

Test of “Managing Canada’s Nuclear Fuel Waste” Draft Brochure Among Aboriginal People

NWMO SR-2008-38

October 2008

Environics Research Group.

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.

Nuclear Waste Management Organization

October 2008



336 MacLaren Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0M6

pn 6386

Table of Contents

Introduction	0
Background	0
Research Purpose and Objectives.....	0
Methodology	0
Report Synopsis	2
Statement of Limitations.....	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	3
Key Findings	3
Detailed Findings	6
First impressions of brochure	6
Detailed assessment of brochure	10
Usage of brochure.....	19
Interest in further information on NWMO or Adaptive Phased Management.....	20
Conclusions	22

Appendices:

- A: Recruiting screener
- B: Moderator's guides

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) was established in 2002 by Ontario Power Generation Inc., Hydro-Québec and New Brunswick Power Corporation. The NWMO was created in accordance with the *Nuclear Fuel Waste Act*, which was enacted to ensure that the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste will be carried out in a comprehensive, integrated and economically sound manner. Under the *Act*, the NWMO assumed responsibility for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel, and its vision is to undertake this management in a manner that both safeguards people and respects the environment, now and in the future.

The NWMO has developed a brochure, entitled *Moving Forward Together*, which is designed to provide information to Canadians regarding the issue of the management of used nuclear fuel, the NWMO itself and its mission and vision, and the basic principles of Adaptive Phased Management (the approach that has been chosen to manage Canada's used nuclear fuel).

The NWMO is currently in the process of designing a version of the *Moving Forward Together* brochure that is specifically for use with Aboriginal people. The purpose of this research was to obtain feedback on an initial draft design for the brochure.

Research Purpose and Objectives

The main objective of the study reported here is to evaluate the brochure entitled *Managing Canada's Nuclear Fuel Waste* among Aboriginal people. The study was designed to gauge reactions to the brochure. More specifically, the study was designed to assess the following:

- overall impressions of the brochure;
- opinions on the overall design and layout of the brochure;
- perceptions of ease of comprehension of the information communicated in the brochure;
- what types of questions the brochure raises in the reader's mind; and
- opinions on how the brochure should be distributed.

Methodology

The methodology used for this study was qualitative in nature; Environics conducted two (2) focus groups with Aboriginal residents of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA).

Target population. The target audience for this study included Aboriginal GTA residents who had significant urban, as well as Aboriginal community, life experience.

Recruitment. All participants were recruited for participation by Environics. As noted above, a key focus of the recruiting was to ensure that all participants (as a group) represented Aboriginal people who had urban and Aboriginal community life experience. This was operationalized as follows:

- At least four of the participants in each session had lived in a community of at least 100,000 population for at least one of the past five years;
- At least four of the participants in each session had lived in an Aboriginal community for three years or more since the age of 14; and
- 2-3 participants in each session had *both* urban *and* Aboriginal community experience as defined above.

In addition, participants were recruited to collectively represent a mix of:

- Gender;
- Age (within the 18-34, 35-54 and 55+ age groups);
- Education; and
- Income.

In addition, all prospective participants were screened to ensure that they:

- had not participated in a focus group session in the past six months and had not participated in more than five focus groups in the last five years;
- did not work for a public relations, advertising or marketing/public opinion research firm, or for a media outlet.

The screening questionnaire used to recruit participants is shown in Appendix A. For all sessions, ten participants were recruited to ensure at least eight actually participated. All participants were offered a monetary incentive for their participation in the study.

Implementation. Both sessions were fully attended, with eight (8) participants in each. The moderator’s discussion guide for the groups was developed by Environics in consultation with the NWMO and is shown in Appendix B.

All qualitative research work was conducted in accordance with the professional standards established by the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA).

Report Synopsis

The body of this report consists of the following sections:

- Executive Summary, which provides an overview of the key findings.
- Detailed Findings, which discusses in detail the qualitative research findings.
- Appendices, which present the research instruments used in the course of this research.

Statement of Limitations

The objectives of this research initiative are exploratory and therefore best addressed qualitatively. Qualitative research provides insight into the range of opinions held within a population, rather than the weights of the opinions held, as would be measured in a quantitative study. The results of this type of research should be viewed as indicative rather than projective.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

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*.

The NWMO is currently in the process of designing a version of its *Moving Forward Together* brochure that is specifically for use with Aboriginal people. The NWMO wished to obtain feedback on an initial draft design for the brochure.

To test the brochure, Environics conducted two (2) focus groups with Aboriginal residents of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). The target audience for this study included Aboriginal GTA residents who had significant urban, as well as Aboriginal community, life experience.

Key Findings

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF BROCHURE

- Initial reactions to the brochure were mainly positive, based on the perceived straightforward, clear nature of the presentation and the fact that the information presented was new to them and seen as important.
- The subject matter (nuclear waste management) did cause alarm in a small number of participants.
- Only one participant made top-of-mind reference to the Aboriginal elements of the brochure design.
- Top-of-mind strengths of the brochure included the circular format, organization of information and clear explication, as well as the importance of the topic itself and the perceived “proactive” approach of the NWMO in inviting people to become involved.
- Discussion of perceived weaker aspects of the brochure tended to focus on concerns about nuclear waste in general. In addition, there were some negative comments about the brochure binding and the fact that the brochure was not seen as very reassuring to those who were alarmed by the issue. There was also some questioning of the focus on Aboriginal elements.

- Most participants felt the *purpose* of the brochure, was to educate the public and raise awareness of the issue. Some felt the purpose of the brochure was, to some degree, to enlist the support of Aboriginal peoples. This was viewed positively by some, but by others as an attempt to mollify Aboriginal people preparatory to an effort to store used nuclear fuel on native lands.
- The majority of participants felt that the brochure was directed at a general public audience. Even those who immediately saw the focus on Aboriginal elements in the brochure design did not generally feel that this meant the brochure was directed *only* to Aboriginal people.
- In terms of format, participants generally liked the circular shape of the brochure, which was seen as attractive and symbolic. Opinions were more negative on the way the brochure was bound. Most wanted to read it like a book and felt it should be bound in a more secure manner.
- Participants generally liked the fact that different colour schemes were used in the different pages of the brochure, noting that this made for a lively presentation. Some noted that the colours used are all “native colours” and reference the colours of the medicine wheel, which was generally seen as appropriate. There was a general sense that the pictures and illustrations used were an asset to the brochure in that they helped convey what the brochure is all about. The level of diversity shown in the pictures also came in for general praise (although there were exceptions). The balance between photos/illustrations and text on the text pages was also generally praised, as was the text itself.
- In terms of perceived “missing” information, some participants felt there was not enough information on the *risks and potential harms* associated with storage of nuclear waste and that the information was not sufficiently *reassuring*.

DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF BROCHURE

The reader is referred to the body of the report for a page-by-page assessment of brochure design and content.

USAGE OF BROCHURE

- Opinions on *modalities of distribution* for the brochure were heavily influenced by the perception that the brochure was directed towards a broad general public audience, leading to a general suggestion that the brochure be mailed out to all Canadians. Another popular suggestion was to distribute the brochure through schools, particularly high schools and colleges/universities. Other suggestions included doctor’s offices and OPG or Hydro One offices (or other offices connected with power utilities).

INTEREST IN FURTHER INFORMATION ON NWMO OR ADAPTIVE PHASED MANAGEMENT

- Most participants agreed that the brochure information raised questions in their minds, mostly related to the nuclear fuel waste itself. A small number of participants wanted to know more about the NWMO; for example, how it’s funded. Most would turn to the NWMO website for this information, although some wanted to see third-party information that they would access through an Internet search.
- Few participants indicated an interest in getting involved in the issue of nuclear waste management beyond getting more information and most did not feel the brochure would have much impact in terms of encouraging people to become involved.
- Most participants felt the most important thing they learned from the brochure was the existence of the issue itself and that something was being done in relation to the issue. The knowledge that there was Aboriginal involvement in the issue was also mentioned as important by some participants.
- All participants agreed that the brochure was ultimately useful, with most feeling that the brochure provided a good introduction to the topic.

DETAILED FINDINGS

First impressions of brochure

After the standard introductory remarks by the moderator and participant introductions, the moderator immediately distributed one copy of the brochure material (printed in colour on 8.5" X 11" paper) to each participant. At the same time, two copies of the *bound* brochure (in the circular format) were distributed and shared around the table, to give participants an idea of what the final brochure would look like and how it could be manipulated. Participants were given approximately ten minutes to read through the brochure material.

Initial reactions to the brochure were mainly positive. Most positive commentary focused on the straightforward, clear nature of the presentation.

"I thought it was straightforward; tells you the basics of what you're trying to get across."

"Easy to read; not full of big words."

"Gives a nice presentation."

Participants also focused on the brochure content in their initial comments. For most, this was new information on a topic they had never (or rarely) considered.

"Pretty informative."

"Interesting."

"Gave some good facts; asking people's opinions."

"I really like it – it made me aware of all the nuclear things they are doing."

There were relatively few negative initial comments. However, the subject matter (nuclear waste management) did cause alarm in a small number of participants. As one participant noted: "It's easy to read; it's just the word 'nuclear', like 'nuclear war', and they're using this for us? I'm a little uncomfortable with it, but I guess what they're trying to do is good."

There was general agreement that the brochure raises some concern, based on the subject matter.

Only one participant made top-of-mind reference to the Aboriginal elements of the brochure design. He noted that the brochure was "very geared towards natives."

When the moderator asked participants what they felt were the positive or strong points of the brochure, comments focused mainly on the brochure format, organization of information and clear explication, as well as the importance of the topic itself.

“It’s active [i.e., the format encourages interaction].”

“Pictures are eye-catching; everything stands out.”

“Well-organized.”

“Once you read a bit, you want to know more, so you read more.”

“It did explain [the topic] in detail.”

“Had a good flow to it.”

A small number of participants felt that a strength of the brochure was its perceived “proactive” approach to the topic. As one participant noted, “I like the fact that it’s an invitation to become involved.” This comment generated strong agreement.

Discussion of the perceived negative or weaker aspects of the brochure tended to focus on concerns about nuclear waste in general. That is, commentary focused on participants’ concerns about the effects of nuclear waste on the environment and human health, rather than elements of the brochure itself. That said, there were some negative comments about the brochure format:

“It flops around in your hand.”

“It’s going to last maybe six weeks. It’s going to rip.”

In the second focus group session in particular, participants who were most concerned about the issue of nuclear waste management did not feel the brochure was very reassuring on the subject:

“It’s almost like they’re questioning it – second-guessing themselves.”

“[They’re] not giving you any guarantees.”

Participants, particularly in the second session (where they were more likely to notice and comment on the Aboriginal elements in the brochure in their initial assessment), also questioned the focus on Aboriginal elements. One participant queried: “Why is it so geared to native people? Is it going on reserve? Are they going to be making deposits [of used nuclear fuel] to reserves?”

When participants were asked what they felt was the *purpose* of the brochure, most focused on education: the brochure was, in their view, designed to “educate the public” or raise awareness of the issue.

However, a number of participants in both sessions interpreted the purpose of the brochure in light of the focus on Aboriginal people and Aboriginal cultural elements seen in the brochure. These participants felt that the purpose of the brochure was, to some degree, to enlist the support of Aboriginal peoples. To some, this was seen in a positive light. One participant noted; “[They are] trying to get native people on board...for this organization to say, you know, ‘if we pair with native culture, native society, that we’ll be more suited to be able to take care of things’.”

To others, the focus on Aboriginal people in the brochure was an attempt to mollify Aboriginal people preparatory to an effort to store used nuclear fuel on native lands:

“It’s like they’re asking permission [to store nuclear fuel].”

“[The purpose of the brochure is] to pacify us.”

“Because it’s on our land, too.”

In terms of the perceived *target audience* of the brochure, the majority of participants felt that the brochure was directed towards the general public:

“It’s family-oriented.”

“These [the colours used] are the four colours of unity, so it’s for everyone.”

Even those who immediately saw the focus on Aboriginal elements in the brochure design did not generally feel that this meant the brochure was directed *only* to Aboriginal people. As one participant put it: “It’s meant to be for everyone, but with a special focus on Aboriginals for some reason, probably because of Niigani.”

Participants were asked their opinions regarding the *format* of the brochure (i.e., its shape and type of binding). Participants generally liked the circular shape of the brochure, which was seen as attractive and symbolic:

“It catches your eye.”

“It’s more compact.”

“It’s a circle for the planet – it’s the medicine wheel.”

“It’s native culture – everything runs in a circle.”

Opinions were more negative on the way the brochure was bound. It should be noted that participants, when first holding the bound brochure, were split as to how they interacted with it. Most read the brochure like a book, holding the binding point with their left hand and leafing through the pages with their right. In addition, there was a basic sense among most participants that the information in the brochure had a structure that encouraged a linear approach to reading, starting at the beginning and moving through the pages in order to the end. Even those who looked at the pages like individual cards, moving pages “out of the way” along the binding point to see other pages, tended to look at the pages in order.

Objections to the method of binding tended to focus on its looseness (recall the earlier comment about it “flopping around”) and the fact that looking at the brochure as individual ‘cards’ (the moderator’s description) obscured the fact that there was information on the back. As one participant noted, “If you’re flipping it ‘that way’ (i.e., as individual cards), you can’t read the back.” Another summed up the discussion on the format by saying, “The circle [shape] is a strength, the weakness is the way it’s bound together.”

Participants were next asked about the use of *colour* in the brochure. Participants generally liked the fact that different colour schemes were used in the different pages of the brochure, noting that this made for a lively presentation. Some (particularly in the second session) noted that the colours used are all “native colours” and reference the colours of the medicine wheel. The fact that the motif of the medicine wheel is also used in the design of the individual pages was also noticed by a number of participants and was generally appreciated and seen as appropriate. One participant noted with admiration, “Whoever did this is really, really thinking.”

Participants were asked their opinions on the use of *pictures and illustrations* in the brochure as a whole. There was a general sense that the pictures and illustrations used were an asset to the brochure in that they helped convey what the brochure is all about and “made you want to read it”. Another participant noted that “the pictures told a story”. Some participants noted that many of the pictures convey a family feeling. Also, some participants noted that some of the pictures (in the words of one participant) “...show the relationship of people to the planet.”

The level of diversity shown in the pictures also came in for praise: the photos were seen as “very multicultural” (to quote one participant). However, one participant noted that the first part of the brochure shows mostly white, middle-class people and that the transition to

showing Aboriginal people (and Aboriginal cultural symbols like the medicine wheel) is too abrupt.

The *balance* between photos/illustrations and text on the text pages was also generally praised. One participant stated, “I like it, really...the text and photos work together.” Although individual participants objected to some pictures on individual pages, there was a strong sense that the brochure as a whole struck a good balance between text and graphic elements.

On an overall basis, the *text* of the brochure was generally praised as clear and straightforward:

“All [the text] is pretty straightforward.”

“...simple words...”

“...no \$20 words...”

No participants identified any individual passage of text as difficult to understand when asked to comment on the brochure as a whole.

Participants were asked if they felt any information was “missing’. That is, if they felt there was any information that should be in the brochure, but isn’t. A couple of areas were mentioned in this context. First, some participants felt there was not enough information on the *risks and potential harms* associated with storage of nuclear waste. Although participants did not want the brochure to be too graphic in its depictions of risk and potential harm, they did feel that this issue should be addressed. The other element that was mentioned (especially in the second group, where concerns about nuclear waste were more frequently and forcefully expressed) was the element of *reassurance*. Participants who were concerned about nuclear waste wanted to see more reassuring information in the brochure. As they saw it, the brochure emphasized uncertainty (“they’re guessing”, noted one participant). Another stated, “There’s not enough information about safe storage.”

Detailed assessment of brochure

Following the discussion of the brochure as a whole, the discussion moved to a page-by-page assessment of the brochure. For each page, the ‘cover photo’ was discussed, as well as the text, photographs/illustrations and design elements found on the reverse page. Pages will be identified in the discussion below by title.

Cover. Comments on the brochure cover were virtually all positive. This was generally considered to be a real strength of the brochure. Themes of nature, innocence and protection dominated perceptions:

“I like the cover. It looks like a little kid’s hands, with a little tiny leaf, trying to save it.”

“You see nature there; the plant, water. Water is clean; leaf is not broken, fresh.”

“Shows innocence; the hands are child’s hands.”

“Shows protection – ‘you’re in good hands’.”

“Canada is in our hands.”

The cover was seen as enhancing the probability that the brochure would be picked up in the first place. As one participant put it:

“I’d see it [the brochure] and pick it up because it has a warm feeling; so I’d pick it up and then I’d see the title and say, ‘Oh, I’ll read it’.”

Perceptions were more mixed in terms of the text on the reverse side of the cover. Most positive comments regarding the description of the NWMO came from the first session. There, the text was generally seen as clear and appropriate:

“[The text is an] introduction to what is to follow throughout the brochure.”

“Values stood out for me right away.”

“[Transparency] means they have nothing to hide.”

When asked what they felt was important to the NWMO, based on what they saw on this page, responses included “the environment” and “the safety of Canadians”.

In the second session, however, opinions of this page were less positive. Comments reflected a greater sense of uncertainty:

“They have ideas, but do they really know?”

“They’re trying to reassure us of their purpose.”

Participants felt that the text was clear and easy to understand and could not generally point to any one element of the text on this page in terms of specific criticism, with the exception of the list of NWMO Values shown at the bottom of the page. A number of participants (in the second session only) felt that these values should not be included:

“I don’t know that they need to put the values.”

“They’re trying to sugar-coat it.”

“...sounds phony.”

The photos used on the text page did not inspire much comment. Some participants felt that they help show the seriousness of the issue, but did not seem particularly reassuring, although one participant noted that the photo did not show “leaky barrels” (i.e., showed what seemed to be secure storage).

How did we get here? The photograph of the plug was generally seen to be appropriate, given the connection between nuclear power and electricity generation. A couple of participants felt that a residential, rather than an industrial, plug should be pictured, as the brochure is aimed at the general public.

The text on the reverse page inspired little specific comment. One participant commented that “there is very little information here.” The purpose of the page was seen as, in the words of one participant, “trying to show the positives of nuclear power.” One participant felt that the phrase in parentheses (...also known as nuclear energy...) was superfluous.

The photos on this page generated much more comment than did the text. Participants in both sessions perceived a sameness and a lack of diversity in the photos:

“Personally, I would show more diversity.”

“Do you see any Aboriginal people here? Not one!”

“First four pages are of a suburban white family, then boom! [shows Aboriginal people]”

In general, there was a strong sense across the sessions that the photos over-emphasized a white, middle-class, suburban viewpoint and should be revised to show a broader range of Canadian society. However, it should be noted that one participant felt that the brochure as a whole showed diversity quite strongly and it was not necessary for every page to do so.

Some participants also noted that the photos seem to show people wasting electricity, which they saw as inappropriate to the message of the brochure as a whole. Also, a couple of participants noted that the text mentions the medical use of nuclear isotopes, but there is no photo with a medical subject.

What is nuclear fuel waste? The photo (a close-up of the end of a nuclear fuel bundle) generated a number of comments. Most participants were puzzled as to what was shown in

this photo (a number thought it was the barrel of a gun) until they read the reverse side of the page. Even so, the photo was positively regarded:

“I really like it.”

“Makes you want to read [further, to find out what is pictured]”

The text on the reverse page was also generally praised as providing useful information in a clear manner. In particular, participants commented on how they learned something new (and important) from this page:

“Very informative.”

“This is information we need to know.”

“I would never have known this.”

“Would have thought of barrels with [radiation symbol] on them.”

“Might be sand or soil, but you see it’s these rods.”

The use of analogies on this page (comparing the size of a nuclear fuel bundle to a fireplace log and using a hockey rink to illustrate the volume of used nuclear fuel) received particular praise:

“Anybody who grew up with a wood-burning stove...could relate to this.”

“The hockey rink...is a Canadian symbol.”

Despite the perception that the information on this page was new and important, participants in both sessions pointed out that they felt this page did not give a complete discussion of the issue. A key element that participants felt was not addressed was the risk associated with used nuclear fuel and the potential harms from it:

“Is it explosive, flammable, corrosive?”

“[If unauthorized people gained access to the bundles,] what can they do with it that could harm us?”

However, participants were sensitive to the fact that information about risks/harms might cause undue alarm. As one participant noted, “I don’t think they [the NWMO] want to alarm you. If you want to know more, you can find out.”

There was also a desire to learn who licenses and regulates storage of used nuclear fuel (this stemmed from the reference in the text to “a licensed and regulated facility”).

What needs to be done? The photo of a small group talking over coffee inspired differing reactions in the two sessions. In the first session, the photo was generally seen to be appropriate and the focus on discussion in the photo seemed suitable to page entitled ‘What needs to be done?’ The major perceived themes of the photo (in this context) were group discussion and sharing information.

Perceptions of the photo were much more negative in the second session. The participants in this session generally felt that they did not understand what the photo contributed to the subject and that it looked, in the words of one participant, “kind of lame.” Another noted that the photo “doesn’t help the reader to figure anything out.”

Perceptions of the text page on the reverse also varied. For some, the image of the medicine wheel was entirely appropriate to the subject of this page because of its connotations of unity and universality:

“It [the medicine wheel] means we all have to work together.”

“It means all of us.”

To others, the image seemed to come ‘out of nowhere’ and was somewhat puzzling:

“Your eye goes right to the dream catcher; so you read it [the text] and it still tells you nothing about the dream catcher, the medicine wheel.”

The text itself was generally seen as clear; the perceived message was quite strongly that all Canadians have to work together on this issue:

“We’re all supposed to have a say.”

“I like the statement of ‘all Canadians’ – when I think of Canada I don’t think just Aboriginal; I think multicultural and that lends positivity to ... the entire country.”

“It’s focused on everybody working together.”

It must be noted that one older participant felt that he was not ‘Canadian’; this led to a brief discussion and a suggestion that the uses of the word ‘Canadians’ on this page be replaced by ‘everyone’ or ‘all people’. However, this was a minority view.

The photos on this page were seen by most participants as emphasizing education and the generational component reflected in other aspects of the brochure. There were no significant negative comments about the photos.

Finding answers to last generations. The photo of the hands was generally positively regarded. Comments focused on the generational component and the message of unity and working together:

“You see unity there.”

“Generations working together.”

“It’s possible for us all to work together.”

“It’s inviting.”

However, some participants (particularly in the second session) felt that the photo did not communicate diversity:

“They’re all white.”

“[It shows a] suburban white family grouped together and there’s more than that to Canada.”

Comments on the text on the reverse page reflected different perceptions of the message. To most participants, the message of collaboration and seeking input from Canadians was viewed positively:

“Shows you that they’re working on it, taking it seriously and inviting the public in.”

“They’re willing to educate.”

“They’re asking for feedback.”

“They’re trying to find the answers, but as long as they keep asking people for their participation, they’ll keep moving forward.”

However, to some participants (in particular, those looking for reassurance), the message of this page was that the NWMO doesn’t really know exactly what to do. This group got a message of uncertainty from the text:

“They don’t know what they’re doing. They’re lost.”

“Why are they asking questions to citizens? We don’t know [the answers].”

“[They’re] still asking questions. Don’t know exactly what they’re doing yet.”

The photos on this page received some comment. In particular, the photo of the group tour of the Pickering dry storage area was mentioned. Some felt this photo to be reassuring, as it showed a group of people near nuclear waste without protective clothing. In addition, one participant noted that this photo reflected the NWMO value of transparency: “It’s part of

the transparency – letting the public in.” However, a small number felt the photo was overly dominant on the page.

Making wise choices for every Canadian. The photo of the globe was positively regarded and seen as appropriate by all participants. Interestingly, most participants did not object to the focus of the photo being broader than just Canada. In fact, participants preferred to change the title (to refer to “person” instead of “Canadian”) rather than change the photo:

“That caption is wrong! [should be more than just Canada]”

“The photo puts everything in perspective.”

“International element; global.”

However, this perception was not universal. As one participant noted, “It’s our problem, our backyard.”

Perceptions of the text on the reverse page were largely positive. When asked how they felt about the fact that the NWMO created an Aboriginal Working Group, comments focused on the value of the contribution of Aboriginal people and the need for Aboriginal people to have a voice in the issue:

“...that Aboriginal people took it seriously enough to create a group to work with the NWMO.”

“They [the NWMO] are trying to partner, to move forward.”

“Shows us they’ve got the backing of these [Aboriginal] people.”

“Because, historically, Aboriginal people were closer to the earth.”

“It affects our animals in the bush up there.”

It should be noted that there was a perception among a minority of participants that Aboriginal involvement was being sought by the NWMO because they might want to dispose of used nuclear fuel on Aboriginal land. This view was expressed in a more-or-less cynical manner, depending on the respondent.

Interestingly, one participant had the perception that the references to the number of people consulted by the NWMO made them seem like a small organization that had not really talked to too many people. This view was not shared, however.

The photo on this page did not generate much comment. However, one participant noted that the title refers to “every Canadian”, but the photo shows only Aboriginal people.

Another, noting that the photo caption refers to New Brunswick, felt that the views of Aboriginal people from other regions (his example was the Haida) might differ.

Storage for a safe environment. This page generated a great deal of discussion. Most participants felt the storage facility illustrated was located on the Prairies, because of the flat terrain. Perceptions of this illustration varied markedly. Some participants felt reassured by it:

“It shows that there is a plan.”

“It shows a safe environment.”

“[The facility] looks safe, secure.”

On the other hand, other participants found the setting alarming:

“To me, it’s troublesome. I could be running in that field. There’s a pond nearby. I could want to drink water from it.”

“It’s a contradiction – we’re going to save the environment by putting nuclear waste in the ground?”

“Could be my town; I don’t want it to be my town.”

There was some discussion of the perceived remoteness of the facility location. Although some participants felt that the facility should be far away from people, most felt that the location of the facility in the illustration was chosen for a reason: to show that the facility is safe enough to be located near inhabited areas. As one participant noted:

“[If the facility was shown in the wilderness] we’d say, ‘why is it so far away – is it not safe?’”

“If it’s isolated, you’d wonder who’s watching it.”

“To show that it’s safe enough to be near people.”

Most participants felt the illustration of the facility itself was fairly clear. However, some did not understand the scale. In particular, the illustration of the man next to the container was confusing. This was because the used nuclear fuel shown was perceived to be a single bundle.

Participants in both sessions viewed the text on the reverse page quite consistently. The first paragraph was generally seen as reassuring:

“I like the first paragraph.”

“A nuclear plant is safe.”

The second paragraph, on the other hand, was not perceived as reassuring. Quite the opposite. The main issue was the perceived uncertainty of the plan described:

“Too many what-ifs.”

“A lot of buts.”

“It’s just vague.”

“Sounds like they don’t really have a plan.”

“Doesn’t say how many storage facilities they will need.”

“To me, it’s unclear what they plan to do.”

Although participants did not generally point to specific elements of the text in making their comments, some specific points can be made. At least one participant perceived the phrase “close the facility and return the ground to its natural state” to mean that the used fuel rods would be dug up and moved again, which the participant found alarming. Another participant pointed to this same phrase as an example of uncertainty: “Return the ground to its natural state? How are they going to do that?”

Also, participants were specifically asked about the last sentence (concerning how the plan will be funded). Most perceived the source of this funding to be taxpayers. Only one participant seemed to be aware of the polluter-pays principle, and he felt that the cost would ultimately be passed along to the consumer in any event.

How do I get involved? Perceptions of the photo of the family around the computer varied among participants. Most (but not all) participants in the first session viewed the photo positively:

“It’s a good picture.”

“It’s easy to get involved.”

“New technology.”

“One generation to another.”

However, almost all participants in the second session (and some in the first) objected to the photo because the expressions on the people’s faces were not appropriate to the seriousness of the subject:

“Looks like they’re all playing a video game.”

“This is not appropriate.”

“They look a little too happy.”

Generally, the text on the reverse page was positively regarded. In response to the moderator question about the message of this page, one participant summed it up as follows: “The NWMO is more than willing to listen.” The *invitation* aspect of the message was clear to most participants.

Most participants who were interested in finding out more information about the NWMO or the issue (the majority of participants) indicated that they would go to the website for that information. One participant noted that the web address should be given throughout the brochure and suggested that it could appear in the border found on all pages.

A small number of participants mentioned that they might call. It is interesting to note that those who would call for more information positioned that call as a kind of challenge to the NWMO: “I would call them to see if they call back.” No participant expressed an interest in contacting the NWMO by regular mail.

Usage of brochure

Following the page-by-page assessment of the brochure content, the moderator asked participants how they thought the brochure should be distributed (given their perceptions of the target audience). Opinions on modalities of distribution were heavily influenced by the perception that the brochure was directed towards a broad general public audience. This perception led many participants to suggest that the brochure be mailed out to all Canadians. However, some participants did note that this would be expensive, and one participant was of the opinion that “if you get this in the mail, you’ll just toss it in the garbage.” To this participant, it was important to “come across” the brochure, rather than have it delivered to you.

One suggestion that was broadly supported in both sessions was to distribute the brochure through schools. Most felt the brochure was best suited to a senior high school or university-level audience, although some felt it should go to all levels. Some participants felt it would be appropriate to place the brochure in doctor’s offices, while one mentioned OPG or Hydro One offices (or other offices connected with power generation). One participant mentioned distributing the brochure through workshops, but most participants were cool to distribution through ‘events’ (perhaps because this was not seen as a good way to distribute to a wide audience).

Interest in further information on NWMO or Adaptive Phased Management

Most participants agreed that the brochure information raised questions in their minds. For most, these questions related to the nuclear fuel waste itself:

“How secure is it?”

“Where’s it going now?”

“Why can’t it stay where it is?”

A small number of participants wanted to know more about the NWMO; for example, how it’s funded.

Most would turn to the NWMO website for more information, although a couple of participants mentioned wanting to see third-party information that they would access through an Internet search.

Few participants indicated an interest in getting involved in the issue of nuclear waste management beyond getting more information. Most (but not all) did not feel the brochure would have much impact in terms of encouraging people to become involved. As one participant put it, “[The design] is too playful.” Another noted that the brochure is “too calming to encourage taking action.”

At this point in the discussion, the moderator distributed the *Who We Are* backgrounder piece to all participants. Time did not permit participants to read this in detail. Because of this and the fact that few participants had questions about the NWMO itself, the backgrounder was generally not seen as answering any questions emerging from the review of the brochure. A couple of participants noted that they liked seeing the staff pictured (although one noted that there were no Aboriginal people).

The moderator asked participants two final questions before ending the session. Participants were first asked to state the most important thing they had learned from the session and the brochure. For most, the most important thing was the existence of the issue itself:

“There’s a major problem.”

“Big impact on the environment and what are we doing about it?”

A number of participants also noted that something was being done in relation to the issue:

“I feel good that they’re working on it.”

“That something is being done.”

“They’re working on it.”

The knowledge that there was Aboriginal involvement in the issue was also mentioned as important by some participants.

The moderator also asked participants whether, when all was said and done, they felt the brochure was useful. All participants agreed that it was. Most comments around this question related to the perception that the brochure provided a good introduction to the topic:

“Yes, it increases the awareness.”

“Definitely gets you thinking.”

“Provides a fair bit of information in a small package that can be distributed easily and can be understood by most people.”

“It’s not a little bit of information; it’s a whole lot of information.”

CONCLUSIONS

When interpreting the findings of this study, it is necessary to keep a two key points in mind:

1. Perceptions of the brochure are inextricably linked to perceptions of the topic. For most participants, this was an issue that they had no prior knowledge of and, in many cases, had never even considered. To some of these participants, the issue raised great concern, even fear, in their minds and these participants were looking to the brochure information to reassure them.
2. The audience for the focus groups was Aboriginal people living in an *urban* setting. Although efforts were made in the recruiting process to ensure that participants had lived for a significant period in Aboriginal communities, it is possible that the findings of this study would be different if it had been conducted among residents of an Aboriginal community.

With these points in mind, we can say that overall perceptions of the brochure were largely positive. With some exceptions, participants generally felt that the brochure presented *good information on an important topic* and that the information was *clear and easy to understand*.

In terms of format, although some participants appreciated the ‘interactive’ nature of the format (binding) tested; most would have preferred a brochure bound in a more book-like manner. The circular shape was widely praised and should be retained, but most participants felt the binding was not conducive to reading the brochure text and seemed too flimsy.

The overall design of the brochure was positively regarded. Although not all participants picked up on the Aboriginal cultural touchstones in the brochure design, most felt them to be appropriate when asked. To be sure, there were some questions raised as to the motivations behind Aboriginal involvement in the work of the NWMO, but the design elements included (notably the motif of the medicine wheel) were seen as appropriate, especially by those with knowledge of the traditions and means of the symbols.

Generally, the photographs and illustrations used, and the balance between graphic elements and text, were viewed positively by participants. Some exceptions are noted in the report, but an overarching concern of participants is that diversity should be emphasized where possible. Also, photos should be chosen with the seriousness of the issue in mind. With this in mind, the photos on the ‘How did we get here?’ text page and the ‘How do I get involved?’ title page can perhaps be re-thought.

Text throughout the brochure was seen as clear and easy to understand. Those who had the greatest level of concern regarding the issue felt the language used could be more reassuring. In particular, the language describing the Adaptive Phased Management plan elicited a feeling that the plan was not sufficiently well-defined. The challenge to the NWMO is to find language that is consistent with the realities of the plan, but that reassures the reader that it is possible to safely manage nuclear waste.

Perceptions as to how the brochure should be distributed were influenced by the general perception that the brochure was directed towards the general public. This led to a general preference for distribution in the general mail. However, a number of participants also felt that distribution through schools was appropriate and there was also mention of doctor’s offices and offices of power utilities.

The brochure appeared to generate interest in the topic and, to a lesser extent, the work of the NWMO. Most participants indicated that they would attempt to find out more through the NWMO website. Interest among most participants was limited to finding more information on the issue; few were interested in becoming involved beyond that.

RECRUITING SCREENER

PN6386

RESPONDENT NAME: _____

NWMO (REVISED)



Home Phone #: _____

Business Phone #: _____

E-Mail: _____

Group #: _____ Recruiter: _____

Recruit 10 per group. Groups are in English.

GROUP 1

GROUP 2

WEDNESDAY

WEDNESDAY

OCTOBER 15TH

OCTOBER 15TH

5:30 PM

7:30 PM

TORONTO

TORONTO

Hello, my name is _____ from Research House. We are calling today to invite you to participate in a special research project, scheduled for Wednesday, October 15th. [IF ASKED: The research is being conducted on behalf of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization.] The research is in the form of a small group discussion. The session will last a maximum of 2 hours and you will receive a cash honorarium as a thank you for attending. May we have your permission to ask you some further questions to see if you fit in our study?

Yes 1

No 2 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**

INDICATE:

Male 1 – **(50%) PER GROUP**

Female 2 – **(50%) PER GROUP**

1. Are you or is any member of your household or immediate family employed in, or ever been employed in:

	1		Ever	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Market Research	()	()	()	()
Marketing	()	()	()	()
Public Relations	()	()	()	()
Any media (Print, Radio, TV)	()	()	()	()
Advertising	()	()	()	()

IF YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE – THANK AND TERMINATE

2. Which of the following categories includes your age?

- Under 18.....1 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**
- 18 - 24.....2
- 25 - 34.....3
- 35 - 44.....4
- 45 - 54.....5
- 55 - 69.....6

AIM FOR MIX OF AGES WITHIN THE 18-34, 35-54 AND 55+ CATEGORIES

3. Would you identify yourself as...? **READ**

- Aboriginal; that is, are you of Inuit,
Métis or First Nations descent.....1
- Non-aboriginal.....2 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**

4. Can you tell me specifically about your descent? Is it . . . ? **READ – CODE ONE ONLY**

- Inuit 1
- Métis 2
- First Nations 3
- VOLUNTEERED**
- Inuk 4
- Inuvialuit..... 5
- Other (SPECIFY) 8
- DK/REF 9

5. How long have you lived in Toronto or the Greater Toronto Area?

- More than one year.....1 – **GO TO Q7**
- One year or less.....2

6. Have you lived in a city of population 100,000 or more for more than one year over the past five years?

- Yes..... 1
- No2

7. Since you turned 14, have you lived in a(an) [Inuit/Métis/First Nations] community (BASED ON Q4 RESPONSE) for a period of 3 years or more?

Yes..... 1

No2

**FOR EACH SESSION: AT LEAST 4 PARTICIPANTS SHOULD ANSWER YES TO Q5 OR Q6
AT LEAST 4 PARTICIPANTS SHOULD ANSWER YES TO Q7
AIM FOR 2-3 PARTICIPANTS WHO ANSWER YES TO BOTH Q5/6 AND Q7**

8a. What is your current employment status?

Full Time Employed ()

Part Time Employed ()

Homemaker ()

Student ()

Retired ()

Unemployed ()

8b. What is your occupation? –IF RETIRED – ASK PRIOR OCCUPATION

JOB TITLE

TYPE / NAME OF COMPANY

IF MARRIED / COMMON – LAW ASK – WHAT IS YOUR SPOUSE’S OCCUPATION?

JOB TITLE

TYPE / NAME OF COMPANY

**IF ANY CONNECTION TO STANDARD EXCLUDED OCCUPATIONS
– THANK AND TERMINATE**

9. As we need to speak with people from all walks of life, could you please tell me into which category I may place your total annual household income? Would that be...? **READ**

Under \$40,000 1

\$40,000 - \$60,000 2

\$60,000 - \$80,000 3

Over \$80,000 4

} **ENSURE A GOOD MIX IN EACH GROUP**

10. Could you please tell me the highest level of education that you have completed?

- Some High School 1
 - High School.....2
 - Some College / University3
 - Completed College / University4
- ENSURE A GOOD MIX IN EACH GROUP**

11. Participants in group discussions are asked to voice their opinions and thoughts; how comfortable are you in voicing your opinions in front of others? Are you.... **READ**

- Very Comfortable 1 – **MIN 50% PER GROUP**
- Comfortable2
- Fairly Comfortable.....3
- Not Very Comfortable.....4 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**
- Very Uncomfortable5 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**

12a. Have you ever attended a focus group or one to one discussion for which you have received a sum of money, here or elsewhere?

- Yes..... 1 – **MAX (25%) PER GROUP**
- No2 – **SKIP PAST Q.12c**

12b. When did you last attend one of these discussions?

TERMINATE IF IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS

12c. How many focus group or one –to-one discussions have you attended in the past 5 years?

(SPECIFY) IF MORE THAN 5 – THANK AND TERMINATE

IMPORTANT:

The session is 2 hours in length, but we are asking that all participants arrive 10 minutes prior to the start time of the session. Are you able to be at the research facility 10 minutes prior to the session time?

- Yes..... 1
- No2 – **TERMINATE**

During the session, you will be asked to look over some basic reading materials. If you require reading glasses, please remember to bring them with you.

RECRUITER: NOTE IF TERMINATION AT THIS POINT

All participants in this study are asked to bring to the group PICTURE IDENTIFICATION. If you do not bring your personal identification then you will not be able to participate in the session and you will not receive the incentive fee. Are you able to bring along picture ID?

Yes..... 1
No2 – **TERMINATE**

The group discussion will last approximately 2 hours and we offer each participant a \$75.00 cash gift as a token of our appreciation. You will also be asked to sign a waiver to acknowledge that you will be recorded during the session, and that you agree to have your name included in Qualitative Central, a registry of people who have participated in qualitative research. The sessions will be audio - taped and members of the research team will be observing the discussion. Please be assured that everything you say will be kept confidential and all information collected, used and/or disclosed will be used for research purposes only and administered as per the requirements of the Privacy Act.

[] CHECK TO INDICATE YOU HAVE READ THE STATEMENT TO THE RESPONDENT.

GROUPS ARE IN ENGLISH – RECRUIT 10

<u>GROUP 1</u>	<u>GROUP 2</u>
WEDNESDAY	WEDNESDAY
OCTOBER 15TH	OCTOBER 15TH
5:30 PM	8:00 PM
TORONTO	TORONTO

INCENTIVE: \$75

LENGTH OF GROUP: 2 hours

LOCATION:

**Research House
1867 Yonge Street, 2nd Floor
416.488.232**

MODERATOR'S GUIDE

October 14, 2008

**Discussion Guide – REVISED
Environics Research
Brochure Assessment – Aboriginal Population
PN 6386**

Nuclear Waste Management Organization

1.0 Introduction to procedures/Participant introductions (10 minutes)

Welcome to the group. We want to hear your opinions. Not what you think other people think – but what you think!

Feel free to agree or disagree. Even if you are just one person among eight that takes a certain point of view, you could represent many others who feel the same way you do.

You don't have to direct all your comments to me; you can exchange ideas and discussions with each other too.

You are being taped and observed to help me write my report. The tapes are only used for analysis purposes and are not given to anyone else.

I may take some notes during the group to remind myself of things also.

The host/hostess will pay you your incentives at the end of the session.

Let's go around the table so that each of you can tell us your name and a little bit about yourself. Anything you want to tell us is fine, if you work, what kind of work you do; if you have children, how many and what ages, etc.

2.0 Overall assessment of brochure (30 minutes)

The main reason we've invited you all here today is to get your input on a brochure that is currently under development. I don't want to say much about the brochure at this point; what I'm going to do is give you each a copy and have you take a look at it. What I'd like you to do is take 10 minutes or so to read through the brochure and then we'll discuss your impressions of it.

**DISTRIBUTE BROCHURE TO EACH PARTICIPANT – ALLOW ABOUT 10 MINUTES
READING TIME**

First of all, I'd like to get your overall impression of the brochure. After the quick look that you just had, how would you sum up your overall impression of this brochure in a sentence or two? What comes to your mind first? **ENSURE EVERYONE IS HEARD FROM BRIEFLY**

Let's talk about the brochure in a bit more detail. Looking at the brochure as a whole, what do you like about it? What are its strong points? Why do you say that?

What do you not like about it? What are its weak points? Why do you say that?

What would you say is the purpose of this brochure? Why do you think it was produced? **PROBE:** To provide information? To get people involved in the issue? [IF YES:] In what way?

Who is it written for? What type of audience or group would you say it is aimed at? **PROBE:** People like you? Experts?

Let's talk a bit about the overall look of the brochure. How do you feel about the overall design? Do you like it? Dislike it? Is it appropriate for the type of reader it's designed for? **PROBE IF NOT MENTIONED:** What do you think of the circular format? Why do you think they chose this design?

What do you think about the use of different coloured backgrounds for the different pages? Do you like/dislike this element? What about the specific colours used? Do you like/dislike them? Why?

How about the use of pictures and illustrations? What do you like/dislike about them? Why? **PROBE:** Are the pictures and illustrations appropriate, given the purpose and target audience of the brochure? Why do you say that?

How about the number of pictures and illustrations – are they enough? Too many?

Let's turn our attention to the text of the brochure. I realize that you didn't have time to read it through really carefully, but I'm just looking for your overall impressions. Overall, would you say the brochure was easy to understand, or was it difficult? What would you say made it easy/difficult to understand? **PROBE FOR DETAILS**

Was there anything that stood out as being confusing or difficult to understand? [IF YES:] What elements in particular did you find confusing? How do you think they could improve these parts to make them clearer?

Is there any information that you think should be in this brochure, but isn't? Anything "missing"? What? Why do you think this needs to be in this brochure?

3.0 Detailed assessment of brochure (40 minutes)

OK, now we're going to go through the brochure in a bit more detail, by looking at each page individually.

Let's start with the cover. What do you think of this cover? What do you like/dislike about it? What about the photograph? Do you like/dislike it? Why? Why do you think they chose this picture for the cover?

Let's look now at the first page of text (mustard-coloured background). What do you think is the purpose of this page? What do you like/dislike about it? Why? Is the text clear and easy to understand? **PROBE FOR SPECIFIC CONFUSING ELEMENTS** In your own words, what do you learn about the NWMO from this page? What is important to them, based on what you see here?

Let's look now at the pages headed "How did we get here". What do you think about the design of these pages? What do you like/dislike about them? How about the specific pictures used? Are they appropriate? Are there enough? Too many? What about the text? Is it clear and easy to understand? Is anything unclear or confusing? What do you learn from this section of the brochure? Is this important information? Should they add anything?

Let's look now at the pages headed "What is nuclear fuel waste?" What do you think about the design of these pages? What do you like/dislike about them? How about the specific pictures used? Are they appropriate? Are there enough? Too many? What about the text? Is it clear and easy to understand? Is anything unclear or confusing? What do you learn from this section of the brochure? Is this important information? Should they add anything?

Let's look now at the pages headed "What needs to be done?" What do you think about the design of these pages? What do you like/dislike about them? How about the specific pictures used? Are they appropriate? Are there enough? Too many? What about the text? Is it clear and easy to understand? Is anything unclear or confusing? What do you learn from this section of the brochure? Is this important information? Should they add anything?

Let's look now at the pages headed "Finding answers to last generations." What do you think about the design of these pages? What do you like/dislike about them? How about the specific pictures used? Are they appropriate? Are there enough? Too many? What about the text? Is it clear and easy to understand? Is anything unclear or confusing? What do you learn from this section of the brochure? Is this important information? Should they add anything?

Let's look now at the pages headed "Making wise choices for every Canadian." What do you think about the design of these pages? What do you like/dislike about them? How about the specific pictures used? Are they appropriate? Are there enough? Too many? What about the text? Is it clear and easy to understand? Is anything unclear or confusing? What do you learn from this section of the brochure? Is this important information? Should they add anything?

Let's look now at the pages headed "Storage for a clean environment." What do you think about the design of these pages? What do you like/dislike about them? How about the specific pictures used? Are they appropriate? Are there enough? Too many? **PROBE ON STORAGE FACILITY DIAGRAM** - is this diagram clear? Is it important information? What about the text? Is it clear and easy to understand? Is anything unclear or confusing? What do you learn from this section of the brochure? Is this important information? Should they add anything?

Let's look now at the pages headed "How do I get involved?" What do you think about the design of these pages? What do you like/dislike about them? What about the text? Is it clear and easy to understand? Is anything unclear or confusing? What do you learn from this section of the brochure? Is this important information? Should they add anything? The page gives contact information for the NWMO. Would you contact the NWMO about this issue? How would you contact them? **PROBE ON WEB VS. MAIL VS. TELEPHONE**

4.0 Usage of brochure (10 minutes)

We've talked a bit about why you think this brochure was developed and who it is aimed at. Now, I'd like to hear your thoughts as to how this brochure can best be used. How should the NWMO make sure that this brochure gets to the people who you think should have it? **PROBE:** Should they make it available at events? [IF YES:] What types of events? Where? Should they distribute it through the mail? [IF YES:] To whom? Are there any other ways they should distribute it?

Does this brochure raise any questions in your mind? What are they? **PROBE ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO THE NWMO ITSELF** – does the brochure raise any questions in your mind about the NWMO? What would you like to know about the organization that's not covered in the brochure?

Does the brochure make you want to get involved in this issue? How specifically would you want to be involved? Do you think the brochure facilitates your getting involved in this issue? How? How about others? Do you think this brochure would motivate others to get involved in this issue? Why do you say that?

5.0 Interest in further information about NWMO/Adaptive Phased Management (10 minutes)

I asked you earlier if the brochure we've been looking at raises any questions in your mind about the NWMO itself and its goals. With that in mind, I'd like you to read a short document I have with me.

DISTRIBUTE "WHO WE ARE" DOCUMENT AND ASK PARTICIPANTS TO READ IT OVER QUICKLY

Does this document answer any of the questions that might have been raised by the other brochure and our discussion here this evening? [IF SO:] Which questions?

Would you like to learn more about the NWMO? What would you like to find out?

Are you interested in learning more about Canada's plan for used nuclear fuel?

How would you go about finding out more about the NWMO and the issue of used nuclear fuel and its management?

Do you have any suggestions to make regarding moving forward with Adaptive Phased Management? What suggestions do you have?

6.0 Final thoughts: (10 minutes)

We're coming to the end of our time together. What would you say is the most important thing you learned here today?

Ultimately, do you think this brochure is useful? Why do you say that? Is this important information for you personally? Knowing what you know now about the NWMO and the issue of nuclear waste management, what will you do next?

EXIT TO CHECK FOR CLIENT QUESTIONS

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!