

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2004 14:22:40 -0500
**To: robbins@kingston.net,mouvementvert.fugere@bellnet.ca,
info@petitcodiac.org,nucaaware@web.ca,graham.simpson.sk@sympatico.ca,
ccc@web.ca**
From: Northwatch <northwatch@onlink.net>
**Subject: Nuclear Waste Watch - Steering Committee Meeting Notes - March
2, 2004**
Cc: mcclenat@lao.on.ca,mcclenaghan@execulink.com

Nuclear Waste Watch
Steering Committee Meeting
March 2, 2004

Participants: Graham Simpson, Dave Martin, Daniel Leblanc, Gordon Edwards,
Michel Fugere, Norm Rubin, Brennain Lloyd, Theresa McLenaghan

1. Housekeeping and Agenda Review

Dave reviewed housekeeping: hotel rooms are paid for, but not extras;
travel to be reimbursed by NWMO directly; made a reservation tonight at the
Bedford Academy at 36 Prince Arthur, for 6 p.m. for dinner; tomorrow
morning there will be a 2 hour meeting from 9 to 11 with the NWMO at 49
Jacks Avenue, which is 3 blocks south of St.Clair, east of Yonge; Dave
will make arrangements to meet for lunch to debrief.

2. Introductions

Graham Simpson is attending for ICUC, which has been struggling against the
uranium / nuclear industries for 20 years; have opposed the uranium mines,
and then AECL efforts to site a slow poke reactor in Saskatchewan; Graham
brought a two pager outlining waste issues, and identifying a lot of buzz
words around waste and the nuclear industries; have to fight the nuclear
industries at a national and international stage; the industry is big and
integrated and we have to deal with them that way; uranium mines are way up
north, isolated from even the Saskatchewan urban centres, and further
isolated by the distances between Saskatchewan and central Canada; have up
to 40% uranium in the ore, and it is so radioactive it has to be mined
robotically; mines in central Canada were less than 1% uranium; have to
dilute the ore with waste rock to process it; have taken Cameco to court,
and won the first round, now is being appealed and is delayed again until May.

Brennain Lloyd works with Northwatch, a regional coalition in northeastern
Ontario. Northwatch was created in 1988, in part in anticipation of the
Federal Environmental Assessment of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited's
"concept" of geological "disposal" of nuclear fuel waste in the Canadian
Shield, which was launched the same year. Founding groups had experience
with AECL's previous siting efforts in the region, as well as other energy
and nuclear concerns, including the uranium mines in the Elliot Lake area
and the uranium refinery in Blind River. Northwatch was a very active
participant in the AECL FEARO, and presented to both the Parliamentary
Committee and Senate Committee on the Nuclear Fuel Waste Act, trying -
albeit unsuccessfully - to get improvements to the Act. Northwatch is a
generalist organization, working on a range of environmental and natural

resources and land use issues in northeastern Ontario; Brennain divides her time between forestry, mining and nukes.

Norm Rubin is with Energy Probe, has been for a long time; most recently had an interesting four or five weekends with the NWMO people doing scenarios, which was the brain child of the Global Business Network; was about 30 people, hand picked, including Ann Coxworth; most of what the GBN has done for competitive large businesses is getting a bunch of people together to speculate on how the future might unfold, the methodology tries to forecast over various time frames, eg. 25 years, 50 years, 10,000 years etc; this is the first time they've gone beyond 50 years; generated ideas of how the future might look; the exercise forces you to admit that there are a range of futures, and if your favourite plan comes out 5% better in three scenarios and leads to the extinction of the planet in the fourth, then it forces you to rethink; talked about as designing the wind tunnel in which the idea for long term management of nuclear waste management must be tested to see if it can fly; fascinating way to approach judging a plan; came up with a set of scenarios; those who came in with strong arguments found that those strong arguments weren't as compelling as we thought they were; eventually, 98% into this, they picked the things that are most relevant - ie process is the key; a real consensus was building that you can't leave out the question of ongoing production of nuclear waste from the discussion of long term management of nuclear fuel waste; clear consensus, which Norm thinks is reflected in the report, that these things can't be separated; was interesting, well paid and well fed, eye opening for those who participated; not many of the NWMO were there, except Tony Hodge full time

Michel Fugere mostly works with Mouvement Verte du Mauricie, and the Mauricie region is sited around Gentilly II, and so people get in touch with them for concerns about Gentilly, such as concerns several years ago with health concerns; for more than 10 years they have been gaining experience in the nuclear field, but most related to the operation of the Gentilly II plant itself; most of Michel's participation in that is to try to see that the local people take the situation in hand; explores with them ways to make the representation to the government; works a lot in the field, organizing with people so they have the information they need, and know what is going on, etc; work a lot on alternative energies, and have done conservation and efficiency projects, as a 3 year pilot project, such as with the municipalities, low income people; for nuclear expertise, rely heavily on Gordon and CCNR

Gordon Edwards has been working on nuclear issues since 1970, and the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility was founded in 1975, when the Port Hope scandal really galvanized them into forming the CCNR; played a significant role in bringing these things to public attention in those early days, and thinks in large part that the Hare Report was commissioned to respond to the rising public interest and concern; CCNR argued then that the uranium tailings was the most urgent issue, whereas high level waste is not being disseminated into the environment in the same way; in some ways, believes that the focus on HLRW is a distraction from the real issues of uranium mining and waste; would really like to discuss our strategy in addressing the Canadian public and politicians.

Daniel Leblanc is here on behalf of the Green Energy Coalition of New Brunswick, which is a loose coalition of 20 groups organized to oppose the

refurbishing of Lepreau; in his day job, Daniel is with the Riverkeepers, and they have had some local successes, and there have been several international successes; only have David Coon who works 10% of his time on energy issues who is the only staff person working on energy issues, all other work is volunteer; Daniel is also on the CNP steering committee; has some ideas about how we should proceed, whereas the reality in New Brunswick is that we are incredibly indebted, and we have no money, and Lepreau is going to close; don't think they will get much support for other provinces paying for their waste management; would like NWMO to either do a proper job in New Brunswick or give them the money and they will do a proper job of consulting with the people of New Brunswick; have a situation now where nuclear materials are being shipped every day; concerned we are overblowing the importance of this issue

Dave Martin works for Sierra Club, and works mostly on nuclear issues although not exclusively; works on issues like export, Chalk River, Port Hope, refurbishment of Ontario reactors; see it as a priority at least through until the end of 2005 and the NWMO mandate to focus on nuclear fuel waste issues.

3. Agenda Review resulted in reducing discussion of NWMO activities to 30 minutes; NWW workplan left at one hour; kept federal political strategies, fundraising and admin and position statement revision all kept at 15 minutes, and kept preparation for NWMO meeting at 45 minutes, with agreement to move to that item at 4 regardless of where we are at in the agenda.

AGREED: that if others come they will be welcomed to sit in.

4. Nuclear Waste Management Activities

Brennain provided a summary of the five areas of activities of the NWMO including the web site, including 35 expert papers and some discussion forums; the focus groups meetings with "a representative cross section of Canadians" who appear to be selected on the basis of no prior information about nuclear issues; the national / regional dialogue, which is four multi-stakeholder sessions coming up this month which are by invitation and are for people with some prior involvement; the specialty workshops including of reactor communities, so called expert tables and the scenarios workshop; and the series of published reports, the first of which was released in November with the second to follow in the summer and the third early in 2005; a final report with recommendations will produced for November 15, 2005.

Norm is giving the NWMO the benefit of the doubt, and thinks that Elizabeth Dowdeswell is sincere in her efforts; Brennain feels they are slicker and smoother than any AECL, but just as much a creature of the nuclear industry, and should be dealt with on that basis. Gordon feels that this is an exercise in co-option at a grand scale, because whatever they hear from the Canadian people say, ie. One option over another, and then they can go back to the federal government and say "this is that the Canadian people want". Would like to blow the whistle on this and say the legislation is all wrong; should not go along with that; very important to realize what is going on.

Michel said that this is a completely non democratic process, the NWMO will

look at three options, just as they were told to do by the federal legislation, and then will go back to the government with a recommendation, not even having gone to Parliament, and that will be the end of it. If they don't come with a way to manage the wastes, they won't be able to build any more in Canada.

Norm questioned whether Brennain really wants an outcome that Canadians want and reflects Canadians values; Brennain responded that she wanted accountability and transparency, which are words that the NWMO appears fond of, if not the practice. Gordon feels our message should be that no option is acceptable; and that the waste production must be stopped. Daniel questioned why ED / NWMO chose such a high tech manner of "consulting" the Canadian people; have their own problems in New Brunswick, and want to use the NWMO to advance their own agenda, ie to have a full public discussion in New Brunswick; if they want to consult, they should consult the victims, ie the people who have to live with it.

Graham asked for clarification on the Hare Report; Gordon clarified that the Hare Report was written by three men in three months; then there were hearings in the Public Accounts office in Ottawa, and it was going badly, with 300 briefs and many of them very critical; Graham sees this round as just being like the last rounds. Gordon thinks that the best use of our time is to say that this process is rotten and the legislation is greatly flawed; the nuclear industry has a great public relations opportunity; by making a noise about changing the law, we are constantly bring pressure to the federal politicians; could go one further than Seaborn and say that this agency should deal not just with the nuclear fuel waste but all nuclear wastes.

AGREED: beneficial to assemble a set of notes from someone who has been to each of the various NWMO sessions

ACTION: each person who participates in a NWMO session will produce a short summary for circulation; eg Brennain will do a note on the North Bay regional "dialogue", Dave on the Ottawa "dialogue" etc.

ACTION: identify someone from previous sessions, eg scenarios workshop, community dialogue, First Nations session, etc. to do the same

5. Nuclear Waste Watch Workplan

Gordon favours a federal focus on politicians; Dave suggested a different approach, ie a grass roots approach; perhaps focusing on transportation routes, and doing things like municipal resolution, ie for transport to geological disposal; Brennain considers these two approaches compatible and suggested that they could be mutually supportive.

Dave explained that the NWW position paper did not go with a position against centralized / storage, in recognition of some concerns about moving the waste away from the shores of the Great Lakes; Norm mentioned that the Scenarios workshop went in the direction of centralized storage ie have it ready to move in case of societal collapse. Dave noted that Greenpeace will not sign on to the position paper because of the possibility of transportation. Brennain mentioned that there was a municipal resolution passed in New Liskeard opposed to geological disposal, which could be a good precedent for a municipally based campaign strategy.

Gordon feels quite strongly that we should be opposed to centralized storage until ten years after shutdown; until you have the reactors shut down, you don't have a defined problem, ie waste will continue to be generated; going to have at least a seven year gap after production ends before you can actually do something; Norm agreed with Gordon.

Brennain noted that there is work on in New England around hardened on-site storage and it might be something to integrate into the NWW work; Dave noted that the NWMO has some papers on this.

Dave noted that the other part of the work plan we need to look at is the more focused steps / actions, such as responding to the NWMO discussion papers; should have been targeting op eds in each of the cities where the national / regional dialogues are happening.

Brennain thinks that the grassroots approach and the federal focus are not exclusive of each other, and in fact work well together; Gordon is eager to work on the federal piece, and changing the legislation; would be an opportunity to work on each member of parliament, exploit the current angst about scandal; Graham raised a concern that with the Liberals and the Conservatives are both pro nuclear, it only leaves the NDP; Gordon responded that there have been many individual members of each party that have been very good on past issues; Gordon thinks this is a worthwhile thing to do, and a good time to do it. Graham said that this is the best time to get in, as things are to change. Norm's reading of the Act is that there are three things that are outrageous: no one to review it, ie privy council will make the decision and declare it to all, thinks there is potential common cause with the NWMO around this decision point; the industry only versus independent of industry agency; not enough money to do anything serious, ie the AECL calculation of the bill was \$13 billion, and what they now have is half a billion and they are collecting \$110 million per year and that is while the reactors are running, and so at best case you have \$2 billion.

Daniel asked if there is a contract between AECL and New Brunswick to take the waste back;

Gordon said that by keeping all the money in the nuclear industries' hands it inhibits new ideas coming forward, with an independent agency there would have been new expertise developing, and new opportunities becoming available, opportunities to do more research and more independent research in particular.

Brennain proposed that we make a plan to make a workplan; summarized grassroots and federal focused activities; revisit ideas of national conference and citizens' panel, plus ongoing work of responding to NWMO, and web site and educational materials; need to put timelines to it and turn it into a workplan.

Dave recalled that his original idea was to be like a shadow organization to the NWMO, doing responses and so on; Gordon favours the idea of a national conference, and thinks there would be money for that, but would need staff people to do it; Dave is not sure there is money from the fed's to do it, Brennain reminded the group of Peter and Franklyn's conference; Dave is confident they were expecting to fund that with NWMO dollars.

Theresa said there is a third option, which is to envision the likely outcome, in which case the strategic discussion is not about how do we get to the option we hope for, but how do we respond most strategically to the option we think likely. Graham said that there are a number of different scenarios and we don't know which way they are going to go, or even which option we think is the best to go. Gordon thinks the outcome of the NWMO is smoke and mirrors, and what the federal government is really interested in is keeping the nuclear industry going and they don't really care about the waste; the biggest plus for the nuclear industry is that they have the NWMO up and running and occupying the discussion; for that reason, our strategy should be to confront the process, and blow it out of the water, rather than playing along with their massive public relations campaign; shouldn't really be going along with this, and should be blowing the whistle all the way.

Daniel agrees with Gordon, but wonders what people think about asking for the money to do the consultation in New Brunswick. Would like to pick ten communities along the river, and have one day open houses; wonders if people have any issues with that. Graham said you have to be very very cautious about taking money from them and being tied to them; Dave clarified that NWW has made a decision to not take money from the NWMO. Brennain said that if the money was to be requested it would have to be very very clear that it was New Brunswick groups and not NWW; Gordon emphasized the importance of running your own show, and doing your own thing.

Norm disagrees 180 degrees with Gordon, Theresa and Brennain; having been vindicated as a Seaborn optimist he is prepared to be a NWMO optimist; NWMO is not his biggest enemy, and in some cases may even be a potential ally, such as in the money things; have already shown a number of signs that they are not the nuclear industry, such as publishing papers by critics; conflict is likely to be later; if they actually ask Canadians about their values, and then actually report them, the federal government will actually choke on them; concern is that if it is just a jumble at that point, and that will create an perfect moment for the federal government to say "there is no other responsible party, so we will make the decision" and that will reflect the federal government values, rather than those of Canadians. Norm thinks we are a disadvantage if we have no special connections to those special groups, eg aboriginal and youth

Theresa went back to Gordon's comments, and asked if that was from the outside, ie completely declining, or is it criticizing and participating; Gordon is undecided; Theresa is very concerned about the "solution" being manufactured, as worst outcome; wondered if there are any funders that would support this work, such as EJLB.

Brennain sees this as a campaign that includes critiquing the NWMO constantly, which means being very familiar and very current and detailed in criticizing the organization and their outputs; disagrees with Norm about any similarities between Seaborn and NWMO; Seaborn was a federal e.a., and while deeply flawed, it is fundamentally different in its structure and functioning. Graham thinks that Norm and Brennain's positions are reconcilable, one of the benefits of being there in the Seaborn process was being there and able to see and smell what was going on; Michel reminisced about meetings with Hydro Quebec about the waste at Gentilly, and HQ said "don't worry, we have a new agency the NWMO

that will solve this problem"; don't want to be part of legitimizing this; should be at the door but not in the room; should be talking to Canadians, instead; Graham said now we know the outline of the process, and that's what we can go to the Canadian public, but if you are up close and watching them carefully you can also go to Canadians on what they are doing wrong.

ACTION: Gordon and Michel will map out what can happen on federal front over a given timeline

ACTION: Daniel and Michel will work on a regional workplan for Quebec / New Brunswick

ACTION: Brennain will work on a regional workplan for Northern Ontario

ACTION: Dave will map out some activities for a grassroots

AGREED: component workplans to Graham and Brennain by March 15

ACTION: Brennain and Graham will work together to integrate into a combined workplan by end of March

6. Fundraising and Administrative

ACTION: Dave, Brennain and Theresa will look at funding, including Soros, EJLB

7. Position Statement Revision

Dave introduced the proposed revision statement to address ambiguities around import. He also reported on a story by Peter Calamine that included a quote from Elizabeth Dowdeswell to the effect of "There's an ethical dimension here ... we export uranium ... there may come a time when we have to take back fuel"

AGREED: replace the current point # 6 with "The Canadian government should guarantee that high level radioactive waste will not be imported."

8. Preparation for the NWMO meeting

Dave reminded the group of the proposed agenda:

- introduction
- introduction of Nuclear Waste Watch, including goals, vision, work to date, position statement
- introduction to NWMO, mandate, vision, study and engagement, work to date and current activities
- roundtable

Dave had asked Donna how the meeting will be referred to in the future by the NWMO; we believe it would be valuable to have a record of the meeting.

AGREED: the meeting should be referred to as one of "information".

AGREED: Dave will act as traffic guy ie co chair and speaking spots in intro of NWW will be shared

AGREED: roundtable will be open discussion, opportunity for all to raise

points and particular to ask questions about NWMO work plan etc.

AGREED: position paper is to be attached to the record of the meeting,
which will be posted on the web site

AGREED: Thanks to Dave for an excellent job of organizing the meeting!

Northwatch

Box 282, North Bay P1B 8H2

tel 705 497 0373 fax 476 7060 northwatch@onlink.net
www.northwatch.org