

NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase IV: Panel Four

NWMO SR-2008-23

September 2008

Navigator Ltd.

nwmo

NUCLEAR WASTE
MANAGEMENT
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION
DES DÉCHETS
NUCLÉAIRES



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

Tel: 416-934-9814
Web: www.nwmo.ca

Nuclear Waste Management Organization

The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) was established in 2002 by Ontario Power Generation Inc., Hydro- Québec and New Brunswick Power Corporation in accordance with the *Nuclear Fuel Waste Act (NFWA)* to assume responsibility for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel.

NWMO's first mandate was to study options for the long-term management of used nuclear fuel. On June 14, 2007, the Government of Canada selected the NWMO's recommendation for Adaptive Phased Management (APM). The NWMO now has the mandate to implement the Government's decision.

Technically, Adaptive Phased Management (APM) has as its end-point the isolation and containment of used nuclear fuel in a deep repository constructed in a suitable rock formation. Collaboration, continuous learning and adaptability will underpin our implementation of the plan which will unfold over many decades, subject to extensive oversight and regulatory approvals.

NWMO Social Research

The objective of the social research program is to assist the NWMO, and interested citizens and organizations, in exploring and understanding the social issues and concerns associated with the implementation of Adaptive Phased Management. The program is also intended to support the adoption of appropriate processes and techniques to engage potentially affected citizens in decision-making.

The social research program is intended to be a support to NWMO's ongoing dialogue and collaboration activities, including work to engage potentially affected citizens in near term visioning of the implementation process going forward, long term visioning and the development of decision-making processes to be used into the future. The program includes work to learn from the experience of others through examination of case studies and conversation with those involved in similar processes both in Canada and abroad. NWMO's social research is expected to engage a wide variety of specialists and explore a variety of perspectives on key issues of concern. The nature and conduct of this work is expected to change over time, as best practices evolve and as interested citizens and organizations identify the issues of most interest and concern throughout the implementation of Adaptive Phased Management.

Disclaimer:

This report does not necessarily reflect the views or position of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization, its directors, officers, employees and agents (the "NWMO") and unless otherwise specifically stated, is made available to the public by the NWMO for information only. The contents of this report reflect the views of the author(s) who are solely responsible for the text and its conclusions as well as the accuracy of any data used in its creation. The NWMO does not make any warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information disclosed, or represent that the use of any information would not infringe privately owned rights. Any reference to a specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or preference by NWMO.



NAVIGATOR

NWMO Citizen Panel Report Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION
SASKATOON PHASE FOUR CITIZEN PANEL
SEPTEMBER 2008

WHAT ARE CITIZEN PANELS?

Building on previous qualitative research studies, the NWMO contracted Navigator to initiate Citizen Panels in 8 cities across Canada. The goal of the Citizen Panel project was to further explore the feelings, attitudes and perceptions of Canadians toward the long-term storage of Canada's used nuclear fuel.

The Citizen Panel project is markedly different from the qualitative research projects that have preceded it. The intent of the Citizen Panel format used in this project is to allow for the discussion to be formed and driven by the views of the individual Panelists. These Panelists have had a brief introduction to the NWMO and are aware of rudimentary facts surrounding Canada's used nuclear fuel such that an informed discussion can occur.

Phase Four of the Citizen Panel project occurred in June 2008.

WHAT IS NAVIGATOR?

Navigator is a research-based public affairs firm that works with companies, organizations and governments involved in the public policy field.

Navigator has grown to become a diverse firm with consultants from a variety of backgrounds who have excelled in the fields of journalism, public opinion research, politics, marketing and law.

Our strategic approach can be summed up as: *“Research. Strategy. Results.”*

PANEL REPORT OUTLINE

1. NWMO Citizen Panel Background

- a. Citizen Panel
- b. Panelist profiles
- c. Panel methodology

2. Panelist Dialogue

- a. Overview
- b. Panel Notes
 - i. Disclaimer

Appendices

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Backgrounder 1: Selecting a Site
- iv. Backgrounder 2: Framing the Discussion
- v. Backgrounder 3: Learning from Others

I. NWMO CITIZEN PANEL BACKGROUND

a. Citizen Panel

The Saskatoon, Saskatchewan Phase Four Citizen Panel was held on June 3, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Saskatoon.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 12 Panelists in attendance. Jaime Watt, a Navigator research professional, acted as Discussion Leader.

A general outline of discussion objectives, as well as a discussion document intended to guide the work of the Panel were prepared in advance of the Citizen Panel. Reproductions of the documents shown to the Panel can be found at the end of this report as appendices.













b. Panelist Profile

In order to ensure that Panelists speak openly and freely over the course of this research, the individual identities of Panelists will remain protected and not revealed to the NWMO at any point of the project. Contact with Panelists is managed exclusively by a dedicated Panel Manager and each Panelist has been given an identifier code to ensure anonymity in all accessible Panel documents. All personal information and contact reports are stored separately and controlled by the Panel Manager.

While verbatim comments are used through this report, the identification will be only by Panel or by unique Panelist identifier code, but never by name.

Panelists have agreed to offer additional information, including their gender and one additional fact about their lives to make the Panel reporting richer for the reader.

Below are the profiles of the Saskatoon Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

 Panelist: SA-1A	City: Saskatoon Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Self-employed, theatre designer	 Panelist: SA-4A	City: Saskatoon Age: 35-44 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, engineer
 Panelist: SA-5A	City: Saskatoon Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, electrician	 Panelist: SA-6A	City: Saskatoon Age: 35-44 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, information technician
 Panelist: SA-7A	City: Saskatoon Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, research scientist	 Panelist: SA-8A	City: Saskatoon Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Self-employed, forensic auditor
 Panelist: SA-9A	City: Saskatoon Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, territory manager	 Panelist: SA-10A	City: Saskatoon Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Self-employed, dance facilitator
 Panelist: SA-12A	City: Saskatoon Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, teacher	 Panelist: SA-13A	City: Saskatoon Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Student
 Panelist: SA-14A	City: Saskatoon Age: 18-24 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, massage therapy	 Panelist: SA-16A	City: Saskatoon Age: N/A Gender: Female Occupation: N/A

c. Panel Methodology

These Citizen Panels have been designed, as much as possible, as collaborative discussions facilitated by a Discussion Leader. They are separate and apart from focus groups in that they empower individual Panelists to raise questions and introduce new topics. The role of the Discussion Leader, in this format, is merely to introduce new topics of discussion and lead the Panel through a number of discussion exercises.

As well, additional measures were incorporated into this Citizen Panel format to empower individual Panelists. Each Panelist was made aware of their independence and responsibilities to both contribute to, and lead, the Panel discussion. A transcriber, traditionally taking contemporaneous notes behind one-way glass or in another room, was, in this case, placed inside the discussion room. Panelists were empowered to direct him or her to take special note of elements of the Panel discussion they felt were important, or ask him or her to recap any part of the discussion upon request. A commitment was made by the Discussion Leader that the notes taken would be sent to Panelists for review, possible revision and approval, to give Panelists faith that they are in control of the proceedings and ensure their contribution is reflected accurately.

Potential Panelists were originally selected through random digit dialling among a general population sample in the wide area in which each Panel was held. Individuals called underwent a standard research screening survey in which they indicated that they were interested and able to participate in a discussion about a general public policy issue with no advance notice of the specific topic. Individuals were screened to include community-engaged opinion leaders in at least one of these topics: community, environment, and/or public/social issues. Those that passed the screening process were asked to participate in a traditional focus group on the perceived trust and credibility of the NWMO, which allowed an introduction to the topic of used nuclear fuel and topics such as Adaptive Phased Management. The discussions were neutral in tone and did not presuppose any outcome on issues such as nuclear power generation and siting for used nuclear fuel.

At the end of this research study, participants were asked if they would be willing to continue in discussions on the topic of used nuclear fuel. Those that expressed interest were placed on a “short list” of potential Panelists for the four-phased Citizen Panel project. Research professionals at Navigator subsequently used this pool to select Panelists that would ensure a diversity of age, gender and experience in the Panels. Only participants who demonstrated both a willingness and ability to contribute to group discussions and complete exercises were included in the pool. The content of each participant’s contribution in the focus groups was not reviewed by Navigator professionals. Rather, the only qualifiers were those individuals who could speak clearly and were able to grasp concepts introduced to them at a basic level.

A target Panel population of 18 was determined for each location in the interest of ensuring the long-term viability of each Panel over the course of four discussions.

Phase One Citizen Panels occurred in late Fall 2007. Although successful in terms of the richness of data collected in all 8 Panel locations, it was clear upon completion of the Panels that it would be necessary to hold Supplementary Citizen Panels in four locations (Toronto, Montreal, Regina and Sault Ste. Marie) due to smaller than expected Panel populations, as well as a difficulty experienced by some Panelists to honour their commitment to attend, as was confirmed on the day of the Panel.

Supplementary Citizen Panels occurred in early January 2008 and consisted of 6 new recruits, selected by random digit dialling, to replicate the experience by which all other Panelists had been selected. New recruits were sent a reading package in advance and then had a one hour “lobby” session immediately prior to the Supplementary Citizen Panel. This session replicated a condensed version of the Preparatory Phase research and allowed for any questions Panelists might have had about the NWMO. Following the “lobby” session, the Supplementary Citizen Panel continued, adding Panelists who had confirmed but, for a myriad of reasons, could not participate in the Phase One Citizen Panels.

Following the completion of the Supplementary Citizen Panels, those that demonstrated a willingness and ability to continue were added to the pool for Phase Two Citizen Panels.

Phase Two Panels occurred in mid- to late January, 2008. The Panel discussion began with the Discussion Leader asking Panelists if they had thought any more about the NWMO since the last Panel, or if they had just gone back to their daily routines and not given the organization much additional thought. The Discussion Leader then distributed a document for discussion, the Executive Summary of the NWMO’s study *Choosing a Way Forward: The Future Management of Canada’s Used Nuclear Fuel*. The document was given both individual consideration, as well as collective consideration. Individually, Panelists were asked to mark the documents with red and green pens, green indicating they felt a certain point was helpful to their understanding and red indicating that they did not find the point helpful. The intent of the individual document review was to serve as a launching point for further collective consideration and discussion of the more complex strategic objectives of the NWMO. The Panel discussion concluded with Panelists reviewing the answers provided by the NWMO to the questions Panelists had posted in the Parking Lot in Phase One.

Again, Panels were successful in the richness of the data gathered. Furthermore, Panelists have begun to demonstrate a higher degree of ownership in the process with impressive attendance, commitment to the discussion and, in some cases, engaging in extra work, such as assembling their thoughts on paper and seeking out additional information.

Phase Three Panels occurred in late April and early May 2008. Unlike previous Panels, Phase Three Panels were divided into two parts: a discussion portion and a question and answer portion with a technical representative from the NWMO.

The discussion portion of the Panel began with a general discussion on Panelists’ thoughts, if any, on the NWMO since the last Panel session and then turned to the Draft Implementation Plan that had been distributed to Panelists upon their arrival. Similar to

Phase Two, the document was not reviewed by Panelists but, rather, used to inform Panel discussion on the NWMO's strategic objectives. Although Panelists were given an opportunity to comment on all objectives, as well as the document as a whole, they were asked to concentrate specifically on four of the seven NWMO strategic objectives: Building Relationships; Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research; Review, Adjust and Validate Plans; and Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process. These objectives were rated by Panelists in Phase One as highly appropriate and important for the NWMO. For each strategic objective, Panelists were given a summary that outlined items the NWMO plans to implement over the next five years (2008-2012) and asked for their feedback; specifically whether they felt the NWMO was moving in the right direction with these plans and whether they felt that anything important had been overlooked.

Phase Four of the NWMO Citizen Panels took place in June 2008. The Panel discussions primarily gathered input and explored Panelist reaction to the design of a process for selecting a site, and used five questions as a foundation for research:

1. Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?
2. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?
3. From what models and experience should we draw in designing the process?
4. Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?
5. What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?

These five questions also served as the organizing principle for the discussion leader's guide. A general outline of discussion objectives, as well as materials intended to guide the work of the Panel, were prepared in advance of the Citizen Panel. Reproductions of discussion materials shown to the Panel can be found at the end of this report in Appendices iii, iv, and v.

This Panel Report is, to the best of Navigator's abilities, a faithful rendering of the discussion held in Saskatoon and stands alone as a record of the Citizen Panel discussion on June 3, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this phase of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Toronto, Sault Ste. Marie, Scarborough, Regina, Saint John, and Montreal has also been submitted to the NWMO.

II. PANELIST DIALOGUE

a. Overview

The Phase Four Citizen Panel discussion of June 3, 2008 took place in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. Unlike Phase Three of this project, Panelists were not given any material to review in advance. Instead, they were asked a series of five discussion questions throughout their three-hour discussion using three ‘backgrounder’ sheets for reference. The five questions were listed in Section I of this document.

The framework of objectives was generally well-received by Saskatoon Panelists, who thought that it covered the bases adequately.

Nuclear power generation in Saskatchewan appeared frequently in the news at the time of this Panel discussion. When asked during the beginning of the discussion whether they had heard about the NWMO in the news, many Panelists instead raised the topic of nuclear power generation. While some Panelists raised concerns about nuclear power and its consequences, this Panelist put them in perspective:

In my little circle, people are aware that [with] uranium and that source of power, if there’s a problem you hear about it, it’s big. But you don’t hear about all the other sources of power. So if you hear “nuclear power” versus “no nuclear power,” yeah, there’s problems and risk to nuclear power.

Panelists first discussed how well the NWMO’s framework of objectives addresses the challenges of siting. During that discussion, the Discussion Leader and one Saskatoon Panelist engaged in an interesting dialogue about fairness. The Discussion Leader asked if the NWMO had outlined a fair process, and the Panelist responded that criticism on the grounds of fairness is sometimes unavoidable:

[There’s] always going to be someone that says they weren’t fair.

The same Panelist was then asked by the Discussion Leader if the NWMO was going about their project in the right fashion. The Panelist responded positively, noting that a solid effort was being made:

Yes. They’re going about it the right way.

Later in the discussion, another Panelist added their thoughts about “fairness” as a concept. They believed that in practice it had something to do with telling all sides, both positive and negative:

I think the definition they provide is quite good. They don’t just say fairness, they say what it means. There’s benefit, but there’s also some risk. They scientifically explain each.

When discussing the second question, some Saskatoon Panelists reverted to some of the themes raised in previous phases, such as the sort of host “community” they envisioned, and how long the process should take. This Panelist struggled with what they perceived to be a disproportionate amount of discussion time spent on process as opposed to fixed timelines, plans, and action:

To me, even on the green one here, it seems more like a mission statement. This is what we know what the objectives are and everything. What we need to do is not just what we want to do but what we’ve got to do. We already know the objectives but what are the actions?

Another Panelist, like many other Panelists in other locations, had difficulty imagining the site being located in within a “community,” possibly because the word conjures a mental image of a densely populated place:

People keep talking about communities... I can’t see it being placed near a community.

Aside from stumbling blocks like those mentioned above, there was a portion of discussion in Saskatoon about the positive aspects of an adaptive process for communities who might agree to host a site. They may have derived that idea from the NWMO’s principle of Adaptive Phased Management:

Panelist 1: ...People renegotiate treaties because they are no longer relevant so there must be an adaptive clause to compensate for that.

Panelist 2: Once again an “adaptive” process.

The Discussion Leader then asked the Panelists how such a process might work in practice. One Panelist thought that that a “contract” should contain a clause that allows for periodic renegotiation:

...Renegotiation and re-evaluation every, say, twenty years?

A Panelist then added to that thought, speculating that a community may not know the consequences when they agree to host a repository, and thus should have the ability to revisit the contract.

During discussion of the third and final backgrounder document and its corresponding question of who should be involved in selecting a site, Saskatoon Panelists spent a substantial amount of time discussing the role of interest groups.

One Panelist asked what sort of role interest groups ought to have, and if their influence would be balanced:

What about the interveners. Were they accommodated? In other words, lobby groups? Where do they fit in? I hope they have a voice. The people that come in from outside a community, do they have a voice? A lobby group from outside the community, so they have a right to speak up also?

Another Panelist echoed that concern with a more direct comment about the influence of money wielded by some interest groups:

*Maybe we should talk about who should not have a say?
...There's a lot of money and power and undue influences on a community in the selection process.*

On the whole, Saskatoon Panelists comprised an active group that was very aware of nuclear power and of provincial issues.

b. Panel Notes

i. Disclaimer

The attached are contemporaneous notes of the general Panel discussion, as well as the discussion on the three backgrounder documents provided by the NWMO. The notes were taken by a transcriber positioned in the room with the Panelists. The transcriber was taking direction from the Citizen Panel on specific points of interest. The following is not an official transcript, but a best effort to capture the sense of discussion with some granularity.

The transcriber for this Panel was Lanny Cardow, a Navigator research professional.

General Discussion:

- Discussion Leader:** Anyone see anything in the news about the NWMO or about any NWMO-related issues?
- SA-13A: Lots of people are talking about it because of the nuclear reactor in Saskatchewan. People are nervous about it.
- SA-12A: There was some detection of radioactivity. I don't know the specifics. Cameco shares going down apparently.
- SA-5A: They had some contamination with Cameco with some of the lakes up there.
- SA-4A: Wasn't that the oil sands?
- Discussion Leader:** Did anyone talk to their families about this?
- SA-12A: I tried to, no one cared!
- SA-14A: I was educating a few of my friends on where the plan is to put the waste. None of them thought that putting it underground was a good idea. I used to be like that too until these sessions. More education makes us feel safer about this.
- SA-16A: I've been reading these articles in the Star Phoenix and they're all so positive. But if you read the editorials, they're all negative.
- Discussion Leader:** Can you imagine why that might be?

SA-16A: I don't know...They're saying in these articles that the public is in favour of power plants

SA-9A: In my little circle, people are aware of uranium and that source of power. If there's a problem you hear about it, it's big. But you don't hear about all the other sources of power. So, if you hear about nuclear power versus no nuclear power, yes, there are potential risks with nuclear power. It's local people who write in to the editor and are negative about everything.

SA-8A: You raise a good point.

SA-7A: There was real negativity with people I talked to. The "Greenpeace mentality" that nuclear didn't belong in Saskatchewan. But with advertising and government support, people now take it as a given, where once there was thought to be too much nuclear in the world.

Discussion Leader: Are there reasons people might feel that way?

SA-7A: Maybe it's more of a risk-taking generation? I don't know if it's a shift in actual technology.

SA-8A: It's been talked about more by the Conservatives than the NDP. Political climate seems to favour nuclear technology.

SA-5A: It's going to be talked about more and more as the price of oil continues to rise. It's affecting everything.

General agreement

Discussion Leader: Canadians have said that the potential site has to be safe and secure, and that the process to select that site has to be fair. The NWMO also knows that it has to find a process that Canadians have confidence in. I'm wondering if you think that the ethical framework that they've proposed in these handouts is a good one?

SA-5A: In terms of the community, as soon as it's semi-selected, they're going to say what's in it for us? What are the dangers?

Discussion Leader: Do you think this outlines a process that is a fair one?

SA-5A: I don't see how they're going to do this fairly. There's always going to be someone that says they weren't fair.

Discussion Leader: Do you think people are going to see this framework and say that "this was a fair process"?

SA-5A: I can see your point.

Discussion Leader: Do you think they're on the right track?

SA-5A: Yes. They're going about it the right way.

SA-13A: I think its outlines everything very well.

Discussion Leader: What will NWMO have to do for you to see that they have outlined the approach that you have confidence in?

SA-7A: Something this important should be based on science. There is a history of picking sites in this province for the wrong reasons, like personal gains. Economics is important but we need scientific facts.

SA-9A: I think that when all is said and done, they do need to be accountable. If Saskatchewan gets it, I will want to know why. I will want to know the science behind it.

Discussion Leader: But we know that this going to be a scientific process. Everyone has said "safe and secure trumps everything". Science is important, but there are other factors as well.

SA-9A: But I want to know why. I will want to know what the location got in return; I will want to know what the deal is. I want to be able to look that information up on the NWMO's website.

Discussion Leader: Did they miss something in this document?

SA-9A: I think this isn't a plan, it's the "basis" of a plan. This isn't a plan but the requirements for a plan.

SA-7A: How are the requirements weighted?

SA-9A: What's the actual plan?

SA-5A: I didn't see Saskatchewan mentioned here. They mentioned New Brunswick and Ontario in the first 3 paragraphs. My first gut reaction is "hey, you guys are getting all the benefits from this". It's all being used in those provinces, so why don't they deal with it?

SA-12A: I want to know the background for site selection.

SA-12A: What have they found in other countries? Why did they choose those sites there? Were there the ten best sites and then a bidding war? Do people want it there?

SA-5A: The government gets involved and tells you where to put it.

Discussion Leader: Let's move on to the next sheet. What are your thoughts?

SA-7A: This is more theory.

SA-1A: It's like doing a lesson plan.

SA-9A: It'll be a bigger challenge to put a plan in place that accomplishes these things accurately and fairly.

Discussion Leader: The NWMO is going to design the process for picking the site. They asked us to get input on the process. If you were the planner, sitting in your office, would this the framework you would like to see?

Consensus that yes, this is what they would like to see.

SA-8A: It's been said before, but where's the experience of others? That's an important component.

SA-5A: One thing they never mention is avoiding fault lines.

SA-7A: Politics is an issue but it isn't mentioned. How will they handle it?

Discussion Leader: One of the things in the back of people's minds is that a politician is going to come here and screw things up. What are your thoughts on that?

Consensus that yes, they feel that might happen.

SA-12A: I guess I don't see an acknowledgement of that.

SA-6A: To me, it seems more like a mission statement. This is what we know, what the objectives are and everything. What we need to do is not just what we want to do but what we have to do. We already know the objectives but what are the actions?

SA-9A: How long is it going to take to find a site? Especially with politics playing a role!

SA-9A: If it's long enough, that would take care of some of the political pressure. Politics could change though.

SA-13A: How much time would a community have to give to withdraw their consent?

SA-8A: People keep talking about communities. I can't see it being located near a community.

SA-5A: What if it's in a national park that is geographically and geologically appropriate?

SA-13A: Transportation to and from just to build it would create a community in itself because of the manpower needed.

SA-8A: I don't see it being near a community.

Discussion Leader: Not traditional community with churches and schools, but I understand what your saying.

SA-7A: You ask where I want more emphasis. I want more on transportation. How will they get to the site?

Discussion Leader: So “siting” needs to be expanded to include route to site?

Panel agrees.

Discussion Leader: One of the things we talk about when selecting a site is the notion of fairness. How do you take that into consideration?

SA-4A: I think the definition they provide is quite good. They don’t just say fairness, they say what it means. There’s benefit, but there’s also some risk. They scientifically explain each.

Discussion Leader: You raise a really good point. How do you ensure fairness across the board? It’s one thing to make decisions for ourselves, but how do you ensure fairness across generations?

SA-13A: That’s exactly what treaties are for. But now people renegotiate treaties because they are no longer relevant, so there must be an adaptive clause to compensate for that.

SA-4A: Once again, an “adaptive” process...

Discussion Leader: So how do we deal with that?

SA-13A: A clause that allows for renegotiation and re-evaluation every, say, twenty years?

SA-9A: It’s not like you can quit if you don’t like the contract you got. It’s there. It ties the communities hands... they’re already committed.

SA-1A: Maybe the NWMO should just choose a site, build it... and then put a town there?

SA-7A: Well it has to be “adaptive”. We’re going to adapt to things as they come up. You can’t know the consequences so as they come up, you will adapt and revisit the contract.

SA-5A: Well it's not going to generate any profit. No, its cost.

Disagreement from other Panelists.

Discussion Leader: Could you imagine how it's going to generate benefits for the community?

SA-5A: It won't make money like a mine would. It would generate employment and all that stuff, but won't make money. It will still form a community around it.

SA-8A: Could I play devil's advocate for just a minute? It's about fairness? I see the security and safety business as much more important. Why would we think that there would be political interference? Wouldn't it be in a safe isolated place in one of these provinces? Why are we wondering if it's fair? Maybe the NWMO would just have to make a decision after some consultation? One of the most important things is the traditional rights of Aboriginal Peoples.

SA-5A: Any place is not so far away anymore. Everything is growing and what's isolated now won't be then.

SA-8A: I wouldn't want to live where there is stuff stored underground.

Discussion Leader: There is a community that is actively campaigning for a new nuclear reactor. They have ads and a web site, among other things. So the real issue of fairness is that whatever happens, it's impossible that there will be one site that stands head and shoulders above the rest. The scientists are going to identify more than one site. There will be more than one scientifically and geologically supported site, so there must be something else that helps make the choice, and that's where fairness comes in.

SA-8A: I've said what my thoughts are and I've listened to you. I've flown across northern Canada. I've seen northern Quebec. There's nothing there.

Why wouldn't it, with great respect, if everything in place, be placed somewhere like that?

Discussion Leader:

Let's say yes. How do you design the process? How do you know that when they say "we've put it in remote location A or B", how do you have confidence that they've chosen the right one? How do you know when they say "we're putting it in this remote location over that one", how do you know they chose the right one?

SA-8A:

I'm old enough to know that there has to be trust in the process. They'll look out for the people of Canada. Trust that there are more good people than bad, even if that sounds foolish.

SA-4A:

Is there something else that we can build on? Another process to use as a principle? Like correctional facilities?

Discussion Leader:

That's a brilliant idea and it happens to be the subject of my next sheet! In terms of fairness, however, it's fair to look at the provinces where the waste is generated and that's where we should look first. Is there anything else that should be taken into account?

SA-4A:

If PEI wants to be the host, should you include them?

SA-6A:

Why not have facilities in Western Canada and Eastern Canada, rather than shipping it from Newfoundland, for example. You can just have one close by, something more centralized. It'll pay for itself.

Agreement

SA-5A:

That's a good idea ... I didn't know there were 20 nuclear reactors in Canada. Did anyone know?

Everyone: No, they didn't know.

Discussion Leader:

A site, community or location that would take this would be "informed and willing". What

does the process need to look like to ensure this happens? How will you know that consent was given in this way?

SA-7A:

But we want it remote. It's hard to get someplace that has access to transportation that doesn't have people. And there's a chance the people there will be poorly educated and poorer than those in other urban centers, so there's the worry that they could be easily influenced by money and bullying. How can they consent?

SA-16A:

I would trust the scientists.

Discussion Leader:

But beyond that. Scientists have said that we have range of places it could go and they all have to be informed and willing. But the NWMO says that that's not enough to decide. Any sense of what you'd like to see in the process?

SA-16A:

Who judges how informed they are?

SA-14A:

I have no idea how they would do that. Go door to door and ask them?

SA-9A:

There are some pretty small places up there. Do you think that we'd be able to have a series of meetings to inform? I mean, this has been a pretty educational process. Could they have the same thing?

SA-8A:

A few years back the Federal government wanted to put a halfway house here. There were meetings and hearings and a lot of objection. Reasonableness and open meetings and city council studies must come into play and make everyone agree with the decision.

SA-5A:

They should have a series of public meetings, then send it to city council. City Council studies it...

SA-13A:

How many people have to be in agreement? What's a fair? 90 percent in favour?

SA-14A:

I know it should be way more than 50 percent.

Discussion Leader: Why?

SA-14A: Because ten percent of pissed off people is still a lot.

SA-9A: That's a valid point. Our elections are based on majorities, but 90 percent is more like it. Given the length of this thing, 50 percent isn't enough. Especially if there are only 100 people in the community.

SA-7A: They can move! People move anyway.

SA-9A: In a small town, 50-50 is not enough.

SA-5A: It'd be a standard requirement.

SA-9A: If it is 50-50, that's really undecided.

SA-7A: What about having some outside experts to come and explain, because people won't know what this will do to their town. They might be able to give the communities some information.

Discussion Leader: I guess they need an education process to build a consensus.

APPENDICES

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Backgrounder 1: Selecting a Site
- iv. Backgrounder 2: Framing the Discussion
- v. Backgrounder 3: Learning from Others

I. NAVIGATOR PERSONNEL

JAMES STEWART WATT, SENIOR DISCUSSION LEADER

Jaime Watt is Chair of Navigator, a Toronto-based research consulting firm that specializes in public opinion research, strategy and public policy development.

Prior to relocating to Toronto, he was, for ten years, Chair of Thomas Watt Advertising, a leading regional advertising agency and communications consulting firm based in London, Ontario.

A specialist in complex communications issues, Jaime has served clients in the corporate, professional services, not-for-profit and government sectors and has worked in every province in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Central America, Korea and Kosovo.

He currently serves as Chair of Casey House, Canada's pioneer AIDS hospice, as well as Casey House Foundation and is a Vice President of the Albany Club. He is a director of the Dominion Institute, Woodrow Wilson Center's Canada Institute, TD Canada Trust's Private Giving Foundation, The Canadian Club of Toronto and The Clean Water Foundation. As well, he is a member of the President's Advisory Council for the Canadian Red Cross and is a member of the Executive Committee of Canadians for Equal Marriage. He was a founding Trustee and Co-chair of the Canadian Human Rights Trust and the Canadian Human Rights Campaign.

CHAD A. ROGERS, SUPPORTING DISCUSSION LEADER

Chad Rogers is a Consultant at Navigator providing strategic planning and public opinion research advice to government, corporate and not-for-profit clients.

He has recently returned to Canada after working abroad with the Washington, DC based National Democratic Institute as director of their programs in Kosovo and Armenia respectively. Chad oversaw multi-million dollar democracy and governance assistance programs directed at political parties, parliaments and civil society organizations in newly democratic nations. He conducted high-level training with the political leadership of Armenia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Moldova and Serbia.

Having previously worked on Parliament Hill as both a legislative and communications assistant to Members of Parliament and Senators, he has an in-depth knowledge of Canada's Parliament and its committees, caucuses and procedures.

He is a board member of the Kosova Democratic Institute and is a member in good standing of the Public Affairs Association of Canada (PAAC) and the Market Research & Intelligence Association (MRIA). Chad has trained at the RIVA Qualitative Research Training Institute.

LANNY A. CARDOW, PROJECT MANAGER

Lanny Cardow is a consultant performing research-based strategic communications work on projects for Navigator's corporate and not-for-profit clients.

Lanny most recently served in the Office of the Prime Minister as the Executive Assistant to the PM's Chief of Staff, having previously worked in the Office of the Leader of the Opposition in various capacities, including Manager of Outreach (Operations).

Lanny graduated with a master's degree from The George Washington University's Graduate School of Political Management in 2006, specializing in both Campaign Management and Polling course concentrations.

While completing his degree, Lanny performed research at GWU's Institute for Politics, Democracy and the Internet, contributing to numerous studies and events that explored the crossroads of online technology and advanced campaigning techniques.

Lanny earned his bachelor's degree in Political Studies at Queen's University in 2002.

JOSEPH LAVOIE, PANEL MANAGER (FRANCOPHONE)

Prior to joining Navigator, Joseph Lavoie worked at Citigroup Global Transaction Services where he improved communications within the Transfer Agency Systems department. Joseph achieved this objective via Web 2.0 technologies, which he previously leveraged in developing Santa's Journal, a successful viral marketing campaign that introduced Santa Claus to the world of blogging and podcasting.

Joseph has been active in numerous provincial and federal election campaigns; has provided political commentary for various websites and television/radio programs; and has served as the recruitment director for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Youth Association. In March 2007, Joseph was selected *Canada's Next Great Prime Minister* by Canadians as part of a scholarship program sponsored by Magna International, the Dominion Institute, and the Canada-US Fulbright Program. He currently serves on the Public Affairs/Marketing Team for the Toronto Symphony Volunteer Committee.

AMY LONEY, PANEL MANAGER (ANGLOPHONE)

Prior to joining Navigator, Amy attended Queen's University where she graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in Political Science. Amy has also completed intensive Explore French Language Bursary Programs at Université de Montréal and Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières respectively.

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

II. DISCUSSION LEADERS GUIDE

PHASE FOUR CITIZEN PANELS

DISCUSSION LEADER'S GUIDE

1. OPENING OF PANEL SESSION (0:00 – 0:03)

- Welcome back
- Explanation of NWMO disclosure of proceedings
- Re-introduction of Transcriber
- Re-introduction of Parking lot
- Re-introduction of Panel Managers

2. PRE-DISCUSSION EXERCISE (0:03-0:15)

'Creating an Information Package' Exercise

- Brainstorming about what an information package should look like.
- Will revisit suggestions later in the Panel discussion.

3. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA FOR SESSION (0:15 – 0:17)

4. RE-INTRODUCTIONS (0:17 – 0:21)

5. GENERAL DISCUSSION (0:21 – 0:25)

- Read, seen or heard anything about NWMO in the media since our last discussion?

6. BROAD DISCUSSION OF SITING PROCESS (0:25 – 0:30)

7. DISCUSSION OF BACKGROUNDERS 1 AND 2: BACKGROUND – 'SELECTING A SITE' AND 'FRAMING THE DISCUSSION' (0:30 – 1:10)

- **Q1: Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?**
 - Do you think this ethical framework will be good for the siting process?
 - Do you feel this framework covers all of the important aspects?
 - Do you feel that anything is missing?

- **Q2: How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?**
 - How, in your view, could fairness be best assured in and by the process for selecting a site?
 - How should the process for selecting a site take into account the needs of both this generation and future generations - so that costs, benefits, risks and responsibilities are distributed fairly across generations?
 - Are there other geographical considerations which should be taken into account for the process to be fair?
 - The NWMO has committed to only choosing a site in a location that is informed and willing. How might the design of the process ensure that this happens?

8. DISCUSSION OF BACKGROUNDER 3: 'LEARNING FROM OTHERS' (1:10 – 1:40)

- **Q3: From what models and experience should the NWMO draw in designing a siting process?**
 - From your perspective, what experience and models do you think would be particularly relevant to consider and draw from in designing the process for selecting a site?
 - What other decisions/processes might we learn from or are comparable? Are there events which have happened in the past which you are aware of which we should look back on for lessons?
- **Q4: Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?**
 - What are your views on who should be involved in selecting a site? What would you count on them to bring to the process?
 - Would you expect each of these individuals and groups to play a different role in selecting a site, or have different responsibilities in the process? What role or responsibilities?

9. DISCUSSION OF 'COMMUNICATIONS' GROUP WORK (1:40 – 2:10)

- **Q5: What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?**
 - What information and tools do you think would help Canadians participate constructively in the siting process?
 - What about reporting: things like documents and publications?

- Do any of the questions raised today strike you as more important than the others? Less important?
- Do you have any suggestions for what remains to be considered?

10. REVIEW “PROJECT DESCRIPTION” AND “WHO WE ARE” AND OTHER DOCUMENTS (2:10 – 2:50)

- Do you think something like this would help explain the project to larger audiences?
- If you didn’t know what you now know about the NWMO’s project, would a document like this answer your questions, or perhaps help you ask some better ones?
- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve this document?

[Distribute ‘Who we are’ document and give Panelists a few minutes to review]

- If you didn’t know about the NWMO or the role it plays, would a document like this answer your questions, or perhaps help you ask some better ones?
- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve this document?

[Distribute ‘Security and Safeguards’, ‘Transportation of Used Nuclear Fuel’, and ‘Monitoring and Retrievability’ documents and give Panelists a few minutes to review]

- And what do you think about these ones?
- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve these documents?

11. WRAP-UP (2:50 – 3:00)

- As we end our session does anyone have any remaining issues to discuss or questions to raise about our discussions here?
- Panel Management issues
- Adjourn

III. BACKGROUNDER 1: SELECTING A SITE

Background - Selecting a site

Canadians have been using electricity generated by nuclear power reactors for about four decades. Canada currently has 20 operating commercial reactors at 5 nuclear generating stations located in New Brunswick, Québec and Ontario. These reactors are fueled by uranium formed into bundles. Once used, the bundles are hazardous to humans and the environment, essentially indefinitely. They must be managed properly.

Canada has about two million used fuel bundles and is generating about 85,000 more each year. We can expect to produce about 3.6 million used fuel bundles if each of the current electricity generating reactors operates for its anticipated average life-span of about 40 years.

Currently, the used fuel bundles are safely stored at licensed facilities located at the reactor sites in Canada. The communities hosting these facilities understand this to be temporary, and that the used fuel has always been destined for long-term management at a specially-designed facility.

Through Adaptive Phased Management, the used fuel bundles will ultimately be packaged into long-lived strongly built containers, transported to the selected site and placed in the deep geological repository.

While technical studies suggest that large geographic portions of Canada have rock formations potentially suitable for the deep geological repository, scientific, technical, social, ethical, economic, and environmental factors also have to be weighed in selecting a site.

That site will occupy a surface area of about 2 kilometres by 3 kilometres. Underground, the repository will be about 1.8 square kilometres in area. It will consist of a network of horizontal tunnels and rooms excavated in stable rock at a depth between 500 to 1,000 metres. Once there, the used fuel will be monitored to confirm the safety and performance of the repository until a decision is made to close the site. It will remain retrievable until such time as a future society decides on final closure and on the appropriate form and duration of post-closure monitoring.

People will be keenly interested in where the site is located, in how the used fuel will get there, and in how safety and security will be assured. Communities considering hosting the site will want to know how their well-being could be affected

including what risks they might face, how they might benefit, and what commitments they will have to make.

Communities will also want to have updated information about the used fuel to be managed. We will regularly publish inventory information on the current and future potential used fuel inventories. Recognizing the potential for industry to make decisions that may affect the amount and characteristics of the used fuel to be managed in future, we will continually monitor, review and invite broad discussion about new developments so that our plans may be adjusted as required.

Selecting the site thus requires dialogue and careful thinking. We expect that the design of the selection process will need to have many features including:

- The objectives of the siting process and the principles that would apply.
- The major steps in the siting process.
- The factors and criteria that will be applied in making siting decisions.
- How Aboriginal insights and traditional knowledge will be respected.
- How information will be communicated and shared.
- The studies required at each step.
- How to work collaboratively throughout the process.

IV. BACKGROUND 2: FRAMING THE DISCUSSION

Framing the discussion

In conversations with Canadians during the study phase of our work, we heard that the approach for managing Canada's used nuclear fuel must respond to a *framework* of objectives and characteristics. This framework will help shape the process for selecting a site and to help guide implementation.

Objectives

The process for selecting a site should help Adaptive Phased Management achieve the objectives set for it by citizens:

Fairness – To ensure fairness (in substance and process) in the distribution of costs, benefits, risks and responsibilities, within this generation and across generations.

Public Health and Safety – To protect public health from the risk of exposure to radioactive or other hazardous materials and from the threat of injuries or deaths due to accidents.

Worker Health and Safety – To protect workers and minimize hazards associated with managing used nuclear fuel.

Community Well-being – To ensure the well-being of all communities with a shared interest.

Security – To ensure the security of facilities, materials and infrastructure.

Environmental Integrity – To ensure that environmental integrity is maintained over the long term.

Economic Viability – To ensure the economic viability of the waste management system, while simultaneously contributing positively to the local economy.

Adaptability – To ensure a capacity to adapt to changing knowledge and conditions over time.

Of these objectives, people consider safety, security and fairness to be paramount: the management approach must ensure *safety and security* for people, communities and the environment, and it must be seen to be safe and secure from the perspective of current and future generations.

Characteristics

The process for selecting a site should also be responsive to the characteristics which Canadians said would be important for any siting process:

- Be open, inclusive and fair to all parties, giving everyone with an interest an opportunity to have their views heard and taken into account.
- Ensure that groups most likely to be affected by the facility, including through transportation, are given full opportunity to have their views heard and taken into account, and are provided with the forms of assistance they require to present their case effectively.
- Respect all Aboriginal rights, treaties and land claims.
- Be free from conflict of interest, personal gain or bias among those making the decision and/or formulating recommendations.
- Be informed by the best knowledge — from the natural and social sciences, Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge, ethics and technology development — relevant to making a decision and/or formulating a recommendation.
- Be in accord with the precautionary principle, which seeks to avoid harm and the risk of harm, and which demands ethical justification for such harm that is unavoidable.

- Ensure that those who could be exposed to harm or risk of harm, or other losses or limitations, are fully consulted and are willing to accept what is proposed for them.
- Take into consideration the possible costs, harms, risks, and benefits of the siting decision, including financial, physical, biological, social, cultural, and ethical costs.
- Ensure that those who benefited most from nuclear power (past, present and perhaps future) bear the costs and risks of managing used fuel and other materials.
- Address scientific and technical factors that may help ensure safety.

Implementation of the approach will respect the social, cultural and economic aspirations of affected communities.

A matter of ethics:

The process for selecting a site should strive to:

- Respect life in all its forms, including minimization of harm to human beings and other sentient creatures.
- Respect future generations of human beings, other species, and the biosphere as a whole.
- Respect peoples and cultures.
- Promote justice across groups, regions, and generations.
- Be fair to everyone affected, particularly to minorities and marginalized groups.
- Respect the values and interpretations that different individuals and groups bring to dialogue and other means of collaboration.

Canadians told the NWMO they want to be sure, above all, that the site for the deep geological repository is safe and secure. The process for choosing that site must be grounded in values and objectives that Canadians hold important. The process must be open, transparent, fair and inclusive. And the NWMO believes it must be designed in a way that citizens across this country are confident meets the highest scientific, professional and ethical standards.

The NWMO makes commitments as to how such a process must work:

1. The decision by a community to host the site must be informed and made willingly.
2. The site selected must meet strict, scientifically-determined safety requirements.
3. In the interest of fairness, the process should focus on the provinces directly involved in the nuclear fuel cycle: New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario and Saskatchewan. Communities in other regions that express an interest will also be considered.
4. Communities that decide to engage in the process for selecting a site, as potential hosts, shall have the right to withdraw consistent with any agreements between themselves and the NWMO

V. BACKGROUNDER 3: LEARNING FROM OTHERS

Learning from others

In beginning to think about the design of a process for selecting a site for Canada's used nuclear fuel, we take the view that a process for Canada needs to be designed by Canadians. In the study phase of our work, citizens told us a great deal about their concerns and expectations.

At the same time, siting experiences here and abroad— involving nuclear waste and other hazardous substances, as well as comparable decision-making processes—offer insight about what might be challenging and about what might work well. Overall, these experiences seem to confirm the merit of a site-selection process for Canada that seeks an informed and willing host community, that is collaborative and that considers technical, social, environmental and social factors together.

The following are some challenges and opportunities that may be important to consider:

Being inclusive

Canadians told us that the success of the process for selecting a site hinges on open and fair collaboration with all potential host communities and other interested people and organizations at every step. At some point, the process will need to focus on candidate host communities and ultimately on the selected community. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site involves the right people at the right times without leaving anyone out unfairly? Participation also carries important responsibilities for all participants. We seek the advice of Canadians in identifying those responsibilities and ensuring they are shared and applied fairly.

Defining 'community'

We want to ensure that people and communities can participate in all aspects of the site selection decision that affect them. It will be important to identify what constitutes a 'community' and who can best speak on its behalf. Should a community be defined narrowly and by political boundaries, such as the confines of a town, or should it be based on patterns of economic activity and include the surrounding area?

Measuring community acceptance

We believe that any community which eventually hosts the nuclear waste management facility must be willing to do so. It will be important to identify how we might gauge the willingness of any community that expresses an interest. In what ways might potential host communities demonstrate they have the permission and trust of their residents to explore hosting the facility? And how might we consider the needs of future generations in considering expressions of interest?

Demonstrating fairness

Fairness demands that any community expressing willingness to host a facility do so in a way which is free and informed. This means that the community has the information it needs to assess how it might be affected by the decision, and that it is not under undue influence of economic considerations. Key decisions must be taken

through full and deliberate engagement. How can this be best accomplished?

Balancing social acceptability with other factors

If more than one community wishes to host the site, how might we decide between them? Each site is likely to have its own but different strengths. One site may be closer to where used fuels are currently stored, but require more engineering to make sure the facility is safe. Another community may have more support among residents but require more technical research to ascertain whether the physical characteristics of the site are appropriate.

Strengthening community capacity

People and communities must have the wherewithal to take part in the process. Different groups will have their own requirements, ideas and way of doing things. Particularly important are the time and resources that potential host communities will require to make informed choices. We need to understand the requirements of participants and seek tools that can aid their involvement. What suggestions do you have for ensuring that people are equipped to take part?

Partnership

Experience suggests that the building of long-term relationships and partnerships is vital to the success of the process for selecting a site. This takes time and effort, but the benefits can range from sharing information and resources to building trust and improving communication. What are the essential ingredients for building real and lasting relationships and partnerships? What kinds of agreements should be forged?

Ensuring community well-being

We are committed to ensuring that any community that decides to host the facility will be better off for having done so. The well-being of a community might be affected in a broad range of ways, from traditional use of land to economic development and socio-cultural cohesion. It will be important to understand how a community might be affected by its decision and to ensure this is weighed appropriately before proceeding. What processes need to be put in place to ensure that the community continues to benefit from the facility well in to the future? How do we resolve potential conflicts and differences in perspective?

RESEARCH | STRATEGY | RESULTS™

