in court. Have it as a public process.

S-15A: I think we need to have government involved because, if it looks too much like a private sector thing, people will worry about accountability. You could have a joint task force. You don't want the upper echelon of government involved, but you have to have a check and balance in it. If there's profit, there are usually shortcuts, so you need to keep some checks and balances.

S-3A: We can't keep the politics out.

Discussion Leader: One of the ways we can look at new situations is to think of experiences we've had before and learn from them. As you look at this, think about experiences that could be helpful to the NWMO as it designs a process. Are there any other models or experiences that you can think of specifically?

S-1A: I think they need to come up with a catchy slogan.

S-15A: They get it on soccer jerseys

Discussion Leader: Let's put the communications ideas aside for a second. I'm interested before we get there if there are other examples, other experiences that NWMO can draw on ...

S-1A: Penitentiaries, halfway houses...

S-2A: If a community says they want to be a host, and it's an acceptable host, we're talking about reality being 60-70 years down the road. Will that host community still have the same feelings? There was that situation in Mirabel...

Discussion Leader: What did we learn about Mirabel that was good or bad?

S-2A: There was a willingness in one sector of society to do something there. The government. But the people never had any interest there. There was no public support at all.

S-1A: People were expropriated from their farms.

S-15A: Another one was the Ajax downs, which is a casino. There was a lot of opposition to it and a lot of people were against it. They built up their case for it. What they did was that they made it palatable to everyone because it's directly not on anyone's doorstep. There's a large area around it. Again, they made it look nice. It doesn't stand out. Design, approach, and economics all comes in.

S-9A: Would you allow the community to hold a vote?

S-11A: There could be a higher percentage of yes in one community over another

Discussion Leader: But would that help choose which one?

S-11A: Well if one is 90% and one is 60%...

S-8A: But then we get into 60 years past, does that still keep the same favour?

Discussion Leader: OK, we've discussed that quite a bit. Does anyone any other times they've seen decisions made like this?

S-3A: What about the cost? Is the cost a factor in this? What if one community is 90% in favour, and other is 60%, but the first one is not as cost effective?

Discussion Leader: What about anything that you've seen when a decision to relocate something has taken place?

S-12A: In a community not far from here, the police set up CCTV in the area. People were upset. There was some crime in the community, but there were people against it.

S-2A: Sometimes there's short-term gain and long-term pain. The Olympics in Montreal were wondrous, but my brother who lives in Montreal is still paying for it. I think the decision has to be made based on involving the least amount of people. Because then it stands that you're affecting the least amount of people. Wherever the site is, it has to be extremely remote so the people that want to be in that area will go there by choice.

Discussion Leader: What about the people on the way, in the transportation corridor?

S-14A: It doesn't have to go near people now.

Discussion Leader: Well, it has to come from where it is now. What about those places? It has to go through populated areas.

S-2A: We have assurances that the containers the waste is stored in will be extremely secure. So if there is a derailment, it's a matter of putting it back on the tracks. Hopefully that is the fact.

S-13A: If you trust that.

S-14A: They've been doing it for 20 some odd years in Europe without a catastrophe.

S-11A: I think they need to ask a lot of people in a community, especially if it's going to be a long-term decision. I've noticed that community decisions have not necessarily meant the community making the decision, but rather the

people who think of themselves as the leaders of the community. Not leaving out the marginalized is important. People who might not stand out as people able to make a decision.

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 BACKGROUNDEERS 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™

