

NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase III: Panel Five

NWMO SR-2008-15

July 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, ONTARIO CITIZEN PANEL REPORT
JULY 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 Three of the Citizen Panel project occurred in Sault Ste Marie, Ontario on April 24, 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. Dialogue: Draft Implementation Plan

- a. Overview
- b. Strategic Objectives
 - i. Building Relationships
 - ii. Building Knowledge – Technical and Social Research
 - iii. Review, Adjust and Validate Plans
 - iv. Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process
 - v. Others as available
 - I. Financial Surety
 - II. Governance Structure
 - III. Becoming an Implementing Organization
- c. Panel Notes
 - i. Disclaimer

3. Questions & Discussion, Technical Representative

- a. Explanation
- b. Questions & Discussion

Appendices

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Excerpts from Draft Implementation Plan

1. NWMO CITIZEN PANEL BACKGROUND

a. Citizen Panel

The Sault Ste Marie, Ontario Phase Three Citizen Panel was held on April 24, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Sault Ste Marie.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 16 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 document 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-6A	City: Sault Ste Marie Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, call center	 Panelist: SSM-5A	City: Sault Ste Marie Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, pharmacy technician
 Panelist: SSM-8A	City: Sault Ste Marie Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Self-employed	 Panelist: SSM-9A	City: Sault Ste Marie Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed full- time at machine shop
 Panelist: SSM-11A	City: Sault Ste Marie Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, finance manager	 Panelist: SSM-10A	City: Sault Ste Marie Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Unemployed
 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	 Panelist: SSM-12A	City: Sault Ste Marie Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Construction

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 discussion 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 that individuals 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. Panel discussions began with an in-depth review of the NWMO's *Moving Forward Together* brochure. Individually, Panelists were asked to mark the document with red and green pens, green indicating they felt positively about a certain point and red indicating that they felt negatively. Furthermore, Panelists were asked to circle the items they felt the most strongly about, both positively and negatively, with the "Sharpie" marker. Panelists were then asked to write down what they thought about the brochure, what they would say about the brochure and how the brochure made them feel. This metaphorical or projective exercise was an attempt to get a more nuanced view of the brochure and to have Panelists share some of their internal reservations they may have been holding back from the Panel. Following the "Think, feel, say" exercise, Panelists reviewed the NWMO's strategic objectives and were asked to rate how important each strategic objective was to them, as well as how appropriate the particular objective was to them. Lastly, Panelists were provided with an excerpt of the draft NWMO's draft approach to transparency. The exercise was introduced with a reminder to Panelists about the frequency with which they raised the issue of transparency as an important pursuit and focus for the NWMO in the previous research phase of the study. Panelists were asked to discuss whether or not the NWMO's proposed approach to transparency met with their general expectations. At the conclusion of the Panels, Panelists were provided with post-session work (homework) to complete following the Citizen Panel. The work consisted of a simple seven question survey to be completed after a brief review of the NWMO website. Those without any access or ability to use the internet were exempted from the exercise.

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.

Due to a timing issue in Montreal, Montreal Panelists were only able to concentrate on three of the seven strategic objectives during the Panel discussion: Building Relationships; Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research; and Review, Adjust and Validate Plans. As a result, all Montreal Panelists present for the Phase Three Panel discussion were contacted by the Francophone Panel Manager to schedule an in depth interview to discuss the remaining objectives not covered in the Panel: Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process; as well as Financial Surety, Governance Structure and Building an Implementing Organization. Panelists scheduled for the individual in-depth interviews were provided with a copy of the Implementation Plan in advance of the discussion and, as was the case in the Panel discussion, were given a chance to provide their feedback on the objectives outlined above.

Once the discussion on the Draft Implementation Plan was complete, in seven of the eight Panel discussions, a technical representative from the NWMO was invited into the Panel discussion for a question and answer session. This was not the case in Saint John, New Brunswick, where the technical representative from the NWMO was brought into the Panel prior to the discussion of the Draft Implementation Plan. All eight Panel discussions concluded with a wrap-up discussion, including feedback on the question and answer portion of the discussion.

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 April 24, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this wave of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Toronto, Montreal, Scarborough, Saint John, Saskatoon, and Regina has also been submitted to the NWMO.

2. DIALOGUE: DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

a. Overview

During this Phase of Citizen Panels, the NWMO's Draft Implementation Plan was reviewed by Sault Ste. Marie Panelists in advance of a general discussion beginning. While a significant amount of Panel discussion was directly related to the four strategic objectives identified by Panelists in Phase One Panels as most important and appropriate for the NWMO, there was time dedicated for a more general discussion among Panelists.

The Draft Implementation Plan was well-received by Sault Ste. Marie Panelists, most of whom felt that the Plan and, by extension, the NWMO was headed in the right direction. As was the case in most Panel discussions, certain technical terms raised numerous questions. A number of Sault Ste. Marie Panelists felt that the language was fairly technical and scientific and, as a result, hard to understand at times. In the words of one Panelist,

We're not geologists, we're not scientists. Give us the straight stuff.

One Sault Ste. Marie Panelist felt that, in order to build relationships with Canadians, the NWMO needed to be sure that the language used in materials, such as the Draft Implementation Plan, was simple and accessible to the average Canadian.

That's part of building relationships. To send out something more technical, there almost needs to be a more simple approach. Dissolution rates, what the heck is this talking about?

Another Panelist echoed this sentiment,

I think it sounds reasonable, but I just hope they'll use layman's terms with the general public.

An interesting evolution in Panelist thought was evident in the Sault Ste. Marie Panel discussion. Previously, a number of Sault Ste. Marie Panelists had viewed NWMO documents shared with them with some scepticism, voicing a concern that the documents were, or could be perceived to be, primarily "sell" documents, rather than factual ones. However, it was clear that opinion has changed as many of the Sault Ste. Marie Panelists appeared to view NWMO documentation as rooted in fact rather than advertising and appreciated the blunt, straightforwardness of the writing. In the words of one Panelist,

I like how it's written. They're telling us exactly what they're going to do, explains it to a T. I like the part about them publishing on an annual basis.

Engagement and education were prominent themes in the Sault Ste. Marie Panel discussion. Many Sault Ste. Marie Panelists were pleased to see the NWMO's plan to

engage and educate Canadians and Aboriginal people. A number of Sault Ste. Marie Panelists felt that it was the responsibility of the NWMO to educate and inform the public, rather than have the public seek out information and educate themselves. However, in order to effectively engage and, in turn, educate, some Panelists felt that it was necessary for the NWMO to increase its profile and public presence as, currently, there is very little, if any, public awareness of the organization and what it does. Some Panelists felt that this could best be achieved through an increased presence in the media. In the words of one Panelist,

I think something on TV saying this is what we're looking at in the future and let people have input and start making people aware that this is something of the future. Slowly you have to start exposing this to people.

There was a greater understanding among some Sault Ste. Marie Panelists of the need to differentiate between Canadians and Aboriginal Peoples. According to one Sault Ste. Marie Panelist, their increased understanding came from reading the NWMO Annual Report, which was sent to all Panelists in advance of Phase Three Panel discussions. Once this Panelist was informed, they had a greater understanding as to why the NWMO differentiated between Canadians and Aboriginal Peoples,

I found the big book I got in the mail, it explained all of this. For instance, the separation of Canadians and aboriginals is because aboriginals are far more aware of their relationship with the earth and some do not want to be considered Canadian. It's a good thing to bring in this stuff.

Another popular idea with some Sault Ste. Marie Panelists was that of the inherent flexibility offered by Adaptive Phased Management. These Panelists appeared to appreciate a large organization speaking about being adaptive – just as they might see themselves acting in their daily lives when the unexpected happens. One Sault Ste. Marie Panelist, however, expressed some scepticism as to whether it would be possible for the organization to remain fully adaptive well into the future,

One thing I see in this is a focus on flexibility, but what about commitment. Does this also mean that if the government legislates that it is going to put money into this, ten years from now a new government could say that they are going to cut the program back?

b. Strategic Objectives

In the Phase One Citizen Panels, seven strategic objectives were shared with Panelists. Panelists were asked to examine each objective and then give an indication of their relative importance and appropriateness. Although all strategic objectives seemed largely in line with the majority of Panelists' expectations, there were consistently stronger views on four of the seven strategic objectives: Building Relationships; Building Knowledge – Technical and Social Research; Review, Adjust and Validate Plans; and Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process. As such, these four objectives were selected as the primary objects of discussion in Phase Three for reasons of time availability.

For each strategic objective, Panelists were given a colour-coded worksheet outlining items the NWMO plans to implement over the next five years (2008-2012). A more comprehensive overview of each objective in the Draft Implementation Plan document was flagged with the same colour of the worksheet for quick reference should Panelists have wanted or required more information. After reviewing each of the four objectives, Panelists were 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.

After reviewing and discussing the four objectives mentioned above, Panelists were provided with an opportunity to provide feedback on the remaining three objectives: Financial Surety, Governance Structure and Building an Implementing Organization. Panelists were asked by the Discussion Leader if any of the remaining objectives now struck them as more important, given the increase in their knowledge on the subject matter since Phase One.

Below, please find contemporaneous notes of the Panel discussion on the strategic objectives.

c. Panel Notes

i. Disclaimer

The attached are contemporaneous notes of the Panel discussion on the Draft Implementation Plan and strategic objectives. 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 Courtney Glen, a Navigator research professional.

Draft Implementation Plan Discussion

Discussion Leader: When you got here today, we passed out a Draft Implementation Plan. Another name for this would be a business plan, work plan, activity plan. What it lays out is the NWMO's thinking about how it can move ahead with its work. The NWMO is transforming itself from being a study organization to an implementing organization. To plan their work over the next couple of years, they put together this plan. In it, they have 7 strategic objectives. Tonight I'd like to focus on 4 of those 7. We're going to look at them one at a time.

Building Relationships

Discussion Leader: Does this make sense? Are they going in the right direction? Doing what you would expect them to do?

SSM-8A: Canadians are Canadians.

SSM-16A: I agree it's the way to go but so far not much has been said. I haven't seen anything on TV, there's been nothing in the newspaper. I don't know when they plan on starting this...it says 2008.

SSM-10A: Even a documentary on it or something. I like the part about establishing a Corporate Citizen Program.

SSM-16A: It says 4 nuclear provinces. What are they?

SSM-3A: It's the first I've heard about doing.

SSM-15A: It's fine to say they are going to engage but where are they going to get their information from. Is it going to be part of

the curriculum in school, such as science projects? Will David Suzuki be involved? It's fine to say they are going to do all this stuff, but is the curriculum going to change all of a sudden to include this in core study? It's kind of a cheap shot to say you are going to involve certain parties without saying why.

Discussion Leader:

We have to take on faith that they will do it. We don't have the tools to evaluate. Right now we're trying to understand at a high level. If you had in your mind that this is something worth doing, do these kinds of things seem like the way to get there?

SSM-17A:

What do they mean when they say establish a corporate citizenship program?

SSM-3A:

Isn't this just saying what they are hoping to provide to see if it covers what people are interested in? If you want more information you can go from there. This isn't giving us the breakdowns, just telling us what they intend to cover.

SSM-8A:

The objectives have to be there but there is a verbiage that needs to be there. I think they want more money.

SSM-10A:

I think what matters is if they will actually do it.

SSM-16A:

I think something on TV saying this is what we're looking at in the future and let people have input and start making people aware that this is something of the future. Slowly you have to start exposing this to people.

SSM-10A:

Even putting something on Facebook. If you get that out and send one invitation, more people will get involved and know about it.

SSM-13A:

I have a problem about where we're going with this. I don't know if it's just me, we all recognize that this is a problem that must be dealt with but no one has determined what could happen if this isn't done. I'd like to know just what the problem is, what can happen, what's the worst case scenario?

Discussion Leader:

We've talked about how we want to see the organization move forward and you've told me a number of things the NWMO could/should do. One of them was to build relationships with Canadians so we could be involved in the future. The organization said they hear what you're

saying and here on the sheet are some of the things they will do to move forward on their promise to build relationships.

- SSM-14A: I think there are a lot of unanswered questions, everyone is running with their tail between their legs.
- SSM-1A: I find it's still a lot of lawyer talk. They're still beating around the bush. If I were to give this to my kid, he wouldn't understand any of this.
- SSM-15A: That's why we have to work it into the curriculum.
- SSM-17A: Am I right in understanding that communications will be in both directions?
- SSM-5A: Are they just going to tell us all the good things?
- Discussion Leader:** What would make you think that in here?
- SSM-1A: Say they build one facility, does anyone think about what the problems will be? It seems the plan is established. I would like to know what the actual plan is. Will that ground ever be usable again? Will everything be in the ground? That's the kind of stuff I'd like to get out in the end.
- Discussion Leader:** What we said was our job now was not to decide whether APM is a good plan or a bad plan because the government has already decided that's how we're going forward. It's our job to help the NWMO understand how to move forward in a way that gives Canadians the most confidence.
- SSM-8A: I don't think anyone is saying that these particular things aren't good. I almost think they are apologizing. They think they need to improve the website. They probably don't have a website. I tried to get into it and couldn't.
- SSM-3A: I found the survey when you went there took you strictly to the survey. I googled it last week and got tons of ways to get into it and then went to the website and everything was there.
- SSM-16A: Just educating people in small steps as to what is going to happen, what to expect, that is the most important now.
- SSM-17A: I want to know what a corporate citizen program is.

SSM-1A: I didn't see one thing on accountability in here. Where's the accountability?

Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research

Discussion Leader: Does this sound like a good research plan?

SSM-17A: My first thought is that they should write everything in the opposite way that they've written here. The language is too much.

SSM-5A: Convene workshops on Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge. What does that mean?

SSM-3A: I found the big book I got in the mail, it explained all of this. For instance, the separation of Canadians and Aboriginal Peoples is because aboriginals are far more aware of their relationship with the earth and some do not want to be considered Canadian. It's a good thing to bring in this stuff.

Discussion Leader: I understand from some of your feedback that there are some issues with the way some of these items have been written.

SSM-8A: They don't give us straight answers

SSM-1A: Complete telephone surveys for input – what do they actually mean?

Discussion Leader: Beyond the word challenges, on a substantive basis, the kinds of things they're looking at doing, does it seem reasonable?

SSM-14A: I see here sedimentary rock? We never discussed that.

SSM-15A: It's not just things we discussed, it's all the other groups too.

SSM-11A: I think it sounds reasonable, but I just hope they'll use layman's terms with the general public.

SSM-11A: That's part of building relationships. To send out something more technical, there almost needs to be a more simple approach. Dissolution rates, what the heck is this talking about?

SSM-1A: We're not geologists, we're not scientists, give us the straight stuff.

Discussion Leader: Is there anything in this Plan that you find useful? Do I have to throw the whole thing out?

SSM-12A: Isn't this basically what they're going to put in place for safeguards? The designs they have are concepts right now?

SSM-10A: From what I understand, they are going in the right direction.

SSM-17A: Near the bottom of the first page, why only the 4 nuclear provinces? Manitoba has great geological formations, if Manitoba is happy to take this, why not?

Discussion Leader: What they have said is that the approach they are taking is the polluter pays approach. The organization has therefore said they will look first at the 4 nuclear provinces because they produced it and scientists tell us there is a lot of suitable rock. The NWMO also said it would hear from other provinces beyond those 4 if they wanted to and they had a suitable location. As far as the work they are doing to move forward, they are basing it on that system of polluter pays.

SSM-17A: If using that principle, logically it should not apply to northern Ontario but southern Ontario. If they're willing to extend it to the whole province of Ontario, why not all of Canada?

SSM-13A: What do crystalline and sedimentary mean? Because I'm thinking in Saskatchewan used to be sandy. Northern Ontario is solid rock.

Discussion Leader: Any comments specifically on the research plan?

SSM-6A: Who is this intended for? Can anyone get this on the street? Because the terminology is bad.

Review, Adjust and Validate Plans

Discussion Leader: You said it was important that the organization continue to review, adjust and validate its plans. While people were supportive of the organization moving forward, they wanted to make sure it didn't move forward on one path

but would review its plan. In order to make sure the organization was open, these are some of the things that the organization is proposing to do in order to give you confidence that they're not just locked into one way moving forward. Do these kinds of things make sense to you?

SSM-10A: I like how it's written; they're telling us exactly what they're going to do, explains it to a T. I like the part about them publishing on an annual basis.

SSM-2A: I can't say that I disagree with anything. I'm still in the process of still taking this all in. I know the nuclear waste is there because my ex-husband is going through nuclear procedures.

SSM-6A: Why triennial and annual?

SSM-4A: This is much easier to understand.

SSM-3A: Posting research papers is good.

SSM-17A: One thing I see in this is a focus on flexibility, but what about commitment. Does this also mean that if the government legislates that it is going to put money into this, ten years from now a new government could say that they are going to cut the program back? We don't have the right to decide for the next 10000 years what future generations are going to have to look after. I think the organization intends to telegraph that this is what we intend to do. We are now saying that this is the future and we undertake that any new development will be part of the plan or part of the budget.

Discussion Leader: Doesn't that seem to you or feel to you that that is what APM is about?

SSM-17A: My feeling about APM is that it's 2 major zones – we have to do something about it right now and we're going to be able to go into the next step which is a 10000 year solution after that.

SSM-16A: I think of all the information that we've received over the last year, I think the green sheet summarizes in an educational way what all of us need to understand.

SSM-12A: I agree.

Discussion Leader: One of the very important things we discussed when we met before was the idea of how do you actually get on with doing something without becoming so driven that you have blinders on and can't see what has changed around you. The organization is coming back and saying that it's heard what you've said. Beyond whether this is readable, are these the kinds of things that show that they'll keep that flexibility? Do these seem to be the right things to do?

SSM-16A: How do we know that they'll remain focused? This could all change.

Discussion Leader: We're going to assume, so we're keen to know if this is hitting the mark.

SSM-1A: I think it is hitting the mark but my concern is that we still get 40% of the power from the United States but we keep on footing the bill for this. That's what I'm concerned about, the way they word this. If we have such a problem that we have to deal with it, maybe we shouldn't be selling power to the United States.

SSM-10A: You were saying about the worry about them staying on one track, but on the yellow sheet it says that they're going to communicate internationally which will make the situation better for them, they'll communicate and collaborate.

SSM-13A: Is there any chance that in the future there will be a future use for this waste?

SSM-8A: I know this organization is in a formative stage. But if you look at what they do on administration and this type of thing and how much do they do on technical research. At some time they need to get something out of the money that they're spending.

SSM-17A: This does address flexibility really well. The reference in the last couple points about the idea of making the reports public. It invites confrontation which is really important.

Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

Discussion Leader: Any thoughts on these activities?

SSM-1A: I understood the sheet, for once.

Discussion Leader: Do these sound like the right activities to be doing?

SSM-1A: Yes, so far

SSM-8A: I like that they will involve all Canadians. It would just be nice if we could see the start of them doing this.

SSM-11A: It makes sense. How much emphasis are they actually going to put on the public opinion when it comes to siting? How many communities are actually going to be saying bring it on?

SSM-17A: This doesn't deal with how to select the site, it deals with how to select the way to deal with selecting a site.

SSM-3A: It says how they intend to go forward.

Remaining Objectives

Discussion Leader: The last thing to I want to cover are the last three strategic objectives. Did you have a chance to read them over? Do you have any thoughts?

No thoughts.

Discussion Leader: Any last thoughts or questions?

3. QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION, TECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE

a. Explanation

Technical representatives from the NWMO were present for a question and answer session at the request of the Panelists themselves. Panelists were twice given the option to have a technical representative present at the Panel discussion but preferred to wait until Phase Three as, until this point, felt that they still had more they needed to learn and discuss so that they were able to ask informed and insightful questions.

The technical representatives had approximately 90 minutes with the Panel to offer technical insight, institutional knowledge and a corporate perspective that, to date, only been present in written materials. Panelists were able to present their questions on a “first come first serve” basis with the Discussion Leader keeping a speaker’s list to ensure all were able to address the technical representative.

Technical representatives were not permitted to view the Panel before, nor after, the question and answer session. The Panel was informed of this so that they felt comfortable being frank before and after the appearance of the technical representative and did not feel required to censor themselves fearing observations.

As was the case in all Panel discussions with the NWMO technical representative, the majority of questions posted by Sault Ste. Marie Panelists fit clearly into five themes: safety, site selection, timeline, international comparison and transportation. For a full analysis of each theme, please refer to the Aggregate Report.

Below, please find questions posed by Sault Ste. Marie Panelists to the technical representative from the NWMO.

b. Questions & Discussions

- SSM-15A: We were asking about different type of rock a little while ago – sedimentary and crystalline rock?
- SSM-14A: Is one more porous than the other?
- SSM-10A: What is transmutation?
- SSM-10A: Is it like when you take steam and turn it into water?
- SSM-1A: What is your idea for safety in containment?
- SSM-13A: What are the real things that we have to fear with regard to nuclear waste? What can really happen to us or the area or the world? Has this stuff caused a problem at some point in some place? What are we fearing?
- SSM-13A: How does radiation affect a person? Is it a matter of energy that does something to somebody? If that's the case, it's obviously measurable. Is there any possibility that this nuclear waste can in the future be put to some useful purpose or do we have to bury it so deep that this generation or the next 20 never see it?
- SSM-13A: Any other possible things that could develop?
- SSM-13A: It seems that the answer is to bury this stuff. How deep are we talking?
- SSM-13A: That's all?
- SSM-1A: The hockey rink scenario. Does that include the glass or just the boards?
- SSM-1A: How much space do you need?
- SSM-1A: How much time do you figure until we have that much again?
- SSM-1A: As a team, do you think this is the best possible scenario for us?
- SSM-5A: You work for the NWMO, the company came to you and said you should come to the Soo. Geographically within Ontario, where would you bury it?

- SSM-8A: I have a question about your interrelationship with nuclear power producers and political aspects.
- SSM-14A: Does anything scare you? Is there something that you feel will be better than the rest?
- SSM-6A: You were saying previously about potentially having copper containers. Would it be one large copper container or multiple smaller ones inside a larger one, in case one or two fail?
- SSM-6A: I understand the importance of giving worst case scenarios. In the hypothetical, if a community does not come forward willingly, are you going to come forward with scare tactics?
- SSM-6A: Why can't all countries that produce nuclear waste get together and make one standard?
- SSM-13A: When you mentioned the size SSM-1A was talking about, it doesn't have to be one big room, right? Have they ever considered, for safety sake, if they put them in a mining tunnel, they have had rails in them, back filled that with concrete, then you're pressure you would get from shifting would not be there. Could that not overcome the problem?
- SSM-13A: What about already established mines?
- SSM-17A: What are the actual health effects of radiation?

APPENDICES

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Excerpts from Draft Implementation Plan

I. 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.

COURTNEY GLEN, PROJECT MANAGER

Courtney Glen is a Consultant at Navigator assisting in public opinion research, strategic planning and public policy advice for government, corporate and not-for-profit clients.

Courtney most recently worked at the Fraser Institute as a junior policy analyst in health and pharmaceutical policy. In her time at the Institute, Courtney co-authored a major pharmaceutical policy paper and contributed to their monthly policy journal, *The Fraser Forum*.

Prior to that, Courtney worked as a researcher for the Scottish Labour Party in Edinburgh, Scotland, conducting an audit of the Parliament's Cross Party Group on International Development.

Courtney has a Masters in International and European Politics from the University of Edinburgh in Scotland and a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in Political Science from the University of Guelph.

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.

STEPHEN LEONARD, PANEL MANAGER (ANGLOPHONE)

Prior to joining Navigator, Stephen attended the University of Guelph where he graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in History. Throughout his undergraduate career, Stephen was an active member of the Canadian Forces Army Reserve in Toronto, which he left in June due to medical reasons as a Corporal.

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

II. DISCUSSION LEADERS GUIDE

PHASE THREE CITIZEN PANELS

DISCUSSION LEADER'S GUIDE

ADVANCE OF DISCUSSION

1. LOBBY EXERCISE

- **Review of Draft Implementation Plan**
 - Panelists are provided with the NWMO's Draft Implementation Plan to review in advance of the Panel discussion.
 - Panelists will be asked to “scan” or read the document quickly, indicating they are not expected to have digested it in detail for the discussion

PANEL DISCUSSION

1. OPENING OF PANEL SESSION (0:00 – 0:05)

- Welcome back
- Reminder: Confidentiality of session
- Explanation of NWMO disclosure of proceedings
- Re-introduction of Transcriber
- Re-introduction of Parking lot
- Re-introduction of Panel Managers

2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA FOR SESSION (0:05 – 0:10)

- Document Review
 - Tonight we will review the Draft Implementation Plan
- Representative from NWMO
 - Guidance for questions

- Speakers list, allowed a limited number of questions, time permitting.
- Briefing details
 - Has read your Parking Lot questions and a summary of your discussions to date
 - Has not viewed a complete session

3. RE-INTRODUCTIONS (0:10 – 0:15)

4. GENERAL DISCUSSION (0:15 – 0:20)

- I am wondering if you thought more about the NWMO after our last session
- Has anyone read, seen or heard anything about NWMO in the media since our last discussion?

5. DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (0:20 – 1:35)

- When you arrived, you were given a copy of the NWMO's Draft Implementation Plan to review.
- This Implementation Plan lays out NWMO's thinking about how it will move ahead with its work. In your opinion, overall, do you think NWMO is moving in the right direction?
- In the Draft Implementation Plan, the NWMO provides a detailed overview of all 7 of their strategic objectives. I would like to concentrate on 4 objectives that Panels have previously rated as important and appropriate for the NWMO:
 - Building Relationships
 - Building Knowledge
 - Review, Adjust and Validate Plans
 - Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

[For each of the above 4 Strategic Objectives]

[Give Panelists a few minutes to review each objective]

- Discuss the objective after review.
 - Do you think that plans are moving in the right direction?

- When you reviewed the Draft Implementation Plan earlier, you will have seen that there were 7 strategic objectives in total. I'd like you to refer to the remaining 3 objectives in the Draft Implementation Plan:
 - Financial Surety
 - Governance Structure
 - Building an Implementing Organization

[Give Panelists a few minutes to review the remaining 3 objectives in the Plan – all marked with same pink colour tags]

- Do any of the other strategic objectives now strike you as more important?
- Do you have any other comments about the Draft Implementation Plan?
- You are free to take the Draft Implementation Plan with you after this evening's session.

6. NWMO REPRESENTATIVE Q & A (1:35 – 2:50)

- We have a lot of work to do here this evening, and have allocated just over an hour for these questions. If we do not finish in that time we will defer to our parking lot or we will look at bringing the NWMO representative back either in person or by teleconference.

[SHORT BIO INTRODUCTION OF PERSONNEL]

- The individual will not be watching you before or after this session, and they will not see a tape.
- Do you have any questions?
- Guidelines for questions

7. WRAP-UP (2:55 – 3:00)

III. EXCERPTS FROM THE DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN USED AS INDIVIDUAL WORK SHEETS

BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS

The NWMO will continue to build long-term relationships with interested Canadians and Aboriginal people and involve them in setting future direction.

In 2008 we will:

- Undertake a communication audit to support the design of our communication strategy;
- Rebuild the NWMO web site to enhance accessibility;
- Develop and implement a strategy to more effectively engage youth in the implementation of APM;
- Work with national, provincial and regional Aboriginal organizations to establish protocols to support Aboriginal involvement in engagement; and
- Establish a corporate citizenship program.

In the period 2008-2012 we will:

- Continue to identify speaking engagements, community-based presentations and media opportunities to develop awareness about NWMO activities;
- Develop communications materials about NWMO, APM, the project and other issues as required;
- Use many tools, including multi-party dialogues, citizen panels, topical workshops and web-based surveys, to invite input from Canadians and Aboriginal people in regional and community-based associations, interest groups, researchers, industry, governments and the general public;
- Broaden NWMO's relationships in the four nuclear provinces to include municipal, regional and provincial associations; Seek advice on engagement of Aboriginal people from the Elders' Forum and Niigani, the working group established by the NWMO Elders' Forum;
- Seek meetings with editorial boards and other media;
- Continue to provide regular updates to provincial and federal government ministers, departments and agencies;
- Maintain protocols with interested organizations, including Aboriginal Peoples; and
- Develop strategies to address knowledge-building as the needs are identified.

Building Knowledge - Technical and Social Research

The NWMO will advance research to broaden its foundation of technical and social knowledge, bringing to bear the most advanced Canadian and international expertise to support implementation of Adaptive Phased Management.

Technical Research

During 2008-2012 we will:

- For the purpose of assessing potential candidate sites, develop the capability to conduct geoscientific aspects of site feasibility assessments, including sub-surface investigations and evaluations, in both crystalline and sedimentary settings;
- Maintain safety assessment system models and data suitable for supporting site feasibility studies;
- Continue to monitor developments in Canada and internationally related to regulatory aspects of used fuel management facilities;
- Prepare an annual report documenting alternative technologies for long-term management of used fuel including reprocessing, partitioning and transmutation; and
- Continue to participate in cooperation agreements with national radioactive waste management organizations around the world, specifically, SKB (Sweden), Posiva (Finland), Nagra (Switzerland) and ANDRA (France). These agreements provide the framework for sharing research information and participating in joint research and development programs in underground facilities such as the Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory in Sweden.

By the end of 2008 we will:

- In the area of geosciences, develop generic geo-scientific siting criteria; and
- In engineering, complete evaluation of container placement methods for the conceptual design of a deep geological repository in crystalline or sedimentary rock; and
- Appoint members to an Independent Technical Review Group and convene the inaugural meeting.
- By June 2009 we will develop the capability to review transportation options to a used fuel long-term management facility for various locations in the four nuclear provinces.

By the end of 2010 we will:

- Develop an improved model for uranium dioxide (UO₂) dissolution rates under deep geological repository conditions;
- Evaluate conceptual designs for optional centralized underground storage of used fuel; and

By 2011 we will support safety assessment and licensing, through completion of two illustrative safety cases, one for a deep geological repository in crystalline rock and one in sedimentary rock.

By December 2011 we will maintain a program to provide assurance of integrity of used fuel while in storage, including completing evaluation of delayed hydride cracking of used CANDU fuel bundles under dry storage conditions.

Social Research

In the period 2008-2012 we will:

- Commission background papers to support the collaborative design of the siting process, drawing on experiences in Canada and abroad;
- Convene capacity-building workshops on selected implementation issues;
- Convene Citizen Panels in each of the four nuclear provinces;
- Convene workshops on Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge;
- Complete telephone surveys for input on siting design and other implementation issues;
- Conduct deliberative surveys on the web site;
- Collaborate with interested academics in Canada and internationally to bring the best knowledge and practices of social and community-based process to NWMO's work; and
- Apply the ethical and social framework developed for the study phase to guide Implementation and report regularly on activities against this framework.

Review, Adjust and Validate Plans

The NWMO will continually review, adjust and validate plans against factors such as advances in technical learning, evolving societal expectations and values, and changes in energy and environmental policies.

In order to facilitate the process of dialogue and adaptation in response to the changes in projected fuel quantities and types, we will:

- Publish on an annual basis information on current and future potential inventories of used fuel volumes and types;
- Seek input from Canadians on how NWMO's plans should be amended to accommodate current and projected inventories; and
- Adapt and develop plans on how to go forward against the framework of the Strategic Objectives and with the guidance of our many advisors including ethicists. Specifically, we will consider the implications of used fuel from nuclear new build in our engagement program, in our technical and social research programs, in our financing formula, on the size and structure of the organization and governance, and on the design of a process for site selection.

We are committed to reporting on developments in technology, societal expectations and energy and environmental policy on an ongoing basis through many communication routes, including:

- Posting research papers and the results of engagement activities on the NWMO web site;
- NWMO Triennial Report to Minister of Natural Resources and public;
- NWMO Annual Report to Minister of Natural Resources and the public; and
- Annual update to the NWMO five-year implementation plan.

Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

The NWMO will proceed with the collaborative design of a siting process, supported by a public engagement program, and subsequent initiation of a siting process.

In 2008 we will:

- Prepare a discussion document to initiate and facilitate conversations with Canadians on the design of the process for selecting a site. The document will, among other things, present an initial framework of objectives and principles and key issues that people will likely wish to consider; and
- Prepare information materials, such as fact sheets, to support a public dialogue on the design of a process for site selection.

In 2008-2012, subject to confirmation of readiness to proceed with each step, we will:

- Engage interested individuals and organizations in a dialogue on the design of a process for selecting a site to invite diverse perspectives;
- Draft a siting process proposal, including preliminary criteria, based on input from the previous round of dialogue;
- Test and validate the draft siting process proposal using a public engagement process;
- Develop supporting information and an education and awareness program; and
- Initiate the process for selecting a site subject to validation of the siting process proposal and readiness of the supporting engagement and information program.

RESEARCH | STRATEGY | RESULTS™

