



South Bruce Webinar

Submitted Questions and Written Responses
Responses are current as of October 20th, 2020.



Willingness & Referendum Questions

1. What is the definition of a compelling willing host?
2. Mayor Buckle – It is extremely important that the residents of South Bruce have a vote to determine if they are a willing host to the DGR in South Bruce. Are you going to accomplish this by a referendum or by a special question on the municipal election ballot?
3. When will you commit to hold a referendum? It is the democratic right of the people to vote YES or No on a DGR project of this magnitude.
4. Mayor Buckle, you have said previously that “6 councillors should not decide this project on their own” – 2016 London Free Press. Do you agree the people should have a vote?
5. When will the residents of South Bruce be given the opportunity to have a referendum? This project affects the municipality in so many facets, that before contracts are signed or the community is divided any further, there should be a vote. If the NWMO and CLC have done their job of informing the community, over these past few years, then the time is sooner than later.

Continued on next slide

Willingness & Referendum Questions, cont.

1. In step 4 of the NWMO process as listed in the document "Moving Forward Together " states "Communities with confirmed suitable candidate sites assess whether they are willing to accept the project, including engaging the community to assess and demonstrate this willingness" We are in step 4 now so how does The Municipality intend to meet this requirement ? When will a Referendum be held ?
2. Back in 2015, (July 9, 2015) Mr. Gowland wrote a letter to the editor stating that "it will be a number of years before any decisions will be made about the location of the DGR, and the community which ultimately hosts it will be required to demonstrate its willingness to do so at the grass-roots level." Well, here it is only 5 years later, and the decision is going to be made by 2023. Is this considered a number of years? Not very long considering nuclear waste has been occurring for over 50 years!
3. How has the community been allowed to demonstrate its willingness to do so at the grass-roots level? The community has never had a say in what is going on!
4. Does the municipality have a legal obligation to give residents a voice in the form of a referendum? If not, Mr. Gowland and Mayor Buckle do you believe the CLC, the council, and the NWMO have a moral obligation to give each resident a democratic voice by having a referendum?
5. Will there be a referendum, to determine whether South Bruce is a willing host or its electorate are in favour of a DGR?
6. With regards to a referendum to decide whether we as a community are willing to host this project: who sets the rules? Is there a law for that? As a tax paying landowner, but without Canadian citizenship will I qualify? Who will be involved in setting the parameters for deciding whether our community is a willing host or not?

Response

- How South Bruce defines willingness and a willing host community is a priority. The Municipality hopes to give community members an opportunity to express what willingness means or looks like to them.
- As such we are working on a draft process which will be brought forward to Council over the next few months. This proposed process will include residents giving input on determining what willingness looks like and how it will be determined. This could include various components, such as a form of vote.
- The Municipality will be setting out these options in more detail as part of our process to establish willingness. We will detail the options and have facilitated discussions on the pros/cons of each.
- It is important to ensure we have all the information necessary – studies, testing, assessments, the risks and/or benefits from a socio-economic perspective, all which are addressing the list of principles– before any decision can be made.
- The Municipality has included our residents throughout this process over the last several years with workshops, open houses, meetings and various communications. It is our plan to continue to hear from our residents and keep them informed and involved.

Response, cont.

- (In reference to Q1) The Municipality is currently in Step 3, Phase 2 of the NWMO's steps in the site selection process and no decision to host the project has been made at this time.
- (In reference to Q4) There is no legal requirement to hold a referendum. The decision to hold a referendum lies with Municipal Council. Council would submit a question to the electorate by way of a by-law.
- (In reference to Q6) The rules for a referendum are set by the provincial *Municipal Elections Act, 1996*. A few of the rules:
 - The question must be a matter within the jurisdiction of the municipality.
 - The question must be clear, concise and neutral and must be capable of being answered in the negative or affirmative. The question may be appealed to the province's Chief Electoral Officer.
 - The result is binding only if at least 50% of eligible voters vote on the question and more than 50% vote in favour of the result.
 - A resident must be eligible to vote in the municipal election to vote on a referendum.
- There are other options to get community input instead of a formal referendum – for example, non-binding polls or votes could be commissioned by Council. The Municipality is undertaking a process on how willingness will be determined. These options will be detailed as part of the process so community members can provide input.

Community Input on Draft List of Principles Questions

1. Are all the comments and questions made public regarding the 34 principles sent in by SB residents and ratepayers because at the last SBCLC meeting when Vivian Kennedy gave her analysis report, we could not detect one item in her analysis that reflected any of our comments. Can you make all of these submissions available please so that we can all form our own opinion?
2. What is the status of the 48 inputs to be considered by the municipality as additions to the 34 principles. According to Leanne Martin's presentation to council on September 5/2020 an update was to be provided to the council on September 22/2020. What is the status of the update and please provide a detailed breakdown of each of the 48 submissions and what if any additions will be added to the 34 principles?
3. What is the status of the 48 inputs received by the municipality on or before Sept 18 2020 for consideration by the municipality as additions to the 34 principles? Also according to Leanne Martin's 's presentation to Council on Sept 5 an update was to be provided to the council on Sept 22nd. What is the status of the update?
4. Please provide a detail breakdown of each of the 48 submissions to the 34 principles and what if any additions will be added to the 34?
5. Why was there no mention of the requests for a referendum included in the report on the feedback collected about the 34 principles? Of the 48 submissions, a lot of people were requesting a referendum, yet it was not included in the report.

Response

- (In reference to Q1) The report that CLC Project Coordinator Vivian Kennedy gave to the CLC was strictly related to the Committee's input in accordance to the motion that was passed by the CLC.
- Staff is preparing a more detailed report to Council about the 48 submissions of feedback on the list of principles.
- It will come to a future Council Meeting. The individual submissions will be publicly available and given to Council for consideration. *[The report was posted in the Council Agenda Package on October 23rd, 2020 for consideration at Council's meeting of October 27, 2020. The report includes all 48 submissions received by the Municipality.]*
- When Council receives this report, they will consider the attached list of feedback, and the recommendations from staff. At that point Council would consider any additions or changes to the list of principles. They will have community, CLC and their own suggestions to consider.

Legal Questions

1. Mayor Buckle and Mr Duffy, how do you intend to compel NWMO to compensate landowners which live in close proximity to the proposed site and have not given consent for the project? How do you intend to address future single and class action lawsuits whereby the municipality is named as complicit in real or potential losses related to property values and other damage with both physical and/or other such nuisances as noise, air pollution, ground disturbance and potential psychological harms?
2. The latest update from the NWMO includes guarantees to property values. How will this be determined? How will the loss of business and income be determined? For many people, their property is also their business and a lifestyle they do not want to give up. How will people be compensated for the stress and harm caused by these losses?
3. It has been said that transparency is a key to building trust. Are you concerned with legal action when you have so many closed session council meetings and do these closed session meetings discuss the DGR as well as wastewater?
4. What are the legal ramifications when so many South Bruce residents and ratepayers do not want a DGR sited in their municipality?

Continued on next slide

Response

- (In reference to Q1 & Q2) There is a principle in the draft list of principles endorsed by Council requires that the NWMO, in consultation with the Municipality, establish a Property Value Protection Program in the event that property values are adversely affected by the NWMO's site selection process and the development, construction and/or operation of the Project. Details of the program need to be established. NWMO has recently announced it will be implementing such a program. The Municipality is waiting on the NWMO's initial draft proposal. This principle provides similar protection to business owners affected by the Project.
- (In reference to Q3) All decisions made with respect to the Project are made by Council in open sessions as required by the *Municipal Act, 2001*. Any closed meeting of Council must meet the requirements for a closed meeting under the *Municipal Act, 2001*.
- (In reference to Q4) The federal government has primary jurisdiction over the Project through the federal *Impact Assessment Act* and the federal nuclear licensing regime. However, the Municipality has an important role in the process. The NWMO has committed that the Project will not be located in a municipality unless that community is a willing and informed host. We are now undertaking the process to determine if the community is willing and informed. This process will be guided by the draft Principles. The Municipality is now undertaking a process to get community input on how willingness will be determined.

Legal Questions, cont.

1. Is entering into a formal agreement in Step 6 between the NWMO and the South Bruce Municipality contrary to Municipal law? The NWMO process requires that the municipality enter into a binding agreement with the NWMO “before” there is any regulatory process to assess this project’s impacts and risks. The clear implication of this process is that consent is supposed to be given before there is a full disclosure of the risks and the impacts upon the municipality and its residents. Step 6 process requires a municipality to commit to host and support a project whose impacts are not fully understood by anyone. Is the municipality surrendering in perpetuity its provincially legislated powers and duties to protect the interest of the residents, prior to and without the benefit of the disclosure of the risks and the impacts that the CEAA environmental process is legislated to provide?
2. Does the council have any say with regards to the size of the project. Right now the NWMO talks about 1500 acres with an above ground presence of 250. It doesn't take much imagination that should this project proceed in South Bruce the amount of waste to get buried will multiply. I'm thinking the low and intermediate level waste, the waste of the small modular units that are currently the hot topic. And what about radioactive waste from decommissioned reactors. And what about radioactive waste from hospitals?
3. If this plan is approved and at any time in its construction, or burial phase, conditions arise that present major difficulties, due to unforeseen complications or accidents, that put the health of residents at risk, will South Bruce Municipality have a legal right to stop the project?
4. This project is to employ local people. Toronto is not considered local to Teeswater/South Bruce. Why does South Bruce/NWMO need to employ such an expensive lawyer from Toronto? Does Bruce County not have qualified lawyers? Pretty sad if there is no confidence in the lawyers from Bruce County!
5. Are there any legal reason why council/clc meetings are not recorded and made available on-line?

Response

- (In reference to Q1 & Q2) Any consent to host the Project must be informed. The Municipality is entering into a study process now, guided by the Principles, that will need to be completed before entering the Hosting Agreement. For example, Principles 1 to 6 address the safety and natural environment. These principles will need to be addressed to the satisfaction of the community before entering into a Hosting Agreement. That is not to say it will be at the same level of detail as we might see in the Impact Assessment, but we will need to fully understand the potential impacts and how they will be addressed. The Hosting Agreement is the mechanism by which the Municipality secures the commitments of the NWMO that address the concerns of the community and the benefits from the Project.
- (In reference to Q3) The federal government has primary jurisdiction over the Project. However, the Municipality can negotiate a role in governance of the Project as part of any Hosting Agreement. There is a principle that requires the NWMO to provide the Municipality with an ongoing and active role in the governance of the Project during the construction and operation phases of the Project.
- (In reference to Q4) Mr. Duffy is a Partner with Stikeman Elliott LLP and is co-head of the firm's Projects and Infrastructure Group. Mr. Duffy has been hired as the Municipality's legal counsel because of his area of expertise. The Municipality was satisfied with Mr. Duffy's background and experience when they considered and then selected him. Mr. Duffy's distinct areas of expertise or experience made him the right fit.
- (In reference to Q5) Procedural By-Law 2017-98 states "The use of audio and video recording equipment during a Meeting is not permitted within the designated areas unless the Chair or the majority of the Council Members permit the use of such equipment or devices and it is not disruptive to the conduct of the Meeting at which the recording privileges are granted." Therefore, there is the possibility to record and something the Municipality can consider.

Economic Development Questions

1. Given the DGR project has a number of hurdles to overcome before any approval takes place, including such activities as (a) a demonstration that South Bruce is a compelling willing host, (b) approval by the regulatory bodies, (c) a vote by SON, and (d) the approval of the NWMO. There is a reasonable probability that this project may not see the light of day in South Bruce. What other non-nuclear related projects have the Council and the municipality considered for economical growth in South Bruce or are you betting the future economic growth on this project alone? Please specify in detail what those projects, if any, might be.
2. Mayor Buckle and Mr Gowland, how will the community be compensated should promised economic development not materialize over the life of the project? What are the metrics for determining success or what will be included?
3. What are the financial consequences to our municipality should the council decide to withdraw from the project.

Response

- (In reference to Q1 & Q2) Studies will occur to give a clearer picture on socio-economic impacts or benefits for South Bruce that would result from the Project. These studies will hopefully be beneficial to South Bruce regardless of whether the project moves forward here. The Municipality expects it will have its next Economic Development Strategy Plan out next year which will give more details on our potential economic growth overall. Staff continue to work on economic initiatives within the community and continue to work with various agencies including the Bruce County Economic Development team to look at new opportunities.
- (In reference to Q3) We do not expect negative financial impacts if the Project does not take place in South Bruce. The NWMO has a commitment that they will not leave a community worse off than when they began/entered into the site selection process. We have a multi-year funding agreement which can be found in the June 23rd Council Agenda that highlights funding received.
- The NWMO's site selection process and the Municipality's involvement is at no cost to the taxpayer.

CLC Information/Educational Presentations

Questions

1. Mr Gowland – the information given at CLC meetings is heavily weighted in the NWMO's favour. When are you going to give the "CON" side for the risks and downsides of this project equal weight and representation?
2. Mr Gowland, why have the CLC meetings been so biased towards "pro dgr" attributes of the project. There are many different and opposing views in your community, yet there is the overwhelming appearance of bias and serious questions regarding your leadership and ability to manage this file.
3. In that same letter, Mr. Gowland states, "...we will be hearing presentations from a variety of different experts with diverse perspectives on the proposed DGR." Have you had diverse perspectives on the proposed DGR? It seems that none of the perspectives have been diverse and all have been pro-DGR because the SBCLC has only used "perspectives" that the NWMO recommends/approves.
4. Mayor Buckle and Mr Gowland - Having read the motion to form the Community Liaison Committee (CLC), it appears that the CLC has not followed their mandate to look at both the Pro's and the Con's for South Bruce or the greater area of Southwestern Ontario hosting this project. Looking through the minutes since your inception, it appears that the majority of the speakers that you have hosted were either from the NWMO or were suggested by them and very pro DGR organizations. The question is – how do you plan to get to an equal number of speakers that will explain to the CLC the down side of this project from the mining impact on the social fabric of our community through the much wider stigma attached to our tourist industry throughout Southwestern Ontario of having Canada's High Level Nuclear Waste Dump. Can you please layout a timeline to include the approximately 50 plus presentations from individuals or groups independent of those that are paid by the nuclear industry to promote the abandonment of their highly radioactive fuel that would be needed to accomplish fulfilling your mandate.
5. What would the liaison committee do differently knowing now how much opposition there is to the project.

Response

- There are many views and also many questions on the Project. CLC member continue to keep an open mind and regularly ask questions as is demonstrated at the monthly meetings. The CLC is interested in continuing to gather information as they have been all along.
- Regarding the meetings or speakers being biased in favour of the Project, it is important to recognize that experts are invited monthly to give presentations to provide more information on one component or another related to the project. The CLC welcomes a range of subject matter experts on topics related to the project, DGRs, barrier science, indigenous relations, etc.
- Any speaker who gives an educational presentation answers questions and acknowledges risks or potential issues as it pertains to the subject. We trust them to provide factual information based on their area of knowledge.
- It is reasonable that the NWMO speaks regularly as part of providing information to the CLC surrounding the project as it is their project.
- The community can suggest or request specific expert speakers for the Committee to consider. In addition to Dr. Gordon Edwards, who was a community requested speaker, the CLC Project Coordinator was also working with a community member to arrange another speaker by community request, however, that speaker has not been in touch.

Communication Question

1. There are many, many people in South Bruce who do not have computers or up to date technology or do not "live" on this technology. Thus they are unaware of all that is going on and are surprised when in conversation with others that this is going on. Your mailings are not read as they think it has nothing to do with them, so are thrown out. How are you going to get all the required information out to the residents on this very contentious issue that all residents should be aware of? You now have a "communications employee". Is he going to make contact with all the residents in South Bruce?

Response

- Communicating with and engaging with South Bruce residents is very important for the CLC and for the Municipality.
- It has been recognized that there is a need for information to be distributed more broadly, and that communicating in print or mail form is preferred/necessary for many of our residents. More recently, for virtual events, the telephone call-in information is available well in advance and in print (flyers, newspaper).
- The CLC regularly has updates and information in a condensed format in the full-page ad that runs in the Mildmay Crier and the Wingham Advance-Times. Posters are distributed in high traffic areas again, and every resident should receive the CLC monthly meeting flyer.
- The CLC has been working on communicating and engaging in an accessible manner with as many residents as possible and appreciate feedback. Both virtual/online and print/mail communication is important.

Other Questions for Mayor Buckle



1. Mayor Buckle – Please discuss the emergency preparedness plan you have in place should a nuclear accident occur allowing for the escape of radionuclides at either the surface facility or the deep geological repository itself.
2. Mayor Buckle, - In the Bruce Power Environmental report of 2019, it discusses the levels of Tritium in the fruits, vegetables etc. in the surrounding Kincardine, and Bruce Power area. Will you commit to testing the water for Tritium in Teeswater and surrounding area as a baseline prior to the Kinetrics facility beginning operation? Secondly will you please elaborate on your knowledge of how Tritium effects our health and our body over time. Mayor Buckle, the 34 principles appear to give NWMO significant power to regulate themselves and to create their own benchmarks for success. What third party source has the municipality consulted with to develop the community's own measures for success and not NWMO's?
3. What is the zoning for the proposed area going to be? Who decides what the zoning will be? Municipality? County? Province? Does the fact that it is waste being buried make it the same zoning as landfill? What factor does the zoning have on the potential revenue to the municipality with regards to property tax?
4. who was on council when our municipality initially signed up for the learn more process? what motivated the council of the day to sign up, and what motivates council today to continue to stay in the process? where did the council of the day learn about the NWMO and what was offered to our municipality by NWMO?

Response

- (In reference to Q1) If the municipality determined that it will host the DGR a thorough emergency response plan related to nuclear surface facility and the DGR would be created. South Bruce over the years has participated in Emergency exercises involving other municipalities, agencies and Bruce Power and we have a great partnership there that could serve us well in creating our own nuclear related emergency preparedness plan down the road. There is a principle that states that “The NWMO will prepare a review of the existing emergency services in South Bruce and provide appropriate funding for any additional emergency services required to host the Project in South Bruce.” This would factor into the emergency preparedness plan.
- (In reference to Q2) We rely on the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) when it comes to knowledge and information on tritium. The CNSC’s mandate is to ensure that nuclear activities are done in a manner that protects the environment, and the health, safety and security of workers and the public. For more information, visit: <https://nuclearsafety.gc.ca/eng/resources/fact-sheets/tritium.cfm>
- (In reference to Q3) The Principles have been established to further our understanding of the project’s potential impacts, benefits and concerns as identified by the community. The Municipality intends to review outcomes with the community that come out of the principles. We will be hiring consultants to conduct studies and will have peer reviews of studies conducted by the NWMO on various items that pertain to the list of principles. The NWMO is not creating the benchmarks; rather the NWMO will provide updates and information to Council, staff, and the community as they relate to the Principles being presented to them. At the end of the process, the community will be able to use this information to judge what NWMO is doing to meet each of the Principles. The Municipality believes this will help the community in making a decision on whether it is an informed and willing host.

Response, cont.

- (In reference to Q4) The Municipality has yet to determine what the zoning and property tax would be for a Project such as this. This is something we will be consulting with external experts on zoning, planning, and municipal affairs on. There is a principle that states that the NWMO will comply with the Municipal Official Plan and zoning by-law and seek amendments to the Official Plan and zoning by-law as necessary to implement the Project.
- (In reference to Q5). In 2012, the Council was: Mayor William Goetz, Deputy Mayor Carl Zettel, and Councillors Don Schnurr, Margie Bates, Garry Dietz, Robert Buckle and David Wood.
- It was noted in the initial report in 2012 that the establishment of the Project and hosting of it is expected to have economic benefits for the community. It was recognized then and still is today, that there is a need to bring sustainability and economic development to all our communities in South Bruce. This is why Council then and now are exploring if and how this project could do that. It is the responsibility of Council and Staff to consider and investigate any opportunity that could impact the community to fully understand if there are potential benefits for us.
- In addition, it was also recognized that approximately half of the used nuclear fuel in Canada is already stored 40 kms from our Municipality. It was felt that our community would be impacted no matter what.

Other Questions for Chair Gowland



1. Mr Gowland – where is the second borehole sight located? Lack of information to the public on these very important issues is a major concern and again shows lack of transparency.
2. Mr Gowland, do you or any family members work directly within the nuclear industry and if so are they involved in the generation of nuclear power which generates this waste?
3. Further, Mr Gowland would you consider stepping down in your role as Chair of the CLC in order to reset the process as you are largely viewed as pro nuclear, - see June 2019 Toronto Star article.
4. If the mandate of the CLC is to “engage, educate and listen to the community regarding the NWMO’s Site Selection Process”, why then is their focus on student bursaries, student gift packages, donations to various clubs and organizations, and not focused solely on acquiring speakers and information, from various organizations, to help **inform** the residents of South Bruce? The residents need to be presented with ANY and ALL information relevant to a Nuclear Waste Geological Repository, and not just that from NWMO and associated associations. The donations etc. are a wonderful gesture, but are not, in my mind, helping to inform us.

Response

- (In reference to Q1) The NWMO just announced publicly last week the location of both boreholes in an announcement that included a map of lands they have optioned. CLC learned this information on the same day as it was announced publicly.
- (In reference to Q2) Mr. Gowland has been open previously in disclosing that he has family that works in the nuclear industry at Bruce Power in various roles. He does not work in the nuclear industry.
- (In reference to Q3) Mr. Gowland intends to continue to serving as Chair at the discretion of Council. He stressed that he is not pro/anti the Project.
- (In reference to Q4) Some of the activities mentioned are part of the engagement process. Furthermore, certain funds which the NWMO provides – such as the Early Investment in Education and Skills – exists for capacity building purposes in communities that have ongoing participation in the Adaptive Phased Management (APM) site selection process. It provides investments in education as well as training for youth and the community. The bursary provided to post-secondary students is an example of such. Funds such as Community Well Being exists to support the Municipality's continuing effort to build community sustainability and wellbeing.
- Funds that support these initiatives does not take away from funding available for educational speakers. The CLC does place emphasis on the education and listening component of our mandate. Speakers are welcomed at our monthly meetings (as are delegations) to provide information and help the CLC and the broader community become better informed.
- As per By-Law 2020-53 which is a multi-year funding agreement, the NWMO has a funding obligation which includes all costs related to the project, Education and Skills, Community Well Being Activities, and near-Term Investment Activities in which NWMO announced at the October CLC meeting to be an investment of 4 million dollars over 3 years.

Other Questions

1. Has the South Bruce council or the CLC requested a third party review of step 2 and 3 of the NWMO 9 step process as highlighted in the NWMO document " Moving Forward Together Process for selecting a site for Canada's DGR for used Nuclear Fuel "
2. Were the answers to the non scientific questions provided by the South Bruce municipality without the input of the NWMO? In my opinion, it is time for the municipality to provide the answers to the residents for these types of questions without the involvement of the NWMO. The NWMO has no accountability to the residents now or in the future only our council has that accountability.
3. Mayor Buckle and Mr Gowland, - Have you thoroughly considered the sociocultural changes and nuclear waste stigma you are thrusting upon this community?

Response

- (In reference to Q1) The NWMO's 9 steps of the site selection process is one which they have established and they are responsible for managing. South Bruce is at step 3, phase 2 of the process and have not completed a review of the steps completed. The Municipality will be actively conducting peer reviews of studies which the NWMO will be leading, as well as having independently conducted studies of our own in the years ahead.
- (In reference to Q2) The NWMO had no input on the questions or answers here tonight. This was an independent, municipal focused event.
- (In reference to Q3) The Municipality and CLC recognize this is a major project and it will have a long-term impact on the community. The draft list of principles was endorsed by Council because the Municipality recognizes the size of this project and specifically some of the concerns noted in the question. This is also why we are taking the time to have studies conducted, engage with the community, anticipate action on the principles and so forth.

Questions for the NWMO



1. The Bruce Nuclear site has a "buffer zone" around it with no farming operations within approximately a 10 mile radius. And people within a 10 mile radius are given potassium iodine medication. This is also routine around the Pickering location. Is all of Teeswater/South Bruce going to be issued potassium iodine pills? And at whose expense? Remember safety is first!
2. Can you please explain why Dr Ben Belfadhel nonchalantly dismisses a buffer zone around the 1500 acre site. This displays a noncaring attitude about the residents of the area. Are you willing to just let them be sacrificed? The site NWMO is interested in, in northwestern Ontario is at Revell Lake, a distance of 35 km from the town of Ignace.
3. Does the municipality have a say in what is a good safety barrier around the facility? It appears that the closeness to town is not enough of a safety barrier.
4. Who is listed as owner of the land once it's sold. (Is it NWMO? Is it the Federal Government? Provincial Government?) What happens to the land once the current owners have move off the land and it is supposedly ready to be farmed again?
5. Mr Gowland, many pro DGR supporters have stated that gravity will protect us from future leakage of radionuclides from canisters into the upper biosphere. Do you agree with this statement?
6. Mayor Buckle and Mr Gowland, Dr Belfadhel with NWMO has highlighted in recent articles that we need to respect the scientific method. Please explain how Dr. Belfadhel and NWMO utilized the scientific method in choosing the current optioned land in South Bruce? As Dr Belfadhel is keen on citing the scientific method, please respond as such to the various steps of the NWMO's selection of lands when no bore hole drilling has been done to date and by their own admission only tabletop studies have occurred. A) Make an observation. B) Ask a question. C) Form a hypothesis, or testable explanation. D) Make a prediction based on the hypothesis E) Test the prediction F) Iterate: use the results to make new hypothesis or predictions.
7. Further can you explain how the Municipality was satisfied with the scientific method analysis completed for the community prior to optioning these lands and can you release the related report NWMO would have completed in relation to the optioned lands? Is there a report?
8. To what degree can the proposed DGR plans be altered after the NWMO has been given the authority to proceed?
9. If for whatever reason the project is abandoned during its construction phase, will those in charge be bound to return the site to its original condition?

Response

- These responses will be provided and published and placed on the CLC Website under the “Community Questions and Answers” page.