

# Information Sessions Report – May to December 2009

NWMO SR-2010-03

January 2010

DPRA

**nwmo**

NUCLEAR WASTE  
MANAGEMENT  
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION  
DES DÉCHETS  
NUCLÉAIRES



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

Tel: 416-934-9814  
Web: [www.nwmo.ca](http://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 Dialogue Reports**

The work of the NWMO is premised on the understanding that citizens have the right to know about and participate in discussions and decisions that affect their quality of life, including the long-term management of used nuclear fuel. Citizens bring special insight and expertise which result in better decisions. Decisions about safety and risk are properly societal decisions and for this reason the priorities and concerns of a broad diversity of citizens, particularly those most affected, need to be taken into account throughout the process. A critical component of APM is the inclusive and collaborative process of dialogue and decision-making through the phases of implementation.

In order to ensure that the implementation of APM reflects the values, concerns and expectations of citizens at each step along the way, the NWMO plans to initiate a broad range of activities. For each of these activities, reports are prepared by those who designed and conducted the work. This document is one such report. The nature and conduct of our activities is expected to change over time, as best practices evolve and the needs and preferences of citizens with respect to dialogue on nuclear waste management questions is better understood.

---

### 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.

---

Nuclear Waste Management Organization

# Regional Public Information Sessions

May to December 2009

Information Sessions Report

January 27, 2010

**nwmo**  
NUCLEAR WASTE  
MANAGEMENT  
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION  
DES DÉCHETS  
NUCLÉAIRES



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	LOCATIONS.....	3
2.2	FORMAT OF THE INFORMATION SESSIONS .....	3
2.3	MATERIALS FOR INFORMATION SESSION ATTENDEES.....	4
2.4	ADVERTISING AND COMMUNICATIONS.....	5
2.5	ATTENDANCE .....	6
<b>3.0</b>	<b>KEY FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	SITING PROCESS .....	7
3.1.1	LOCATION SPECIFIC COMMENTS.....	11
3.2	TECHNICAL ISSUES .....	11
3.2.1	LOCATION SPECIFIC COMMENTS.....	12
3.3	SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES .....	12
3.3.1	LOCATION SPECIFIC COMMENTS.....	13
3.4	ENGAGEMENT .....	13
3.4.1	LOCATION SPECIFIC COMMENTS.....	15
<b>4.0</b>	<b>CLOSING REMARKS.....</b>	<b>16</b>

### APPENDICES:

- Appendix A: Regional Areas
- Appendix B: Information Sessions Story Boards
- Appendix C: Participant Materials
- Appendix D: Advertising and Notification

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

This document is a report on the 17 regional public information sessions held by the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) to engage the Canadian public in dialogue on its proposed process for selecting a site for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel.

The NWMO was established in 2002 to assume responsibility for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel. Initially, the NWMO's mandate was the study of options for long-term management, and in 2005, it submitted its study and recommendation to Government. Subsequently, in 2007 the Government of Canada selected "Adaptive Phased Management" (APM) as the preferred approach for the long-term management of used nuclear fuel.

The NWMO's mandate is to implement Adaptive Phased Management. Through dialogue and discussions with Canadians, the NWMO seeks to collaboratively design the process that will be used to identify a safe and secure site in an informed and willing community to host Canada's long-term management facilities for used nuclear fuel.

As part of its engagement program on the proposed siting process, the NWMO hosted 17 regional public information sessions in the four provinces involved in the nuclear fuel cycle: New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Saskatchewan. The NWMO's objectives of the Information Sessions are as follows:

- To provide the general public with opportunities to learn about the NWMO, APM and the draft proposal for selecting a site for the long-term management of used nuclear fuel;
- To solicit informed comment from attendees with respect to the proposed siting process;
- To confirm that the proposed siting process is consistent with Canadian values;
- To document the discussion and comments on the proposed siting process, particularly in terms of feedback from the general public; and
- To complement other NWMO engagement activities planned for 2009.

### **This Report**

This report describes the methodology and findings from the regional public information sessions, specifically the following:

- Information on the regional locations, format and attendance at the regional information sessions;
- Background NWMO documentation provided to attendees;
- Advertising and communications to invite participation; and,

- A summary of the attendee comments and suggestions.

The report is structured according to the following sections:

Section 2: Methodology

Section 3: Key Findings

Section 4: Summary

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Locations

The locations for the regional public information sessions held in each of Canada's four nuclear provinces were determined using a regional approach. This approach was designed to ensure that sessions were conducted in each major region in the province, with the information session held in a regional centre. The dates and locations for the regional public information sessions were as follows:

Province	Locations	Date
New Brunswick	Edmundston	June 4, 2009
	Fredericton	June 3, 2009
	Saint John	June 4, 2009
	Bathurst	June 18, 2009
Québec	Montréal	June 1, 2009
	Trois-Rivières	June 2, 2009
	Québec City	June 3, 2009
Ontario	London	May 19, 2009
	Walkerton	May 20, 2009
	Toronto	May 21, 2009
	Sudbury	May 25, 2009
	Thunder Bay	May 26, 2009
	Whitby	May 28, 2009
	Ottawa	June 8, 2009
Saskatchewan	Regina	December 7, 2009
	Prince Albert	December 8, 2009
	Saskatoon	December 9, 2009

The list of key cities and towns covered in each regional area and a map of each province showing the regional centre is provided in Appendix A.

### 2.2 Format of the Information Sessions

The regional public information sessions were held in an informal open house format, inviting attendees to review the proposed process for selecting a site and provide comment on it. Attendees were invited to pick up a copy of the discussion document, view story boards, obtain background information, watch an NWMO video, complete a workbook and have discussions with NWMO staff. The sessions were held from 2 to 9 p.m. in each regional centre.

A set of story boards provided information that included (but was not limited to) the following:

- Who is the NWMO and what is its mandate?
- What is used nuclear fuel and where and how is it currently stored?
- What is Canada's plan for the long-term management of used nuclear fuel?
- What is Adaptive Phased Management?
- What are some of the key components of the process for selecting a site proposed by the NWMO?
  - Guiding principles and steps for a proposed process for selecting a site;
  - Transportation issues;
  - Ensuring safety and community well-being;
  - The regulatory process; and,
- Invitation to provide comments.

A copy of the full set of story boards is provided in Appendix B.

## 2.3 Materials for Information Session Attendees

A broad range of materials was provided for attendees at the information sessions. Key information related to the proposed process for selecting a site was provided in the following formats:

- A movie on the proposed site selection process was shown at the sessions. It was entitled "Moving Forward Together";
- A 40 page discussion document, "Moving Forward Together: Designing the Process for Selecting a Site – Invitation to Review a Proposed Process for Selecting a Site" (May 2009);
- A six-page fold-out summary of the discussion document;
- A self-directed workbook with information on the proposed process for selecting a site and a series of questions for attendees; and,
- Backgrounders and information sheets on a range of related topics.

Computer stations were available at each information session for attendees who wished to provide their comments in an online version of the workbook.

Also available as background information for attendees was a series of background papers on the following topics:

NWMO Backgrounders	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Who We Are</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Status of National Used Fuel/High- Level Radioactive Waste Management Programs</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Nature of the Hazard</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Climate Change</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Security and Safeguards</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Canadian Nuclear Regulatory Framework</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project Description of Canada's Long-Term Plan for Used Nuclear Fuel Management</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Monitoring and Retrievability</li></ul>	

Comment cards and exit surveys were provided for attendee comments and suggestions at each session. The comments made in discussions at each session, including those provided in comment cards and exit surveys, are summarized in Section 3.0 Key Findings.

Copies of the NWMO discussion paper, discussion paper summary, workbook, backgrounders, comment card and exit survey are provided in Appendix C.

## 2.4 Advertising and Communications

The information sessions were advertised by means of a press release, newspaper advertisements and letters of invitation. A press release was issued on May 5, 2009 advertising the discussion paper and inviting attendance at the regional public information sessions.

Newspaper advertisements were placed by the NWMO in regional newspapers in the two weeks leading up to each information session. The dates and times of the sessions were also provided by the NWMO along with letters and the proposed siting process to those individuals on its mailing list and as well via email notification to the NWMO subscriber list.

Copies of the press release, a sample newspaper advertisement and the advertising plan are provided in Appendix D.

## 2.5 Attendance

A total of 717 people attended the regional public information sessions, as follows:

Location	Number	Location	Number
London	21	Trois-Rivières	23
Walkerton	21	Québec City	11
Toronto	68	Edmundston	30
Sudbury	83	Fredericton	30
Thunder Bay	60	Saint John	52
Whitby	21	Ottawa	41
Montréal	25	Bathurst	64
Regina	43	Prince Albert	65
Saskatoon	59		
<b>Total</b>			<b>717</b>

People attending the information sessions represented a broad range of interests. These included participation from the following types of organizations:

- Government (municipal, regional, provincial, federal);
- Members of Parliament;
- Political parties;
- Environmental/conservation groups;
- Educational organizations;
- Business/industry interests;
- Unions;
- First Nation and Métis;
- Social organizations (church, health);
- Media (print, radio, TV); and,
- Members of the public.

## 3.0 KEY FINDINGS

---

The summary of the findings is compiled from comments provided at the regional public information sessions, recorded on comment cards, provided in the exit surveys and handed in as submissions.

The summary of findings is provided according to the following themes:

- Siting Process
- Technical Issues
- Social and Economic Issues
- Engagement
- General Comments

### 3.1 Siting Process

---

#### ***Overview of the Proposed Siting Process***

Overall, attendees expressed positive comments with respect to the proposed siting approach; it was very well received. Many people indicated that they were impressed with the availability of information on the process and the opportunity to discuss the process with NWMO staff.

Attendees noted that the NWMO had taken the right approach by not being too prescriptive in selecting a particular site for the project. The facility was noted as being a good opportunity for a community with vision. Attendees asked whether the community would retain the right to close the facility after a certain threshold or quantity of bundles has been deposited. Some individuals felt that an expedited site selection process would be beneficial. Other attendees were pleased that early discussion with communities is recognized as part of the process.

A number of attendees expressed their concern that the siting process information downplayed environmental risks and presented a one-sided view of the waste management facility. They suggested that the NWMO should address potential pitfalls and challenges and provide information on the risks and hazards of radioactive spent fuel over time.

Some people raised questions about the relationship between the NWMO process and the federal and provincial environmental assessment processes.

#### ***Aboriginal Community Site***

Some attendees reiterated the importance of involving Aboriginal peoples in the siting process. There was a general acknowledgement that Aboriginal peoples are likely to be affected regardless of the site and will need to be involved in a fair way in decision-making, and it was noted that this had not necessarily been the case in other projects.

A comment was made on the possibility that First Nation communities could propose a site and use this as leverage in other provincial negotiations. Some Aboriginal and

First Nations representatives expressed distrust of the process stating: “We never agreed to the *Indian Act*, and it was imposed on us. We never agreed to the reserves, and they were imposed on us. How can we trust that a site will not be imposed on a community?”

### ***Timeframe***

The length of time the NWMO would take to find a site and construct a facility was seen by several people to be too long. Some attendees were concerned particularly about the process extending over multiple terms of office and were concerned how momentum might be sustained.

When the steps in the process were described and the reason for the length of time required, people were hard pressed to suggest how the process might be shortened. In response to the lengthy timeframe, some suggested that the NWMO may need to select an area, develop a short list, expropriate land or go directly to governments.

### ***Third-Party Review***

The Third-Party Review component of the process was seen to be important by many, particularly by those who are suspicious of the nuclear industry. People had questions about the mandate of such a group and how members would be selected. Others questioned how neutrality of third-party reviewers would be assured.

### ***Willing Host Community***

The willing host community approach was generally seen by attendees as the right one, but people were concerned about what would be done if this approach is not successful. Many assumed that the NWMO had a “Plan B” that it was not communicating and wanted to know what that was. Some felt that implementing the long term management plan for used fuel was so important that the government should decide upon a community and ensure the project moves forward. Many asked why we would not simply be focussing on locating this facility on Crown land, as this is in the hands of the government and covers more remote areas.

Attendees stated that they were not sure the willing host concept was workable. It was felt that more information was needed with respect to defining community willingness, and defining siting and safety criteria. Attendees also wanted to know how NWMO will judge whether a willing host community is sufficiently informed.

Session attendees expressed some concerns with regard to the communities that were to be affected by the siting process. Comments pointed to the idea that the NWMO wanted to “buy off” communities that were economically deprived. As well, people wondered how the negotiations would take place between the NWMO and the affected communities. It was important for attendees that the expression of willingness would not just be from the elected Council but be driven from citizens at a grassroots level.

Political indecisiveness and interference were noted as likely barriers to the site selection process, with attendees expressing concern about the role and influence of the federal government in the regulatory approvals process.

The issue of willingness was mentioned in several comments from most information session locations. While most attendees were pleased with the willing host approach

adopted by the NWMO, several indicated that demonstrating and measuring willingness would be difficult.

At the same time, attendees wondered how the NWMO planned on tackling jurisdictional issues where a region or a local government would accept to host the site, but a community would not. The issue of benefits was raised, with individuals seeking more discussion about risks and benefits as well as discussion on the funding formula to be used.

Doubt was expressed by some people that a consenting community would be found through this engagement process; the concern was that the NWMO would then unilaterally choose a site.

Some attendees were of the opinion that since municipalities exist through provincial laws, there should not be direct contact between the NWMO and municipalities, without going through the provinces. Others stated that permission of the province should be obtained before a site is selected in that province.

### ***Siting Process vs. Facility Siting***

Some attendees stated that they believed that the NWMO had already selected a location for a site or had a list of potential sites. Others were relieved to learn the site would be regulated regardless of which community accepts it. A number of the attendees in various locations thought that the regional information session was actually to find a site for the facility rather than to discuss a proposed siting process; moreover, they felt that their area was being targeted for a site. In some communities attendees mentioned that the media coverage implied that the area would be host to a potential waste management facility.

A number of people indicated in strong terms that they do not want a nuclear waste management facility of this type in their city or province. In one information session location in Ontario, a petition with several hundred names from the local high school was delivered to the session by one of the teachers. Some people said that the used nuclear fuel should “stay in the Toronto area where it belongs and where the nuclear energy is being produced”. Others indicated that the selection of a province for the waste management facility should take into account the quantity of waste produced in that province. The use of existing mines for a Deep Geological Repository facility was also proposed by some attendees.

Questions were asked at the information sessions about the role of the USA (or state government) if a community that steps forward is located close to the US border. People questioned whether, through the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Canada would have to accept used nuclear fuel from the USA in Saskatchewan, several people expressed their concern about, and opposition to, the potential for waste to come from the USA.

### ***Opposition to Nuclear Energy***

For some attendees in various information session locations, the key issue was broader than the siting process; they were concerned about the use of nuclear energy in general. These people preferred to have all energy come from renewable and clean energy sources, citing that nuclear energy “is neither clean nor environmentally friendly”.

In one information session location, approximately 12 anti-nuclear protesters picketed outside the venue and handed out pamphlets which read “Nuclear Power is Not Safe.”

Some people indicated that building this facility was an unspoken promotion of nuclear energy and felt that nuclear energy should be phased out. They suggested that it would be easier to find a disposal site if there is a commitment to stop producing nuclear energy, mentioning that with renewable energy, used fuel will no longer be a problem.

### ***Keeping Waste at Generation Sites***

Many people questioned why APM was selected as the preferred waste management approach; they wondered about how it was chosen as Canada’s plan and why another approach was not considered. Some people questioned the rationale for a centralized site.

In a number of information session locations, people expressed that they would like to see waste kept at the site where it is generated until the nuclear industry has been shut down and the production of waste has ceased, being concerned that the implementation of APM may encourage the growth of the nuclear industry. The suggestion was made that, if the lifespan of copper canisters is 100,000 years, then the canisters can be used for dry storage at the generation plants.

### ***Trust***

Trust was an issue for attendees at many information sessions. Many people expressed a lack of trust in the safety of the facility. Other people indicated they did not trust the NWMO because of its closeness to the nuclear industry. Attendees provided examples of cost overruns and other problems with existing nuclear facilities to illustrate their lack of trust of the nuclear industry.

Another issue among attendees was a lack of trust in government to effectively regulate the facility, citing that in the past, problems were not handled with openness. Some people did not trust that the regulatory standards are sufficiently rigorous.

Some attendees thought that in the long term, the site or the NWMO would be privatized, and they were concerned that the private sector would not respect the same standards. They indicated that they placed more trust in public sector oversight.

### 3.2.1 Location Specific Comments

- A number of attendees in New Brunswick mentioned the position taken by the provincial government to not import any nuclear waste into the province. Some people noted that a fault line and seismic activity in New Brunswick make the province unsuitable for a deep geological repository.
- Many attendees in Québec wanted to make sure that the NWMO was aware of the National Assembly resolution, and therefore questioned why the NWMO was conducting sessions in the province. Some Québec attendees believe that a facility in Québec would not be fair, noting that Québec produces only 4% of nuclear waste.
- Several attendees at the information sessions in Saskatchewan voiced their disagreement that the NWMO include the province as a potential site for long-term storage of used nuclear fuel. They indicate that, unlike Ontario, Québec and New Brunswick, Saskatchewan is not a 'nuclear province' and should not be considered for a repository.
- The question was asked: "Since Saskatchewan sells uranium to other countries, would we be responsible for also accepting used nuclear fuel from them?"

## 3.2 Technical Issues

### *Retrievability*

Some attendees questioned why retrievability is part of APM, expressing their concern that the nuclear industry has a plan for reprocessing this material in the future, which is the reason for this component of APM. Some questioned how the prospect of retrievability might affect the decision on a site.

While some people were satisfied with retrievability as being a very positive aspect, others did not like the opportunity for retrievability because of the potential for weapons use.

### *The Environment*

Information session attendees expressed anxiety about the possible effects of nuclear waste on the environment. For the most part, people sought clarification on the effects of used nuclear fuel on watersheds, drinking water, groundwater and fish. Some attendees felt that the NWMO information downplayed the environmental risks involved with the waste management process. The efficacy of geological barriers, disruption of groundwater flow, the potential for seismic activity and the issue of retrievability in the event of an earthquake were of particular concern to the attendees.

### *Monitoring*

Many people wanted to know about how the facility would be monitored over the long term to ensure it is safe and how long this monitoring would extend. Attendees highlighted the need for the community to have a role in monitoring.

### ***Recycling/Reprocessing***

Some attendees wanted to know how the opportunity for recycling/reprocessing was being explored and protected in the process; others felt that consideration should be given to re-using/recycling spent fuel instead of burying it.

Other people at the information sessions wanted the prospect of recycling shut down; there was the risk of a proliferation and were concerned about the option for retrievability for this reason.

Attendees were interested in finding out how other nuclear nations were dealing with their used nuclear fuel and whether the NWMO had explored these options. An example was provided about the potential use of thorium as opposed to non-enriched uranium and whether the NWMO would be dealing with this kind of change in technology. Questions were raised about whether the NWMO was exploring other options, specifically partitioning, transmutation and vitrification.

#### **3.2.1 Location Specific Comments**

- Problems at the New Brunswick and Ontario nuclear facilities were reported to result in a lack of trust for participants.
- Participants raised questions about the potential environmental or ecosystem effects around the Bruce and Pickering nuclear stations.

### **3.3 Social and Economic Issues**

#### ***Health and Safety***

Many attendees expressed concerns about whether used nuclear fuel can be safely managed for the long period of time required, and how we can be sure that APM will safely and securely contain and isolate the used fuel for hundreds, even thousands of years. People asked if this type of facility has been built anywhere in the world and is in operation, and were concerned that there is not experience to draw upon. Many people at the information sessions cited what they identified as past problems in nuclear facilities in general and nuclear waste facilities in other parts of the world in particular as part of the basis for their concern about APM. Some expressed their belief that the US had cancelled the proposed Yucca Mountain site out of safety concerns.

Several attendees felt that the approach to safety assurance (e.g. the science and multiple barrier system) was sound. Some recommended that NWMO should carry out a health baseline study as part of the site selection process.

Questions were raised about how the site would be marked, particularly in the event of major catastrophic environmental problems, so that it could be identified by the population as and when needed.

#### ***Transportation***

Many people had questions and concerns about the safety of transportation and expressed a desire for transportation distances to be limited. Attendees in all information session locations felt that transportation communities ought to have a

say; however, there was no common view on how much influence they should have in decision-making.

Attendees were interested in how the NWMO planned to deal with transportation safety issues regarding potential impacts on communities and the environment due to the hauling of radioactive waste. Some people were interested in compensation for communities that would be affected as a result of the used nuclear fuel travelling through them in order to reach a site at a distance.

It was noted by some attendees that transportation accidents do occur which caused them to feel that radioactive materials “don’t belong on our roads.” More generally, people expressed interest in having more information on all the particulars dealing with transportation of radioactive waste, including the design and safety of the containers that would be used to transport the waste. Some attendees suggested that NWMO should have discussions with all provinces to be crossed in transporting the waste.

### ***Economics***

Attendees expressed the need to know the real costs of the proposed management method. Some people felt that the potential economic benefits of hosting a waste management site were of importance, particularly in relation to job creation, local training opportunities and a buy-local policy. Concern was expressed that the project not be out sourced.

Some attendees questioned whether or not it is cheaper to keep the waste above ground from an economic and monitoring stand point and wondered why that option was taken off the table.

### **3.3.1 Location Specific Comments**

- Some New Brunswick participants were concerned about the long-term financial health of New Brunswick Power. They asked question regarding whether the utility was putting in enough money and wanted to see financial statements.
- Some participants in Saskatchewan indicated that used nuclear fuel should not be transported to the province due to distance from generation, insurance costs, danger of terrorist attack and the fact that there are no nuclear plants in Saskatchewan.

## **3.4 Engagement**

### **Information Sessions Well Conducted**

Generally, attendees in most locations thought the information sessions were well done with clear, informative and educational information. Attendees enjoyed the discussion with staff and the one-on-one story board walk-about. Complimentary comments were provided about the content of the boards and the amount of time that NWMO staff was taking to explain the overall project, the need for it, and the process that is currently being undertaken to develop an approach for siting the waste management facility. Positive comments were also made on the video “Moving Forward Together” presented on the siting process.

### ***Certainty of Information***

In some sessions, the message given by attendees was related to the “certainty” of the NWMO information in the literature and the story boards. They suggested that information should also be made available on the types of dangers involved in managing high-level radioactive waste, the potential for leaks once storage has begun and potential consequences of a breach in containment or barriers over hundreds of years. They indicated that having the pros and cons of the repository presented would allow for informed questions, discussions and debate. Some attendees noted that doubt was never expressed in the information, nor any aspects related to risk. Attendees felt that this does not increase trust because it gives the impression that “all is not said.”

### **Information Session Staff**

Many of the attendees expressed appreciation about the availability of NWMO staff to assist with answering questions and understanding the overall concepts and the site selection process. Attendees, who at the outset had little knowledge of nuclear issues, were impressed by the access to highly skilled professionals.

### **Low Attendance**

With respect to the overall intent of informing people, many attendees questioned why so few people were coming out to the information sessions. Many attendees feel this is an important issue and one that Canadians should know about.

Some attendees suggested that more needs to be done in terms of publicizing the sessions. The suggestions for additional methods of reaching out to educate people included the following:

- Extend newspaper advertising for longer periods and more local newspapers;
- Expand media advertising to include radio and TV announcements;
- Extend advertising to malls, universities and high schools;
- Have more signs outside the information session buildings;
- Disseminate more information; and
- Communicate with professional associations.

Some mistakes in the French advertisements in a particular community were noted by attendees; some stated that they could not access the French NWMO web site.

### **Future Participation**

Approximately 75% (155 of the 206 attendees who completed the exit surveys) expressed interest in participating in future information sessions.

For future sessions, attendees indicated that the pros and cons of the siting process should be clearly provided and that the NWMO website should be easier to follow with future events clearly outlined. People also stated that future sessions should take place at more public and accessible locations such as schools or malls.

A number of attendees indicated that the information sessions should be structured to allocate time for presentations and questions for people in a larger group. It was

suggested that this would help in understanding others' views and formulating their questions. Such a format, they suggested, would lend itself to more informed discussions. Others proposed the idea of town hall meetings.

Some attendees sought to know what other people who attended previous sessions said about the process and any questions that have arisen following these sessions. Many people at the information sessions liked the session, but were disappointed that it was not in a more formal setting.

### ***Story Boards***

The story boards were generally seen to be very helpful and provided a good foundation for one-on-one discussions with NWMO staff and gave a good overview of the story on their own.

Some attendees provided suggestions for the types of information they felt would also be beneficial to present on the story boards:

- Instead of the skating rink image to depict the volume of spent nuclear waste, present examples using a building;
- Provide information on the half life of radioactive waste;
- Clarify the types and timing of environmental impact assessments;
- Provide additional information on the types of transport for used nuclear fuel;
- Depict the total nuclear cycle – generation to disposal;
- Use of terminology such as “radioactive waste” or “nuclear waste” instead of “used fuel”; and
- Provide more detail on the technical selection criteria.

It was also suggested by attendees that the NWMO provide photos of existing nuclear waste storage facilities and develop a small scale model of a DGR facility to better help people visualize the concept.

### ***Engagement with Additional Sectors***

It was suggested in several sessions that universities near the repository site be brought in the project. It was felt that a local university could be engaged to research the latest developments and train people in nuclear physics and nuclear health. Some attendees suggested that where there is not a university or college nearby, one might be constructed as part of the project.

A suggestion was made that tourism potential of the NWMO process could be maximized by having information/education centres in big cities, as well as the Centres of Excellence within the host community. Some attendees suggested that the Centre of Excellence proposed for a preferred site should be located nearby, but not directly at the site, for broader exposure.

#### **3.4.1 Location Specific Comments**

- Attendees asked why the NWMO did not hold a regional information session in other New Brunswick locations.

- It was suggested that information sessions should not be held in Saskatchewan in December (too cold; people too busy before Christmas).

#### 4.0 CLOSING REMARKS

---

This report provided a description of the regional information sessions hosted by the NWMO in 17 regional locations in New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario and Saskatchewan. The findings reflected the key comments and suggestions made by attendees on the proposed siting process, technical issues of concern and the public engagement process.