

# NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase IV: Panel Seven

**NWMO SR-2008-26**

**September 2008**

Navigator Ltd.

**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 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 Saint John, New Brunswick

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION  
SAINT JOHN 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 Saint John, New Brunswick Phase Four Citizen Panel was held on June 10, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Saint John.

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 Saint John Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

	City: Saint John Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Self-employed, interior decorator		City: Saint John Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, plumber
<b>Panelist: SJ-1A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-3A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Student		City: Saint John Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, teaching assistant
<b>Panelist: SJ-4A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-5A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Unemployed		City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed
<b>Panelist: SJ-7A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-8A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Student		City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed
<b>Panelist: SJ-9A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-10A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Home maker		City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed
<b>Panelist: SJ-11A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-12A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed		City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, customer service call centre
<b>Panelist: SJ-13A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-15A</b>	

### **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 Saint John and stands alone as a record of the Citizen Panel discussion on June 10, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this phase of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Toronto, Sault Ste. Marie, Scarborough, Regina, Saskatoon, and Montreal has also been submitted to the NWMO.

## II. PANELIST DIALOGUE

### a. Overview

The Phase Four Citizen Panel discussion of June 10, 2008 took place in Saint John, New Brunswick. 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 are listed in Section I of this document.

The framework of objectives was generally well-received by Saint John Panelists, who thought that it covered the bases adequately. The Saint John Panel was particularly eager to discuss local experiences for large projects, as their community recently engaged in a high-profile debate that many Panelists cited as an anti-model for what the NWMO is attempting to do. As a result, many of their statements focused on input and citizen voice.

Saint John Panelists arrived with plenty of ideas and began to share them as soon as the session began. In the general discussion at the beginning of the discussion, one Panelist raised the notion of community benefits that could be attained through hosting a repository, foreseeing a list of needs and wants that could be matched to the project:

*What’s in it for the community? I think there has to be some sort of partnership or some sort of need the community has that putting a facility in around that community can fulfil. If it’s low employment, then that facility can increase employment, if it’s things for the schools. Enhanced parks. Your community has to have some of the needs on this list that they need.*

Later on in the discussion, another Panelist warned that a need-based “rivalry” between potential host communities could create an unhealthy sort of competition that would result in communities trying to “underbid” each other:

*If you have two that want it, one community might say “we’ll do this for less.” They may end up fizzling themselves out.*

A Saint John Panelist delved into the merits and disadvantages of interest group pressures, mentioning that they ought to be counterbalanced by a strong voice for the local community. This Panelist was also worried that poorly-funded voices could be drowned out in the public dialogue leading up to the selection of a site:

*They say every interest group should be heard, but in the end it has to be a majority of citizens living in the community. It should be easier for citizens than businesses. Say it comes down to a referendum. Once it gets to that level, what kind of campaign regulations are there? Things like that get left to the end. Then citizens have no money to fund their side of the campaign and*

*businesses have money for theirs. Make it very clear that it is individuals as a collective which have a final say.*

Two Panelists engaged in a discussion about whether the public would express their opinions, and particularly the onus upon the NWMO to encourage attendance at public forums and information sessions. One Panelist thought that any public discussion would attract attendees simply through its high profile:

*If it's a major decision there's going to be a lot of publicity. You'd have to be in a hole not to know about it.*

One Panelist believed that, while there was a responsibility to provide forums for discussion, those who stay home would generally have less to contribute:

*You should have open forums. The people that turn out at those meetings are going to have the thoughts that elected representatives need to hear. The people who don't go to those meetings aren't going to be interested.*

When discussing the first question, Saint John Panelists spoke about the strength of local voices. One Panelist used a local example to warn the NWMO that it is not often the contented majority who write letters or engages in opinion campaigns:

*A lot of people when they agree with something are silent about it. They don't go to meetings. But people who are dead against it try to organize, fill all the seats. The people who are for [a local project] don't write letters, but the people who are against it say it's a bad thing.*

Two Panelists made the same point in a different way. They thought that the NWMO's framework was geared towards achieving unanimous consensus when finding a willing host, and that threshold was simply too stringent:

*Panelist 1: It's never going to be a unanimous decision. ... it sounds like they want to have that. But it will never be that way, ever.*

*Panelist 2: I think they realize that, Panelist 1, but these are worthy goals to strive for.*

Panelists in Saint John also raised the notion of withdrawing consent to host a site. The motivation behind this Panelist's statement was to ensure that successive local governments had a say, or at least could attempt to withdraw from an agreement that no longer works for them:

*And what would the process be for withdrawal? The agreement would be with, say, City Council, as opposed to that decided through a referendum.*

The discussion of the second question was brief in Saint John. This Panelist voiced a concern that the local decision-making process should not be dominated by any one group or interest:

*...You have to have a process or a system set up so you can't be dominated by one group. Including the City Council. Everyone taking part in it has to have some accountability. Try to get a diverse group... where half don't belong to a group trying to promote something or trying to destroy it.*

When discussing the third question, a few Saint John Panelists engaged in a discussion about international experience and its value. This Panelist thought that other countries might have a lot to tell Canadians as we embark on a process to build a repository:

*You have Sweden, Finland, France, Switzerland. The groundwork has been done! They have already said "if you accept this as a host community, then these are the benefits, and the non-benefits." Why can't we have some sort of communication from these other host communities? We have to hear from them how it's affected them and their lives. The fear is the biggest factor.*

Near the end of the Saint John Panel, The Discussion Leader asked the Panelists a hypothetical question: If the NWMO could figure out how to bring all the principles listed on the backgrounder sheet to life, would that be a good thing? One Panelist spoke up and affirmed that the NWMO is indeed on the right path:

*They're on the right track, if they can do it.*

Overall, Saint John Panelists were highly informed and motivated to discuss local experience and examples. In addition, they had much to say about community involvement and local input in decision making.

**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:**

Did anyone see anything in the news or did you read anything about this topic? Have you talked about this to friends or people at work?

SJ-1A:

I did. I brought this up with some friends one night. Most people don't even realize that we already have nuclear waste and we're not dealing with it on a larger scale. It's not anything negative or positive, but there was little or no awareness.

SJ-3A:

Most people think that it's the government's problem. They don't know about these panels, committees, they just think the government will do what they want. If they sat in on some of these meetings, they would have a better outlook on what to do and what not to do.

SJ-13A:

I took the annual report to someone to read and they found it very helpful.

SJ-7A:

I gave mine to a friend to read. He found it very upsetting and interesting all at once. He had never thought about it. He was glad for the information but what upset him is that it's taken too long for things to get moving the way they should.

SJ-15A:

Uranium mining is in the news a lot.

SJ-8A:

My daughter made an interesting comment. She asked why I was doing it. I said it was all about



her future. She said, thanks, you're doing enough.

**Discussion Leader:**

We talked about selecting a site, and how it can be a long time. Tonight we want to talk about the site selection process. Not the site itself, but the way they're going to figure out how to select a site. The process – the best way for it to take into account all the things we've been talking about. I'm going to provide two backgrounders for you to look at. Take a minute to look them over. You said before the NWMO believes that it has to design a siting process that people across Canada feel meet the highest scientific standards. Do you think that this is a framework that could be good for designing a siting process? Any thoughts? Any comments? What was your first reaction?

SJ-10A:

The “aboriginal insights and tradition knowledge” is here again. It catches my eye. I'm not sure why. Is it just to cover their behinds?

SJ-15A:

It's because if they get together, it would make the newspapers.

SJ-4A:

It's because they've been the ones screwed over in the past.

**Discussion Leader:**

It's because Canada has special obligations to them. They have treaty rights and other rights that require organizations like the NMMO to include them in the decision making process.

SJ-15A:

They should explain that, because a lot of people will read that and get irritated.

SJ-11A:

What kind of land claims do they have? Maybe they should let us know what they do have so we don't go there.

**Discussion Leader:**

So, about this approach. Is it going in the right direction? Are these the right questions? Which parts of it ring a good bell with you?

- SJ-8A: What's in it for the community? I think there has to be some sort of partnership or some sort of need that putting a facility in or around that community can fulfill. If it's low employment, then that facility can increase employment, or have things for the schools. Enhanced parks. The community has to have some of its needs on a list that says "this is what we need."
- SJ-4A: They say every interest group should be heard, but in the end, it has to be the majority of citizens living in the community. Say it comes down to a referendum. Once it gets to that level, what kind of campaign regulations are there? Things like that get left to the end. Then citizens have no money to fund their side of the campaign. Make it very clear that it is individuals as a collective who have a final say.
- SJ-11A: I don't know if you have a referendum or something. There are so many people who are ignorant and who have no idea.
- SJ-4A: Fine, if they're ignorant and they want to stay ignorant then, that's their choice. Not enough effort has been made to educate people. It's not the choice of the City Council alone. It has to be a community process.
- SJ-11A: That's what we elect government officials for, to make decisions. In a community like Saint John, there are so many people who are not informed enough to make a decision like this. I would rather have a panel of 100 who are well informed to make the decision than 100,000 in which very few have been educated. No matter how much information you have out there, there are some people who are not going to climb out of their holes for it.
- SJ-10A: I have two comments to make on that. If I am not committed to knowing something, I don't vote on it. If it's a major decision, there's going to be a lot of publicity. You'd have to be in a hole not to know about it.

SJ-8A: I think you're both right. You need to take the people you elect and make them accountable. You should have open forums. The people that turn out at those meetings are going to have the thoughts that elected representatives need to hear. The people who don't go to those meetings aren't going to be interested.

SJ-15A: I think we're designing the process for selecting a site. Tell us if it's going to be a referendum, tell us it's going to be ten men behind a closed door.

**Discussion Leader:** That's what I'm asking, your opinion on how to select a site. One technique may be to hold a referendum, or a plebiscite, but that doesn't help us choose a final site.

SJ-4A: If you had to, give it to those who want it the most.

**Discussion Leader:** What the NWMO has said is that they need to put it in a 'safe and secure' area. We've heard from the geologists that this is a huge area. How do you judge where in all that suitable land to put it?

SJ-1A: The process is probably going to take care of itself. You're not going to identify, say, 20 sites. That's going to cost a lot of money. You narrow down three to five sites. And then you put the word out that they're ready for development. Those communities will understand. They'll probably be clamouring for it. It will take care of itself.

**Discussion Leader:** In some countries they are deadlocked. They have two communities that want one. So what's the process for deciding that?

SJ-10A: If you have two that want it, one community might say "we'll do this for less". They may end up fizzling themselves out.

SJ-1A: That's good for the NWMO, too. They know that they don't have to go through this process

next time. There's one willing to take it when it's full.

SJ-4A: The security and the viability and the long-term are factors, but are they really that equal? Is it going to come down to the point where the only factor is one is just a little bit better? Perhaps less snow on the road in the winter? More labour?

SJ-15A: Transportation. The shortest distance you can carry the most nuclear waste. What reactor produces the most waste and what has the best highway to get it there.

SJ-5A: I do respect having a community that is willing. In Saint John, the city was quite willing to have a LNG pipeline here, but I'm not sure it would have passed a referendum.

**Discussion Leader:** That's only one part of the whole process. If there are ten willing communities, we have a process to choose within them.

SJ-1A: I disagree with a referendum. You can't trust people all of the time. We have to entrust our standards and values to the people who represent us in these things.

SJ-11A: Some people like referendums, some people like elected officials to make those decisions. Why not have open forums and when you attend these meetings you become a delegate? Once you've attended a few of these meetings, then you can vote.

SJ-8A: There's only one problem with that. A lot of people, when they agree with something, are silent about it. They don't go to meetings. But people who are dead against it try to organize and fill all the seats. The people who are for the LNG don't write letters, but the people who are against it say it's a bad thing.

**Discussion Leader:** The NWMO made four commitments here. Do these four sound like the right foundational commitments?

- SJ-10A: They mention the potential host could back out. What happens if the agreement has been made, and something else comes up, but if you've already committed?
- SJ-5A: What would the process be for withdrawal? The agreement would be with, say, City Council, as opposed to that decided through a referendum. It's true, if there was a change of government, and the next City Council... subsequent administrations would have to honour those commitments.
- SJ-11A: Wouldn't this involve municipalities?
- SJ-3A: It'd be federal, too, wouldn't it?
- Discussion Leader:** Let's just not get hung up on that for now. Are they missing anything?
- SJ-11A: It's almost an impossibility. You can't please all of the people, all of the time. You can respect someone's difference of opinion, but if you don't respect their view, they feel insulted.
- SJ-15A: I think the middle one is kind of redundant, the one about people and cultures. But it covers everything.
- SJ-11A: It's never going to be a unanimous decision. It sounds like they want to have that. But it will never be that way, ever.
- SJ-5A: I think they realize that, but these are worthy goals to strive for.
- SJ-11A: I understand and respect it, too.
- SJ-5A: That will come later, and I like that they will be held to these things.
- Discussion Leader:** The other things they've outlined on these green sheets are characteristics that people told them would be fair. Are they just words on paper? Are they on track?

SJ-9A: They're on track. They're covering all the bases.

SJ-8A: Look at the first one. How? I'm picturing a three-member panel going into communities and giving a report to Council.

**Discussion Leader:** So, town hall meetings are the way?

SJ-8A: Yes. They'd meet with City Council, go to town hall meetings, and take all that information back.

SJ-7A: Sounds good to me.

SJ-15A: It doesn't mention communication. I'm not sure where it fits. But it's something that's come up many times. I don't see it in there. It could be highlighted.

SJ-1A: Do we get to find out how other countries and other host cities that have facilities are doing this? Do we have any models about how they approached communities and what the outcome has been?

SJ-15A: I don't think we want to. They don't tell the communities anything in Europe there. They just said it's going here.

**Discussion Leader:** Is there anything the process needs to stay away from, or needs to steer clear of?

SJ-7A: I guess when it comes down to transporting from point A to point B, everyone should be aware of the route it takes.

SJ-1A: I disagree. You don't want people knowing that. There're things that go by every day that we don't know about.

SJ-13A: Any place they could consider should be 'the less transportation the better'.

SJ-1A: I agree. But how is going to be encased?

**Discussion Leader:**

Remember our technical expert explained this to us? He said it'd be in a series of containers when they put them through a series of tests.

SJ-1A:

So why not leave them in there? Why do they have to be in a rock repository?

**Discussion Leader:**

I imagine because there is a difference between moving something from A to B than leaving something that is supposed to last for 10,000 years.

SJ-8A:

They improve on these processes year after year and technology is getting better. But the thing of most concern to me is that you have to have a process or a system set up so you can't be dominated by one group, including City Council. Everyone taking part in it has to have some accountability. Try to get a diverse group where half don't belong to a group trying to promote something or destroy it.

**Discussion Leader:**

So, the NWMO is going to spend the summer coming up with a process. A long process with lots of steps along the way, eventually coming up with some sort of a review. What does that mean? What does this look like? Think of similar things you might have experiences in your own life? Something as a model?

SJ-8A:

When I started working for the school board, the decision was made to close a school down. One of my priorities was to put it in the paper so that people in the community could get involved. Since that has taken place, it has eliminated an awful lot of animosity, because people could come out and share their thoughts. My priority would be to have a process in place so people don't find out about in the newspaper the next day. It involves community consultation.

**Discussion Leader:**

So-called "real time" disclosure and a process so that people can see how it's moving forward?

SJ-8A:

Yes, so they say could say "I wouldn't mind it so much if we didn't just put this playground up. I wouldn't be so upset if we could move it."

**Discussion Leader:** I don't want to put words in your mouth, but what if they put transcripts up?

SJ-4A: They will have to set out what they're going to have to do rather than how they're going to do it. If it could be publicly visible, like a checklist, that would be good. So there are no shocks along the way.

SJ-3A: Why put one in a place like Saskatchewan? We don't need to burden them with our problem? It was here, Ontario and Quebec who wanted these.

**Discussion Leader:** The scientists are saying that it is best to put it in one location.

SJ-3A: The same time people are worried about the transportation from point A to point B.

SJ-11A: Most people, if you talk about this, say "I just thought it was going to be in the Canadian Shield somewhere". It says "community". Who would you have to inform? I can't imagine this in anyone's backyard! I always got the feeling that this is going to be miles and miles from anyone.

SJ-15A: There has to be a community for it. It would employ up to 50 people full-time.

**Discussion Leader:** Theoretically it is possible to create a new community right?

SJ-15A: Yeah.

SJ-11A: But those people you wouldn't have to inform because they'd be there because they work in the business. Maybe we don't have to inform anybody in that case.

SJ-8A: I disagree. Every community has a broader community. For instance, the nearest town. It has to be owned by somebody.



- SJ-15A: Even if it's 50 square kilometres in the middle of New Brunswick that we don't use, it could be a provincial park someday. We should think of what that space could be 50 years from now.
- SJ-11A: As Canadians, shouldn't we be concerned about it?
- SJ-1A: You have Sweden, Finland and France who have been working on this. The groundwork has been done! They have already said "if you accept this as a host community, then these are the benefits, and the non-benefits." Why can't we have some sort of communication from these other host communities? We have to hear from them how it's affected them and their lives. The fear is the biggest factor.
- Discussion Leader:** I hear that one of the things we should do is look to the experiences of other countries. But I also hear that we need a made-in-Canada solution.
- SJ-1A: I think their values are just as stringent as ours.
- Discussion Leader:** I'm still interested to know other ways we could approach this. Some other lessons from LNG, housing, garbage dumps. All often come with plusses and minuses.
- SJ-4A: Again, going through the other processes. One of the problems is that you're constantly changing the people you're dealing with. The city, the builders. If this is some sort of national waste management project, they have to stay at the centre of it. They have to be the go-between.
- Discussion Leader:** But that doesn't come in until the very end. The only way you're going to have that is at the very end.
- SJ-4A: Again, keep the number of people communities deal with to a minimum. It's not a job that one person can do, but it's not a job 100 people can do. Keep it as personal as possible so that anyone who needs information has a contact. It

should be a long-term job and process. And that requires management within the NWMO.

SJ-5A: I have a question on something mentioned here under the section partnerships. Who are the other parties?

**Discussion Leader:** Who would you imagine they would be?

SJ-5A: I would imagine City Council.

SJ-9A: When the LNG came to town they heard from the LNG company.

**Discussion Leader:** Are their lessons we can learn from that?

SJ-9A: “Here’s your LNG plant, take it or leave it.”

**Discussion Leader:** So you say it’s the anti-model?

SJ-5A: It was not handled democratically. It was City Council agreeing to it under serious pressure.

SJ-9A: It was a Saturday and they had a meeting with the former mayor who said ‘take it or leave it’. It went to Council and it was slipped on the agenda. Normally Council is given a briefing and they didn’t have that. It was 11<sup>th</sup> hour and they said “we have this LNG plant, accept it or not”. And they accepted it.

**Discussion Leader:** And they accepted it.

SJ-15A: My mother called me and she said “you won’t believe what’s happening. They ripped up our street”. And there is a 4 foot deep trench in the street. And it was 8:00AM on a Friday. People couldn’t get to work. They didn’t have a phone number to call.

SJ-8A: I’m sure that the process was a farce. But I’m not sure that LNG itself doesn’t have benefits for the community. It’s the process. You have to separate the two.

**Discussion Leader:** Given then NWMO doesn't want to end up in the same jackpot, what do they have to do differently?

SJ-1A: The LNG could have done all this heartfelt stuff.

**Discussion Leader:** Do people think the process was corrupt? Dishonest?

*Many say "all of the above".*

SJ-4A: An example of how far-reaching it was was that 16,000 signed a petition. 14,000 voted for the Mayor. More people were against it than were for the Mayor. Ask people if they are against LNG? No. It's the way they did it.

SJ-1A: It's the plan that was put in place by the LNG and the Rexall/Irving group. They sold them the farm for an unbelievable tax break. They gave them this whole thing for \$500, 000 per year. Unbelievable.

**Discussion Leader:** What I hear you saying is that if the NWMO figures out how to bring these things on this sheet to life, that looks like a process that makes sense to you?

*Consensus that yes, it does make sense.*

SJ-15A: They're on the right track, if they can do it. If the LNG had any of this, there wouldn't have been a problem.

**Discussion Leader:** So again, a lot of it was a lousy process that didn't involve citizens or give them a chance to have input. By not following the rules, it left people with a feeling that there was something untoward going on, a sweetheart deal.

SJ-1A: It's going to be a sacrifice for the Council of the day that made that decision.

**Discussion Leader:** The ends justify the means, is what they would have thought?

SJ-1A:

Exactly. When they're appointing people to oversee these applications, we should rely on their expertise.

## 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 BACKGROUNDEERS 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™

