

the Métis Nation *of* Ontario

Nuclear Waste Management Dialogue Process
Final Activity Report
2004/05

Submitted to:

Metis National Council,
Nuclear Waste Management Organization
& Natural Resources Canada

May 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1. Introduction.....	92
2. Overview of the Metis Nation of Ontario.....	93
3. Activities and Outcomes.....	94
4. Year-End Summary and Next Steps.....	98

Part A - Financial Statement (April 1 2004 – April 30, 2005)

Part B - MNC/MNO Letter of Agreement

Part C - Memorandum – MNO Planning Retreat – Belcourt, North Dakota

Part D – Draft MNO Provincial Framework for Engagement

**Part E - Memo to MNC Board of Governors, Nuclear Fuel Waste Management
Information Kit**

Part F – Agenda, MNO Nuclear Fuel Waste Training Initiative

Part G - MNO Draft Nuclear Fuel Waste Questionnaire

Part H - MNO Nuclear Fuel Waste Presentation

Part I – MNO Community Dialogue Preliminary Reports

1. INTRODUCTION:

This final activity report is one of the five regional reports funded by the Metis National Council (MNC) through the federal government's Nuclear Fuel Waste Program in Natural Resources Canada (NRCAN) and the Nuclear Waste Management Organization's (NWMO) Aboriginal Dialogue Program. As part of this process, the Metis Nation of Ontario Secretariat (MNO) entered into a Letter of Agreement with the Metis National Council (MNC) to undertake a series of specific activities on the issue of the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste (**Part B**).

Under the Agreement, the MNO is to develop necessary capacity to engage our citizens in a series community dialogue sessions on the following issues:

- To discuss the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste, including the three proposed concepts in the Nuclear Fuel Waste Act (NFWA), 2002;
- Determine how to utilize Metis traditional knowledge in our dialogue process, and;
- Identify Metis rights in relation to the long-management of nuclear fuel waste

In addition, the MNO also agreed to work with the MNC on a number of activities in order to assist the national process:

- to develop information materials to be used by MNC's Governing members to prepare for and implement regional dialogue sessions with their respective community members;
- Provide "expert advise" on nuclear waste management issues to the MNC and its Governing Members for the purpose of training and assisting community dialogue facilitators;
- Provide quarterly and final reports on progress of MNO's activities and financial statements to the MNC, NWMO and NRCAN during the period of 2004/05.

During the past year, our focus has been on developing the necessary capacity to prepare for and roll out our dialogue sessions with Metis citizens on the proposed options for the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste. In the Activities and Outcomes section of this report, you will find greater detail to the initiatives that the MNO participated in, dialogue tools produced and preliminary reports from the dialogue sessions.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE METIS NATION OF ONTARIO (MNO)

The Metis Nation within Ontario has a long, rich and proud history. Historic Metis communities have existed and continue to exist along the Ottawa, surrounding the Great Lakes and through to the northwestern part of the provinces.

In the past, pan aboriginal lobby organizations and associations, to which some Metis people and communities. However, these types of organizations and associations continually impeded the Metis Nation's aspiration of implementing Metis self-government. Therefore, in 1993, the Metis Nation of Ontario (MNO) was established through the will of Metis people and historic Metis communities coming together to create a Metis-specific governance structure to achieve the nation's aspirations.

At the founding meeting for the MNO, Metis representatives from over 90 communities throughout the province set the foundational principles, which have continued to guide the evolution of the MNO. These foundational principles focused on the following:

- establishing a Metis-specific governance structure for the implementation of the nation's inherent right to self-government;
- establishing a credible and recognized identification system (Registry) for Metis people within the province;
- focusing on 'nation building' by working together as a collective to support Metis citizens and communities;
- pursuing a rights-based agenda and proudly asserting the Metis existence as a distinct Aboriginal people within Ontario.

These foundational principles, as well as, the values and vision of the Metis Nation within Ontario have been encapsulated in the MNO's Statement of Prime Purpose which serves as a guide for the MNO's on-going evolution and decision-making process. Grounded on this solid foundation, the MNO has drawn Metis people and communities together in Ontario.

Today, the MNO has over 10,000 Metis citizens within its Registry, as well as a, solid governance structure through the Provincial Council of the Metis Nation of Ontario (PCMNO) which represents these citizens at a local, provincial and national level. As well, the MNO provides programs and services to Metis people in specific sectors such as employment and training and Health through a community based, province-wide delivery structure with an annual budget of over \$10 million. The MNO's governance and administrative capacity continues to grow as the Metis Nation moves forward on its ultimate goal of self government

3. ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES:

Throughout the fiscal 2004/05, the MNO have worked with the MNC to meet the terms and obligations set out in MNC/MNO Letter of Agreement. The MNO will have an effective voice in the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste issue in the near future and over the long term.

The following are a list of the activities and outcomes performed by the MNO:

A. MNC Environment Committee Meetings:

The MNO participated in three MNC Environment Committee Meetings over the course of the 2004/05 fiscal year. Each meeting was a chance for the representatives of the MNC and its Governing Members in the development of the national action plan on the nuclear fuel waste management file and the on-going sharing of information on the file from a regional perspective.

The following is a chronology of meeting events taken place and their respective outcomes:

Date / Meeting Location	Purpose(s):	Outcomes:
April 2-3, 2004 Ottawa, ON	▪ The purpose of the meeting were to finalize 2003/04 deliverables set out in MNC Workplan and; ▪ make recommendations to the MNC on the draft MNC proposal to the NWMO; ▪ develop 2004/05 workplan to NRCAN	▪ deliverables outlined, including a "Issues paper" and a "framework for engagement" were not completed ▪ draft NWMO proposal not complete for review by the MNC – no timetable set for completion ▪ NRCAN workplan not completed in time for review by committee
December 18-19, 2004 Ottawa, ON	▪ Invite NWMO officials to make presentation on current stage of the NWMO Study ▪ MNO to provide training session rolling out Community Dialogue process for Committee members ▪ Discuss milestones and timelines of regional dialogues and draft year-end reporting	▪ NWMO made presentation to MNC Committee and answered questions from committee members ▪ MNO official provided training on elements of the NFW initiative, draft survey and information kit (Part E) ▪ MNC Governing members were anticipated to begin their own regional dialogue sessions in the winter of 2005. ▪ Initial timelines were set by the Committee for completion
March 21-22, 2005 Calgary, AB	▪ Provide national update on the NFW file and relations with NWMO and NRCAN ▪ Provide regional updates to progress of MNC affiliates dialogue process	▪ MNC officials provided status on relations with NRCAN and NWMO and on funding flow issues ▪ MNC affiliates each provided a progress report on the status of regional dialogue process

B. MNO Preparation of draft Community Dialogue Plan

In May 2004, the MNO submitted its “Provincial Framework for Engagement” document to the MNC. The provincial framework sets out our role and responsibilities under the MNC “Framework for Engagement” workplan. Included in the MNO Framework is our draft dialogue process with Metis communities in Ontario on Canada’s option for the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste.

C. MNO/NWMO Information Exchange and Planning Retreat

As part of our engagement process, the MNO held a retreat with its executive body called the Provincial Council of the Metis Nation of Ontario (PCMNO) in Belcourt, North Dakota USA on August 9 – 10, 2004. This was the first opportunity to bring together the PCMNO and invited guests from MNC and hear from the NWMO (Donna Pawoloski) on the nuclear fuel waste issue. The NWMO also made a presentation on the organizations’ mandate, its obligations to ensure Aboriginal dialogue and its important milestones before November 2005.

The meeting was utilized to get some initial feedback from the PCMNO on the issue posed and allow this body to provide overall guidance and direction to MNO’s Framework for Community Dialogue process. Outcomes included PCMNO acceptance of the Community dialogue document and agreement on scheduling the Dialogue sessions in winter 2004/05. At this point, the MNO did not have confirmation on the funding amount it would receive or the terms of the Letter of Agreement from the MNC.

PCMNO Members in Attendance:

Tony Belcourt – President, MNO
France Picotte – Vice-Chair, MNO
Gilbert Gervais – Senator
Cam Burgess – Councilor, Region 2
Brent McHale – Councilor, Region 4
Pat Thibault, Councilor, Region 6
Anita Tucker , Post-Secondary Rep

Gary Lipiniski Chairperson, MNO
Tim Pile, Secretary Treasurer
Reta Gordon – Senator
Roland St. Germain – Senator
Olivine Tiedema – Senator
Valerie Stewart – Councilor, Region 9
Marc Neumann – Youth Rep

MNO Staff: Pierre Lefebvre – Executive Director & Paul Heigington, Policy

Guests:

Bill Flett –Vice President, Manitoba Metis Federation (MMF)
Donna Pawloski, NWMO

Dan Benoit, MMF

D. Prepared MNO Information Kit to MNC and Governing Members:

In accordance with our obligation to develop information materials for the MNC and its Governing members on the issue of nuclear fuel waste, the MNO put together an information kit consisting of MNC, MNO, NRCAN and NWMO documents and submitted to the MNC Board of Governors on November 29, 2004.

The Information Kit included the following items:

- NWMO video "Invitation to Dialogue"
- MNC Framework for Dialogue Presentation – prepared by the MNO
- MNC Framework for Engagement Documents – MNC workplans with NWMO and NRCAN
- MNC Backgrounder and Issues Paper
- NWMO Fact Sheets – NWMO Mandate, study and the three proposed concepts
- Assessing the Options --- NWMO Assessment Team Report July 2004
- NWMO Document # 1, Understanding the Choices – NWMO Document # 2
- Responsible Action – Research Report prepared by the Canadian Policy Research Networks July 2004
- Drawing on Aboriginal Wisdom and Traditional Knowledge – NWMO Workshop Report, October 2003
- Draft Nuclear Fuel Waste Survey – prepared by the MNO and to be used by MNC and its Governing Members

E. Capacity Building and Training Session for representatives of the MNC

Outlined in our MNC/MNO Letter of Agreement, the MNO hosted a Capacity Building & Training session on December 18 –19, 2004 at its offices in Ottawa with the MNC and representatives of the Metis organizations from Manitoba westward (MMF, MN-S and MPCBC officials were in attendance). The MNO gave an overview of the nuclear fuel waste issue and walked officials through the materials in the Information Kit. In addition, a representative from the NWMO accepted an invitation and made a presentation on the "Understanding the Choices" Document, up-coming milestones for the NWMO and detail on what the organization seek from the MNC Dialogue process. **(Part F – Training Session Agenda)**

Outcomes: Representatives from the MNC were satisfied with the information provided and were prepared to design and execute their own regional dialogue process. A draft community dialogue questionnaire **(Part G)** and a power point deck **(Part H)** were provided by the MNO to representatives of the MNC and its Governing members in attendance for their review and comment.

MNC Representatives in Attendance:

Bob Stevenson – Chair, MNC Environment Committee
Valerie Nichols – MNC Consultant
Dan Benoit – Natural Resources, MMF

Duane Roth – President, MNS
Paul Heighington – Policy Advisor, MNO
Dean Trumbley – Policy Advisor, MNBC

Day 2 Representatives

Clem Chartier – President, MNC

Kathy Hodgson-Smith, Executive Director, MNC

Presenters: Pat Patton, NWMO

F. MNO Community Dialogue Sessions:

In the months of January and February 2005, the MNO rolled out Community Dialogue Sessions in six locations and participated by 311 citizens' representative of 25 Metis Community Councils in Ontario.

In preparation for the series of community dialogues, the MNO head office engaged in the following activities:

- Renting of Meeting space, catering services and technical equipment
- Development of Agenda
- Mail-outs to MNO members in each region and up-loading of Dialogue Sessions on MNO website www.metisnation.org
- Travel arrangements and accommodations are being made for staff and community members
- Requests to NWMO for a quantity of documents for dissemination to community members, including Document #2, CRPN Documents, NWMO Fact Sheets, and Video

Community Dialogue Sessions:

The following lists the place and dates of sessions and Metis community council participation.

Place/Date	MNO Regions and Council Participation
Midland, ON January 15- 16, 2005 Midland Community Centre	Georgian Bay Metis Council, Moon River Metis Council, Saugeen Metis Council, Owen Sound Metis Council, and the North Humberland Metis Council
Hamilton, ON January 22-23, 2005 Best Western Hamilton	Hamilton-Wentworth Metis Council , Port Credit Metis Council, Toronto Metis Council Windsor Essex Metis Council, Oshawa Metis Council
Ft. Frances, ON January 29- 30, 2005 Hotel Rendezvous	Dryden Metis Council , Sunset Country Metis Council, Kenora Metis Council , Rainy River Metis Council , Thunder Bay Metis Council
Timmins, ON February 5- 6, 2005 Centennial Hall	Timmins Metis Council, Northern Lights Metis Council, Temiskaming Metis Council Chapleau Metis Council
Sudbury, ON February 12- 13, 2005 - Howard Johnson's Sudbury	Sault Ste. Marie Metis Council , Thessalon Metis Council , Bruce Mines Metis Council , Sudbury Metis Council , North Bay Metis Council
Thunder Bay, ON February 18 – 19, 2005 Best Western	MNO Community Council Presidents Meeting (representatives from all 30 Chartered Community Councils)

Methodology:

The methodology used could be best describes as a “primer” exercise on the issue at hand. The MNO used many of the NWMO’s materials including the discussion documents and videos during the dialogue’s introduction. The dialogues were followed by an MNO produced power point presentation and then ample opportunity was afforded to take questions and comments from the audience. At the end of the dialogue session, participants were encouraged to fill out and submit the MNO survey prior to leaving the session.

Dialogue Session Preliminary Reports;

In total, 311 people participated in the five sessions throughout the province. The MNO were encouraged both by the turn out and interest in this important public policy issue. The dialogues were insightful not only on the level of knowledge and awareness of the nuclear fuel waste issue, and the importance of having a say on its management as well as on questioning the viability of nuclear energy as the future main source of energy for Ontario. Full preliminary reports on “what we heard” from questions and comments made during the dialogues are available for each session.

4. YEAR-END SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS:

Overall, the MNO were encouraged by the turn-out from community leaders and citizens alike on the important public policy issue of Canada’s options for the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste. Stormy weather in January and February contributed to the low participation levels in the Hamilton and Ft. Francis dialogue sessions, however, we are encouraged with the feedback received and view this as only the beginning of MNO’s meaningful involvement over the long-term.

Documents and materials from the NWMO were valuable tools for participants, who may have never have given the nuclear fuel waste issue much consideration or thought in the past. However, when presented with information we found that the nuclear fuel waste issue tends invoke emotional and passionate debate among people from all walks of life.

Initial comments received on the strengths and weaknesses on the three proposed management scenarios varied from each participants level of knowledge on the issue or on similar waste management issues and often posed a number of other questions on nuclear waste in general. There were some in our dialogue sessions that are proponents of variations of the options proposed by the Nuclear Fuel Waste Act, but, there was greater resistance and/or concerns with nuclear fuel waste, nuclear energy in general and its long term impacts in Ontario. Another important issue that came out of the sessions were that participants were surprised by the limitations of the Act related what nuclear waste is to be managed and what is not, such as the Act not covering or responsible for water used to cool the rods, reactor materials, etc.

A number of common themes did come out of the sessions based from the on “what we heard” in comments and questions from the presentations and submitted surveys. These themes are outlined, but not limited to the following:

- Paramount consideration should be given to the health and safety of our communities;
- Greater consideration must be given, in term of fairness. There is wide speculation that rural communities and/or current host communities could be burdened with the storage/disposal facility;
- How should government and Industry make every effort to ensure Aboriginal peoples, including the Metis are meaningfully at every stage of the management approach;
- Utilizing or investing in alternative energy sources must be Ontario’s energy policy focus;
- How best can Metis traditional knowledge be utilized in the nuclear waste management disposal/storage process; and
- The northern vs southern Ontario divide; differing opinions on the public policy issue
- Transportation issues
- Is there a full accounting of the associated risks and costs in moving ahead with one proposed option over another?

the Métis Nation *of* Ontario

Community Dialogue Roundtables on:

The Long-term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada

Preliminary Notes from:

Midland, ON
Hamilton, ON
Ft. Frances, ON
Timmins, ON
Sudbury, ON



Georgian Bay Region Metis Community Dialogue on:
Canada's Options for the long-term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste

Saturday January 14, 2005
Midland Recreation & Community Centre, Midland ON

Preliminary Report:

1.0 Participants:

There were 77 participants that attended dialogue session. Participants were made of five Community Councils' representatives, including the Georgian Bay Metis Council, Moon River Metis Council, Saugeen Metis Council, Owen Sound Metis Council and the North Humberland Metis Council.

The MNO was represented by members of the Provisional Council of the Metis Nation of Ontario, including President Tony Belcourt, Chairperson Gary Lipinski, Co-Chair France Picotte, Senators Marion Larkman, Allan Vallee and Executive Director Pete Lefrbrve.

The MNO facilitator on the dialogue session was Paul Heighington.

The following are comments from the dialogue session and MNO Nuclear Waste Management Survey:

2.0 Nuclear Fuel Waste Management Concepts:

2.1 Storage at reactor sites:

2.1.1 Advantages

- Less/no transportation required if left on-site
- Cost convenience, no mega project development needed
- Less expensive in the short term and It may keep hydro costs down
- Better control of waste on site
- Expertise on site and monitoring will be constant;
- Public awareness of the issue is much higher when it is in front of them

2.1.2 Limitations:

- There are no guarantees on how long on-site structures will last for
- Multiple sites will present security concerns in relation to being targets of terrorism and sabotage
- Human error is a concern – people get lazy over a long period of stability
- Potential health risks multiple with several sites in host communities
- Cost disadvantage, costs will continue forever
- Multiple sites will constantly have to be watched
- Limited amount of space in or around existing reactor sites – because they are high populated areas

2.1.3 Other comments on concept

- Do not support this concept at all – too dangerous
- Cold war era bomb shelters are all over southern Ontario i.e. near Camp Borden. They make oxygen and are currently not being used. They would be ideal for the storage of the waste.

2.2 Deep Geological Disposal:

2.2.1 Advantages:

- Potential terrorist or security concerns can be better contained underground
- Economical over the long term because it only is one site, one host community
- Out of sight out of mind
- Probably the safest, because it is away from people and communities

2.2.2 Limitations:

- How will the storage last for?
- Some participants issues concerns regarding plate shifting and potential earthquakes that might effect any structure under ground;
- Concerns were raised on transporting all the waste to one central site - other communities could be affected by transporting the waste materials by rail or truck – accidents can and will happen
- A participant said it could not be recovered if found to pose some good to society
- Could potentially change from the inside out (weather, cracks, toxic soils)

2.2.3 Other comments about the concept:

- What about leaching under the ground?
- Has this concept been tested over time? Will the structures age underground?
- Who will monitor the waste when put underground?
- Long term effects not known -- Maybe we should leave this decision for the future
- Possibility of seepage over the long-term in all three concepts
- Less awareness by removing from sight of the public, must remain in public view
- No one knows the environmental impacts on the concepts

2.3. Centralize Storage Concept:

2.3.1. Advantages:

- Some participants view that this concept would be a cost advantage being in one centralized location and maybe most cost effective in the long run
- Expertise would also be centralized and provide an more concerted effort for constant monitoring the structure(s)
- One participant said the concept is good because the “problem” is in one location

2.3.2 Limitations:

- Some participants were not sure about the safety factors in terms of the transportation of hazardous goods to one central location
- Other participants worried about the potential security risks if kept above ground
- Costs would never stop because structures would need to be upgraded over time

2.3.3 Other comments about concept:

- One participant asked what communities would want this stuff – not in my backyard
- Another participant would not support this concept above or below ground
- Others worried if concept chosen that their could be possible contamination in the form of leaks into the water table and will create a very dangerous area
- One participant from North Humberland County raised concerns that there is nuclear waste that is being processed in their region by companies
- One participant said It should be away from large population areas for safety precautions
- Some believed that they were not really informed enough to comment

Other General Comments about the Management concepts and presentation:

- One participant said that they live in close proximity to Bruce Power and said many of our people do work there. The participant serves on a committee which studies the impacts of the warm waters extracted by the plant. Also sites on a technical working group facilitated by Bruce Power Corp and has a favourable opinion of the outreach Bruce provides to the community and believes they have a better track record on this issue than government
- Other participants said they found the presentation to be informative and enlightening on this important issue. The nuclear waste issue should actually take a full day or two to properly educate and to provide research so our people can make an informed decision on these matters
- Our youth should play an instrumental role in this process, considering they are the ones that will have live with whatever solution is decided
- We are starting to understand from the comments today that we have a lot of knowledge and expertise within our nation --- It should be something to consider in forming ideas on how we will respond to industry and government on this issue
- Another participant questioned the concerns he had in North Humberland county about the nuclear waste currently being process by Zarteck Corp. He didn't see anything in the presentation and wondered why?

3.0 Other comments from the dialogue session:

Other Comments and questions were asked not related to the management options, but are important to the overall discussion and are loosely grouped under the following categories:

3.1 Alternative Energy Sources:

- We should be like Germany and stop nuclear energy production --- direct more resources to renewable energy development
- We must find alternative energy sources other nuclear
- Strongly in favour of using other sources of energy

3.2 Nuclear Energy & Nuclear Waste Issues:

- Does anyone know how long the nuclear bundles stay hot for?
- Is there room at the reactor sites to store all of the spent fuel?
- The plants that we have in Ontario – do we supply any of the U.S. with hydro from these reactors? -- if so, does the U.S. have any involvement in our discussion?
- A participant questioned the rationale for discounting the recycling of the spent fuel in the NWMO video “Understanding the Choices” – suggested that it is not an option because of the expense is not strong enough
-

3.3 Governance and Public Participation Issues:

- The MNO should be seeking partnerships to help form opinions --- I suggest we partner with First Nations
- It frightens me who is on the NWMO Advisory Council – we are the little people
- There are a lot of mainstream professionals working on this issue. There have been Senate hearings regarding the Pickering Power Plant to determine risks associated with the job --- it is necessary to continue testing.
- The MNO should be working with mainstream professionals and put an aboriginal lens on it

3.4 International Issues

- We should be checking with other countries on how they are dealing with this problem
- What is the U.S. doing?

4.0 Questions & Comments from MNO Survey:

The MNO distributed the MNO Nuclear Waste Management Survey at all dialogue sessions. The following are answers gathered from the completed survey questions:

In your view, do you feel there are any concepts that are not present that should be part of the discussion:

- What about using bomb shelters? There is one sitting near Camp Borden that is not being used
- I worry about the environmental effects such as climate change and global warming in calculating the risks in the management concepts. Just 20 years ago, climate change was not part of our vocabulary;
- A participant said that a major factor to them was the fear of the unknown, fear for our children and having not enough knowledge before decision is made
- What about putting it in abandoned mine shafts underground – all nuclear waste should be encased in concrete
- Whatever concept chosen, it should be in the “safest place known to man” with the technology to support it
- Should be stored at the reactors sites with proper security
- We should keep up the studying on transmutation before moving the fuel bundles
- After neutralizing, it could be a combination of all three concepts
- Why don't we just store it in “space”
- Any movement of the waste will create the potential for accidents to happen – keep it where it is

If there were economic benefits to your community, would you support nuclear storage in your region?

- Aboriginal people should be approached before decisions are to be made
- If proven to be safe and secure
- Not a chance
- Not a consideration in light of the health, safety and environmental concerns
- Because of the fear of the unknown would not want near my community no matter the economic benefits are
- Never
- We can survive economically without having these hazards near by
- Not worth the risk

Could Métis traditional knowledge play an important part in the recommendation or decision making process for a management approach?

- If the nuclear fuel waste is to be relocated in whatever area, Metis and First Nations would have knowledge to add into any environmental impact or effects study
- Not enough information on traditional knowledge and its use on this to comment

- Years of managing our own resources should teach us now on proper waste disposal issues
- Yes, talk to the elders and the people who know --- and learn how our people in the past dealt with the disposal of unwanted things
- How would traditional knowledge come into play on this?
- As aboriginal people we have a direct connection and respect for the land
- Before any site is selected, the government will need to know from an aboriginal perspective the potential environmental impacts of the surrounding people
- I don't want our knowledge being used at all in this process
- Yes it should be used – everything is connected
- Our people could build that “bridge” between the aboriginal world view to the mainstream approach
- The use of traditional knowledge and its ability to look beyond the immediate monetary value will be beneficial to this discussion
- Metis traditional knowledge could assist and be integrated into the mainstream
- I think our elders should be front and centre giving input into this process – do we have a way of measuring our knowledge?
- Would be another approach to ideas not previously thought of

Greater Toronto Area & South-western Ontario Metis Community Dialogue on: Canada's Options for the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste

Saturday January 22, 2005
Best Western Hotel – Downtown Hamilton, ON

Preliminary Notes:

1.0 Participants:

There were 43 participants present at this dialogue process, representing five community councils including; the Hamilton-Wentworth Metis Council, Port Credit Metis Council, Toronto Metis Council, Windsor Essex Metis Council and the Oshawa Metis Council.

The Provisional Council of the Metis Nation of Ontario were represented by Tony Belcourt – President, Gary Lipiniski – Chairperson, France Picotte – Co-Chairperson, Tim Pile – Secretary Treasurer, Pete Leferbrve – Executive Director, Marc Neumann – Youth Rep and Anita Tucker – Post-Secondary Rep.

The MNO facilitator was represented by Paul Heighington. The following is a summary of comments from dialogue session and completed MNO Nuclear Waste Management Survey.

2.0 Nuclear Fuel Management Concepts:

2.1 Storage at Reactor Sites:

2.1.1 Advantages:

- Stays with the producer
- No transportation is needed if stay where it already is

2.1.2 Limitations:

- It is an interim plan not a solid long-term solution
- May run out of space at the reactor sites

2.1.3 Other comments about the concept:

- This is a very serious approach to managing nuclear waste – I am dead set against it

2.2 Deep Geological Disposal:

2.1.1 Advantages:

- Canadian shield seems to be the most stable concept
- Out of site out of mind
- Will be out of areas with high populations

2.1.2 Limitations:

- We don't know of the effects underground
- Very difficult to fix or contain the structure if something should go wrong

2.1.3 Other comments about the concept:

- Would burying the waste cause harm to the water table?
- Would it just stay there and decompose?
- They are talking about putting it in the Canadian Shield because it is less seismic, but we can't guarantee we will not have earth quakes or earth movements due to climate change in the future
- Once underground, the casing where the waste is store can no longer be measured

2.2 Centralized Storage:

2.2.1 Advantages:

- Would create some definite economic opportunities for needy communities
- Same advantages as deep geological disposal concept

2.2.2 Limitations:

- Transportation of the waste to one location will be a concern for a number of communities
- Too costly to maintain and replace structures over time
- Same limitations as deep geological disposal

2.2.3 Other comments about the concept:

- If they chose a central location, it will be a hot spot for eternity
- Who is going to determine this central location, government, industry or the people

Other General Comments about the Management Concepts and Presentation:

- Have they thought about putting the nuclear waste back in the mines or putting the storage facilities near the abandoned mines?
- One of the things that comes up for me is the possibility of storage beside the Rocky Mountains?
- Doing a study in Saskatchewan and most people seemed to be against nuclear waste being stored in Saskatchewan
- I know about trucking other wastes to landfill sites and I know things that the average public does not know about waste issues
- I think transportation is a major problem. I think the idea of transporting it anywhere is a really bad because how many more people will be at risk? It should stay where it is developed
- We need people involved who can inform us along the way. I will have questions throughout our dialogue process
- This is such a politically charged issue, however every opinion and every thought is valid – There is different models and each one has good and bad scenarios – it is a serious problem and maybe we can't afford to pass the buck
- Why not space? Blow it up in space? Can it be done?
- Do we have any experts within the Metis Nation that could be of great use to us?

3.0 Other comments from the Dialogue:

Other Comments and questions were asked not related to the management options, but are important to the overall discussion and are loosely grouped under the following categories:

3.1 Alternative energy sources or solutions:

- The MNO should move forward with plans to make a strong case for alternative sources of energy
- Maybe we could start projects in our communities to conserving energy so we will not have to rely on nuclear energy production

3.2 Nuclear energy and waste issues:

- What is the projection for the nuclear usage in Canada? How long can the current storage practice go on?
- What is the life expectancy of a used fuel line? In the presentation they said they want to have access for this – what is the reason?
- Those caskets which currently hold the rods also be considered nuclear waste?
- A big concern is that when you talk about 10 to 20 years before a government makes a decision on this – how much more of this waste will be produced only to add to the issue?
- You have to consider the heavy water as waste, it the by-product of nuclear production and it is just as lethal
- We should consider pushing the Ontario government to discuss with us their future energy plans and examine all other potential energy sources – in the meantime, we as Canadians must deal with the current waste and finding a solution to its management.
- The NWMO video presentation stated that used rods remain radioactive for a long time. This is very misleading when the reality of that “long time” is hundreds or thousands of years.

3.3 Governance and Public Participation Issues:

- Would it be better to work with other aboriginal peoples so we would have more of a voice as a collective?
- Is the government funding this or is it the nuclear producers?
- The discussion seems to create more questions. From my council's perspective we have been aware of the issues as Canadians, but are open to more focused and collective Metis voice
- One participant asked if there have been any discussions on bringing this issue back to the MNO and determining our role – will we have our own experts in this process?
- We are a collective and have governing institutions within the MNO structure and I believe we must be heard once we put forth recommendations and/or a position
- Because this is an important issue for the Metis, particularly for Ontario - shouldn't the MNO request full standing on the NWMO Advisory Council?
- Is the government going to continue on its own and operate these nuclear facilities or are they going to sell them off like the Bruce plant and reduce their accountability to the public?
- We must ensure that the MNO collectively comes together on this issue and address the provincial and federal government
- What stage are other aboriginal peoples in their discussions?
- Do you know what other aboriginal people are saying?
- Have they set up a situation already what will be the best concept or do they really want to know what the people want
- The question of partnering has come up and would good to further explore with First Nations, the province and Industry (NWMO) in order to be better informed to express our views on this subject

3.4 International Issues:

- What are other countries doing with there waste? I heard thing are not going well for the U.S. on their Yucca Mountain selection. I also hear that Europe wants to find alternative energy like wind and solar to produce their needs

4.0 Questions & Comments from MNO Survey:

The MNO distributed the MNO Nuclear Waste Management Survey at all dialogue sessions. The following are answers gathered from the completed survey questions:

In your opinion, are you in agreement with nuclear energy providing Ontario and Canada with its energy needs into the future?

- The nuclear energy industry has prematurely entered into its implementation and usage stage without a long-term disposal plan – the Industry should not be given any more chances for production if they can not clearly take care of it without the burden on society
- Based on the presentation alone – I am strongly in favour of finding alternative energy sources for our hydro
- I enjoy the comforts of my home and I know I am benefiting from nuclear energy – however, also feel we are responsible and must find alternative sources to live

In your view, do you feel there are any concepts that are not present that should be part of the discussion? (Where do you think it should be stored?)

- I am a little uncomfortable about telling the government where to store the waste - government and industry should have thought about this before they started producing nuclear energy
- People in southern Ontario have been the beneficiaries of nuclear energy, therefore, I believe we have a direct voice on where the waste should go but also direct say on what future energy we want to consume.
- Send it to a less populated place of the province
- Maybe the nuclear producers should keep it where it already is – at the reactor sites

If there were economic benefits to your community, would you support nuclear storage in your region?

- Absolutely not, government cannot begin to put a price tag on the fundamentals of health and safe communities. Any price tag flashed now can only be seen by people who will not be around for any significant amount of time compared to the life span of nuclear fuel waste. Once a decision and digging begins, it will be impossible for future generations to try and change it
- No, security is never guaranteed

To your knowledge, have aboriginal perspectives and insights informed the direction, and influenced the development of the management approach identified?

- Not until now, with the community dialogue happening
- I admire the MNO for feeling compelled to be part of the decision making process with the NWMO, since the government are a bunch of procrastinators.

Could Metis traditional knowledge play an important part in the recommendation or decision making process for a management approach?

- Yes, our communities are growing and building strength and could provide excellent insight to generating ideas
- We should hold an elders and youth conference soon with this being the theme
- Do we have the knowledge?
- Yes, we have many in our community that can advocate the sensitivity of lands

Northwestern Ontario Metis Community Dialogue on:
Canada's Option for the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste

January 30, 2005
Hotel Rendezvous – Ft. Frances, ON

Preliminary Notes:

1. Participants:

There were 38 participants present at this dialogue process, representing five community councils including; the Sunset Country Metis Council, Dryden Metis Council, Kenora Metis Council, Rainy River Metis Council and the Thunder Bay Metis Council

The Provisional Council of the Metis Nation of Ontario were represented by Tony Belcourt – President, Gary Lipiniski – Chairperson, France Picotte – Co-Chairperson, Tim Pile – Secretary Treasurer, Pete Leferbrve – Executive Director and Marc Neumann – Youth Rep

The MNO facilitator was represented by Paul Heighington

Special guest Included Metis National Council President, Clement Chartier

The following are comments made during the dialogue session and comments received from the completed MNO Nuclear Survey

2. Nuclear Fuel Management Concepts:

2.1 Storage at Reactor Sites:

2.1.1 Advantages:

- None given

2.1.2 Limitations:

- Costs too high

2.1.3 Other comments about the concept:

- Against dump nuclear waste

2.2 Deep Geological Disposal:

2.1.1 Advantages:

- None given

2.1.2 Limitations:

- Ground could cave in

2.1.2 Other comments about the concept:

2.3 Centralized Storage:

2.3.1 Advantages:

- None given

2.3.2 Limitations:

- None given

2.3.3 Other comments about the concept:

- Danger for terrorists

Other comments on the management concepts and presentation:

- Site selection: who picks them? Where does it go? Where are we going to dump this stuff?
- I heard discussion that the government may find a place around the Timmins area, is this true?
- We should just get out of the industry, however we still have to deal with the waste
- We reap what we sow. Southern Ontario does absorb a lot of energy. Is there any way that we cannot use alternative sites that aren't inhabited?
- How do they fill the casks? Do they wait til they have 350 bundles for dry storage? Where are they keeping them until then?
- When does industry think they are going to build this thing?

3.0 Other comments from the Dialogue:

Other Comments and questions were asked not related to the management options, but are important to the overall discussion and are loosely grouped under the following categories:

3.1 Alternative energy sources or solutions:

- More research is needed on alternative sources of energy less harmful to the environment and future generations – we have a history of ecological disasters
- we here in the north are clearly affected by the changes in the climate -- who needs to be more pro-active in finding better energy sources than nuclear
- Can we get enough energy from wind?

3.2 Nuclear energy and waste issues:

- The presentation doesn't tell how much power is generated in my area from nuclear energy. Maybe the waste should stay in the areas that produce
- If we shut down the reactors we still have to get rid of the waste. If we go to alternative energies, what would happen to the existing sites and waste?
- I am in favour of alternate resources, but think there is a spot somewhere for the nuclear waste
- What is the effect on global warming

3.3. Governance and Public Participation Issues:

- Who is the NWMO Advisory Committee?
- Is the MNO willing to strike a community of some kind to work on this issue?

4.0 Questions & Comments from MNO Survey:

The MNO distributed the MNO Nuclear Waste Management Survey at all dialogue sessions. The following are answers gathered from the completed survey questions:

In your opinion, are you in agreement with nuclear energy providing Ontario and Canada with its energy needs into the future?

- Is it not possible to research the possibility of a more friendly energy source such as wind power?
- This is going to be such a high cost for Canadian people

In your view, do you feel there are any concepts that are not present that should be part of the discussion? (Where do you think it should be stored?)

- It should be stored in a very far away place and closely guarded
- Site must be very safe
- Not in northern Ontario – keep it in Toronto

If there were economic benefits to your community, would you support nuclear storage in your region?

- I believe that we have disturbed mother nature enough and there is no economic benefit for that
- No, nuclear as we know it is always dangerous

To your knowledge, have aboriginal perspectives and insights informed the direction, and influenced the development of the management approached identified?

- Native peoples in my opinion are gentle fun loving people who are brought together for the love of the land. We have much to offer others about the land and the respect for it – history has proven this to be.
- I still think that we have some concerns of with them really listening to us
- As a people we have our rights and be enlightened to be a full participant in this process
- Don't regard us as a stranger in our own land – we could assist them
- No not to my knowledge

Could Metis traditional knowledge play and important part in the recommendation or decision making process for a management approach?

- Absolutely, as long as such things as greed, self-promotion and mis-management does take place, traditional knowledge is the cornerstone of which decisions could be based on
- Yes, we have many people in my community of Kenora who educate government and nuclear people about the area
- Yes, if the right people were involved

**Greater Abitibi-Temiskaming Region Metis Community Dialogue on:
Canada's Options for the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste**

Saturday February 5, 2005
Centennial Hall – Timmins, ON

Preliminary Notes:

1.0 Participants:

There were 67 participants that attended the dialogue session. Participants were represented by the five area community councils which included; the Timmins Metis Council, Northern Lights Metis Council, Temiskaming Metis Council and the Chapleau Metis Council.

The Provisional Council of the Metis Nation of Ontario was represented by Tony Belcourt – President, Gary Lipinski – Chairperson, France Picotte – Co-Chairperson, Tim Pile – Secretary Treasurer, Pete Lefebvre – Executive Director, Women's rep and Marc Neumann – Youth Rep.

The MNO facilitator for the dialogue session was Paul Heighington.

The following comments were received from the dialogue session and completed MNO Nuclear Waste Management surveys:

2.0 Nuclear Fuel Waste Management Concepts:

2.1 Storage at Reactor Sites:

2.1.1 Advantages:

- Stays where it is
- Constantly under observation
- No transportation risks

2.1.2 Limitations:

- Seems like it is a interim solution
- Not a solid long-term plan – in effect making no decision
- Increases the security threat
- Costs will continue forever at the taxpayers' expense
- Limited storage capacity

2.1.2 Other comments about the concept

- Very serious if chosen
- Too dangerous
- The waste should definitely be stored at the reactor sites
- If you keep at the reactor sites, you eliminate the danger of double handling the hazardous waste
- Leave it where it is, the areas are already contaminated dead zones

2.2 Deep Geological Disposal

2.2.1 Advantages:

- Out of sight, out of mind
- Job creation opportunities in communities
- Much safer in all aspects and unlimited storage potential

2.2.2 Limitations:

- Is the Canada Shield the most stable concept
- How can this be measured
- Transportation concerns

2.2.3 Other comments about the concept:

- Do not like the idea of putting into the ground
- We don't know the potential effects yet if put inside the rock
- Too dangerous
- None are safe
- Impact of the earth underground
- I have concerns regarding leaching of the structure below
- Ground is unstable -- there are sinkholes, ground movement and temperature changes
- Some disaster is bound to happen during the transportation of the waste.
- A big "no"

2.3 Centralized Storage:

2.3.1 Advantages:

- Cost effective
- In one place

2.3.2 Limitations:

- Transportation concerns

- Must be under ground for heighten security

2.3.3 Other comments about the concept:

- Too dangerous
- None are safe

Other general comments about the management concepts and presentation:

- I was very impressed with the presentation and have learned a lot about a topic that I honestly have not given much thought to. The nuclear issue is important and I think today's generation must deal with a final solution on the waste issue.
- Some participants were very concerned and they hoped northern Ontario would not be stuck with Toronto's burden
- Participants were very supportive of keeping the used fuel at the reactors sites
- There is no safe site to disposal of nuclear fuel waste because there is a danger of emissions into our water
- Why should this area accept the waste, we don't want government thinking because there is less people in the north that this is the best location for the storage facility

3.0 Other comments from the Dialogue:

Other Comments and questions were asked not related to the management options, but are important to the overall discussion and have loosely grouped under the following categories:

3.1 Alternative energy sources or solutions:

- We need to find alternative energy to supply us like wind or solar

3.2 Nuclear energy and waste issues:

- How is the nuclear energy transported to the sites where they are stored
- Lets get out of the nuclear production business
- I do not want the waste at all. Up here, we have had to deal with Toronto wanting to truck all their garbage to this area and throw it in an abandoned mine pit. The south can keep their waste – we don't want it.

3.3 International issues:

- Maybe we should follow the examples of other countries in the world, like Germany, that is shutting down its nuclear power plants

4. Questions & Comments from MNO Survey:

Other Comments and questions were asked not related to the management options, but are important to the overall discussion and are loosely grouped under the following categories

In your opinion, are you in agreement with nuclear energy providing Ontario and Canada with its energy needs into the future?

- Yes, but in 40 or 50 years other sources of energy available may change the whole prospect for nuclear energy to generate power
- No, its too much of a risk to our future generations
- Before beginning to produce nuclear energy they should have had an proper plan of ways disposal
- Why are we in the process of discussing the storage of the waste while we are still producing this waste?

In your view, do you feel there any concepts that are not present that should be part of the discussion?

- Maybe store it in Africa and create some energy there instead of building dams from water
- Unfortunately we've started this process without having all the answers to the long-term implications
- Should not have started without a long-term storage plan. Maybe we should send it to another planet or the moon.
- What about sending to another country that would accept the waste?
- Keep it on site and use the resources to look into researching ways of utilizing the waste
- Can we not find a way to destroy the material?

If there were economic benefits to your community, would you support nuclear storage in your region?

- I would never accept a storage facility in my area
- Not for the money, this issue is too important to be blurred by dollars
- I don't want Toronto's garbage no matter what the economic benefits are
- No amount of money will replace your health – the waste will pollute the environment, water and vegetation

To your knowledge, have aboriginal perspectives and insights informed the direction, and influenced the development of the management approached identified?

- I personally did not know about this issue or our involvement until today
- Not sure yet, however I am glad to see that efforts are put forth
- We will see with the final report from the NWMO and from government

Could Metis traditional knowledge play and important part in the recommendation or decision making process for a management approach?

- If the government is willing to help the Metis with rolling up our traditional knowledge, we could be a important part of any decision being made on the site location
- Who knows – would government or industry care or even listen?
- I would like to believe so
- I think that a spiritual approach is important considering all life on this planet now and in the future

Greater Sudbury Region Metis Dialogue on:
Canada's Options for the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste

Saturday February 11, 2005
Howard Johnson's Hotel – Sudbury, ON

Preliminary Notes:

1.0 Participants:

There were 86 participants that attended the dialogue session. Participants were representative of five community councils, including the Sault Ste. Marie Metis Community Council, Thessalon Metis Council, Bruce Mines Metis Council, Sudbury Metis Council and the North Bay Metis Council.

The Provisional Council of the Metis Nation of Ontario (PCMNO) was represented by Tony Belcourt – President, Gary Lipinski – Chairperson, Tim Pile – Secretary Treasurer, Pete Lefebvre – Executive Director and Marc Neumann – Youth Rep.

The MNO facilitator on the dialogue session was Paul Heighington

The following are comments received from the dialogue and completed MNO Nuclear Waste Management Survey to date:

2.0 Nuclear Fuel Waste Management Concepts:

2.1 Storage at Reactor Sites:

2.1.1 Advantages:

- One participant said that its already there and that might the best place to keep it
- Their would be very little or no transportation needed reducing costs of wear and tear on our highways

2.1.2 Limitations:

- There was some concern that reactors sites were not planned to be permanent – should those communities be burden with it?
- A participant thought this concept would be too expensive to maintain because of multiple sites and the taxpayers would be on the hook
- Storage at reactor sites would pose a real security threat in several places
- There is no infrastructure at existing sites

- One participant thought there would be increased health and safety concerns in communities where the reactor are located
- Storage at reactor sites could come under threat by any natural disasters

2.1.3 Other comments about the concept:

- A participant said it would be paramount to making no decision
- Is there currently any room for the future waste and the existing sites?
- Sounds good, but how much may be stored at the reactors

2.2 Deep Geological Disposal

2.2.1 Advantages:

- It would be cheaper to the taxpayer over the long-term if stored in one place
- If it is underground, the structure will last longer because it will not be exposed to the elements
 - safer than outside storage
- Probably the safest and cheapest of the three concepts
- Will provide the best security hundreds of feet underground

2.2.2 Limitations:

- Out of sight, out of mind
- Transporting the waste to one location could lead other troubling issues such truck or rail accidents
- There would be no options in the future for retrieving the waste
- One participant thought the costs would be like any other mega-project --- expensive
- Another participant was concerned about the possible contamination of the water table

2.2.3 Other comments about the concept:

- Could use existing mine shafts and fill in with cement
- We have no way of predicting nature under the earth's surface
- Are earthquakes a factor in the planning of the management concept?
- What about the ground caving in?
- I think this is a good type of disposal, but how much space would this take
- Just another way to pollute the earth
- It would a boost to a regional economy

2.3 Centralized Storage

2.3.1 Advantages:

- One site to monitor and will be watched constantly
- More secure than current storage facilities
- Purpose built and suitable for storage
- Sufficient security would be in available in one place
- Ability to access materials if needed in the future
- Could be implemented, prior to extensive consultations with host community

2.3.2 Limitations:

- Transportation concerns would increase as waste is moved to one central location
- High costs of up-keeping site infrastructure --- site will wear over time
- Site selection will be challenging and maybe difficult to find willing community to host the storage facility
- Concerns were raised that in light of the new security environment we live in a that a centralized site above ground will pose potential terrorist threats

2.3.3 Other comments about concept:

- Management and responsibility will need public, not government oversight
- This is really beyond my knowledge to make any comments
- Centralized storage seems to be the most reasonable option based on today's lense

Other General comments about the management concepts and presentation:

- Some participants regarded the presentation as a very informative exercise, and had given them an opportunity to begin thinking about the issue and the concepts proposed
- Why is the MNO involved with industry and government on this?
- A participant did not want the MNO to do the government's bidding

3.0 Other Comments from Dialogue:

Other Comments and questions were asked not related to the management options, but are important to the overall discussion and are loosely grouped under the following categories:

3.1 Alternative Energy Sources or solutions:

- I think Canada and the world should look at other services of energy. We should not look strictly at nuclear
- We must look at alternative sources of energy, such as solar
- It has always been a dream and desire of mine to be self-sufficient so we are not faced with this problem. I think if we slowly make these changes in new communities and new homes ...there are new resources out there already and we are responsible to try to take advantage of them
- We enjoy power and we call hydro our source of electricity for life, but we tend to live beyond our means and maybe its time we cut back

- I took a vacation and toured the hydro projects in the Quebec. It seems that Quebec is a leader. They have built huge dams; have flooded some lands but created work for generations. We should be looking at creating dams and not nuclear reactors
- Energy conservation should be the number one priority for Ontario
- There are better ways to produce energy such as wind, solar or reducing consumption
- We need to invest in cleaner, safer and cheaper energy
- Technology is a wonderful theory when used with common sense or respect – just because we can do something with should not
- We need to look for better, more friendly environmental sources of energy
- Hydro costs are very expensive now --- what's the future generations going to pay? Ew sources have been established
- With any type of energy, there are both good and bad effects. Unfortunately, most information is obtained only after production begins

3.2 Nuclear Energy and Waste Issues:

- When the rods are cooled down in wet storage – what happens to the water?
- We should keep the waste close to home
- Is there a way of recycling or reusing the waste?
- It is an issue of the future. Our children, our great, great grandchildren will be impacted and we have to think seriously about this waste. They don't even know for sure what will happen with this stuff. They should have considered this before they started playing with nuclear energy production
- I have a solution – why don't they just shoot into space?
- It seems to me that mother earth must be left to take care of it in its natural form
- One of the things I am realizing is how little I know about the effects and the dangers of nuclear waste. The presentation gives us only a few options
- My concern is that we have problems today like finances and health and yet the government is now charging us more for energy to get less
- There is so much risk when dealing with nuclear energy and the waste
- This is a fairly new thing. Nobody knows down the road the effects it will have on people and the earth
- I am not for nuclear energy, but I'm sure I wouldn't be one of the first to complain. I am sure we can come out of this with a more secure source of power in the future
- Lets get out of the nuclear producing industry
- Ship it to the sun in outer space
- Get out of the nuclear producing industry
- Neither land or water --- I feel they should resolve within another solution
- More public awareness is needed before any real or safe disposal is implemented
- Do we still want the Ontario government to use nuclear power?
- Let's mothball the reactors like Germany's doing before it is too late

3.3 Governance and Public Participation Issues:

- I was wondering if we would consult with municipalities in the north? I think it would be important that the Metis Nation meet with other community representatives on this issue

- I am not sure how much we can trust government – there are many sites that have to be cleaned up
- What are the companies who are making profits doing about it? Their input must be secret. They should come forward and tell us how much money they are making and how they will help
- That fact is that we don't have any of our experts in this area who can be giving us advice from a technological viewpoint. In our communities, I believe we have some citizens who have good knowledge in this field that could assist the Metis Nation in bringing forth recommendations -- we should work with First Nations and should not necessarily give a position on this subject right away
- We should definitely consult with other municipalities
- To date my confidence in the current authorities of nuclear energy production has not been compromised
- A greater perspective of the overall need of the Metis homeland in relation to energy, health and the economy would increase the ability to develop a sound opinion on a this specific issue.
- One the main weaknesses of this process is that it is government driven – not by the public

3.4 Geographic Regions:

- One of the things is if there is a decision on what geographic regions at play, there will be a definite economic opportunity for the host community and should be considered in our discussion
- What response does northern Ontario have on this issue? Do you feel it should be brought to the north?
- Feedback from northern Ontario is important because this is where Toronto wants to send the nuclear waste

3.5 International Issues:

- I am not sure if we should accept the waste from another country. Each country should be responsible to take care of their waste. It is important that the international community work together to find a global solution but I am not sure if I want waste from another country
- If Germany can get out of nuclear production – Canada can too
- We should be constantly checking on what the rest of the world is doing on getting rid of their nuclear waste – Many great scientists in the world are working on this serious problem

4.0 Questions & Comments from MNO Survey:

The MNO distributed the MNO Nuclear Waste Management Survey at all dialogue sessions. The following are answers gathered from the completed survey questions:

In your opinion, are you in agreement with nuclear energy providing Ontario and Canada with its energy needs into the future

- No, there has been many effective, cost efficient ways to produce energy like solar and wind
- Our energy needs on Ontario are considerable and the demand has continued to increase. I am comfortable that the benefit outweighs the risks of this power sources, though I would be open to supporting other viable options if they present themselves
- I am in agreement, however should look at other similar and safer ways in the future such as looking a more water turbines improvements in the future

In your view, do you feel there are any concepts that are not present that should be part of the discussion:

- self sufficiency and the costs –how about go it on our own in the future
- Should be accessible just in case there is a way to use it in the future
- Underground in old mine shafts
- What options?
- I feel there must be other options
- Canada should stop production of nuclear energy --- we must learn from our mistakes

If there were economic benefits to your community, would you support nuclear storage in your region?

- No, there is no price to the health and safety of the community
- Security is never guaranteed
- If all matters i.e. risks, health, the environment was addressed and a sound, safe plan was created – yes.
- Yes, as long as it would be done in the safest possible manner – it has to go somewhere
- It would be okay if it was made in our own immediate area
- If we produce here in Sudbury, then we should store it
- Not in my background
- If there was even a 1% risk, it is not worth it
- I would chose life and health over money and short term gain
- Not sure, we need to look at the whole concept of the workplan
- Yes, if proper health and safety concerns could be satisfied, I would consider it --- Our community is poor and are losing our health services
- Let's look at the economic benefits to communities of other alternative energy sources

To your knowledge, have aboriginal perspectives and insights informed the direction, and influenced the development of the management approaches identified?

- I am proud to Metis and I know that the MNO has this issue in their heart and resolution is of great importance
- Yes, much more than I was aware of
- Yes, I think they have somewhat

- No as discussion is just now being implemented
- I think it is good during the process that they ask us if we are informed
- My knowledge of being Aboriginal, would be that this is not a healthy option for energy for people or our planet
- Other than this presentation, not to my knowledge
- I would be interested in hearing from Metis senators and youth reps on these issues
- Common sense first off, then aboriginal perspectives and insights come into play --- if we can't respect mother earth she will no longer sustain us
- I do not have enough knowledge on this
- I have little or no information to make any kind of opinion regarding this question
- Not yet, the dialogue with aboriginal peoples has just got underway

Could Metis traditional knowledge play an important part in the recommendation or decision making process for a management approach?

- Have we heard anything from the other community dialogues on Metis traditional knowledge?
- We should hear from our senators/ people who know and the youth on what their understanding is to this question
- I believe that the Metis is on its way to live clean, providing and maintaining life that should be priority above all
- Yes it could be utilized
- Definite use
- Yes, I believe it would be good that traditional knowledge and the Metis teachings of this area could be part of the process
- I hope so
- I believe that the unique heritage we have as Metis people gives us an opportunity to be leaders in environmental concerns – we need specific elder input and youth input
- I don't know anything that I have heard to date that could be utilized
- Yes, it could play an important role --- traditional knowledge holders will have the greatest insight into the environmental effects/impacts because they respect mother earth, something the "white man" has forgotten
- We are already part of this discussion along with all citizens
- Yes, I think we should have a say in what happens to mother earth
- Metis citizens who use the land on a daily basis (trappers and harvesters) could possibly give valuable testimony as the effects of nuclear use
- Yes, our stories and teachings reflect timeless insights of humanity is sound and should be a meaningful part of this process --- However, I would be unhappy if it is used not for our benefit
- No I don't think so for we have no professional people who know about nuclear waste