

**Quarterly Report on the  
National Inuit Specific Dialogues on the Long-Term  
Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste  
(October 16, 2004 – December 15, 2004)**



**Submitted to:**

**Elizabeth Dowdswell**  
President  
Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO)

**By:**

**Soha Kneen, M.A.**  
Environment Department Coordinator  
Environment Department, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami

<b>OUTLINE OF OCTOBER 16 – DECEMBER 15, 2004 ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. EXPERT PRESENTERS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. STATEMENTS OF EXPECTATION MADE AT THE TWO REGIONAL INUIT-SPECIFIC DIALOGUES (IQALUIT/INUVIK)</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE INUIT-SPECIFIC DIALOGUES</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. NWMO SPONSORED COMMUNITY FEAST/PARTICIPANT DINNER</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. REVIEW OF DISCUSSION DOCUMENTS #1 AND #2</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6. NEXT STEPS</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>APPENDIX A (NTI RESOLUTION):</b>	<b>11</b>

## Outline of October 16 – December 15, 2004 Activities

Throughout the past three months, ITK, with the help of the National Task Force Members of the Inuit Landclaims Organizations, has been actively engaged in the organization, coordination and execution of two Regional Inuit-Specific Dialogues on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste. This work in preparation of the upcoming Inuit specific dialogues on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada is a part of an ongoing process. During the upcoming quarter, ITK will further engage in the preparation, coordination and implementation of Inuit specific dialogues in two other Inuit Landclaims Regions.

The particulars of ITK's recent activities in preparation for these dialogues will be addressed as follows:

1. Expert Presenters;
2. Statements of Expectation made at two Regional Inuit-Specific Dialogues (Iqaluit/Inuvik);
3. Draft recommendations from the two Regional Inuit-Specific Dialogues (Iqaluit/Inuvik);
4. NWMO Sponsored Community Feast/Participant Dinner;
5. Continued review and critiquing of Discussion Documents #1 and #2;
6. Next Steps.

### 1. Expert Presenters

The expert presenters that presented at the first two of the Inuit-Specific Dialogues on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada (Iqaluit and Inuvik) were as follows.

#### Iqaluit (Nunavut):

- |                       |                                     |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Jo Anne Facella    | NWMO                                |
| 2. Dr. Gordon Edwards | Campaign for Nuclear Responsibility |
| 3. Robert Del Tredici | Campaign for Nuclear Responsibility |

#### Inuvik (Inuvialuit):

- |                       |                                     |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Tony Hodge         | NWMO                                |
| 2. Dr. Gordon Edwards | Campaign for Nuclear Responsibility |
| 3. Robert Del Tredici | Campaign for Nuclear Responsibility |

*\* Dr. Edwards and Mr. Del Tredici conducted a joint presentation at both dialogues\**

All of the above-mentioned presentations were very well received. The participants at both the Iqaluit and Inuvik Inuit-Specific Dialogues were very interested in the presentations and asked numerous questions as these presentations had clarified the issue of the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada immensely for them.

As a result, the participants were able to provide informal regional responses during the Iqaluit and Inuvik Inuit-Specific dialogues on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada.

## **2. Statements of Expectation made at the two Regional Inuit-Specific Dialogues (Iqaluit/Inuvik)**

The dialogues (each lasted two days) were very well received by the attendees of each meeting. The first day of each of the dialogues was designed as an educational day. The morning was spent with general introductions, as well as the attendees' expectations from the meetings. This was later followed by the ITK, NWMO and expert presentations.

The attendees of both dialogues included in their statements of expectation that they were in attendance to receive the following information.

- Long-term effects of storage;
- Effects on Nunavut (NU) and the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR);
- Impacts on the environment;
- Impacts on wildlife;
- Degree of safety associated with storage;
- Proposed storage location(s);
- Proposed storage method(s);
- Existing plans;
- Storage of nuclear fuel waste in light of current gold mining development (this was a Nunavut specific comment);
- Locations where nuclear fuel waste is currently stored;
- Existing research, including who conducted the research.

## **3. DRAFT Recommendations from the Inuit-Specific Dialogues**

Below you will find the DRAFT recommendations that were compiled by the meeting participants of the Iqaluit and Inuvik Inuit-Specific Dialogues on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada.

ITK is currently engaged in writing the first two dialogue reports, which are currently in draft format. Draft versions of these reports, once completed, will be provided to the respective Inuit regions for their review, comment and eventual approval. ITK's Board of directors will also need to approve the final document prior to its formal submission.

This process must be followed prior to the formal submissions of each of the Inuit-Specific regional recommendations for inclusion in the NWMO document (containing the NWMO recommendations on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada) that will be submitted to the Minister on November 15, 2004.

## DRAFT Iqaluit Recommendations:

### Preamble:

These recommendations are provided with the understanding that they are informal submissions and are not the result of a consultation process that took place within the Nunavut territory.

The meeting that has taken place during Nov. 9-10, 2004, was a positive meeting, which has resulted in the provision of information and educational materials to those in attendance.

Attendees present at this meeting specified that they could not provide formal feedback that is representative for their organizations or communities as they have not yet been able to take the information provided back to their constituents (with the exception of NITI who already has a resolution in place on this matter).

Dialoguing with Inuit of Nunavut on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste with the NWMO prior to November 15, 2005 is important. However, Inuit of Nunavut and other Nunavimuit are citizens of Canada too and have been left out of some of the NWMO processes (such as the Advisory panel, the Scenarios Team and the Ethics panel).

Inuit have values unlike others. Inuit know a lot about the land and the animals on the land. Inuit also have agreements and processes in place that require for Inuit to have a voice.

It should also be recognized that a resolution by NITI does already exist (please see Appendix A), but that it does not prevent the attendees of the Nunavut dialoguing commenting on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada as a whole. However, due to the uncertainties of climate and weather conditions, storage, disposal or transportation of nuclear fuel waste in Nunavut is not acceptable now or in the future.

### Specific Recommendations:

1. The NWMO and NRCan must do more research/risk assessments before actually making a choice on the options for the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste.
2. The NWMO and the Government of Canada must take the necessary steps conduct research to develop alternative energy sources in Canada with the goal in mind to eventually stop the production of nuclear fuel waste
3. To conduct ongoing research on methods of eliminating the hazardous nature of nuclear fuel waste
4. Use a combination of options (Canadian shield – but shallower in the ground and keep it accessible – don't fully encapsulate it – reason: may develop technologies to destroy the waste in the future).
5. Regardless of the option selected – proper consultation should take place across the country to inform the public of what the selected option means – a formal consultation should take place with the public
6. All written materials provided to the general public should be released in the appropriate language (incl. Inuktitut and Inuinaktun)

## Comments Resulting from the Iqaluit Inuit-Specific Dialogue:

The following comments by participants were recorded at the Iqaluit Inuit-Specific Dialogue on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada.

- Increased education to the public including and especially in the North is necessary;
- Getting into the logistics of language, education issues, transportation issues – as it applies to community relations/consultations/dialogues – outline difficulties and obstacles regarding the organization of these types of events in the North;
- Suggestion of an extended deadline as there isn't enough time to properly educate the public on the issue of the long-term management of nuclear fuel waste;
- Traditional land use should be included in the community well being objectives of NWMO assessment;
- Traditional knowledge (IQ) are important to the nature of the value of human life, wild life, the land, the sea, our ecosystem – in the south food comes from a store – in the North the land is the food source/ecosystem/the land;
- The Nunavut landclaim secures the rights of Inuit. Consideration of any economic regions without Inuit approval, that fall within this area, is contrary to the NLCA that was negotiated and settled. The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement was passed in June 1993 and takes precedent over other legislation including the NFW Act.

## DRAFT Inuvik Recommendations:

### Preamble:

These recommendations are provided with the understanding that they are informal submissions and are not the result of a consultation process that took place within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region.

Regarding the subject of the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste, the attendees of this dialogue made the following recommendations.

- To keep the nuclear fuel waste at the existing reactor sites near the population centers;
- To support the idea of rolling stewardship (decide on the on-site option for the next 200 years and then revisit the issue of the management of nuclear fuel waste at that time);
- To hire unaffiliated and independent scientists to conduct a study on a management approach for the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste;
- To increase research in the area of containment methods (e.g. dry storage containers);
- To increase the information provision on the subject of the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste to the Canadian public (including in the North);
- To organize a tour of a nuclear reactor in order to obtain all available information of the issue. Participants should include representatives from each of the Inuit Land Claims Region.

## Option-Specific Recommendations:

The three options that were provided to the attendees of this dialogue were considered unacceptable as a method for the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste.

However, the option of On-Site Storage was deemed the most workable at this point in time. This was decided for the following reasons.

### 1. Transportation is not required:

- Transportation represents unacceptable risks that are involved in transportation;
- Generally, as the fuels cool over the first few hundred years, the danger to the public decreases exponentially;
- It is generally thought that the transport of radioactive waste poses a much greater danger to the public and the environment than temporary or intermediate on-site storage, using responsible methods;
- Transportation of waste spreads the risk factor across thousands of miles and hundreds of communities across the country.

### 2. Location:

Attendees at this dialogue felt that the current location of the reactor sites and current storage sites (near population centers) is favourable as it ensures that this subject receives the attention that it requires. The removal of these materials to a remote location may not ensure a continued focus by the general public. A continued focus on a possible management method is required in order to decide on how to proceed in the short and long term.

### 3. Guardianship:

- The nuclear guardianship ethic must guide our choices. Until a solution is found only the rolling stewardship solution is deemed an acceptable approach;
- Each generation has the responsibility to preserve the foundations of life and well-being for those who come after. To produce and abandon substances that damage following generations is morally unacceptable. Given extreme toxicity and longevity of radioactive materials, their production must cease;
- As Canadians we have the responsibility to protect our environment and inform the future generations on this subject. Future generations have the right to know about the nuclear legacy bequeathed to them and to protect themselves from it;
- Nuclear reactors and weapons productions facilities should be permanently closed now.

The attendees of this dialogue further stated their opposition to the other two proposed options for the reason that these options would require:

- Transporting highly radioactive waste from the site of generation to create new sacrifice areas will not eliminate the problem;
- They are not feasible options as the general Canadian public (north and south, east and west) would not accept the moving of nuclear wastes to one central site (not to have it in their backyards).

It was further stated by the participants of this dialogue that they do not want Nuclear Fuel Waste stored or transported through the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR), but that they also do not want to recommend that these materials should be stored in or transported through another region, as similar problems could be experienced there. At this point their recommendation was to keep Nuclear Fuel Waste on the reactor sites.

#### **4. NWMO Sponsored Community Feast/Participant Dinner**

##### Iqaluit:

In Iqaluit a community feast was not possible to organize. This was in part due to the limited amount of time that was available to prepare the community feast. However, more serious problems arose when the hunters that are usually hired for the purpose of providing the food for community feasts in Iqaluit proved to be unavailable (some were on the land and not reachable, one was unavailable due to deaths in the family, and in another due to equipment failure). In the end it was decided (in consultation with Mr. Tony Hodge and Mr. Morrie Herman) to hold a dinner for the participants of the Iqaluit dialogue instead. The dinner, which took place in the restaurant of the Discovery Inn, went extremely well and served to advance further discussion by the dialogue's participants on the subject of the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste.

##### Inuvik:

In the case of the Inuvik dialogue it was possible to organize a community feast. The feast took place in the main hall of the Ingamo Friendship Centre and was attended by well over 100 Inuvik community members. This feast proved to be an excellent opportunity for ITK staff members, the NWMO representative, as well as the expert presenters to introduce the attendees of the community feast to the subject of the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste, and to answer any questions that were asked directly by interested community members.

#### **5. Review of Discussion Documents #1 and #2**

We are currently continuing the review process of Discussion Documents #1 and #2. We will complete this process in the upcoming quarter and will be submitting our reviews of these documents as part of the March 31, 2005 report.

#### **6. Next Steps**

The work in preparation of the upcoming Inuit specific dialogues on the Long-Term Management of Nuclear Fuel Waste in Canada is a part of an ongoing process. Throughout the upcoming quarter, this process will result in (but will not be restricted to) the following activities:

- Preparation, coordination and implementation of all necessary procedures for the Kuujjuak (Nunavik) and Makkovik (Labrador) dialogues;
- Confirmation of the expert presenters for the Kuujjuak and Makkovik dialogues;
- Drafting of Regional reports and the Regional review, comment and approval of these reports before being submitted to NRCan.

In addition to this, the local coordinators for the Kuujjuak and Makkovik dialogues must also be confirmed and the invitations list must still be finalized.

The current status of these items is as follows:

<b>Region</b>	<b>Regional Inuit Land Claims Organization</b>	<b>Task Force Member</b>	<b>Invitations List submitted</b>	<b>Local coordinator</b>
Nunavik	Makivik Corporation	Still in the process of making a choice	Yes	Robert Lanari/ Michael Barrett
Labrador	Labrador Inuit Association (LIA)	Carol Gear	Yes (but it is not complete yet)	Keith Chaulk

The invitations to these two dialogues have now been sent out and we are awaiting confirmation by each of the possible dialogue attendees.

**Appendix A (NTI Resolution):**

NUNAVUT TUNNGAVIK INCORPORATED

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Arviat, N. W. T.

August 26 to 28, 1997

*Resolution No.: B97/08-24*

*Re: Storage of Nuclear  
Material In Greenland*

*Moved by: James Eetoolook*

*Seconded by: Larry Audlaluk*

WHEREAS there are reports that the Premier of Greenland is giving serious consideration to a plan to store weapons grade nuclear waste and other nuclear material from Russia and the United States in Greenland;

AND WHEREAS Rand Unrestricted Draft Series data posted on the Internet as "A Concept for Strategic Material Accelerated Removal Talks {SMART} 'Debat om Thule Air Base: 'Atom-feenQsel' i Gn~nland" gives considerable detail on this nuclear proposal;

AND WHEREAS Rand estimates the material involved could be enough to manufacture about 100,000 nuclear warheads;

AND WHEREAS in addition to Greenland, other circumpolar locations including Canada, Iceland, and Northern Scandinavia could be under consideration;

AND WHEREAS the U.S. airbase at Thule, Greenland is cited as the most favorable location by the designers of the project proposal;

AND WHEREAS the transport of hazardous materials to or from the proposed Thule site could threaten people, lands or waters protected under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement;

AND WHEREAS concern has been expressed to NTI by residents of Grise Fiord, N.W.T., a community which is relatively close to Thule;

AND WHEREAS; NTI is opposed to the storage of nuclear and other hazardous materials in the arctic;

# NUNAVUT TUNNGAVIK INCORPORATED

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Arviat, N.W.T.

August 26 to 28, 1 ~97

AND WHEREAS NTI has already conveyed its strong concerns about this matter directly to the President of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference and requested that he convey tile matter to the Premier of Greenland;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOVED that NTI voice its opposition to any plans for the storage of nuclear goods, or the transportation of such goods in the Arctic.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that NTI take steps to notify representatives of governments and organizations involved in any such planning of our strong opposition to such plans.

In favour: 9  
Against: 0  
Abstentions: 0

CARRIED Date of Vote: August 28, 1997

