

NWMO APM Regional Dialogue – “What We Heard” – Final Report

APM-REP-00622-0003

November 2009

Métis Nation of Ontario

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

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.

***THE NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION'S
ADAPTIVE PHASE MANAGEMENT REGIONAL DIALOGUE***

***MÉTIS NATION OF ONTARIO – REGIONAL DIALOGUE
“WHAT WE HEARD - FINAL REPORT”***

NOVEMBER 30, 2009



REGIONAL DIALOGUE WHAT WE HEARD – FINAL REPORT TO NWMO

BACKGROUND

MNO proposed to work with the NWMO to plan, manage and facilitate Métis Regional Dialogues in Ontario. In accordance with the NWMO invitation, the proposal was designed to bring together representatives of Métis peoples in Ontario, with regional representation that ensures a broad range of perspectives reflective of Métis citizens from across the province. Working with MNO's provincial, regional and charter community governance structures, this initiative engaged Métis citizens including elders, youth, elected leadership, harvesters and women.

The topic of the Regional Dialogues was the *Proposed Process for Selecting a Site* for “Adaptive Phased Management” – the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel. The topic area encompasses technical information and the potential for polarized viewpoints. Additionally, NWMO wished to obtain meaningful input from Métis in Ontario by addressing potential communication barriers through a culturally appropriate approach that respects the governance structures of the Métis Nation of Ontario.

The approach proposed by MNO was intended to first provide the participants with basic information about the nuclear energy sector. This will empower them to make informed comments on the issues that arise during the process. Initial work also included self-assessment by all those party to (i.e. both Métis and NWMO) the dialogue to address any perceived concerns on either side about the process and purpose of the dialogues. This is meant to foster an atmosphere of trust in which participants can engage comfortably and participate effectively.

Creating opportunities for information-sharing and exchange of ideas was intended to be a hallmark of the dialogue as it encouraged a creative, as well as a collaborative approach. This means there must be adequate opportunity for Métis citizens to pose questions and receive authoritative answers from qualified sources, in addition to the communication on the issues and questions from NWMO.

REGIONAL DIALOGUE

On August 21, 2009, the Nuclear Waste Management Organization held a consultation meeting with seventy-eight (78) Métis citizens from across the province at the Métis Nation of Ontario's Annual General Assembly. The meeting was opened by President Gary Lipinski and Chair France Picotte, who agreed that the issue was very important and that these consultation meetings are an opportunity to provide input as decisions made regarding this project would have an effect on Métis communities today and in the future.

Nuclear Waste Management Organization approached the MNO to provide input into the process of site-selection for the storage of High Level Nuclear Waste and to determine how the MNO can best be involved in the process. To date site selection has not begun and there have been no sites selected in Ontario or in Canada for the storage facility. This is the beginning of the process and there will be many more opportunities to provide input.

NWMO played a DVD entitled “Moving Forward Together” and made a presentation for the Métis audience on the NWMO and Adaptive Phased Management and the *Proposed Process for Selecting a Site*. Following the viewing and throughout the presentation, Pat Patton (NWMO) opened the floor to questions.

On November 14, 2009, the NWMO held a second consultation meeting with seventy (70) Métis citizens from across the province at the Holiday Inn International Airport Hotel in Toronto. The meeting was opened with a prayer by Senator Gordon Calder and with opening remarks from MNO President Gary Lipinski who expressed the importance of this consultation process. The objective of the second Regional Dialogue meeting was an opportunity for those citizens who attended the first Regional Dialogue meeting in August to provide any feedback they received from their respective communities, provide additional questions or concerns to the NWMO facilitators who in turn would provide answers to the questions or concerns raised.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Transportation of nuclear waste

Radioactive materials are transported all over the world daily by land, rail and water and there have never been any radioactive incidents. Nonetheless, NWMO will need to ensure that there will be emergency preparedness processes developed with input from all communities along the proposed transportation corridor. While there are currently safe and secure methods of transportation of nuclear materials, it is not anticipated that any transportation of materials will occur until the repository is constructed which could possibly be in about thirty (30) years. Transportation and emergency response measures will have to meet all federal and provincial regulatory requirements at that time and the NWMO will have to demonstrate the safety of any transportation system prior to its implementation and emergency personnel within communities along the transportation corridor will need to be prepared as well.

What participants said:

Nonetheless, participants felt that “low risk” was not good enough; any transportation of nuclear waste must be “no risk”. It was recommended by MNO participants that compensation for emergency response personnel be considered prior to an accident rather than in the event of an accident.

As well, participants recommended that the NWMO develop a more detailed transportation fact sheet as transportation safety issues were a major concern.

Recycling and reusing used nuclear fuel

MNO participants questioned the disposal of used nuclear fuel as opposed to the recycling and reusing of the fuel. NWMO advised that used nuclear fuel is reprocessed in some parts of the world. In Canada, any decision to reprocess would have to be made by the nuclear operators in conjunction with government and the regulators. Consideration would have to be given to other types of radioactive wastes which would be produced, the potential for separating out material that could be used in the production of nuclear weapons and the expense of reprocessing.

Nevertheless, the NWMO would be responsible for the long-term management of high level wastes resulting from reprocessing and continues to monitor ongoing research in the area of recycling used nuclear fuel.

International safety standards of nuclear waste management

NWMO is committed to working with a number of other countries which are also developing deep geological repositories for used nuclear fuel. Other countries share information regarding nuclear safety practices with Canada. This is done through the Nuclear Energy Agency and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Natural disasters

The containment system for used nuclear fuel has a multi-barrier system composed of the used fuel form itself which is solid, the material used in the fuel bundle, the copper canister, and the various natural material used to seal the used fuel containers in the repository. Release of radioactive material from the containers would mean that all of the barriers would have to fail however the site evaluation process is designed to select a site with suitable geology that would still contain the used fuel even if the barriers failed.

Continued production of nuclear fuel

The deep geological repository will be designed to safely handle the volume of waste when the formal decision to go forward is made with a community. The NWMO will continue research and testing to ensure that its plans and programs address new circumstances and remain robust.

What participants said:

There was a strong sentiment among the Métis citizens present that we each have a responsibility for the nuclear waste produced by the nuclear energy generation process from which everyone benefits.

Importing used nuclear fuel from the rest of the world.

Participants asked if the deep geological repository will take waste from other countries. The NWMO noted that Canada has made it clear that it will not import used nuclear fuel from other countries.

Geological requirements

NWMO's site selection process will seek communities to come forward and request an assessment rather than NWMO approaching communities. Initial screening for geological suitability would be done with communities that come forward and then further research would be conducted. The site that will ultimately be selected must be in an area that has been geologically stable in the past and will safely contain and isolate used nuclear fuel in the future for at least one million years.

Canadian and international studies have shown that this is possible in both crystalline rock formations such as those found in the Canadian Shield and sedimentary formations such as those found in many sedimentary basins in Canada. Additionally, NWMO has a wide range of experts including mining experts on staff investigating the effects of repository development and design and researching methods of ensuring stability.

Private land ownership

If a private land owner came forward as a potential site location, that private land owner would have to engage with the political entity of the community. The surrounding communities would also have to be involved during the process. The decision-making must come from the residents of a community.

MNO involvement

NWMO has an Elders Forum and Working Group called Niigani made up of First Nation, Métis and Inuit people from across Canada. NWMO worked with 15 national organizations across the country during the study period from 2002-2005, including the MNO. Two Métis elders suggested by the MNO sit on the Elders Forum and each Elder invites a Métis youth representative to attend with them.

These Elders do not represent organizations, but rather they have been brought together to provide NWMO with a unique perspective as Aboriginal peoples. Senator Joseph Poitras and Senator Roland St-Germain are members of the Forum. Of the total of 20 Elders from across the country, 9 are Métis. NWMO will ensure that there is a Métis voice in the site selection process. The definition of "community" has been described in the site selection process however the NWMO asked the MNO participants to consider this and provide advice according to the Métis perspective.

What participants said:

The issue of demonstrating willingness among Métis people is an asset. The political entity of a community (city, municipality, and town) must engage with people in the broader regional area including First Nations, Métis and Inuit people that may be impacted.

Métis rights are collective rights and this will need to be considered in the selection process. Participants suggested that the site selection process will need to include this perspective and that there will need to be a way that the unique voice of Métis citizens living in municipal areas is taken into consideration.

Involvement of Youth

Last year NWMO selected 18 youth (including three Métis) through a third-party selection company, to form a youth roundtable that would meet during 2008 and early 2009 to discuss how to involve youth in the process. Among other things, one of the areas of advice that they were looking for was how to encourage young people to study in this area. Other things they discussed were how to help young people to understand nuclear waste management and communication methods with youth. The youth round table met three times and provided loads of advice and the NWMO is currently looking at this information to see how to proceed. NWMO feels very strongly about encouraging youth involvement throughout the process, including Métis youth.

What participants said:

MNO participants strongly encouraged the involvement of youth and noted that this planning must take into consideration the impact on future generations.

It was also mentioned that NWMO should encourage youth to research other forms of energy by means of bursaries and scholarships so that Canada could cease production and use of nuclear fuel completely.

Benefits to community

When a community decides to move forward with this \$16 to \$24 billion project, there will be a large investment in the community throughout the site selection, design and construction phases of the project.

Selection process

The selection process is slated to take approximately 20 to 30 years. NWMO does not intend to identify communities as they have proposed a willing host approach to site selection and it is not practically possible to identify communities in advance. A recent study by the NWMO on the possibility of excluding sites confirmed that it would not be possible to do this. This study is posted on the NWMO website.

If a community does come forward, the community decides if it will continue at each step of the process and can pull out at each step of the process. If a community does not come forward Canada will continue to store the waste at ground level at the reactor sites and continue to engage with Canadians to decide on the best way forward. NWMO will not put a timeline or an end-date to this process as their primary goal is to ensure communities are engaged meaningfully.

What participants said:

There was a strong sentiment that NWMO should provide information on possible suitable sites for the repository and then invite communities to nominate themselves rather than determining suitability after communities come forward.

Construction of site

At the surface the site would be approximately 2 by 3 kilometres, however surface facilities will take a small portion of that land. Monitoring will be done remotely and canisters would remain retrievable if needed.

Nuclear waste would be buried approximately 500 meters below the earth's surface. This depth is viewed to be the best in terms of rock stability and it is also ideal because there is very little water movement at this depth.

If the geology of a site is ideal, then the site could be very close to a community with no security issues.

What participants said:

Participants indicated that a buffer zone should be added around the facility.

Government

Canada's work has taken place over several decades and governments are aware that the waste exists and that it needs to be dealt with in a safe manner. All levels of government, understand that the work must continue.

DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED PROCESS FOR SITE SELECTION

August 21, 2009 Consultation:

Representatives from NWMO left the room to allow MNO participants and staff to have a closed-door discussion on the issues raised so far, as well as to address the following questions:

1. Are the proposed principles fair and appropriate?
2. Are the proposed decision-making steps consistent with selecting a site and making a fair decision?
3. Do the proposed decision-making criteria address all that are important?
4. Are there others that should be added?
5. Does the proposed process provide for the kinds of information that are important? Are there others that should be added?
6. Are there important questions that should be answered by this document but are not? What needs to be added? What changes, if any, should be made?

MNO participants were split into groups of 8-10 at their tables to discuss the questions and then reported to the larger group. Each table had a hard time answering the questions posed by NWMO because they felt the questions were

worded awkwardly and were theoretical and therefore difficult to understand. In particular they felt that the first two questions were hard to answer without identifying specific regions or areas with suitable geology.

As a result, there were widely varying responses to each question. In order to provide NWMO with more representative feedback, MNO participants and staff spent time rewording each question in order to determine what MNO interpreted the meaning to be. Participants gave some initial feedback to the NWMO and made the following suggestions:

The group suggested that NWMO come forward with proposed sites that could house the facility. They felt that by asking communities to come forward, there is a possibility for conflict among communities. Additionally, the definition of “community” must be addressed within the process in order to ensure that Métis people have collective rights as a community.

The group wanted NWMO to provide five to ten possible sites where the facility could be located. The groups did not think that communities would be coming forward as possible locations – this was unrealistic. Also, additional information needs to be shared within the process.

MNO participants recommended that MNO should be developing a process on how to move forward with NWMO. The cumulative effects of all the different nuclear power cycle projects (from uranium mining to power generation to disposal of used fuel) need to be addressed from a Métis perspective. They suggested that MNO set up a meeting with decision-makers to discuss these important issues, including Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, Ontario Power Generation, Ontario Power Authority, Bruce Power, Nuclear Waste Management Organization, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and the Minister of Energy and Infrastructure to provide a better understanding of the Métis viewpoint.

Participants also wanted an opportunity to take the information back to their communities for discussion and to hear what others might have to say.

Finally, MNO informed NWMO that there was a need to come to an agreement in terms of what both parties can expect in terms of outcomes of the consultations. True consultation is an opportunity for both sides to learn from each other. The MNO invited the NWMO to come back to hear what they had learned from the MNO participants after they speak with people in their communities.

November 14, 2009 Consultation:

Representatives from NWMO remained in the room while MNO participants and staff worked to address the following questions:

1. Are the proposed decision-making steps consistent with selecting a site and making a fair decision?
 - a. What are the strengths of the proposed steps?
 - b. How could the decision-making steps be improved?
2. Do you think that the proposed sitting principles are fair and appropriate?
 - a. What are the strengths of the principles?
 - b. How could these principles be improved?
3. Decision-making criteria: Do the proposed safety-related questions address all the factors that you think are important?
 - a. Are there others that should be added?
4. Supporting the participation of communities: Is the proposed approach to considering factors beyond technical safety - community well-being and partnership and community factors appropriate?
 - a. What are the strengths of the proposed approach?
 - b. What improvements might be made?

MNO participants were split into groups of 8-10 at their tables to discuss the questions and then reported to the larger group. The groups had an easier time understanding and responding to these questions than they did the questions posed at the August 21, 2009 meeting.

Participants gave the following feedback and suggestions to NWMO:

- The Step 6 option of backing out of the process is important and very good.
- A community referendum should be held earlier in the process to verify whether they were in agreement with hosting the site.
- The inclusion of the community throughout the process is important and very good.
- Education across the country is needed to help dispel the fears society has of nuclear waste.
- It is important that the process continues to take into consideration the environmental, human and natural impacts.
- A healing process should be available for those community members who were not in agreement with hosting the site.
- Participants suggested that a Métis board be established as part of the process.
- The fact that the decision process involves the entire Métis community is very good.
- Participants indicated that the steps outlined need to be flexible.
- Continued research should be conducted on what other countries are doing in terms of safety protocols.
- Some participants indicated that the site selection process should be shorter.

- Some participants indicated that they liked the time frame but wanted it to be more specific.
- Participants indicated that they liked that support funding was in place for communities throughout the process.
- Participants indicated that the Métis should be recognized in step 2, so that they were recognized as part of the community very early on.
- Participants indicated that Métis protocols should be put in place as part of the process.
- It was recommended that the environmental assessment should be part of step 3, not step 8.
- Participants indicated that a definition of terms should be included in the booklet to ensure that there was no ambiguity with terminology.
- One of the steps should include a budget development so that the community was aware of how much was being spent throughout the process.
- It was recommended that communities should be made aware of whether a site qualifies prior to step 4 of the process.
- The definition of community needed to be defined further and should include the Métis Nation as a unique community.
- It was recommended that each of the communities between the nuclear facility and the repository should have some approval capacity for the passage of nuclear waste through their communities prior to the site being finalized.
- Participants indicated that the terminology in the booklet should be changed to “First Nations, Métis and Inuit” instead of “Aboriginal people”.
- There was some fear that no comparable facility existed yet in the world to what is being proposed in Canada.
- It was suggested that the booklet should refer to those that use the area for hunting and harvesting, not just those living in the area.
- Throughout the steps the booklet referred to community in the singular, participants felt that throughout the community should be referred to as “communities” and that Métis should be considered throughout the process and be part of the signing of the final agreement.
- Participants indicated that the steps were consistent and would enable a fair decision to be made.
- The steps as outlined allowed communities time to analyze and to make an informed decision.
- Participants indicated that the process had the appearance of being transparent process.
- It was recommended that all First Nations and Métis people would be part of the process across Canada.
- Participants asked what the contingency plan was if no community came forward as a potential site. The response was that if no community came forward then they would need to continue to store the nuclear waste at the current storage facilities and continue to work with Canadians to decide on the best way forward. NWMO advised the participants that, currently, each

facility had the ability to store the waste that would be produced at that particular nuclear reactor site.

- Participants indicated that Aboriginal communities needed to be included in the definition of “Interested Community”.
- The NWMO needed to ensure that sufficient funding was available for maintenance and to address emergency issues.
- A question was raised about how many shipments would be made per year. The response was that, based on a generic scenario, the NWMO was anticipating that there would be 53 shipments per month for 30 years.
- It was recommended that the most stringent policy in terms of security be international, federal or provincial, should be implemented and adhered to by NWMO.
- Participants indicated that the impacts of construction and delivery needed to be addressed further.
- Participants indicated that a buffer zone around the facility should be considered in greater detail.
- Participants indicated that they needed assurances that the safety protocols that were established would be sustainable over the entire period of the project.
- Participants indicated that an emergency preparedness monitor should be put in place to ensure that all safety protocols were implemented.
- It was recommended that NWMO develop a more detailed transportation fact sheet to respond to questions posed.
- A question was raised about whether research had been undertaken about the impact of road transportation versus train transportation. NWMO responded that road, rail and water transportation methods are all being researched.
- A question was raised about what the NWMO was going to do to ensure that all community members were engaged in the process. The response was that the NWMO would need to work with leadership in communities to ensure that discussions took place and that communities were fully engaged. They would also need to work with communities to help them make sure that community involvement happened.
- It was recommended that a curriculum be developed to ensure that children learn as the process evolved.
- Métis cultural awareness programs should be offered to incoming workers that would be moving to the community.

STATEMENTS OF PRINCIPLE

At the November 14, 2009 meeting, NWMO requested that the Métis Nation of Ontario develop Statements of Principle if any are found to be lacking in the current list. Below is a list of recommended Statements of Principle:

Economic development is an important benefit of the proposed nuclear waste management strategy. Measures should be developed, however, to ensure that

impoverished communities do not come forward as potential host communities out of economic desperation alone.

Safety and security are paramount to the continued success of a nuclear waste management program. Safety and security must be assured and under no circumstances can they be compromised due to a lack of funding.

Education is critical to overcoming fears associated with hosting a nuclear waste management deep geological repository. An education strategy must be developed and maintained to ensure communities are equipped to make such an important decision.

Youth engagement must be at the forefront of our consultation efforts. The next generation will play the most important role in this project and we must ensure they are involved from the beginning.

The inclusion of traditional knowledge in the site selection process is paramount to the success of this project. Métis, First Nations and Inuit peoples have a deep connection to the earth and have had a strong understanding of this land for generations. Elders and traditional knowledge holders can often recognize small changes and trends in our lands, waterways and resources that conventional science cannot. Understanding these changes and trends can help NWMO more accurately predict future conditions for sites considered for the deep geological repository.

The preservation of memory is necessary for a project that will literally last a million years. The next 4000 generations must understand how we worked together to come to this decision, and what we hoped their future might look like as a result of our decision-making.

APPENDIX A

**August 21, 2009
Meeting Minutes**

Minutes of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization Adaptive Phased Management – Regional Dialogue Meeting with the Métis Nation of Ontario scheduled on August 21, 2009 in Georgia D room at the Holiday Inn Hotel in Sudbury, Ontario.

CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING PRAYER

Facilitator Melanie Paradis, Director, Lands Resources and Consultation, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Senator Gravelle offered an opening prayer.

Welcome and Introductory Remarks

President Lipinski welcomed the participants to the meeting and thanked Senator Gravelle for his opening prayer. He stated that it was nice to see old friends and to be able to talk about issues that were important. He was happy to see such a good turn out for the meeting. The issues that would be discussed were interesting and important to Métis people across Ontario. He stated that people needed to dialogue about how they wanted to see nuclear waste safely dealt with in Ontario. The decisions being taken would have an effect on Métis communities today and in the future. This was an opportunity to provide input and to make sure that the Métis provided input into the process. They needed to make sure that the rights of Métis people were protected. He stated that he looked forward to hearing the outcome of the meeting.

Chair Picotte welcomed the participants to the meeting. She stated that the topic that they were discussing was important and she was happy that the Métis people were participating in this process.

Ms. Paradis introduced herself to the group. She provided an overview of the meeting to the participants. She informed the participants that the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) had approached the MNO asking them to provide input into the choice of a location for storage of High Level Nuclear Waste. She stated that, to date, there had not been a site selected in Ontario or in Canada for the storage facility. She stated that this process was to discuss how Métis people could be involved in the site selection process. She asked that participants be respectful of each other and encouraged them to ask questions.

She informed the participants that the MNO would be preparing a report to the NWMO following the meeting. She encouraged people to send her e-mails following the meeting if they wished to provide further input. She encouraged people to have open minds about this issue. She stated that there was a need to deal with the nuclear waste in some way and the idea was to gather many different positions so that information could be provided to the NWMO. She stated that the meeting was the beginning of the process and that there would be many opportunities for providing input into the process.

Ms. Patton, Nuclear Waste Management Organization, informed the participants that the NWMO would be presenting a DVD that would provide an overview on the process and the goal of the meeting. She also stated that they would also be providing a presentation on the proposed process for engagement. Following that, she explained, they would be opening the floor for questions and comments.

NWMO Presentation – NWMO and Adaptive Phased Management

Ms. Patton presented the video entitled “NWMO and Adaptive Phased Management” to the participants. Following the presentation Ms. Patton opened the floor for questions and comments.

The following was offered in response to questions and comments:

- There was a concern expressed with regards to the transportation of nuclear waste. The response was that radioactive materials were transported all over the world daily by land, rail and water and there had never been a radioactive incident. There would be a process in place where all communities around the route would be involved and emergency preparedness processes would be in place.
- There was a question raised about the possibility of recycling and reusing the waste. The response was that there were existing processes around the world for recycling the materials but the chemicals used for the process were highly toxic. It was explained that they would be still left with a toxic material that would also need to be managed safely. In Canada, there was very little reusable fuel left in the fuel bundles so, at this time, Canada is not looking at reprocessing, as it is very costly. In the recycling process, they had to extract the plutonium and it was weapons grade plutonium, which Canada did not participate in producing.
- A participant asked what data was available internationally with regards to safety of these facilities and the process for undertaking the geological surveys. The NWMO representative responded that they worked with a number of countries and that the countries that were developing repositories shared their information. In regards to the geological data, more information would be provided in the afternoon presentation.
- A question was raised with regards to the measures that would be taken in the event of a natural disaster. The response was that each canister had a multi-barrier system so if the repository was to fail, all the barriers would have to fail in order for there to be an issue. This was seen as being very unlikely because all the multi barriers would have to fail.
- A participant raised concern with the continued production of nuclear waste and the ability to be able to dispose of it properly. A suggestion was made that the continued production should be stopped until solution was found for the disposal of nuclear waste. The response was that the NWMO had produced a report in which these issues had been brought forward. She referred the participants to the NWMO web site for further information.
- A participant asked if the chosen site would become a dumping ground for the rest of the world. NWMO stated that Canada did not import waste from other countries and that this was the trend internationally.
- A participant stated that all of them were responsible for the nuclear waste that had been produced and had benefited from it so they all needed take responsibility for the waste.
- A question was raised about where the repository could be situated in Ontario in terms of geology. The response was that the NWMO would be looking for communities to come forward and that they would not be approaching communities. She stated that geological specialists were looking at possibilities but that they did not have a site in mind. Initial screening would be done with communities that come forward and then further research would be done.
- A question was raised about whether a private landowner could come forward as a potential site location. The response was that a private landowner may go to a community and suggest that his land may be used but the decision to move forward would need to be a community decision, not the private landowners.
- A question was raised with regards to the safety of transporting the nuclear waste from present location to new site. The response was that there were currently safe and secure methods for transportation of nuclear materials and that these would be

updated as laws changed. They were not anticipating transportation of materials to start to occur for approximately 30 years.

- A concern was raised with the ability to find stable land in Canada. The response was that the development of the repository at the depth that it would be built was in an area that had been unchanged for millions of years.
- A question was raised with regards to how long the selection process would take and the response was that the selection process would take approximately 20 to 30 years.
- A participant stated that the NWMO should provide information on possible suitable sites for the repository.

Health Break: The meeting recessed at 10:32 a.m. and resumed at 11:00 a.m.

NWMO Presentation – Proposed Process for Selecting a Site

The following was offered in response to questions and comments: (continued)

- A question was raised with regards to the Elders Forum and the Working Group and about how many Métis people participated on the Working Group. The NWMO responded that they worked with 15 national organizations across the country and they were asked them to recommend two Elders to sit on the forum. Each of those Elders invited a youth member to come with them. The NWMO clarified that the Elders did not represent the organizations but brought their unique perspective. The Elders forum met annually and the Working Group, formed in 2006, met more regularly. In terms of Métis members, the MNO recommended Senator Joseph Poitras and Roland St-Germain. There were a total of 20 Elders of which 8 or 9 were Métis.
- A question was asked with regards to the monetary value to the community that decided to move forward with the project. The response was that the project was a \$15 to \$20 billion project and that the monetary value would be discussed with the community selected.

Dialogue and Input to Proposed Process for Selecting Site

Ms. Patton presented the power point presentation entitled “*Adaptive Phase Management – Proposed Process for Selecting a Site*” dated August 21, 2009 to the participants.

The following was offered in response to questions and comments:

- A question was raised with regards to the size of the area required for the site. The response was that, at the surface, the site would be approximately 2 by 3 km, which would include the roadways that led to the site.
- A question was raised with regard to there actually being a site in Canada that would meet the requirements for such a facility to be built. The NWMO responded that they believed that such a site did exist in Canada.
- One of the participants stated that he wanted everyone to be clear that there was no shutting off the harm created by nuclear waste. They needed to be aware that there were only so many holes that could be built and that this was a finite process. They needed to have a full understanding of the impacts on the environment of continuing to use nuclear energy. He stated that the NWMO was asking much of them when they were asking them to bury a ticking a ticking bomb in mother earth. One leak was all it would take. He stated that they had the modern technology to choose another way of creating fuel and they needed to make a choice.

- A question was raised with regards to communities being able, through the democratic process, to impose this on the Métis community. A participant asked what processes were in place to protect Métis rights. The NWMO responded that the issue of demonstrating willingness among Métis people was definitely an issue that needed to be looked at further.
- A participant stated that if they were going to be transporting nuclear waste, it should be at no risk, not low risk.
- A question was raised with regards to what was meant in terms of community.
- A question was also raised with regards to how Métis people were considered and how were they engaged in the process. The response was that the community was the political entity, i.e. city, municipality, town, but the final decision must include people in the regional area. It was mentioned that First Nations, Métis and Inuit people that were affected must be involved in the process. The NWMO would ensure that there was a Métis voice in the process.

Lunch Break - The meeting recessed at 12:15 p.m. and resumed at 1:18 p.m.

The following was offered in response to questions and comments: (continued)

- A participant stated that the NWMO was looking for a stable place for the repository but he feared that once they drilled holes for the repository, it would make the area unstable. The NWMO responded that they had mining experts as part of the team and that they would be looking at this issue, as it was definitely a concern.
- A question was raised with regards to a community engaging in the process and deciding five years down the road that they did not want to proceed with the process. The NWMO responded that in the process allowed for community decides if it will continue at each step of the process and can pull out at each step and at step 5 of the process the community takes a formal decision through the residents that they are willing to proceed and a formal agreement is signed in step 6.
- A participant wanted to know how they would monitor for leaks and, if a leak was found, what would be the counter measures be. NWMO responded that the monitoring would be done remotely and, if there was a leak, the canisters could be removed, fixed and replaced.
- A question was raised with regards to the process for notifying the community when nuclear waste was transported through the community and it was asked if this would not be a security risk. The NWMO responded that only emergency preparedness would be part of the discussion with transportation. Communities and emergency personnel would be informed and prepared.
- A participant asked how long the NWMO had been looking for a site and what would happen if no community came forward. The NWMO responded that the Nuclear Fuel Waste Act was passed in 2002 and a study was conducted over a three year period to discuss with Canadians an approach for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel. Currently the NWMO has not begun looking for a site and is seeking input to the proposed site selection process. Once the process has been refined the NWMO will initiate the process and will seek a willing host community. If communities did not come forward, Canada would continue to store the waste at ground level at the reactor sites and continue to work with Canadians to determine the way forward.
- Participants asked if the NWMO would be identifying areas that could become potential sites and letting communities know that their community could be a potential site. The NWMO responded that there was no intention to identify communities; they were waiting for communities to come forward first.

- A question was raised about how they were involving youth. The NWMO stated that last year through an independent company they had selected 18 youth through a random search method to participate in a youth roundtable through 2009 and early 2009 to discuss how to involve youth in the process. One of the things that they were looking to do was encouraging young people to study in this area. The youth round table met three times and provided loads of advice and the NWMO was currently looking at this information to see how to proceed.
- A participant asked, if and when the Government changed, how were they going to ensure that the government continued to be supportive of this process? The NWMO responded that the work had gone on for several decades and that governments were aware that the waste existed and that it needed to be safely managed of a very long term. Every level of government and party knew that the work had to continue.
- A question was raised with regards to the reliability of the transportation canisters. The NWMO responded that transportation of nuclear materials is currently conducted throughout the world and that the transportation canisters go through a very robust testing procedure. They also noted that videos of the testing can be seen on You Tube.
- A participant stated that she was concerned about the technology and that she was not reassured that this was an actual viable alternative for storing nuclear waste.
- A question was asked that if they had bored holes and it was found that the site was not suitable, what would happen with the holes that were bored. The NWMO responded that they would need to get this answer and get back to them with a response.
- A participant requested that a Métis youth consultation happen as part of the process. The NWMO responded that, after the meeting, the MNO would have a process for moving forward with the discussions and that the NWMO felt very strongly that youth be involved throughout the process.
- A concern was raised about a site being identified on Crown Land and if Métis Rights would be protected. The NWMO responded that the NWMO recognized the unique status Métis people under the Constitution and that Métis people must be consulted if Métis Rights were impacted, so it was agreed that this would definitely need to happen.
- A participant stated that somewhere along the line someone had to have a timeline for this process to end because the process could not go on forever. He stated that the NWMO needed to have a deadline for this to happen. The NWMO responded that they could not put a timeline as the community needed to be part of the process.
- A participant stated that compensation should be considered prior to an accident happening.

MNO Staff Meeting with MNO Participants (Excepting NWMO)

The participants undertook small group work at their tables. They were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. Are the proposed principles fair and appropriate?
2. Are the proposed decision-making steps consistent with selecting a site and making a fair decision?
3. Do the proposed decision-making criteria address all that are important? Are there others that should be added?
4. Does the proposed process provide for the kinds of information that are important? Are there others that should be added?

5. Are there important questions that should be answered by this document but are not? What needs to be added? What changes, if any, should be made?

Each group was then asked to provide point form responses to the questions to the reminder of the participants. The following responses were provided from the various groups:

1. Are the proposed principles fair and appropriate?
 - They were fair and appropriate depending on how community was defined
 - The principles should be province wide
 - The principles were not fair and appropriate as the project was unrealistic
 - The group felt that a community would not come forward
 - The principles were somewhat fair, but the definition of community needed to be determined
 - The group felt the principles were fair
 - The group felt that it seemed to be priority to ask people first in the process
 - The group felt that the NWMO should narrow the list down of eligible communities first, and that this would be a good starting point
 - Principles were fair to a certain degree, but more health related groups needed to be involved (nurses, doctors etc)
 - The group felt that they were fair and appropriate as far as they went
 - The group stated that the questions were too vague. They asked what was meant by fair and appropriate. The question raised more questions than answers.
 - The group stated that they needed more time to study the process that the NWMO had put forward
 - Participants stated a need to consult with their community councils before they could provide answers
 - They would like to see a report on the discussions for comments
 - Duty to Consult is being implemented – good
 - Awareness of requirements were vague
 - Regulating bodies of the NWMO did not hold Métis interest
2. Are the proposed decision-making steps consistent with selecting a site and making a fair decision?
 - The group felt that the timeline was very lengthy
 - The group was comfortable with a community being able to pull out up to step 5
 - Yes
 - The group felt that there was consistency apparent in the decision making process
 - The group stated that there was a need to take care of the nuclear waste
 - The group felt that more groups and communities needed to get involved
 - Colleges and Universities needed to be involved
 - There was a concern expressed on the site being located on Crown Lands
 - A question was raised with how was fairness determined
 - A concern was raised with regard to government intrusion
 - The group felt that the timeline was lengthy and there was a need for a drop dead date

3. Do the proposed decision-making criteria address all that are important? Are there others that should be added?
 - The group felt that they did not address health concerns
 - The group was not sure that it was safe
 - No, as the issue of continued use of nuclear power needed to be addressed
 - The group felt that many more factors needed to be addressed
 - Transparency between Nations and generations needed to be addressed
 - Affect on vegetation and harvesting needed to be looked into
 - Cities and municipalities needed to be involved in the process and the discussions
 - Yes, as far as present technological knowledge permitted
 - A question was raised with regard to when the waste would stop being produced
 - A question was raised with regards to what would happen if the nuclear waste was buried on top of a resource that was more important at a later date
 - A question was raised about what would happen if it was determined that it was not 100% safe and no other site was available
 - A question was raised about what would happen if multiple communities came forward

4. Does the proposed process provide for the kinds of information that are important? Are there others that should be added?
 - The group wanted to know who would define the term “community”
 - Fair and equal representation for all Aboriginal Groups was required
 - Guidelines were needed on how people would be engaged in the process
 - Continuity needed to be addressed
 - The group stated that no matter how much information was given, there would still be unknowns
 - More information would be required once the location was determined
 - Youth needed to have a greater voice in the process
 - The group wanted to know if Métis input would be implemented

5. Are there important questions that should be answered by this document but are not? What needs to be added? What changes, if any, should be made?
 - The forum should involve youth, Senators and all community members
 - The group wanted to know what plan B would be if this did not work
 - The group wanted “community” defined
 - A question was raised about when nuclear waste would stop being produced
 - A question was raised with regard to compensation in the event something went wrong
 - A question was raised around if a community would be able to force a referendum
 - A question was raised with regards to the provisions that would be made to the community if the rods were removed from the site at a future time
 - A group wanted to know the diameter of the test holes and how they would be filled back in
 - A question was raised about considering underground mines as homes for the site
 - A group stated that they should stop making waste if they could not dispose of the waste properly

- The group stated that more information on future developments needed to be addressed
- A group asked that compensation and safety regulations be shared
- A group stated that there was not enough discussion of the safety of transportation and storage facility
- Regulations needed to be put in place for the facility
- A group stated that no matter what, the waste needed to be dealt with soon
- A group stated that monitoring should involve Métis people and also be hands on
- Métis archaeological issues needed to be taken into account when selecting a site
- A group stated that legislation needed to be developed for these types of processes

Ms. Paradis thanked the group for their work. She informed them that the input provided would be used to generate a meeting report and reflected back to them following the meeting. She informed the participants that she did not like any of the questions that were provided by the NWMO and maybe the group could come up with questions in order to frame the MNO response to the NWMO.

With regards to question number one, Ms. Paradis stated that what she had heard was that the group wanted the NWMO to come forward with proposed sites that could house the facility. By asking communities to come forward, there was a possibility for conflict and fighting among communities. Also, one of the main issues raised was around the definition of “community” and this needed to be addressed within the process. The group felt that there was a need to make it clear that Métis people had collective rights as a community and this needed to be clear from the start of the process. The point was that the Métis people needed to be involved no matter where the facility was located.

In terms of question number two, Ms. Paradis stated that she heard that the group wanted the NWMO to provide possible sites where the facility could be located. The groups did not think that communities would be coming forward as possible locations; this was unrealistic. Also, further information needed to be shared within the process and the groups stated that the report that was provided during the meeting should have been mailed out to participants prior to the meeting to allow them to review and provide input.

She also stated that she had heard that the MNO should be developing a process on how they wanted to move forward on all these issues. The cumulative effect of all these different projects needed to be addressed from a Métis perspective. The MNO needed to be meeting with the people that made the decisions, such as Ministers, when discussing these important issues. There was a need to have the decision makers in the room during discussions.

Ms. Paradis suggested that the NWMO representatives be invited back into the room. She stated that she would be informing them that the MNO would be going back to the communities for input prior to providing them with feedback on the discussions. However, in terms of this meeting, the group wanted the NWMO to know that they thought the questions provided were vague and they wanted the NWMO to provide possible locations for the site. She would also be stressing that the participants felt that

Métis Nation needed to be involved at the regulating level as the process moved forward.

Health Break: The meeting recessed at 3:49 p.m. and resumed at 4:00 p.m. and the NWMO representatives were invited to rejoin the meeting.

Ms. Paradis thanked the NWMO representatives for taking this time to meet with the MNO. She thanked them for coming and sharing the information. She informed the NWMO that the participants had had the opportunity to have discussions and that they had decided that they would be taking the information provided back to their respective councils for further input. However, the participants stressed that it was very important that potential sites be provided prior to undertaking discussions. They felt that a list of five or ten potential sites needed to be generated in order to start the process. Participants also felt that it was important that the word “community” be defined within these discussions.

Furthermore, the participants indicated that, given the broad range of issues and concerns that were raised within the discussions, a meeting with Ontario Power Authority and Ontario Power Generation officials needed to be convened in order to look at the issue from a global perspective.

Ms. Paradis also informed the NWMO that the participants felt that the government understood the Duty to Consult but that there was no stated Duty to Comply with the consultations. Therefore, there was a need to come to some kind of agreement in terms of these consultations prior to starting so that both parties knew what to expect in terms of the outcomes of the consultations. She stated that true consultation was an opportunity for both sides to learn from each other. The MNO invited the NWMO to come back and share what they had learnt from the MNO participants.

Closing Remarks

Senator Gordon provided closing remarks. She thanked the NWMO representatives and provided them with a gift on behalf of the MNO.

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Senator Micheline Boisvert, Chapleau Métis Council
Senator Janette Lévis, Grand River (K.W.) Council
Carol Lévis, president representative, Grand River (K.W) Council
Claude Boisvert, Observer, Chapleau
Morris Desjardins, Veteran Delegate, Espanola
Senator Al Roussin, Dryden Council
Alvina Cimon, President, Dryden Council
Provincial Senator Gordon Calder, Sunset Country Métis
Joe Paquette, Councillor, Credit River Métis Council
Senator Eugene Comtois, Cochrane
Senator Jacques Leroux, North Channel Métis Council
Romeo Sarrazin, Veteran, Mattawa
Senator Gerry Bedford, Veteran, PCMNO
Senator Rene Gravelle, Veteran, Sudbury
Maurice Sarrazin, Veteran/PCMNO, Sudbury/North Bay
Steven Callaghan, Veteran, Sudbury
Natalie Durocher, Council President, Timmins Council
Marc Laurin, Councillor, North Bay Council
Senator Ruth Wagner-Millington, PCMNO
Senator Audrey Vallee, Honorary PCMNO
Trent Desaulnier, President, Superior North Shore Métis Council
Bonnie Beaulieu, Women's Director, Thunder Bay Council
Jean Camirand, Veteran, Thunder Bay
Ken Simard, Captain of the Hunt, Region 2 Thunder Bay
Dr. Alis R. Kennedy, Veteran/Senator, Credit River Region 8
Senator Stephen Quesnelle, Niagara Region Métis Council
Cameron Burgess, Region Councillor, Thunder Bay/Geraldton/Terrace Bay
William N "Torch" Gordon, President, Geraldton Métis Council
Wendy Landry, President, Thunder Bay Council
Senator Doris Lannigan, Hamilton
Senator Marlene Greenwood, North Bay
Larry Duval, President, Moon River Council
Senator Brenda Powley, Sault Ste. Marie Council
Kim Powley, President, Sault Ste. Marie Council
Senator Andre Bossé, MNO
Senator Joseph Poitras, PCMNO
Senator Leonard Rouleau, MNO Timmins
Claudette Roseau, Timmins
Rick Paquette, President, MNO, N.R. Métis Council
Derrick Pont, Vice President/Chair, N.R. Métis Council
Daniel Gilbeau, President, Ottawa Métis Council
Allan Vallee, Chairperson, Georgian Bay Métis Council
Senator Cecile Wagar, Oshawa Métis Council
Senator Olivine Tiedema, Oshawa Métis Council
Andrée Wagar, Citizen, Oshawa Métis Council
Senator Helen Bradley, Georgian Bay Métis Council
Senator Bob McKay, Thunder Bay Métis Council
Wayne Trudeau, President, Northumberland Métis Council
Senator Reta Gordon, PCMNO

Alexander Campbell, Veteran, Toronto
George Kelly, Veteran, Ottawa
Malcolm Dixon, President, Gray-Owen Sound Métis Council
Norman Horlock, Toronto
Senator Lois McCallum, Ottawa Council
Shirley Pantuso, Women's Representative, Ottawa Council
Larry Fotz, President, NCMC
Greg Garratt, GBMC
Patsy Dryden, Geraldton
Senator Roland St-Germain, Owen Sound
Liliane Ethier, President, Témiskaming Métis Council
Chris Belisle, Captain of the Hunt Region 4
Urgel Courville, President, Northern Lights Métis Council
Senator Ernie Lavallee, Témiskaming Community Council
George Ethier, Témiskaming Métis Council
David Hamilton, Chapleau Métis Council
E.B. Elmer Ross, Veteran

APPENDIX B

**November 14, 2009
Meeting Minutes**

**Métis Nation of Ontario
Dialogue on the Nuclear Waste Management Organization's
Proposed Process for Selecting a Site**

Saturday, November 14, 2009

Minutes of the Métis Nation of Ontario Dialogue on the Nuclear Waste Management Organization's Proposed Process for Selecting a Site Meeting held November 14, 2009 at the Holiday Inn Toronto International Airport, Toronto, Ontario.

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Melanie Paradis, Métis Nation of Ontario, called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

Opening Prayer

Senator Gord Calder provided an opening prayer

Opening Remarks

President Lipinski thanked Senator Calder for providing the opening prayer. He also mentioned that it was exciting to be participating in the dialogue with the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) in a consultation process model that was developed by the MNO based on the input that had been provided by the Métis people across the province. They had brought together Métis people from every corner of the province to participate in the consultations. The model was a unique process to the MNO and no other organization was involved in a similar process with the NWMO. All segments of the Métis society in Ontario were taking part in the consultations with the NWMO and he commended everyone for taking part in the process.

He said that it was good to be watching the MNO Lands and Resources Consultation Branch take form and begin to undertake the work that was needed. The MNO now had key staff located across the province to work directly with communities on Lands and Resource issues. He indicated that this was just the beginning of the work that the Branch would be undertaking in the future.

President Lipinski stated that the MNO was working hard to make sure that more forums took place and that more people were included in the process. The MNO had learned a long time ago the benefit of partnerships and, when the MNO was able to work in partnership, both sides came out winners. The process was allowing the MNO to learn about the NWMO and for the NWMO to learn about the Métis people in Ontario.

President Lipinski indicated that he had reviewed the report that was produced from the last consultation at the MNO Assembly in August. The discussions held at that time were productive and he looked forward to the discussions continuing at this meeting. He stated that, at some point, the issue of nuclear waste management would need to be resolved and someone would need to make a tough decision on how things would be moving forward. It was important that Métis people be involved to ensure that their point of view was taken into consideration prior to decisions being made.

The report indicated that there multiple opportunities for the Métis people throughout the process. One of the major themes that had come out of the report was the issue of the environment. He stated that the environment would always be important to the Métis

people. The project could have major impacts on the rights bearing communities. These impacts needed to be taken into account, bearing in mind that this project would also provide a huge economic boost to the region in which it would be located. It was appropriate that the MNO be involved in the discussions from the beginning of the process to ensure that the Métis Nation benefited from the project over the long term. There would be an infinite number of opportunities created around the project.

France Picotte, PCMNO Chair, welcomed the participants to the discussions. She stated that it was nice to be able to gather and to have the opportunity to discuss these important issues. She wished the participants a productive meeting.

Chair Paradis introduced the MNO Lands and Resources Branch staff to the participants. She provided an overview of each of the staff person's position and the work they would undertake.

Recap of Dialogue on August 21, 2009

Chair Paradis referred the participants to the document entitled *"The Nuclear Waste Management Organization's Adaptive Phase Management Regional dialogue – Métis Nation of Ontario – Regional Dialogue – What We Heard Report"* dated October 30, 2009 that was distributed at the meeting. Ms. Paradis provided an overview of the report to the participants. She invited the participants to ask questions of the NWMO throughout the day if they required further clarification or wanted to provide additional comments. She introduced Ms. Pat Patton and Mr. Ben Belfadhel from the NWMO to the participants.

Health Break

The meeting recessed at 10:44 a.m. and reconvened at 11:17 a.m.

What we heard from Community Meetings/Brainstorm of the input received to date/Clarifying any outstanding questions

Pat Patton welcomed the participants to the meeting. She stated that they were going to open the floor to questions and comments now that people have had time to review the materials and talk to people in their communities.

The following was offered in response to comments and questions:

- A question was raised about the number of protective barriers that surround each canister. The response was that the deep geological concept was based on a multi barrier system. The barriers started with the nuclear pellets themselves that were not soluble in water, then the fuel bundle assembly, which was placed in a steel container. It was then placed into a copper container to prevent corrosion, which was then placed in the borehole and sealed with bentonite clay. The final barrier is the rock formation itself.
- A question was raised about why it took thirty to forty years for talks to begin about how to deal with nuclear waste. The response was that, in reality, the repository concept had been considered for decades and research and discussions had actually started in the 1970s. But, over this time the problem that arose was not with the design of the concept itself but through the Seaborn Panel hearings societal acceptance could not be proven. People were afraid and it had taken time to move the process forward.

- A question was raised about how far down below the surface of the earth were they looking at storing the nuclear waste. The response was that they were looking at approximately 500 meters and the reason was that this was viewed as the best depth in terms of rock stability; if they went any deeper, it could become unstable. Also, it was noted that there was very little water movement at this depth.
- A question was raised about whether there were any other deep geological repository sites being used around the world. The response was that there are two that are further ahead of Canada and the host communities have been selected in Sweden and Finland and that the United States had chosen a site in the late 1980's but that the process of site selection in the US is currently not moving forward at this site – Yucca Mountain.
- A question was raised about whether the site would be under government control or private control. The response was that it would be under governmental control as all nuclear issues in Canada were under government control.
- It was mentioned that used fuel was highly radioactive when it came out of the reactor and this radioactivity decreased rapidly in the first 100 years but it would take 1 million years for it to reach the radioactivity level of natural uranium. It was explained that this was why the repository would remain efficient for 1 million years.
- It was suggested that an area that would be good for storing the nuclear waste was in former mining areas. The response was that the repository should not be located in an area where natural resources may be needed at a later date. They did not want to have future generations looking for natural resources in the area and breaching the repository. The other reason that this would not be desirable was the geology of the areas themselves. It was explained that areas where minerals are found might have fractures; therefore, former mines would not be a good option.
- A question was asked about what would happen if or when the site failed and what was being put in place to mitigate this failure. The response was that the repository itself had multiple barriers and that they would make sure that such a scenario did not happen based on the strict site selection process and the criteria that the site would need to meet in order to be approved.
- A participant asked what resources were available that could be used at community meetings to inform the communities about the process. The response was that, as the process progressed with the communities, the NWMO would be providing resources at each step to ensure that communities were fully involved and informed. It was indicated that further information would be provided later on in the meeting.
- A question was raised about how they would be refilling the test sites that were being drilled for the repository. The response was that the site evaluation would take between seven to ten years and, at that point, the NWMO would be drilling boreholes. Once complete, the boreholes would be sealed using known techniques.
- A question was raised about whether the site would be sealed or would it be accessible at a later date. The response was that Canadians had indicated that they wanted the used fuel to remain accessible so that they could be used at a later date if new technology was discovered. The repository would be designed so that the used fuel would be retrievable.
- It was also noted that other options for storage of the used fuel had been studied but, so far, the best option was the deep geological repository.
- Research was going on in the area of recycling used fuel. In some countries, like France, they were recycling their used fuel. However, because of the type of fuel that Canada used, that was not feasible for Canada. Even with current technologies, they would still end up with waste that needed to be stored.

- Many places in Ontario would be feasible for a deep geological repository site. Most of Northern Ontario had potential for a deep geological repository and there were also areas in Southern Ontario. However, no drilling had been done to date to determine suitable sites.
- A question was raised about what recourse a community would have if it did not want the deep geological repository to be located at the selected site. The response was that, as part of the site selection process, the community would need to be willing to host the site.
- A question was raised about whether it was possible to make medical isotopes from the spent material. The response was that it was technically possible but the existing reactors would need to be modified and this modification was not economically feasible.
- A question was raised about how far a community would need to be located from the site. The response was that this would depend on the geology; if the geology was good, it could be very close to a community with no security issues.
- A question was raised about whether the site would be expandable to accommodate more storage in the future. The response was that, currently, they were looking at being able to store approximately 4 million used bundles, which would accommodate all used fuel that had been or would be produced by current reactors however as new information becomes available on new nuclear there will need to be continued discussion with a host community. It was also noted that the design of the repository can be expandable but this will also depend on the geology of the site.
- A question was raised about the kind of mitigation projects that would be put in place for loss of biodiversity due to the site development. The response was that this was an area that would need to be part of the joint decision making process with the selected community. Whatever might be impacted at the site would need to be discussed and decisions would need to be made with regards to mitigation.
- A question was raised with regards to carbon offsets that would be put in place to mitigate the carbon footprint due to transportation of spent fuel. The response was that, once the site was selected, this was an area that would need to be looked at in further detail.
- A question was raised with regards to security throughout the process. The response was that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) dealt with security and all nuclear facilities were required to comply with the rules set out by the CNSC.
- It was noted that the repository would be designed to accommodate all spent fuel that currently existed and all future spent fuel generated from current sites.
- A question was raised about whether there was a plan "B" in case of new technology being developed that could take care of the nuclear waste. The response was that one of the key pieces of the design of the site was that the fuel needed to be retrievable. If a better solution were developed, Canada would change course.
- It was suggested that safety protocols be part of Canadian law versus regulations. The response was that these safety protocols were already Canadian law.
- A question was raised about why was it safer to store used fuel in a deep geological repository versus above ground where they could be better monitored. The response was that when long-term management was explored, Canadians indicated that they preferred under ground storage. They felt that leaving the spent fuel on the surface was not a sustainable option as for security reasons.
- A question was raised about what the rest of the world is doing with their nuclear waste and how could Canada ensure that they were doing the right thing so it did not

impact on their country. The response was that most countries with nuclear programs had adopted the deep geological repositories as an option for storage.

- A participant noted that Canada was promoting the use of nuclear power in other countries and asked why Canada could not make money in storing the waste if it had the technology to do it. The response was that it was an accepted practice that each country was responsible for its' own waste. Canadians had been very clear that they did not waste from other countries to be shipped to Canada.
- A question was raised about whether there would be opportunity for Aboriginal businesses and opportunities for Aboriginal employment in the development o the site and maintenance of the site. The response was that absolutely that this would be part of the community discussions.
- Environmental concerns were brought up as a major issue throughout the discussions.
- A question was asked about whether it would be better to have several smaller repositories versus one repository to avoid long distance transportation issues. The response was that Canadians had indicated that they preferred one site due to security issues.

Lunch

The meeting recessed at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Discussion of the proposed Process for Selecting a Site

Pat Patton referred the participants to page 19 of the booklet entitled *“Moving Forward Together Designing the Process for Selecting Site – Invitation to Review a Proposed Process for Selecting a Site”* dated May 2009 that was distributed at the meeting. She provided an overview of the steps involved in the process for selecting a site. Following the overview, the participants broke into small groups to discuss the following question.

Question #1 Are the proposed decision-making steps consistent with selecting a site and making a fair decision?

- **What are the strengths of the proposed steps?**
- **How could the decision-making steps be improved?**

The breakout groups reported back to plenary and provided the following comments and suggestions.

- The backing out option in step 6 was very good.
- Felt that the referendum in the community should be held earlier in the process to verify whether they were in agreement with hosting the site.
- The inclusion of the community throughout the process was very good.
- There was a need to educate all people early in the process about nuclear energy in order to dispel their fears.
- The process was taking into consideration the environmental, human and natural impacts, and participants thought that this was very good.
- A healing process should be available for those that were not agreement in the community with hosting the site.
- A review process should be part of the site selection process.
- Participants suggested that a Métis board be established as part of the process.
- The fact that the decision process involved the entire community was good.
- Participants indicated that the steps outlined needed to be flexible.
- Research should be done on what other countries were doing in terms of safety protocols.

- Some participants indicated that the site selection process should be shorter.
- Some participants indicated that they liked the time frame but wanted it to be more specific.
- Participants indicated that they liked that funding was in place to support the process throughout.
- Participants indicated that the Métis should be recognized in step 2, so that they were recognized as part of the community.
- Participants indicated that Métis protocols should be put in place as part of the process;
- The environmental assessment should be part of step 3, not step 8.
- Participants indicated that a definition of terms should be included in the booklet to ensure that there was no ambiguity with the terminology.
- One of the steps should include a budget development so that the community was aware how much was being spent.
- Community should be made aware of whether a site qualifies prior to step 4 of the process;
- The definition of community needed to be defined further.
- A question was raised about whether each of the communities between the nuclear facility and the repository would need to approve the passage of nuclear waste prior to the site being finalized.
- Participants indicated that the terminology in the booklet should be changed to First Nations, Métis and Inuit versus using Aboriginal people.
- There was fear that no facility existed as yet in the world comparable to the one being proposed in Canada.
- The booklet should refer to those that use the area for hunting and harvesting, not just those living in the area.
- Throughout the steps the booklet referred to community in the singular, participants felt that throughout the community should be referred to as communities and that Métis should be considered throughout the process and as part of the signing of the agreement.
- Participants indicated that the steps were consistent and would enable a fair decision to be made.
- The steps as outlined allowed communities time to analyze and to make an informed decision.
- Participants indicated that the process had the appearance of being transparent process;
- Participants felt the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) should be part of the process so that they could answer questions as they arose.
- A question was raised about whether all First Nations and Métis people would be part of the process across Canada.

Pat Patton referred the participants to page 16 of the booklet entitled *“Moving Forward Together Designing the Process for Selecting Site – Invitation to Review a Proposed Process for Selecting a Site”* dated May 2009. She provided an overview of the Guiding Principles to the participants. Following the overview, the participants engaged in a plenary discussion to answer the following question.

Question #2 Do you think that the proposed sitting principles are fair and appropriate?

- **What are the strengths of the principles?**
- **How could these principles be improved?**

The following comments and suggestions were generated by the plenary discussion:

- A question was raised about whether the final decision would come down to a referendum. The response was that this was the question that they were posing as they moved forward in the process. Some people had suggested that it should be by consensus.
- Participants asked what the contingency plan was if no community came forward as a potential site. The response was that if no community came forward then they would need to continue to store the nuclear fuel waste at the current storage facilities and continue to work with Canadians to determine the way forward. Currently, each facility had the ability to store the waste that would be produced at that particular nuclear reactor site.
- A question was raised about whether the communities along the transportation route would need to be part of the discussions. The response was that, once a community was selected, all the communities along the route would need to be part of the discussions. It was not a matter of transportation communities having a veto but they needed to be part of the process. All the concerns of the communities affected would need to be addressed as part of the discussions. If a community had a lot of concerns, they would need to be addressed prior to transportation process starting.
- A participant stated that he feared that this strategy would be targeting poor communities as it could be seen as an opportunity to make money. He feared that this whole system was going to affect those that needed help most of all. In response, the NWMO asked how this fear could be turned into a statement of principle that could be incorporated into the process.
- A participant indicated that concerns about socio-economics needed to be addressed in the Guiding Principles. A question was raised about how this could be worded in the principles. The MNO indicated that they would look at drawing up some options and bringing them back to the group for further discussion.
- It was noted that the Principles needed to reflect that safety needed to be assured and would not be compromised due to lack of funding.
- Participants indicated that Aboriginal communities needed to be included in the definition of Interested Community.

Mr. Ben Belfadhel referred the participants to page 26 of the booklet entitled *“Moving Forward Together Designing the Process for Selecting Site – Invitation to Review a Proposed Process for Selecting a Site”* dated May 2009. He provided an overview of the section entitled *“Protecting humans and the environment”*. Following the overview, the participants engaged in a plenary discussion to answer the following question.

Question #3 Decision-making criteria: Do the proposed safety-related questions address all the factors that you think are important?

- **Are there others that should be added?**

Health Break

The meeting recessed at 3:10 p.m. and reconvened at 3:27 p.m.

The following comments and suggestions were generated by the plenary discussion.

- The NWMO needed to ensure that sufficient funding was available for maintenance and to address emergency issues.

- A question was raised about how many shipments would be made per year. The response was that, based on a generic scenario, the NWMO was anticipating that there would be 53 shipments per month for 30 years.
- Participants indicated that the most stringent policy in terms of security, be it international, federal or provincial, should be implemented and adhered to.
- NWMO indicated that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission had strict rules and the site would have to comply with these rules.
- Participants indicated that the impacts of construction and delivery needed to be addressed further.
- Participants indicated that a buffer zone around the facility should be added.
- The issue of transportation through traditional territories needed to be looked at further in terms of safety.
- A question was raised with regards to the type of monitoring that would be put in place for the transportation of used fuel. The response was that the processes and protocols were well established in other countries. The shipments would be monitored in real time at all times throughout the process.
- Participants indicated that they needed assurances that the safety protocols that were established would be sustainable over the entire period of the project.
- Participants indicated that an emergency preparedness monitor should be put in place to ensure that all safety protocols were implemented.
- Transportation safety issues were of major concern to participants.
- It was recommended that NWMO develop a more detailed transportation fact sheet to respond to questions posed.
- A question was raised about whether research had been undertaken about the impact of road transportation versus train transportation.

Pat Patten referred the participants to pages 31-35 of the booklet entitled *“Moving Forward Together Designing the Process for Selecting Site – Invitation to Review a Proposed Process for Selecting a Site”* dated May 2009. She provided an overview of the section entitled “Fostering Community Well-Being” to the participants. Following the overview, the participants engaged in a plenary discussion to answer the following question.

Question #4: Supporting the participation of communities: Is the proposed approach to considering factors technical safety-community well-being and partnership and community factors appropriate?

- **What are the strengths of the proposed approach?**
- **What improvements might be made?**

The following comments and suggestions were generated by the plenary discussion.

- A question was raised about how the NWMO was going to ensure that all community members were engaged in the process. The response was that the NWMO would need to work with leadership in communities to ensure that discussions took place and that communities were fully engaged. They would also need to work with communities to help them make sure that community involvement happened.
- A question was raised about how they would ensure that Canadians were the ones undertaking the work and benefiting from the project. NWMO responded that they would hope that Canadians would undertake the work and that this issue would need to be further discussed with communities.
- A participant asked if any work was being done in the education system to educate children on the safe storage of nuclear waste. The response was that curriculum

would need to be developed to ensure that children were learning as the process evolved.

- A participant indicated that the document should reference the Métis culture and the preservation of the culture. Cultural awareness programs should be offered to incoming workers that would be moving to the community.
- Participant referred to page 34 – bullet 1 of the document. He indicated that this would need to happen much earlier in the process because, in 30 years, the Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge may no longer be available.

Questions and Comments

Participants indicated that there were number of people that were aware of the process that was being undertaken by the NWMO but the question was raised about how this information could be further shared with the broader public. The response was that the NWMO was aware that Aboriginal People had unique rights in the community so the NWMO had approached Aboriginal Organizations to ask them to help bring people together to discuss these issues. Aboriginal people needed to have a forum where they could be involved in the process but they could also be involved with the general public sessions that were also being held to inform people.

A question was raised about whether funding would be provided for legal counsel, if required. The response was that the NWMO provided funding to the MNO to hold the sessions and the MNO decided the type of participants that should be in attendance. However, as the process progressed and communities came forward, funding would need to be provided for professional services.

A participant suggested that the document should provide further information on the types of benefits communities could anticipate if they became the host community for the site.

A participant stated that he did not like the terminology of Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge and felt that different terminology should be used.

Summary and Conclusion

Chair Paradis thanked the participants for their input throughout the day and she indicated that they had had very meaningful conversations and the MNO Lands and Resources Consultation Branch would have a lot of work in terms of the putting together the report. The MNO would be writing the report based on all of the information that they had heard to date. She invited the participants to send in further information in response to the questions that were posed or to provide further information that they felt should be reflected in the report. She informed the participants that the report was due for submission to the NWMO on November 30, 2009. Once MNO provided the report, she asked the NWMO what the next steps would be in the process. She indicated that perhaps the MNO could collect some meaningful data on what was meant by the Métis way of life, as this could further inform the discussions. She thanked the NWMO for bringing the group together to participate in the process.

Pat Patten stated that the NWMO was in the process of completing the dialogues that they had undertaken. They would then review the information collected and received. The document entitled “*Moving Forward Together Designing the Process for Selecting Site – Invitation to Review a Proposed Process for Selecting a Site*” dated May 2009

would be refined based on the information. She anticipated that this would take the better part of 2010. The NWMO would then approach the MNO to come back to follow up on what had happened and to look over the revised document. At that point, they would be looking at whether they were ready to initiate the process with a community or communities that had come forward indicating that they were interested in hosting the site.

Closing Prayer

Elder Audrey Valley offered a closing prayer.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

APPENDIX C

**November 14, 2009
List of Questions**

Questions and Concerns: NWMO Conference November 14th, 2009-11-23

1. How many protective barriers will there be?
2. Why wait 30~40 years for a solution? Let's look at the future.
3. How far below the surface will it be stored?
4. Are any other countries storing nuclear waste this way?
5. Will it be under government control or private industry?
6. How long does it take for nuclear waste to break down?
7. In reference to the cooling process, what kind of heat are we generating?
8. Can the heat generated be used for energy?
9. What about using old mining sites?
10. What happens if/when the site fails?
11. What research will be done over the long term?
12. What kinds of resources are available to educate? (DVD, pamphlets)
13. What are they using to fill the test sites?
14. Will they seal it, or does it have to remain accessible?
15. What about sending it into space?
16. Can we break it down differently so that it isn't so toxic?
17. Where is a suitable site in Ontario?
18. How far away from the community would the site be located?
19. Where is the concrete coming from?
20. Is it possible to make isotopes out of the spent materials?
21. How far is far enough down? How deep?
22. Will the site be expandable?

23. When will NWMO start looking for a second site, if the first site is full?
24. Once a site is selected, how will the MNO be involved?
25. Will there be projects around the site to encourage biodiversity?
26. What contracting opportunities will be developed?
27. Where will contracting opportunities be posted?
28. How will the NWMO offset the carbon footprint?
29. Can you tell us more about storage, security and transportation?
30. Can we talk more about the community selection process?
31. How much NW will it take to fill the first section?
32. What are the cumulative impacts?
33. Describe the mining process of uranium.
34. How does the used fuel become cooled?
35. How much energy will it take?
36. Where will the energy come from?
37. In 20~30 years, will there be a process in place in case we find a “better” solution?
38. Is there ground water running through the rock?
39. What will be the impact on communities?
40. What will the NWMO do to educate youth? (training, integrating it into the education system, cleaner energy, employment opportunities)
41. How many facilities will be created? What will their cumulative effects be?
42. Will it be 100% consensus, or majority rules?
43. Should safety protocols become Canadian law?

44. Will the NWMO be adopting the most strict safety measures?
45. Are the materials 100% contained in the containers?
46. What about storing the nuclear waste above ground, where it can be more easily monitored?
47. How much nuclear waste will we have 400 generations from now? When will it end?
48. What is the rest of the world doing with their waste? Will we have the same standards?
49. What is the cumulative cost when considering all materials? (steel, concrete, trucks on the road)
50. Will there be a ratio of green power to nuclear energy to keep control over nuclear waste?
51. What other uses can be found?
52. What types of bursaries and scholarships will be provided by NWMO for research on new energy?
53. What about military uses?
54. Why doesn't Canada use this opportunity to make money?
55. What is the cost analysis of nuclear power vs. clean energy (solar, wind)?
56. What is the true cost (\$) of nuclear energy?
57. Will there be more opportunities for aboriginal businesses vs. non-aboriginal businesses?
58. Why not stop using nuclear power completely?
59. What are the sites plans re: natural obstacles?

60. Would it be better to spread out the repositories?

61. What happens to the water in the wet pools at the reactors once the fuel bundles have been cooled?