

Multi-party dialogues Fall 2008 – Saint John session report

NWMO SR-2008-35

January 2009

Stratos Inc.

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.

**NWMO-Stratos Multi-Party Dialogues
- Saint John, October 7, 2008 -**

Summary Report

Submitted to:

**Nuclear Waste Management Organization
22 St Clair Ave. E.
Toronto, Ont.
M4T 2S3**

January 21, 2009

Prepared by:



Stratos Inc.
1404-1 Nicholas Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
tel: 613 241 1001
fax: 613 241 4758
www.stratos-sts.com

1 Introduction

Purpose & Context

A series of dialogues on the design of the process to select a site for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel was held across the four nuclear fuel cycle provinces in September – October 2008.

The purpose of the dialogue sessions was to seek input, among a diverse cross-section of Canadians in each nuclear cycle province, on the critical elements of a fair, ethical, and effective siting process. The dialogue sessions are an important input, among several inputs, to the development of NWMO's draft proposal for the siting process, to be released in 2009.

The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) retained Stratos Inc. to design, organise, facilitate and report on these dialogues.

Individuals with a wide range of perspectives were invited, including those from Aboriginal organizations, business associations, municipal groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academia, nuclear industry, and professional associations. While many of the participants were affiliated with organizations, they were asked to participate as individuals. A total of 18 participants, as well as staff from NWMO and Stratos, attended the session held in Saint John, New Brunswick on October 7, 2008 (see Appendix A for a list of participants).

To facilitate conversations on the design of the process to select a site, NWMO has published a document entitled *Moving Forward Together: Designing the Process for Selecting a Site*. The document draws on the past study process in which many Canadians were involved, proposes objectives to guide the future work, and identifies a number of considerations, challenges and opportunities for discussion. The document also presents six discussion questions, which formed the basis for the agenda used in the dialogue session (see Appendix B).

Organized according to the agenda, this report provides a summary of perspectives and ideas expressed and exchanged during the dialogue. The dialogue session was not intended to reach consensus among participants, though the report notes areas of general agreement.

Dialogue Opening

Kathryn Shaver, Vice President, Corporate Affairs & Corporate Secretary of the NWMO, welcomed participants to the dialogue session and provided an overview of the history of the NWMO, its mandate, and the Adaptive Phased Management (APM) approach recommended by the NWMO and selected by the Government of Canada on June 14,

2007. She explained that the NWMO's next step is the development of a draft site selection process in 2009, and that ideas exchanged during the dialogue sessions will serve as input to this process. Finally, Ms. Shaver indicated that a report capturing the views heard in the dialogues would be shared with participants following the sessions.

2 What is Important in a Siting Process

To initiate the dialogue, all participants shared with the plenary group their thoughts on what is important in a siting process. Participants' perspectives ranged from technical through to social considerations, as well as general comments on the design of the process itself.

Technical Considerations

Participants agreed that the siting process must result in the selection of a site that will ensure the long-term integrity of the repository, as well as safety and security at all stages of the project. Specific threats to safety and security were identified including: earthquakes and other disasters, major accidents, acts of terrorism, and public access (security breaches).

Some participants stated that the siting process must recognize and communicate the risks of the current storage situation at reactor sites. Others emphasized the importance of recognizing the post-storage implications of becoming a host community including issues related to the potential long-term uses and impacts of the used fuel such as: residual energy in used fuel, retrievability, long-term toxicity, and requirements for proximity to an industrial base for reprocessing.

An important theme for several participants was transportation. A few participants emphasized that transportation risks should be minimized or avoided, and some suggested that NWMO should do this by reconsidering its proposal of storage at a single site.

Related to the theme of transportation, a few participants expressed views on siting in a remote vs. an urban setting. Some raised concerns about selecting a remote location and felt that safety should not be dependent on remoteness, and even expressed a preference for an urban site location that was not "out of sight out of mind". One participant suggested that existing 'brownfield' sites (abandoned, vacant, derelict, or underutilized commercial or industrial properties) should be considered for the project.

Some participants indicated that the siting process should be informed by the 'best science' from the beginning, but also that the limitations of science should be clearly communicated.

Social Considerations

Participants agreed that the siting process must achieve social acceptability through comprehensive public engagement and open and fair consultation. This type of engagement and consultation was further characterized as one that:

- involves the Aboriginal peoples of New Brunswick;

- is based on communication materials that are appropriate for an “average family” and that are not perceived as “PR” (public relations);
- requires more public education to ensure informed decision-making;
- excludes any implications that a community’s support is being bought off; and
- is transparent, based on established standards of transparency.

Economic viability and the equitable sharing of economic benefits were also identified as a key aspect of the siting process by several participants. Some participants presented this point in the context of economic disparities between different regions of New Brunswick in relation to certain large projects.

One participant viewed the issue of selecting a site in an urban vs. a remote location as a point of fairness issue based on the principle of locating the site close to those who benefit most from nuclear energy.

Participants stated that the siting process must work towards a waste management strategy that is sustainable over the long-term. A range of views related to this point were expressed, including the following:

- A sustainable waste management strategy can only be achieved through a phase-out of the production of used fuel and by moving to renewable energy. Some participants felt that the siting process must be tied to the social acceptability of the production of more used fuel in the future.
- Full consideration must be given to the amount of used fuel anticipated for storage. There was a perception among some participants that the scope of discussion has shifted since the study phase in terms of the quantity of bundles to be managed, and that communities will demand more certainty on this in the siting process. The prospect of more fuel bundles, from new nuclear power stations, including those in new ‘nuclear provinces’, could be viewed as a threat, but also as an economic opportunity for host communities. In response to this issue, some participants stated that the siting process must address the need for scalability and adaptability.
- The process must consider future generations; for example, by planning for seven generations, as is done in some Aboriginal cultures.

An important theme raised in this plenary session and throughout the dialogue was the adequacy of the regulatory system. Several participants expressed a lack of confidence in current regulatory processes, federal and provincial, based on their experiences in New Brunswick with certain projects. Some of this lack of confidence was related to the perceived deficiencies of the provincial EA process and the federal government’s unwillingness to use its full regulatory authority. It was suggested that NWMO study the applicable regulatory processes to determine if they are adequate for dealing with this project. It was noted that the NWMO’s own credibility depended in part on the credibility of the regulatory process, and that if the latter was weak it would undermine NWMO’s own efforts.

3 Testing the Set of Objectives, Ethical Principles and Characteristics

In plenary, participants reviewed the framework of objectives, ethical principles and characteristics presented in the NWMO document *Moving Forward Together: Designing the Process for Selecting a Site*. This framework was developed based what NWMO heard in conversations with Canadians during the study phase of its work.

Participants had few general comments on the overall framework, but did note that the challenge will be in applying the framework to the process so that the framework statements are more than just 'words on a page'. Several participants offered suggestions to add clarity and specificity to the framework statements.

Objectives

Individual participants offered the following observations and specific suggestions related to the statements on *Objectives*:

- The objectives statements need to be more explicit about social acceptability, the engagement of young and future generations, and emergency planning.
- The objective on community well-being is vague and needs to be strengthened with a definition of 'well-being'.

Characteristics

A few participants requested an elaboration of the statement "Respect all Aboriginal rights, treaties and land claims" by including references to the following:

- Both pre- and post-confederation rights, treaties, and land claims
- Consultation and accommodation, in accordance with recent Supreme Court of Canada decisions, of all Aboriginal peoples regardless of residence or status

One participant also indicated that this characteristic statement would be difficult to operationalize due to many unresolved issues related to the certain Aboriginal groups in New Brunswick, such as recognition of Passamaquoddy Nation.

Ethics

Participants had few comments regarding the statements on ethical principles. One participant asked what the basis was for the statements of ethics, given that there are different moral leaders and value systems in our society.

4 Major Activities in a Siting Process

Breakout groups discussed the major activities in a siting process. Overall, participants identified six categories of activities.

Pre-screening to define eligible communities and regions

There was broad agreement among participants that a preliminary feasibility assessment or pre-screening process should be completed to provide the basis for excluding certain areas as potential host communities based on geological characteristics and other considerations. This suggestion was based on a view that existing information and tools (geologic maps, GIS) could support pre-screening, and that it would make the process more efficient and fair by not “wasting the time” of certain communities who might otherwise be interested in hosting the repository. Most participants indicated that the NWMO should exclude certain regions in this way as an initial step, whereas others suggested that exclusion criteria be presented to communities as part of the call for expressions of interest. In the latter case, these communities could apply the exclusion criteria themselves to determine whether or not to proceed further. Geological suitability was seen as the primary basis for exclusion criteria, but some participants also considered transportation logistics and economic capacity as potential exclusion criteria. Some participants stated that certain communities in New Brunswick are economically too small, or lack sufficient transportation infrastructure, to support the project.

Defining the project for Canadians

Some participants expressed a strong need for a more detailed and clear description of the project, particularly the economic benefits of the project. One participant described this as the *value proposition* that communities need to consider and react to. A detailed description of economic benefits would answer questions such as the following:

- How many and what type of jobs will the project bring to the community?
- How will economic benefits be realized in an urban vs. a rural or remote community?
- Are there opportunities to establish an industry cluster in the community, and are there specific requirements in this regard related to reprocessing the waste, if and when it is retrieved?

Some participants emphasized that the potential benefits of the project need to be presented in a compelling way to entice communities to take interest.

Public education and outreach program

Most participants identified public education and outreach as an important initial and ongoing activity in the siting process to inform Canadians about the project, including aspects such as: safety, transportation, and economic benefits. Raising the level of awareness and knowledge of the project and of nuclear issues among Canadians was

seen as a prerequisite to informed decision-making. The following range of observations and suggestions on the characteristics of this engagement were put forward:

- Information should be balanced by informing Canadians on both the risks and benefits of the project, such as:
 - clear information on the nature of the waste and associated risks at all stages of the project, including the long term; and
 - potential impacts to communities around the host community including transportation route communities.
- A multi-stakeholder approach is required, including provision of information to all levels of government.
- Information should come from a variety of sources, not just the NWMO.
- Educational material for schools (junior high and high school) should be factual and based on sound science. However, some participants were not comfortable with the development of education material dedicated to nuclear issues or the siting process.
- A wide range of media and communication mechanisms should be used including websites, printed material, public fora, and media kits.

Participants expressed a range of views on the scope and sequencing of public education and outreach activities. Some participants envisioned the NWMO engaging broadly, including all provinces (not just the 'nuclear cycle' provinces), whereas others suggested focusing engagement activities on eligible regions, as defined by pre-screening.

Activities to invite interest

Some of the participants proposed a step involving the NWMO issuing a call for expressions of interest where communities would be invited to 'apply'. Information and funds would be made available to those communities to support their expression of interest. Information would include criteria to help a community assess its potential as a host community, including exclusion criteria. Support could also include the provision of grants and scholarships within the community.

Community planning and visioning exercises

Some participants suggested that interested communities engage in a broader community planning process to develop a long-term vision for sustainability and future growth, and to assess their resources and assets (e.g. land base, water resources). Participants referred to a range of approaches including visioning exercises, and *community asset mapping*. This type of process could be mandatory, or not, for communities intending on expressing interest and could be supported by the NWMO through the provision of guidance, tools, and/or funding. Participants emphasized that such planning exercises would be a positive experience and could provide benefits to the community regardless of how far it goes in the siting process.

Activities to express interest and willingness

Participants discussed a few ideas on how a community would express interest or willingness including leaving the decision to elected representatives or holding a referendum, and defining what would constitute a majority for such processes (e.g. 50% +1 vote).

There were mixed views on the use of referenda. A few participants claimed that, based on their experience, referenda can create divisions and raise expectations that are difficult to manage. Many felt that the referendum approach presents too many risks for political leaders and may dissuade them from becoming involved. Therefore it will be important for communities to be supported in their consultations and for the expressions of willingness to be driven as much by the grassroots as by the leadership. It was also noted that people must not feel that decisions have been made before they are consulted.

5 Who should be involved? What should their level of influence be in decision-making?

In discussing who should be involved and their level of influence in the site selection decision-making process, participants identified several communities of interest as outlined in the following table.

Who should be involved?	Factors for defining involvement and level of influence
Non-Governmental Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could include environmental organizations and community organizations • Involvement is based on interest and concern for the environment and other issues
Regulators (CNSC and others)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement based on regulatory mandate and authority • Responsibility to safeguard public health and safety
Potential Host Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of influence on decision-making • Role based on being potentially impacted and on economic interest • Could be represented by municipalities or planning commissions • Host community could be a region that includes more than one municipality
Transportation Communities and Other Potentially Affected Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities along transportation route • Involvement based on zone of potential impact (communities that are downwind, downstream)
Nuclear Industry	
Owners of the waste	
Provincial and Federal Governments	
Technical and Scientific Experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes engineers , geologists, and other scientific and technical experts • Technical and scientific expertise on site characterization, transportation, security • Role may also include peer review
Elders and other spiritual/traditional leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holders of traditional knowledge
Aboriginal Governments and Communities	
Youth Networks	

Several factors affecting a group's level of influence in decision-making were identified, including the following:

- Level of potential impact by the project
- Interest and concern for the environment
- Regulatory authority and responsibility for public safety and environmental protection

- Economic interest
- Traditions of stewardship for the land (Aboriginal elders)
- Technical expertise

Participants generally indicated that the process should be open and inclusive, but some participants stated that those who are potentially most affected should have more influence and that groups wanting to be part of decision making should justify why they should be listened to. It was also suggested that the terms of reference for expressions of interest should include prerequisites for inclusiveness in the decision-making process.

There was agreement among the dialogue participants that the host 'community' would likely be a region, rather than an individual municipality. Many participants also agreed that the boundaries of a host community would be better defined using ecological or environmental factors, such as watershed boundaries, or the zone of potential impact from a worst case scenario accident. Some participants also observed that defining boundaries in this way could have them extend beyond provincial borders, especially in the Atlantic provinces.

It was recognized that expressing interest or willingness for a community not defined by political boundaries will be challenging. For example, a few participants asked about the implications of the community definition on who will sign the contract, and on who will be the liaison with regulators. One participant suggested that there could be a local board composed of various communities of interest that would serve these roles and that would be accountable to the public.

Participants suggested that the NWMO further explore other models for defining regions, including concepts such as "air quality management districts", as used in California. It was also suggested that additional parameters regarding transportation be defined and communicated to inform the involvement of transportation communities.

6 Ensuring a fair site selection process

Participants discussed and identified measures to ensure a fair site selection process, focusing on defining criteria and setting terms of reference for the community to ensure public support and understanding.

There was agreement that awareness needs to be raised before communities can be expected to express interest. As part of this awareness-raising, there needs to be a clear definition of siting criteria, including:

- scientific or technical criteria, including geological suitability; and
- social criteria, including criteria regarding decision-making.

Several participants suggested the development of standard terms of reference for communities to satisfy, especially with regards to gauging public understanding and support. Some participants stated that communities should be able to define their own process, while others cautioned that communities should not be given too much flexibility on key requirements.

The following questions and proposals for gauging public understanding and support emerged from the discussion:

- What was the uptake of available information, tools, and funding by the community in its process leading up to its expression of interest or willingness?
- How did the community define consensus or majority support (plebiscite/referendum, margin of support required (50% + 1)) and what was the result of its process?
 - A few participants proposed a two-step voting option for expressing willingness in a host *region*: i) voting within the immediate community where the repository would be located, followed by ii) a second vote (presumably if the first vote is affirmative) for the population of the larger surrounding geographical area.
- Was the process in the community transparent? Transparency would be a factor to ensure *informed* consent. A host community must demonstrate that they have conducted adequate community engagement to show that they have earned the social license to operate. Within the context of a host region, the process would need to demonstrate that all issues in the potentially affected region were addressed with rigour and transparency.

Clarity and predictability of the process were also considered elements of fairness. Communities expressing an interest or offering to become a host community need to know what criteria are being used up front and have a sense for what “scores” they need to achieve to move to the next step.

Some participants suggested the establishment of a regional commission or board to provide oversight of the siting process.

Even with the best intentions to ensure fairness and broad support at major decision points, a few participants cautioned that the siting process could still face serious challenges:

- Despite requirements for consultation within each candidate community, there may be 'a silent majority' of people who will not participate during early stages of the process. This silence does not constitute consent, and this majority may only express its opposition as the process reaches the latter stages. As a result, the siting process may run smoothly when many candidate sites are still involved and become adversarial when only a few sites remain.
- NWMO also needs to recognize that there are communities that may wish to become a host community out of economic desperation rather than sensible consideration. This issue should be addressed by a policy to ensure that consent is fairly given.

7 Considerations, Factors and/or Criteria Guiding Decision-making

Participants discussed a range of broad issues related to defining factors, criteria and considerations guiding decision-making. The participants identified technical, social and exclusionary considerations and criteria, as summarized in the following table.

Technical Considerations / Factors / Criteria	Social Considerations / Factors / Criteria	Exclusionary Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geology (stability, integrity, seismic considerations) • Surface area impacts • Construction impacts • Climate change impacts on repository site and on transportation logistics • Transportation risks • Overall risk assessment, including probability of various scenarios • Risks of doing nothing (i.e. risks associated with current reactor site storage) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution of economic benefits in impacted regions • Measures to ensure ongoing and sustainable benefits to the community • Presence of unresolved land claims • Psycho-social environmental health impacts • Support for and outcomes of community planning process (e.g. Community asset mapping) • Integration of traditional and community knowledge • Allowance for growth in urban areas and emergency relocation, including migrations due to climate change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsuitable geologic formation • Existing resource base or potential disturbance of major economic activity • Burial grounds • Designated protected area

Generally, participants indicated that the paramount criteria must be safety and environmental integrity. Associated with this requirement was compliance with all applicable regulations.

Most participants agreed that technical criteria should be satisfied first and should lead the process, including the identification of exclusion zones based on geological suitability and other technical consideration. However, participants also recognized that social and political factors will ultimately drive the process.

8 Information & Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Participation

Participants discussed the information and tools that would be required to facilitate stakeholder participation from various perspectives, including those of potential host communities and other interested parties.

Participants identified the following range of information and tools that could be helpful for a potential host community:

- A clear definition of the project including a comprehensive description of direct economic benefits, such as jobs associated with the project, and indirect benefits, such as jobs associated with supporting infrastructure
- A clear definition of liability requirements (related to ownership of fuel bundles throughout project life-cycle)
- Guidance and financial resources to support:
 - Proper internal consultation within the community
 - Community planning processes, such as *Community Asset Mapping* or other similar processes to take stock of community assets (social and environmental) and develop a long-term community plan
- Technical risk assessments on various aspects of the project, while recognizing that the results of these assessments may be overridden by non-technical considerations
- Information on insurance considerations for the community in light of the insurance challenges faced by the nuclear industry and its facilities today

It was understood that much of the information during the siting process would be provided by the NWMO, though some participants indicated that some information should come from more independent sources.

Some participants emphasized that communities need to be fully funded at an early stage to conduct the multi-stakeholder consultation required to ascertain support for their response to the call for expressions of interest.

Participants noted that for other interested parties to be involved, they would require access to funding. To ensure an equitable and fair distribution of funding and resources to communities and interested parties, clear processes must be in place. Some participants also stated that proponents, interveners, and other interested parties should have the opportunity to work together or separately regardless of their funding arrangements.

9 NWMO's Future Challenges & Opportunities – Best Advice

In the final plenary, participants were invited to provide their best advice to the NWMO for the design of the siting process. Participants offered advice to the NWMO and identified a range of challenges that they thought the NWMO and the siting process would face:

- Addressing the concerns of transport communities will be very difficult, but this will be a necessary challenge if all waste is to go to one site. The evaluation of the transportation corridor needs to be integrated into this process and can not be perceived as an add-on.
- NWMO must maintain the current high quality of engagement and ensure that it continues to include credible and well-known individuals from all communities of interest, such as respected environmental NGOs.
- A clear presentation of a worst case scenario for the repository is important as it may reduce fears about catastrophic accidents at this type of facility, in comparison to a reactor facility for example. Education about the risks and risk communication will be a key part of this process.
- The lack of clarity on the quantity of used fuel for the repository may lead to concerns about the NWMO project becoming a justification for the growth of the nuclear industry. The NWMO must address this perception.
- The siting process will cause anxiety and fear for some people, which could lead to psycho-social environmental health impacts. These types of impacts are starting to be more recognized by respected organizations. NWMO may wish to explore this area of research and its implications for siting.
- With technical development being so rapid, careful consideration needs to be given to the aspects of the process that are most lasting, such as spiritual connections and traditions, morals, and connections between people. Therefore, relationships and trust between the diversity of peoples involved in this process need to be built and cultivated.

Appendix A – Agenda

NWMO Dialogues on Designing the Process to Select the Site for Managing Canada’s Used Nuclear Fuel for the Long-Term

Objectives

- To seek input from individuals and organizations, which reflect a diverse set of perspectives, on the design of a siting process
- To invite/generate ideas about critical elements and issues in the design of a siting process

Time	Subject
8:00-8:30	Greeting & Registration
8:30–8:40	NWMO Welcome
8:40-9:00	Stratos Opening Remarks & Roundtable Introductions
9:00-10:30	<i>Plenary: What matters in a siting process?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is important in a siting process? • Testing the set of Objectives, Ethical Principles & Characteristics (Q1)
10:30-10:45	Refreshment Break
10:45-12:30	<i>Breakout Groups: Design Elements for NWMO Siting Process - Methods</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major activities in a siting process • Who should be involved? What should their level of influence be in decision-making? (Q4) • Ensuring a fair site selection process (Q2)
12:30–13:00	Lunch (provided)
13:00-13:45	<i>Reporting Back in Plenary: Design Elements for NWMO Siting Process - Methods</i>
13:45-14:45	<i>Breakout Groups: Design Elements for NWMO Siting Process - Content</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerations / Factors / Criteria guiding decision-making • Information and tools to facilitate stakeholder participation (Q5)
14:45-15:15	<i>Reporting Back in Plenary: Design Elements for NWMO Siting Process - Content</i>
15:15-15:30	Refreshment Break
15:30-16:25	<i>Plenary: What are the NWMO’s future challenges & opportunities? What are the key considerations?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key challenges & opportunities in the design and implementation of a siting process (Q6) • Best advice to NWMO on design of a siting process (Q6)
16:25-16:30	<i>Plenary: Wrap-up</i>

Appendix B – List of Participants

Name	Organization
Dr. Tom Al	University of New Brunswick
Mr. Bill Artiss	
Ms. Donna Augustine	Niigani
Dr. William Cook	University of New Brunswick
Mr. David Coon	Conservation Council of New Brunswick
Mr. Neil Craik	Canadian Nuclear Society
Mr. Gordon Dalzell	Citizens Coalition for Clean Air
Ms. Susan Farquharson	
Dr. Mary Lou Harley	United Church
Mr. Danny Harrigan	Harrigan Insurance Agency Ltd.
Mr. John Herron	Atlantica Centre for Energy
Ms. Teresa James	Union of Municipalities of New Brunswick
Ms. Brenda Kelley	Bathurst Sustainable Development
Chief Betty Ann Lavallée	New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council
Mayor Jacques Martin	Cities of New Brunswick Association
Mr. Raymond Murphy	Union of Municipalities of New Brunswick
Mr. Tom Sisk	Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of New Brunswick
Mr. David Thompson	Fundy Baykeeper