



Share Your Thoughts on...

Moving Forward Together: Designing the Process for Selecting a Site

Invitation to Review a Proposed Process

We invite you to review our discussion document. Share your thoughts on whether the proposed site selection process is appropriate and what changes, if any, need to be made.

The comments you and others make will be used to refine the design of the process. To help initiate this conversation, we invite you to consider these questions:

1. Are the proposed siting principles (outlined on pages 16 and 17) fair and appropriate? What changes, if any, should be made?

See page ① enclosed.

2. Are the proposed decision-making steps (outlined in brief on page 19) consistent with selecting a safe site and making a fair decision? What changes, if any, should be made?

See page ② enclosed.

3. Does the proposed process provide for the kinds of information and tools (outlined on pages 33 to 35) that are needed to support the participation of communities that may be interested? What changes, if any, should be made?

See page ③ enclosed (question 4)

4. What else needs to be considered?

See page ④ enclosed and Question #3 at page ③

Please return to:

Jo-Ann Facella
Director, Social Research & Dialogue



By Mail

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



By Fax

416.934.9526



By Email

jfacella@nwmo.ca

Name (optional): *MR. ALAIN PICHE*

Question 1: Are the proposed siting principles fair and appropriate? What changes, if any, should be made?

Focus on safety: "The process must be open, transparent, fair and inclusive." What about Canadian National Security; first grounded value for Canadians? It is not a regular process; it is an unique process who need a unique standard of Canadian National Security. The project must be 100% Canadian "Homemade" from engineering, contractors, subcontractors, expertise Centre, to indirect jobs. And no communication about the project with other countries; it is important for Canadian National Security. The transportation of used fuel must be secret.

Right to withdraw: If the communities have the right to withdraw, they must be obligate to keep secret all information obtained during the siting process. If the communities who want to host the site decided to do a referendum; it must need more than 50% +1.

Aboriginal rights, treaties and land claims: Should it be better if claims between Aboriginal peoples and the Crown be resolved before Step 9?

Main prob-

Question 2: Are the proposed decision-making steps consistent with selecting a safe site and making a fair decision? What changes, if any, should be made?

Accountable authorities: They should be under the direct orders from the federal government.

Regulatory authorities: What is, specifically, "Regulatory Authorities"? How does it work? For example: Who will hire and manage the staff. The staff is it secure, discreet, etc...?

NWMO website: Results will be published on the NWMO website. Does the information published will be safe for the Canadian National Security?

Regulatory Agencies: What's the difference between "Regulatory Authorities" and "Regulatory Agencies"? What's the name of these Agencies?

Public hearings: When public hearings are involved, what is the plan to keep sensitive information secret? For Canadian National Security?

Main Page

③

Question 3: Are there additional safety-related questions which you would like to see addressed?

Used fuel could reach to 8 million bundles (p 13):
The used fuel could pass from 4 to 8 million bundles (From simple to double). So, an additional safety-related question would be: ~~As~~ the deep geological repository would cover about four (4) by six (6) kilometers? (The double of two (2) by three (3) kilometers).

Question 4: Does the proposed process provide for the kinds of information and tools that are needed to support the participation of communities that may be ~~interested~~ interested? What changes, if any, should be made?

Possible risks to be managed: On p. 11, some risks for a community considering hosting the project are explained "partially". For example: housing and land values may rise at the outset and fall as construction of the deep repository is completed. The NWMO should offer to communities guarantees that they will be de-damaged if housing and land values fall.

Main Piche-

For NWMO

August 18, 2009

Question 5: What else needs to be considered?

- This national initiative is a Canadian initiative (Canada's plan). Our scientists are competent, the Government of Canada should not reveal to other countries like Switzerland, Sweden, United Kingdom, Finland or France (see p 9) the secrets of the project. It must be "confidentially" for Canadian National Security.
- NEA and/or IAEA are extra-territorial organizations, so there is a possibility that some secrets (important secrets) for Canadian National Security would fall in bad hands. The NWMO should not give sensitive information to NEA and/or IAEA.

Main Probe-

For NWMO

August 18, 2009