Appendix G

Comments by Discussion Question

This appendix includes all comments received, organized by discussion question. Similar comments are grouped together. Each box represents a comment and each participant may have provided multiple comments, reflected with multiple boxes. This appendix provides readers the opportunity to see all of the comments received for each discussion question and what themes emerged.

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What types of processes do you prefer and why?

Public Referendum

General preference for referendum

I am hoping that referendum will be held to determine out community's willingness	Public Referendum	Public Referendum	Let us vote	Public Referendum	The only process that should be considered to determine willingness of our South Bruce community is a public referendum. This should be a standalone referendum	A public referendum is the only way to reach a majority of the residents and get a true opinion. All others are skewed by the influence of NWMO.	I am hoping that referendum will be held to determine out community's willingness	I am hoping that referendum will be held to determine out community's willingness	public referendum
resident/taxpayer vote	Public Referendum	Public Referendum no other approach is acceptable	Public Referendum	referendum	A Referendum - I am a Farmer, educated, worked in nuclear. Does not trust the NWMO, Council, or the municipality. Would like to see a referendum. This process is bigger than the Municipality and should have involvement from the Feds	Referendum. Doesn't understand why there needs to be workshops on willingness.	Public referendums	Public referendum 50/50	Binding referendum
Public Referendum	Public referendum	people vote on issue not just a money grab.	Referendum	A public referendum is the only way	To get large number of people out is most effective way.	Public Referendum with 51% in favor to approve the project	Public referendum	Public referendum	Public Referendum. It's a way to ask the community directly.
In person vote	Referendum	Some of the diverging issues in the community could have been avoided should a referendum been committed to early on. Everyone will respect the vote of the community.	Referendum is the best way to go - top priority	Public Referendum - should be done by the residents. We are the ones that are going to have to live with it. Council is only here for a short period of time.	Public referendum	Always thought a Public Referendum - but not sure when that should happen or how that should look. Who is considered an eligible voter?	"Public referendum. This whole thing has caused such a rift in our town I think if we do it any other way people will say but that's not what I wanted	Public Referendum. Council did not discuss the DGR before the last election as a result, we need to have an election or referendum because it wasn't part of us voting them in.	"Public referendum
Public Referendum	On all the committee's I've been on and also within the Kinsmen club we always vote. There is no better way to determine willingness.	I feel that the final decision will need to be made by referendum. Anything else will be seen as taking the decision away from the residents.	Referendum for sure because everyone who wants to vote can, not just a select few.	Referendum. Let the voters that actually take the time to vote decide.	Public referendum	People do care and they will come out to the pole	There is no other fair option. All proper governance on this issue has been ignored to date. A public vote by tax payers gets proper governance back on track	Public referendum is the only feasible and practical option. Tax payers of SB need to make the decision not council. We need to get passed the issues of conflict of interest. We need a proper referendum	

Provides clear yes/no question

To me there is only one fair way to do this regardless of your views. Have a referendum. With the question: Are you in favor of burying Canada's nuclear radioactive waste at the Teeswater location?	Most fair - only two options, yes or no, don't need an explanation and no grey area	A lot of things are up for interpretation and yes or no is not	Yes or no referendum with a clear question. E.g. are you in favour of a DGR being built and operated in South Bruce. Democratic process	To intimidating when its more complicated than a yes or no	We need a Referendum Yes or No
"I strongly feel there should be a referendum on the burying of nuclear waste in South Bruce. It should also be a very clear question "yes or no".	I prefer a public referendum with a clearly stated question asking if I as a resident and a tax paying member of the Municipality of South Bruce wish to have a DGR located in my community - Yes or No	Only a referendum as it makes it clear whether there is a yes or no answer. It's really the only certain result.	For this reason a question to the residents must be clear and precise with a "Yes" or "No" answer. To ask each resident via a one person one vote is important and the voting to determine "willing host" must be seen to be fair and unbiased. The vote will need to be defined and supervised by both pro and con DGR groups.	Yes or No This is simply and fair	One straight vote yes or no before real dig starts

Referendum is anonymous

Public referendum, everyone has a say anonymously. Community engagement activities, if people provide non bias information so people can determine their willingness. There must be no judgement which is difficult.	I prefer private responses from the residents of the community - so each person has the ability to express themselves without pressure, dominance or outside influence by others. It also helps to avoid negative consequences by others for your decision.	Referendum - people may be scared to voice opinion. Referendum is anonymous
Easier to voice opinion anonymously. Stigma exists around a decision either way. Certain comfort.	Would be a draw for many people having anonymity	

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What types of processes do you prefer and why?

Public Referendum

Referendum provides a fair/democratic way to decide

- Binding Referendum with 70% majority of those must be in favour of the decision for it to be binding. This is the only democratic way to vote
- don't have time to submit a workbook before tomorrow, but they prefer a referendum and feel it's the only fair way to give everyone the chance to speak
- A binding referendum with 70% majority of those votes must be in favour of the decision for it to be binding.
- Public Referendum - everyone has the opportunity to have a voice
- Public Referendum. All have a chance to have their say
- Public referendum because everyone has a say.
- Referendum because that is how all decisions are made in Canada. This is not a dictatorship. The people should have a vote.
- Public referendum. I prefer the public referendum as it follows the democratic process that allows for a true community-centred decision.
- The only fair process, a referendum
- Public referendum, so all have a say in it.
- A public referendum has the broadest reflection of the community
- public referendum - this is the only fair way for everyone in the municipality to participate
- Only a vote is fair
- Public referendum. The only fair way to decide this decision
- Public referendum- residents get to make a majority decision. No special interest groups dealing with just 6 people.
- Public vote - makes sense in a democracy
- public referendum: because it allows everyone to voice their opinion. Although opinion polls should be random, they may not be representative of the entire community. This is a large decision that will affect everyone in the area for years to come so everyone's opinion should be heard.
- Public Referendum everyone has a chance to have a say
- Public referendum, gives everyone a vote on proposed project, yes or no. Avdisory committee, separate of CLC make recommendations to council in respect to dangers and possible irresersible scenarios to environment, agriculture and well being of community as whole.
- Public referendum, this topic is too large, impacts too many residents to be handled any other way
- Public referendum (vote) it seems the most fair to everyone
- Stipulations on referendum - 50, and 50. Potential for 25% making a decision for all. Not appropriate
- Referendum: seen as fair for everyone, even if not binding, it influences council.
- Everyone needs to be able to vote on this issue"
- Don't feel that we've been heard in the past
- A referendum. This is absolutely the only fair way to decide willingness, one way or the other.
- Every ratepayer and anyone living in the community should have an opportunity to say yes or no
- A public referendum is the only way
- "Public Referendum - everyone will have a chance to voice an opinion by voting and not just the few vocal people
- I prefer a voting referendum. We live in a democratic country where decisions are made by voting with the majority ruling.
- Referendum - the only way to fairly determine yes or no is by letting every resident have a ballot
- I like a process where everyone has a vote and every vote counts
- Referendum is the only democratic way to decide the issue. This insures that everyone has a chance to register their opinion for themselves.
- Public referendum..... majority rules
- A public referendum is the only way
- Public Referendum - good enough for the government of Canada and the voice of Canadians. It's objective not subjective and hesitate people can come out and vote. All resident have a voice.
- Public Referendum - democratic
- Public Referendum... most representative of affected community.
- Public referendum - I believe it is the only fair and unbias way to make such a large decision
- 2. Referendum. This seems like a logical choice. Everyone gets a vote and I feel like the 50% or more of 50% of the community seems really fair. I have hesitations about a referendum because I feel some people are spreading misinformation that may sway neutral votes. The benefit is that everyone gets "a say" and no one can argue that the decision was swayed by the NWMO.
- Referendum only - it is the only fair, democrative, transparent way to assess willingness from the majority of the residents. Everyone needs to have a voice in this decision, not just a few. No one can decide another persons willingness. Only a referendum give legitimacy to this process. This is a massive project affecting the entire community therefore all residents need to have a vote.
- Referendum - only honest way, no way to manipulate vote, referendum is safe and independent of other factors
- Public Referendum. It allows every community member that would like their voice to be heard to cast a vote. It also provides equal rights and opportunities for all residents.

Comments about timing of a referendum

- Agreement that referendum is only way- honest, straightforward question and answer for residents to answer. Ability to move on with lives after vote. Sooner the better. The people have a voice.
- "Referendum - should have been done before any borehold land purchased etc undertaken.
- Public referendum, 50 +1. Vote of council, at election time our candidates pour soy if in our ouch.
- The sooner the better
- A formal binding referendum held concurrently with the 2022 municipal election.
- There are signs of information fatigue as the same information is repeated. This process needs to be concluded quickly.
- A referendum that is separate from municipal elections. Two messy, many emotions elect based on other issues
- To be truthful, no preferred process. They all speak of a bias towards a SGR. Where does Guiding Principle #9 say that a third party is to be involved? If something is to be done referendum but not doing a municipal election and must be a 70% majority. A stand alone referendum
- Public Referendum - shouldn't be held with an election, council shouldn't be involved and no municipal staff
- Even after all the ears the timeline for the referendum seems tight. Need results of the borehole testing and further studies will this be available to council by March 2022 fall vote?
- Referendum: but concerned about dates Captured at the right time, should be informed. Take the time to make the right decision.
- Referendum in due time when there is time to do the research when the borehole drilling is completed
- During an election or after? Hard call, may have a better turn out
- Lots of communications - timeline, when is the right time

Referendum is unbiased, not open to manipulation

- Referendum- safe and way to vote without being manipulated. Concern that other ways can be manipulated (phone calls, events being held at certain times, etc).
- Referendum - no one else can or should determine another persons willingness. Paper allot only no one else can be in the polling booth with them to influence them one way or another.
- Public referendum----eliminates any bias----each resident is allowed to vote and the majority is the final decision---too many people on Council and Community Liaison Committee are connected to REDACTED NAME through family employment and/or personal opinions that could sway a decision. this is too big a decision to only allow the chosen few to decide. Also there are people affiliated to the Bruce who are afraid to comment publicly in case there are repercussions to them personally or their associates----eg---family---businesses-----and personal gain opportunities

Comments related to percentages required for a binding referendum

- Public Referendum -The only true way to measure the community's willingness is to let the public vote on this issue. Also this project should not go forward without a 60 to 70 % of the people in favor. The reason I feel this way is because the proposed site is not located centrally in the middle of the municipality. So many of the voters may not be adversely affected by the project especially if something were to go wrong.
- referendum: the only way but provincial, must be 70%, 50% is not enough
- Public referendum with majority of 66 7/3 % anything less that would not it a willing host. The referendum should be held sooner rather than later so life can get back to normal. The community is so divided that neighbours don't speak to each other.
- Referendum. However, your criteria of 50% of the voting public is too high - it's unrealistic, and you are omitting this as a viable option using this criteria.

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What types of processes do you prefer and why?

Public Referendum

Referendum combined with other activities

- Public Referendum may be the fair process for all property owners but not enough facts out to all. Advisory committee as they are probably the most informed
- Like referendum. could do an opinion poll in advance for reassurance.
- Referendum, opinion polls and surveys
- Vote in conjunction with other forms of gauging willingness. Non binding vote (survey)
- Referendum is a way to commit to a decision. Other things need to happen - for example "informed" piece not achieved yet. This is decisive and referendum only way to determine answer.
- 1/6 Referendum and community panel used together. A concern I have with a referendum is that many people will not be well-informed, and thus are vulnerable to exploitation through ignorance or misinformation.
- 4/6 A small, highly informed group should decide whether we are sufficiently informed to make a decision and whether the NWMO is acting fairly, in good faith, and in a way that will satisfy our priorities (as laid out in the guiding principles). If this group gives their approval, the actual decision would go to the rest of the community. This pair of processes would seek to address "depth" and "breadth" respectively.
- I feel that town hall meetings be held to truthfully answer questions from the community that are not influenced by council CLC, NWMO. We should have a legal binding referendum with a straight forward question with a yes or no vote
- Community Engagement activities where I can listen to experts, on both sides of the issue, present their views without interruption by anyone. These meetings will have to wait until people can attend in person. Follow this with a public referendum
- "I would like a separate advisory committee, independent of CLC which present pro dgr speakers. Workshops, where individuals can have their questions answered. Referendum is ultimate"
- Now a referendum not during a municipal election time. Best way- door to door with real people just asking a question willing or not willing"
- community engagement town halls and a public referendum. Every citizen should have a say in the process and an impartial way to be informed, and all I have seen so far is the "loudest" participants trying to have more of a say than what is their individual right
- I like all of the community engagement activities, that allow the community to get the correct information (free of fear mongering). At a later point in time a public referendum will need to be held, but only once all site suitability information is available.
- Community Engagement followed by Public Referendum. Everyone needs a voice in this decision.
- Community Engagement Activities, Opinion Polls and Surveys and Public Referendum in 2023 or later. I believe this gives the community the most opportunity to learn about the process prior to a vote.
- 2/6 Due to the power imbalance between the community (which is busy with many other things and has limited attention for this project) and the NWMO (whose entire job and considerable budget concerns this project), the default position must be that the project will not go ahead.
- 5/6 For the small group, I would support a special community panel. These people would be randomly selected (perhaps with requirements for including representative demographics). This committee could hear from a diversity of voices, including ones independent of the NWMO, in order to become more deeply informed about the project and the process so far so that they could judge whether the community has been fairly treated and accurately informed.
- Combination or referendum bc it leaves it up to a large group of community members - more people = better
- Panels, activities and a referendum would be preferred. The more things done in person the better
- Public Referendum is not an option.. this has to occur! Community engagement would be nice to see.
- Community engagement activities and referendum
- community panel and public referendum. I think these are the only 2 types that really allow a complete picture. South Bruce is so small and many different socioeconomics in play, that a sampling that is brief and not in depth where discussion can happen and have questions asked and answered does not seem to be able to fully capture all views or necessarily be representative.
- Panel or engagement activities in addition to referendum. Concern that nearing the end of consultation and not that much participation and need for more dialogue. Support for polls and surveys to provide more information to achieve more informing
- Council should be prepared to make a recommendation before a referendum
- Opinion polls first, then referendum
- 3/6 In other words, while it would be acceptable for the process to allow people to turn the project down due to irrational concerns (since this is an issue of simple unwillingness), it is not acceptable to have them approve it because they are poorly informed. I would propose that for the project to go ahead, two levels of approval would be needed.
- 6/6 The decision should ultimately come to everyone in the community I think the best system for doing this would be through some form of referendum. "
- Public Referendum may be the fair process for all property owners but not enough facts out to all. Advisory committee as they are probably the most informed

Referendum results should be considered even if minimum turnout is not met

- What is the typical voter turnout in South Bruce? In the past few municipal elections it has been in the low 40%
- Could you lower the voter turnout for a referendum? Let's say it is in the 40%, could the community feel comfortable to say that council can vote to support the majority of the result?
- Even if referendum criteria (50%) isn't met, that the voice of the community either way should be listened to
- Council could take this information even if it didn't make the threshold to make a decision
- Less concerned with voter turnout because it is such a polarizing issue - people will be motivated to cast their ballot. I do not have any other suggestions at this time. Even if not binding, it will be a measure of the sentiment. Would want to answer the questions of other ideas, after a referendum as the first option.
- Council could take this information even if it didn't make the threshold to make a decision

Suggestion for mandatory referendum

- Is there a potential for mandatory type census like the federal census - requiring participation getting closer to 100% participation. Would like others to build on this.
- Would be great to be required but not sure that it is possible. They do this in Australia where people are charged if they do not answer the census.
- Is there a way for making the referendum a requirement by the Federal Government? If referendum was selected

Referendum question should be clearly worded

- If referendum on its own it needs to be clear what you are voting on
- Referendum: if you go this way it has to be very carefully worded.

Other Comments about Public Referendum

- If referendum, Bruce County or Municipal Council should not have involvement in a referendum
- A public referendum would seem like a good idea but my question is this- may more people than the residents of South Bruce will be effected by this decision so who will be allowed to vote?"
- No sense of who will be asking the question we answer - in a hybrid
- Is there a potential for mandatory type census like the federal census - requiring participation getting closer to 100% participation. Would like others to build on this.
- referendum: based on taxpayers allows for dissenting voice
- Referendum: but need to be informed, not suited to all candidates, everyone gets a voice
- Non-canadian citizens who can't vote in a referendum
- I think a referendum could work if enough people voted but then I think only the people with extreme opinions may vote.
- Referendum as a stand alone/binding not representative
- Any sort of referendum that does not follow current law of 50%+1 cannot be considered. Some are saying that they want a 2/3 referendum, but in reality that means a small 1/3 will be deciding the outcome
- There have been enough consultations, information sessions, surveys, etc. and each interested group should make a final one page submission to the voters much like a final offer in labour negotiations.
- Could you lower the voter turnout for a referendum? Let's say it is in the 40%, could the community feel comfortable to say that council can vote to support the majority of the result?
- Vote of council or public referendum. As it shows who directly or indirectly the majority of what the community wants
- Would like to brainstorm ideas to ensure we have a good turnout
- When this project first started, I never dreamed it was going to get off the ground and they may have interpreted my disinterest as willingness. Yes or no is pretty simple and can't be stretched in one direction or another. I am willing to accept the results of the referendum but it has to be the peoples choice.

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What types of processes do you prefer and why?

Opinion Polls & Surveys

Collect a variety of opinions

Polls and surveys or public referendum - encompasses more view points. Eliminates "random" picking to determine a whole community decision. People who feel strongly will participate. In person or mail in ballot removes the possibility of internet hacking, paying off people for their login information.

Opinion polls and surveys because it allows for a variety of opinions from anyone in the community. Allows people to expand on their reasons and opinions.

Survey to harvest all the concerns from the community. The survey could be integrated to get a documented list of what facts they want to know about in a way that is transparent. How do we distill the concerns in a way that can simply be responded to.

Multiple people with multiple opinions get to say what they think

Allows for privacy/anonymity

Polls/survey could be a compromise on anonymity. Project can't be boiled down to one question. Could also multiple questions

I prefer polls/surveys as they offer more than one question and more than a yes/no response, in an anonymous setting. I also am drawn to a community panel or something similar to that, provided residents are able to be respectful and open to honest dialogue.

Perhaps opinion polls and surveys to start. Privacy component to it- express opinions without division. People may speak more honestly

"Polling/Surveys - would allow multiple questions/ answers be asked in an anonymous medium should people wish to remain unknown

"Polling/Surveys - would allow multiple questions/ answers be asked in an anonymous medium should people wish to remain unknown

i think for our community doing something like the opinion polls would be a good fit. a lot of people want to share their voice but not have a name attached

Representation of population in opinion polls & surveys

I prefer a 3-step approach:

Step 2: Use the survey / poll results to determine if a referendum is the right avenue to take moving forward. I believe that the participation rate of the survey / poll is a good indicator for a potential referendum participation rate.

The higher percentage of the community that participates the better. "

Opinion polls and surveys get my vote but they need to engage a larger portion of the population than would normally be sampled due to the subject matter. This nuke dump decision will impact all of us in the vicinity. I also think a public referendum is essential before any final decision is made.

Step 1: Deploy online polls and surveys to all permanent and seasonal residents of South Bruce with questions regarding a referendum and if the resident would participate in an official referendum. I believe the the number of residents that correctly complete the survey / oll is a good preliminary indicator of how many residents would participate in a referendum.

"Opinion polls and surveys- can get the larger populations feedback.

Step 3: If the participation rate of the survey / poll results is below 50%, then I believe an advisory committee, and or community panel is the best process moving forward."

Phone surveys - maybe a great number of responses

Considerations for opinion polls & surveys

For answering the questions/ concerns, you could ask have we answered the question? Are you satisfied with the response?

Public referendum - only after enough years have passed that we can all get enough info to make a proper decision, so we don't decide too quick and make a decision with out all the correct info.

The questions should include: What is the cost of doing nothing vs. the cost of doing something?

Other comments or reason not given

Opinion Polls and Surveys

Opinion Poll & Survey.

Polls and surveys because I can do them on my own time

Opinion polls: keep asking to give a sense of what information people have.

Community Panel

Other comments or reason not given

Community panel could help Council decide.

Community panel similar to vote of Council... decision of Council would be based on panel recommendations

A new advisory/panel with diverging opinions.

Community Panel - as long as it is randomly selected and not weighted for one side or the other"

With a panel - how would non-landline people be randomly selected

Community panel- need to be carefully selected and participants need to be provided with framework and relevant information before hand to ensure effective use of knowledge"

Community panel will give a wide perspective of interest groups, who hopefully will evaluate the science. Two opinion polls that are random should be done as a 'barometer' to seek the general opinion of citizens as more 'info' is shared re test holes, etc.

Community panel: age, education, occupation

Community panel- residents willing to be informed.

How is panel selected?

Provide independent review

A community Panel - could be used to independently provide advice.

The idea of an advisory panel that reviews the draft legal agreements between NWMO and the municipality is a great idea. This group should not be the CLC and should not be a committee of council. They should have the latitude to review all documents without political or municipal staff interference.

This would allow for an independent review of the agreement. Folks on the advisory committee would need to be bound to confidentiality agreements. Plus have a working knowledge of legal agreement or the willingness to learn during the process."

Should represent the community

It takes more of a cross section of resident opinions compared to others"

Community Jury / Panel - representative group on behalf of the community

Citizen's jury – if it's a large enough sample of residents, it should represent the prevailing public sentiment towards the project.

Community Panel - should allow for a dialogue between citizens but represent the prevailing opinion

I like the community panel and advisory committee IF they are from a diverse selection (youth included). Proper non-bias education and information is key before making any decisions. Community engagement and information sessions (from non-biased educated people) is essential. Then the opinion polls and and a referendum is relevant IF it is based on an informed decision by an educated community! People need to know what they are actually voting for. People need to trust the information.

Community Engagement Activities

Other comments or reason not given

I feel these options would best give the overall opinion of the people of South Bruce"

"Town hall meetings- diverse ideas and clarification of points of view possible

Community Engagement activities and a Community Panel are also good ideas, provided that they don't unnecessarily prolong the ultimate decisions, which need be made by our elected officials."

I like community talks/meetings. Some meetings too long to go to, but Im trying!

Information sessions- presentation of facts that can be discussed

Community engagement- greater opportunity to gather information.

Way to have dialogue

Engagement activities: get current information, discuss with others we have to live with this, no downside to having every opportunity. Transparency

Respectful town hall-style communication to allow for people to challenge thought processes of others

Community engagement as a way of keeping community informed

Community Engagement Activities .. the more education and information we receive the better to make a decision.

Engagement activities are good but covid hasn't been great for engagement and so in-person is important to keep people informed and up to speed on things like results of the studies. This needs to continue.

Community engagement sessions - provide information while collecting feedback at the same time"

Community engagement activities are a great way for people to learn about the borehole results

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What types of processes do you prefer and why?

Advisory Committee

Other comments or reason not given

"Advisory Committee

"Advisory Committee

advisory committee

The CLC members are the community members that have been following since day 1 with the exception of the newest member. Between the CLC and the Council - they should have a lot of say in this Project.

advisory committee,

Advisory committee: as long as it's representative cross section and has structure

"Advisory committee- CLC, doing great job.

Advisory Council if it is the current CLC, should be able to present to council. Perhaps a formula using outcomes of above 3 would be put forth and council would have to endorse based on that.

Impartial role of CLC / advisory committee

Advisory Committee - polar opposite of the CLC - would love to hear more from the other side. Committee that brings in guest speakers that would enlighten to not just the benefits but also the hazards and repercussions

Then an advisory group/panel can look to find the answers - addressing the primary concerns of the community including the NWMO, Peer Review. They can then present that information to council.

Mandate of CLC to review pros and cons - however feeling that is not the case, speakers that only provide one perspective. Not enough information for pros and cons shared. Once public meetings can take place that may provide the opportunity to share both pros AND CONS of this project.

CLC / Advisory committee is informed

Committee members would likely be knowledgeable about the project."

1. The CLC - this group has stayed informed on the topic and it's main goal is betterment of the municipality. They know what's happening and what's possible.

Advisory committee that then gives a report to council. This way the public can give input and the decision is an informed one.

Vote of Council

Other comments or reason not given

Vote of Council

Vote of Council

Council

(Vote of Council) as I hope the council has the community's best interest in mind and is not biased or corrupt.

want vote of council over a referendum. council informed by survey, panels)

Councillors should be the only one's to be able to vote this should be done after the next election

Vote of council- these people are voted in to make decisions in the best interest in the community, informed of pros and cons as much and more as the average resident"

Council as representative of / elected by the community

Elected officials are elected by community members. They make all of our other decisions for us. It is appropriate for them to assist with making the decision for this Project.

Some think referendum is only democratic option - Council is elected democratically to make decisions for us

vote of council - we elected council to make our community decisions.

I think a decision needs to be made by the council elected to represent the people. Polls surveys but most importantly facts and science should dictate that direction

Democratic vote - we put Council in place and they should provide input on what is good for community

Vote of council - the council was elected to represent the voters of our municipality and should have a good idea on what the community wants

A vote of council. This is why we elected them to represent us. We can't always go to a referendum

A vote of council This is why we elected them to represent us. We can't always go to a referendum

"I support a Vote of Council primarily. We live in a representative democracy, and our politicians should campaign, then lead decisively, and account for their decisions in the following election.

Votes of other Councils is important

agree that vote of other councils important - benefits etc. are shared.

discussion of motion of support/no support at County Council (Bruce).

Project as an election issue in next election

should be an election issue

A municipal election will be happening next year. Could be an opportunity for people to vote councilors in who they believe will represent their values and ideals

It's a huge failure that they were voted in to represent the community but all they are following is the NWMO money

Municipal council doesn't have the right and make a decision on willingness because they weren't voted into their position with this project as part of their mandate

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What types of processes do you prefer and why?

Combination of Processes

Comments recommending a combination

provide a mix

1/3 I interpret this question as more of "whom" will decide the outcome of the project from the standpoint of the Municipality Of South Bruce leadership and constituents. Certainly the South Bruce council of the day will either choose to endorse or not to endorse the terms and conditions of the project. That is why we elect officials to govern.

2/3 It is a federal project and society (including South Bruce and leadership) needs to respect the intentions and directives from the federal government that takes into consideration for the "greater good" of all Canadians.

3/3 To that end, I believe in conjunction with municipal Council and senior staff that a blend of the fore mentioned bodies such as advisory panels, community engagement activities (without interference from self serving anti nuclear activists and for that matter anti economic development activists), surveys and polls, and community panels. I do not support referendum option.

"Advisory Committee, Community Engagement Activities,

Advisory, Community engagement, community panel, opinion polls, vote of council, media newspapers, radio, mailing

Leaning towards polls, surveys, community engagement activities

community engagement, opinion polls and a vote of council

Online surveys, door to door surveys, workshops.

Leaning towards vote of council; with insufficient referendum turnout, Council decides anyway

Advisory Committee / Community Engagement Activities / Vote of Council

Advisory committee and vote of Council

"Community engagement Activities, Community Panel and Opinion Polls and surveys,

Advisory committee or vote be either citizens or council. Council was elected by residents so they should have best interests of residents while making their vote.

Combination of CLC and council decision.

"Community Panel (with polls and surveys), or Referendum.

community engagement activities and opinion polls and surveys. I would like there to be an open dialogue for information to be delivered.

Combining Public consultation methods, many different approaches (polling, meetings, panels, independent and unbiased arbitrator makes final decision?)

Community panel or poll

Community Panel or Public Referendum. Community panel because it would randomly draw from the community and the panel would spend time thinking about the issues. Public Referendum because it would allow more people to decide; however, this would ignore the votes of people who are not Canadian citizens and I think non-citizens should also have input.

Community panel, polls, surveys and engagement activities. They allow multiple questions and answers, while allowing people to be anonymous if that is important to them.

The advisory group/panel would play an impartial advisor that would aggregate the input from the survey from the public and get back to the council

Opinion polls - doesn't know half the people. Vote of council, to some of the people want this project in our country

"Advisory committee - CLC, doing great job. Community engagement- greater opportunity to gather information. Community panel - residents willing to be informed. Vote of council - these people are voted in to make decisions in the best interest in the community, informed of pros and cons as much and more as the average resident"

Community Engagement Activities - gives the community and opportunity to become actively involved; Advisory Committee-been involved for the long haul educating and learning the pros and cons through dedication to the process over numerous year of CLC meetings, Vote of Council - with the vote so close to the time for a decision, its likely the elected officials are elected based on their views on the project. Elected officials are also most likely to have the best interest of the community in mind.

"Include CLC that has studied ths issue for many years. Along with community panel who may reflect new ideas on the issue.

Decision is representative

Community engagement and Community panel. That shows the actual residents of South bruce are making the choice.

Community panel, public referendum, vote of council, - believe the methodology on the decision needs to be completed based on giving everyone a voice

Other Comments

i don't know what will work. Wish i did.

I prefer not to have nuclear waste burried anywhere. We are seeing water damage everywhere Nitrates in water lagoons killing fish ever miles from site. Water ponds proposed all asking for health issues years from now. We have good water so don't risk polluting it. All the money spent trying to bury nuclear waste would be much better used to find a use for apart fuel.

All of the options do have some benefits but none of them really determine actual opinion.

Representation / High Participation

The options that get the most people in the community involved.

Vote of council or public referendum. As it shows who directly or indirectly the majority of what the community wants

"I think there needs to be a multi stage process so all facts are public prior to any decision making process.

Processes that do not provide an opportunity for input by all citizens cannot be true and full representations of community willingness

Other Comments

Concerns about the Willingness Study

Asking the community their opinion on how to do your job (GHD)

If we are defering to consultant, wouldn't that be giving up the right to an opinion

Concerned with the GHD Willingness Study Report and getting people to review it.

Concerned with the lack of attendance at this workshop and that there is no one from the opposition group here.

The municipality shouldn't be here

Only a smoke curtain to consult on measuring willingness

Don't overburden community on the how - people want to get to the actual discussion/ decision

Is it right to be asking the community how it should be done, or defer to consultant

Other Comments

No process, not willing, NO DGR. There should have been a vote in 2012

Don't have 3 hours a week for DGR

I have visited the store front location and the open house(?) that was held in Teeswater. During my working career many discussions occurred and after discussions had defined the relevant or most of the relevant factors, continued discussions tended to go off on tangents and even become personal.

In my opinion this is an engineering project involving the risks inherent with may large projects. Many of the issues have been identified and the importance of each issue will vary by South Bruce resident. We are not all the same in our method of assessment and prioritizing project factors.

Over 1,600 people have signed a petition against a DGR - PreCovid

After living near Teeswater for five years it seems to me that the information about the DGR has been plentiful. There have been frequent mailings about meetings covering various topics that are relevant to the project.

Those opposed are educated

Do not burry it

Some of the community will never heal from. Community is thinking about this project with stress and anxiety from the time they wake up to go to sleep.

The Municipality wants to move the project forward

It wouldn't matter what the council votes, it wouldn't appease some members of the community.

Yes or no question to be used to gain other information of concerns and questions from the community

I feel that there are a lot of people for the project. However, I believe that the fear of opposition to being an advocate for the project has discouraged residents from voicing their desire for the DGR to come to South Bruce."

Hopeful that at end of this study, that the result/process moving forward is accepted in the community.

Clarifying opinion vs. fact within the articles in the paper

Provide multiple formats for information

Too many people that just can't be bothered

A lot of articles in the paper are about the 'nays' which isn't necessarily true facts.

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What do you *dislike* and why?

Public Referendum

Voter turnout and/or apathy

Risks with a referendum - if not enough people show up

Referendum. I believe there are three groups. For against and apathetic. The apathetic will not vote and sway the results.

Referendum is a good way to make a decision but concerned with voter turnout

"Referendum - could result in a minority of community making a decision, people who "don't care" are omitted from the process

Referendum may not work - I don't believe there will be the required percentage of voters for a decision through a referendum. If a referendum is held it should not be until all studies are done to determine whether it is a viable site. Any kind of vote should not happen prior to residents knowing all the facts.

Public referendum - I think the public is tired of polls/surveys. I believe there will be too many votes not totally informed or neutral on the subject. Also believe the 50% number of voters may not be met"

Dislike referendum/ puplic vote - too many people that have no opinion or too intimidated to vote.

"Referendum - could result in a minority of community making a decision, people who "don't care" are omitted from the process

Other concerns or about referendum or comments that its disliked

Public referendum, vote of council should decide

Referendum

Public Referendum

"Public Referendum

Dislike referendum. Can't govern by referendum. Again, we elected council for a reason and they should make a decision for a reason.

public referendum, Bias would be given to the most vocal groups,

Public Referendum,

(Public Referendum) I feel some of our citizens are only considering themselves and not the community's best interest.

"I feel a referendum would only be an indication of what 'side' did the most campaigning. It is very easier to vote yes or no without having to give a lot of thought or consideration to the long term pros and cons of the project.

Public Referendum

I feel it would spur on a whole pile of door knocking, costs of printed materials and confrontations. Would someone one from the 'yes' platform even be able to campaign door to door?

I do not like a referendum. How many people are being bullied into voting. We all have a vote in the municipal election. If people are elected to sit on council they should have the right to vote for what they fell is best for the area. Every person eligible to vote is also eligible to run for a council position.

I don't like the idea of a referendum because one yes or no question doesn't cover the scope of this project.

There was a ward referendum that didn't get the binding voter turnout.

There was a ward referendum that didn't get the binding voter turnout.

Concern that the silent majority will not come out and the opposition will get out to vote on the referendum.

Lack of consensus building, potential to create division

1/8
I do not support a referendum, Period! I have belonged to many boards and organizations over the decades and been Chair of many local, provincial and national organizations.

3/8
A referendum that is suggested by many anti proponents could also set a detrimental precedent for future decision making in this municipality.

5/8
The other dangerous precedent is that do we all feel like we have the "right" to decide what industry (agriculture, forestry, aggerates etc etc) can be here or not ?

7/8
Also though this DGR process I have heard that "we don't need those type of people in our community" meaning anti racist sentiments.

Process would likely create deep division within the community."

2/8
A referendum or forced vote on an important issue never allows opportunity for consensus building to reach an amicable solution or outcome. It becomes a "winner or loser" outcome. Everyone needs to win!

4/8
Confusion for any future council will be in the back of their minds of whether or not they can make a decision, or do many decisions have to be made by the general population in the municipality?

6/8
I know for a fact that large agriculture farm operations become more targeted as "factory farms" that disregard many environmental expectations by the general majority of the population.

8/8
One ponders whether or not this is about safety of the DGR, or excluding minorities from our community.

I dislike referenda on many issues, as they present divisive dichotomies, and often raise questions about how binding they are upon future generations.

Level of awareness / not being informed

Not sure a public referendum right way to go; communicating about Project would help. Needs all info to make wise decision

Public referendum - I think the public is tired of polls/surveys. I believe there will be too many votes not totally informed or neutral on the subject. Also believe the 50% number of voters may not be met"

In a perfect world I'd like to see a referendum, but the level of awareness may not be there.

I dislike referendum because I feel not all information is known at this time to make a decision on the project

Referendums-we say no to the referendum since it is very difficult to get all voters informed enough to make a good decision. It takes door to door contact which is near impossible.

I expect that most folks that would vote on a referendum question would never have attended an information meeting. Also you would have to be 18 to vote."

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What do you *dislike* and why?

Vote of Council

Concerns about bias, mistrust, being informed

- Vote of council: cautious about vote of council because of bias.
- Do not feel that the municipality or council should be involved in any way in a referendum. This is the only way it is considered a third party and representative of the community. There is at issue of trust with council.
- Vote of council - No. This council has lost trust. They fail to adequately deal with questions and concerns and project the image of wanting to host the DGR for municipal gain.
- How come council makes this decision? They, unaware to residents, took on this adaptive phase management only seeing dollar signs.
- Very disappointed if council gets the last say. column Mistrust of council, big risk
- Those on Council don't seem to be as educated as those who are opposed
- vote by council - too many are already accusing the council of taking bribes -
- vote by council - too many are already accusing the council of taking bribes - totally wrong by the way
- I have concern with vote of council - conflict of interest. How many coucil members have members of family in nuclear energy protection employment? How many council members will be in positions come next election

Project was not an election issue/ Council not mandated to decide

- 1/3 As a side note, while the survey says that a vote of Council would be required in any situation, I have a concern about this. First of all, I do not think the current Council should make this decision, because when they were elected the DGR was not foremost in people's minds, and so the Council cannot be seen as representatives of the community on this important issue.
- 2/3 Placing the decision after the next election solves that issue, but creates another. I think the process should not be tied in any way to a municipal election, since this would needlessly interfere with local politics (people might run on platforms centred around this single issue, and this would skew how people vote).
- 3/3 All this would accomplish is to have an "indirect referendum" via who is voted in. It would be politically healthier and more accurate to simply have a completely separate referendum. This would really render Council's final approval unnecessary, so I would oppose including it as a step in the process.
- This process was not transparent. When our province had municipal elections and I ran as councillor this topic never came up as an election topic.
- Hate the idea of council deciding because when they were elected in 2018 it wasn't for the DGR
- 1/3 Vote of council - this was not an election issue so council has no right to claim they speak on our behalf.
- 2/3 Their actions clearly show they are obediently marching along with the NWMO plan and process. They ignore anybody who raises concerns about the issue and even get angry we keep asking questions.
- 3/3 These people cannot make the decision on our behalf as they are not even listening to anybody unless it supports the NWMO.
- Safety of residents, water, the environment, and socio-economic impacts need to be our first considerations and not financial benefits. This council does not have a mandate to make
- this decision no one ran i the last election with hosting DGR election issue. In an interview with the london free press in 2016 Mayo Buckle said he would not allow council to make this decision if he ran again for mayor. He needs to be held to this. Mayor Buckle also stated on the news that we erre not dependent on NWMO money so the people need to decide willingness"

General

- Vote of Council - potentially only considering (or could be accused of only considering) financial compensation
- The CLC is connected to the nuclear industry, they do not see anything wrong with the DGR, they fear for their jobs.
- Vote of Council
- Agree that it shouldn't be just the council
- It was far more important than allowing a marijuana store to operate in our town so why when 2012 seems to be the date that a nuclear waste dump site was being discussed in our area were we not informed them?
- I feel that the councillors who were elected already knew about this and were hush hush until after they were elected, land being purchased before community has had a chance to say yeah to no is wrong.
- Dislike what the mayor and council having all the say
- Echo previously stated council.
- Vote of council: moot point, could tear apart council, could fragment them
- Council
- I also don't like the idea of council making the decision on their own. I feel that it should be at least based on a broader opinion of the public.

Not representative/ doesn't speak for everyone

- Vote of council - they don't speak for everyone.
- Vote of Council - should not have 8 or 9 people making a stand alone decision"
- Vote of council: mixed feelings and they are supposed to represent us, but they are all male
- i don't like the vote from council, a lot of people in our community already think that they don't have a say and that the CLC is making it for them
- Vote of council - they don't speak for everyone.
- I've attended several meetings, listened to CLC and info shared by speakers seems one sided. Council should not decide for constituents! People need their own voice and vote
- Not a good representation of all constituents (Council Vote)
- Not knowing what the true project was about. Council is only a select group of people who do not speak for everyone but they think they make decisions for all. This project is not a decision for them to make alone
- Council and mayor only making this decision. This is one sided
- Council Decision - does not represent the community as whole for such a large scale project.

Too much responsibility / too big a decision

- Not fair for council to make the decision - that is a lot of responsibility for them to bear down the road
- The Council doesn't have to live with the decision after. They aren't around for the long haul. They shouldn't be ignoring the request of the residents. Take the easy road. Let the people decide.
- Vote of Council - something of this magnitude should not be decided on by 7 people who will be biased
- 3. Council. This type of decision is what we voted them in for but I feel like this project has brought on so much stress to them as our friends and neighbours already I don't think we can put this decision on them."
- Council represents people; tremendous onus on them to make the decision
- Do not want it to be strictly a vote of council. That is not fair to the community members and to council. There is a lot of one side or the other in the community.
- Vote of council - the council is elected to carryout the business of running a municipality. The magnitude of the decision regarding the DGR is beyond the mandate of council.

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What do you *dislike* and why?

Opinion Polls & Surveys

Open to bias / manipulation / different interpretation

- opinion polls and surveys are always questioned
- Opinion polls & surveys- no. Questions can be skewed and manipulated to produce a desired result.
- Polls and surveys done by phone or online. Seem they are always questioned or manipulated
- Opinion polls/Surveys- can be misinterpreted. Questions can be misleading, accuracy is unreliable.
- Polls and surveys done by phone or online. Seem they are always questioned or manipulated
- Opinion polls & surveys- again and again we have seen the NWMO manipulate these to get the answers they want. Cant be trusted.
- Opinion polls/Surveys- can be misinterpreted. Questions can be misleading, accuracy is unreliable.
- Opinion Polls: useful but should not be used for a designed final decision, open to bias
- Opinion polls & surveys, can be interpeted vastly different in how its worded and answered. Vote of council, no council decision for a single municipality. No trust in this group of characters.
- Opinion polls & surveys, can be interpeted vastly different in how its worded and answered. Vote of council, no council decision for a single municipality. No trust in this group of characters.
- I dislike opinion polls and random surveys. I feel this information can be easily manipulated to show whatever a specific group would like.
- Opinion polls & surveys- no. Questions can be skewed and manipulated to produce a desired result.

Concerns about sample size and who completes surveys

- Opinion polls or surveys. The community is too small to obtain a large enough random sample. Plus it will not be viewed a an open process
- Opinion Polls & surveys, who would get heard if other people fill out
- Opinion polls or surveys. The community is too small to obtain a large enough random sample. Plus it will not be viewed a an open process
- Opinion polls & Surveys because it's hard to monitor who is filling them out
- Opinion Polls & surveys, who would get heard if other people fill out
- Opinion Polls and surveys are low on my preference. Not a fan and not sure that they are always a true reflection. Depends on the selection group and people completing them.

Does not help educate

- Opinion polls: too much influence not enough interactions, reactionary, two tainted by the signs, letters to the editor, etc. Can have an opinion without being informed
- Opinion polls: doesn't help educate people

Other

- If opinion poll, must go door to door
- Opinion Polls & Surveys
- opinion poles-nothing to track what people actually voted.
- Opinion polls
- How many survey do we need to do before we get answers
- Polls & surveys
- Opinion poll: doesn't drive anything forward
- Not in favour of opinion polls or surveys.

Advisory Committee

Bias / Lack of independence

- 1/3 Advisory committee - they are not neutral and have not provided a fair and balanced education on this project. Some have shown pro DGR biases with letters in rural papers. Lack of response to questions and concerns.
- 1/2 Advisory committee - this would end up being selected by the council, CLC, and NWMO and would become one more promoter of the DGR.
- I truly dislike the way the CLC is set up and the way it handles inquiries of the DGR. They are pro-DGR members have written letters to the editor of local papers demoralizing residents and rate payers that are against the proposed DGR.
- Advisory committees are often not random in composition and frequently are stacked with people who will just agree for various reasons (ie: they work at Bruce Power or for the OPG).
- CLC is largely defunct. Largely seen as an NWMO representatives
- 2/2 They present majority of speakers that are pro DGR and approved of NWMO. I feel they are not trustworthy. Council should represent residents and rate payers who elected them and not court the NWMO.
- 2/2 CLC is a promoter so can't be the decision makers.
- Advisory committee - CLC doesn't seem independent
- CLC: being spoon fed by the NWMO and they do not accept any speakers from the no DGR group.
- Advisory Committee - CLC members are biased and want the DGR
- Advisory committee - CLC no responses to logitimate concerns, cand and wont answer questions, only presents from NWMO funded pro DGR. Only one against which POW suggested and they bring in

Not representative of the community

- I feel these options are more able to be a select few chosen people decide for all the rate payers of South Bruce
- This particular project shouldn't be left to a tiny slice of the population. Young people need to be consulted. This impacts their future most of all
- Using the advisory panel to form an opinion on behalf of the entire community. Not a representative sample.
- I most strongly oppose the exclusive use of a vote of Council or the CLC. I do not believe that these parties can reasonably be assumed to reflect the community's willingness.
- Committees where individuals are not elected or random.
- Committees where individuals are not elected or random.

Ability to access / participate in CLC

- Advisory Committee or Panel is a good way for people to learn. In the case of the CLC, it's great but inaccessible (time of day)
- Agree that CLC and Council have been the most involved. They have traveled and been provided with a lot of information. There would be an uprising if this decision will be left to CLC / Council. How do we get people to participate? I could list a lot of people who do not have internet and can't participate online.
- Can't ask questions as members of the public (observers)
- Difficult to partake in the CLC meetings because they are on a Thursday meeting and inconvenient time. Would like the CLC meetings to be recorded. Is important to educate the community - this is an opportunity for the community to learn.

Other Comments

- Don't like the CLC
- CLC: hand picked
- CLC: a limited number
- Advisory Committee Dislike CLC
- Advisory committee- not the CLC for sure.
- Advisory Committee
- Similar concern with the (low) number of people attending the CLC meetings.
- Dislike CLC
- against advisory panel made up of current clc

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What do you *dislike* and why?

Community Engagement Activities

Low attendance

- Community engagement activities - but attendance is key if low doesn't represent a the community
- Community engagement activities get low #s
- Community engagement - not working, very few attend

Cause division / allow intimidation

- Concerns on engagement activities (town hall meeting) getting rowdy - may divide community
- Workshops- as some people are too intimidated. To voice concerns because as verbal abuse and as been seen on facebook pages.
- 1/2 I dislike townhall and workshop meetings were vocal residents dominate the conversation and less vocal residence feel uncomfortable to speak and be validated.
- 2/2 This divides the community further instead of a joint effort to work together.

Other Comments

- Workshops where public is not allowed to ask questions
- Workshops, engagement activities - All end up being subjective and allow the NWMO to twist the responses to the answer they want.

Community Panel

Not representative / Potential bias

- To easy to overlook opinions in such a small sample size
- Community panel - no. All residents deserve to vote.
- Community panel - who selects the panel? If municipality pick they pick who they want
- Community panel- they would not be randomly selected because we can't trust the NWMO, council, or CLC. This panel would randomly end up being supporters of the DGR with the occasional neutral person. Nobody opposing would be allowed on the panel. Like the CLC only pro-DGR applicants need to apply, nobody else will be selected. and how can 40 residents make such a monumental life changing decision on behalf of everyone.
- Community Panel, I believe the randomly selected community members could be lopsided to one side or another.
- Community panel, it can't be over run by the panel committee
- Community panel: someone like me would not participate and it's likely not representative
- community panel-40 random people-it is too important a decision to leave to "random" people who may have agendas or on the other hand, no real interest in learning about the dgr proposal
- Community panel, it can be over run by the panel committee

Selection process

- How is panel selected?
- With a panel - how would non-landline people be randomly selected

Concerned about ability to get consensus

- Positive aspects of the community panel & advisory committee. 40 is large - may be difficult to get a consensus.
- Community panels- would be confrontational on both sides

Level of informed

- Community panel feels random and risky there is a level of education that is needed it is important to be informed
- Community panel - we need experts in the field making the decision not keyboard warriors who know nothing on the topic except are in it for their own personal gain reasons

Other

- Community panel.
- Some benefit to advisory committee / panel but not a good way to determine willingness
- Community Panel

Dislike of Everything Except A Referendum

- These processes allow for only a few people to make this important decision. This is not the way we do things in Canada - a public referendum is the only way to decide."
- All of the others
- These processes allow for only a few people to make this important decision. This is not the way we do things in Canada - a public referendum is the only way to decide."
- Anything but a referendum is open to misinterpretation and or manipulation. Yes or no to a referendum is the only truth
- I feel that the referendum is the best way to get the voice of the Community.
- Anything but a referendum is open to misinterpretation and or manipulation. Yes or no to a referendum is the only truth
- All, not willing, no DGR. Not being able to vote to have this over.
- All, not willing, no DGR. Not being able to vote to have this over.
- as above ---eliminate any chances of bias voting---- everyone needs to have their chance to vote their decision in confidence
- all of the above, except referendum
- All other processes are unacceptable because citizens should have their own vote on willingness to have a DGR
- All other options. Are not acceptable
- Let us vote
- The rest - are only approximations and participants may be influenced by other issues
- Any process that is less inclusive
- Nothing except a vote is fair. Nothing else can be trusted. NWMO, Council + CLC can't be trusted.
- All others do not reflect a fair democratic process and are not likely binding on the elected council of 2022. They are open to manipulation and results can be skewered. ie. As in offering prizes to those who fill in surveys or possible bursaries to students who attend NWMO workshops. Online survey's much like other social media are not readily available to many of other seniors or those not techno savvy.
- I dislike all of the other processes. We live in a small municipality and for that reason I don't think there would be a broad enough spectrum for the other processes to work.
- Most people in our community will not or cannot get to a public meeting. Our aging population don't do well with computers. Most people are not inclined to fill out a survey. A public referendum gives everyone in the community a chance. It is the only way to truly understand how the people of South Bruce feel, and is truly the democratic way.
- All of the other processes provide for assumptions about my opinion, which may not be true of my opinion
- Nothing except a vote is fair. Nothing else can be trusted. NWMO, Council + CLC can't be trusted.
- Any process that allows a select group of individuals to determine the outcome for the community as a whole.
- All other processes do not give residents a vote
- All processes other than referendum do not permit every member of the community to have a voice. This situation should be handled by a public referendum
- All of your other options are not options at all as they are subject to conflict of interest. All other options will not reflect the wishes of the tax payers
- The rest of the processes as it doesn't make any answer clear to anyone as there could be bias on the part of any participants in any of the other methods chosen.

1 What process(es) should be used to determine willingness?

What do you *dislike* and why?

Other Comments and Comments on Multiple Processes

Not representative/ don't allow everyone to speak

- Vote of council, panels, surveys, cannot reflect entire populations wishes, and not anonymous.
- Vote of council, panels, surveys, cannot reflect entire populations wishes, and not anonymous.
- Processes that do not provide an opportunity for input by all citizens cannot be true and full representations of community willingness
- Disagree with vote of Council or advisory committee. Not one small group making a decision
- Community panel - no. All residents deserve to vote.
- Community panel - who selects the panel? If municipality pick they pick who they want

Potential for intimidation / manipulation / disinformation / bias

- A lot of these process can be negatively influenced through boycotts, and possible intimidation tactics.
- One that does not have a lot of disinformation to influence people that are easily lead with no regard of the concepts
- 3/3 Parents worry about alienating their children from friends. People fear being counted as willing if they attend. Division in community keeps people from voicing opinions. Private vote will stop this.
- A special, randomly selected community committee or survey could be acceptable, but I dislike these options because they seem needlessly limiting in who they include. We have time and resources to consult everyone in the community, so I believe we should do our best to do this rather than only consult a subset.
- Opinion polls & surveys- again and again we have seen the NWMO manipulate these to get the answers they want. Cant be trusted.
- Workshops, engagement activities - All end up being subjective and allow the NWMO to twist the responses to the answer they want.
- Word of mouth: can sometimes be one sided
- 2/3 Workshops - poorly attended and people often intimidated to speak in front of others. Too much NWMO influence and control. Lack of involvement can cause hardships in the neighbourhood and even families.

Concerns with limiting scope

- Community panel, opinion polls/surveys. Doesn't give s good of an overall picture
- Advisory committee, community engagement activity, and community panel: They all limit their scope of getting public opinion.
- Advisory committee, community engagement activity, and community panel: They all limit their scope of getting public opinion.

Technology / Online access

- I do not like computers and will not participate in so called virtual meetings or phone calls
- I do not like computers and will not participate in so called virtual meetings or phone calls

Concerns about the Willingness Study and Engagement Process

- I dislike the process of South Bruce is using at present to determine willingness. Surveys, workshop, etc can be used to manipulate the outcome of the process. Unfair process it reminds me of heads I win tails you lose
- The process being used with this workbook and workshops. The data can be manipulated and influenced by the people collecting and interpreting the data.

Comments about the Project and NWMO

- I do not like being used by the NWMO. They pass out money and then say we are in favour once our land and water are destroyed it will be too late. Mother nature can change the land very easily and will e left with a major problem.
- The trust with the NWMO is lacking and the more you fear the less you trust. They say it will continue to look the same but it won't.
- I really dislike the process they NWMO used to acquire their land in South Bruce. I think it was very unfair to the rest of the neighbourhood other than those who profited.

Other

- Yellow Sign process
- Engagement activities, polls and surveys and a community panel. I just think these choices aren't going to move our municipality forward. Too many variables, too much room for opinions.
- There are pitfalls with each of the processes that will result in some people not being happy
- Community engagement activities would be too inconclusive; they cannot be used to make a clear yes/no decision. A special, randomly selected community committee or survey could be acceptable, but I dislike these options because they seem needlessly limiting in who they include. We have time and resources to consult everyone in the community, so I believe we should do our best to do this rather than only consult a subset.
- I don't think that surveys or advisory committees should make a final recommendation. Those are great for getting feedback and informing the process, but not for decision-making.
- Word of mouth, 1 way news reports, influences of people outside of South Bruce
- Advisory committee, community engagement - don't like
- Advisory Committee, Community Panel, opinion polls & surveys, vote of council, & etc.
- "Advisory Committee, Community Panel, opinion polls & surveys, vote of council, & etc.
- "CLC, Vote of council, committees
- All are influenced by NWMO and their financing hired by directly or indirectly NWMO. All engagement activities present only pro-information"
- Electronic vote make it a simple yes or no
- "Money Talks" process is not an option.
- How many of these processes will be legally binding and result in a final say on the project?
- "Advisory committee (CLC), can be biased
- South Bruce cannot make this decision on their own
- Community panel- only 40 people to represent 1000's also can be biased
- the willingness to go thru this motion and waste everyones time and effort against this dgr
- Polls surveys - Only a small sampling of people
- Vote of council - can be biased"
- Get people to understand what they are voting on has to happen and how well we can do that get info to people who aren't seeking it
- Dislike Community Panel, Opinion Polls and Surveys & Public Referendum because they are likely to be influenced by fear rather then facts.

2 What would you like to ensure is included in the process to determine willingness?

Comments on the broad representation

Need to have a broad participation - measuring willingness	All South Bruce residents should be represented.	All South Bruce residents should be represented, and only South Bruce residents.	Those who "don't care" are included in the numbers somehow. All residents should have the opportunity to express their opinion	Minority opinions do need to have their time to be heard, either for or against the project.
All residents need a method to voice their willingness or unwillingness.	Ensure those opposed are heard	Each resident needs to have a vote. Also this affects those under 18 more than those over 18 so their voices should also be heard.	Broad representation and feedback from community members	Honesty.... listening to the people of the Community...
All residents have an opportunity to be heard	All South Bruce residents and landowners should be consulted, to have their vote.	Everyone should benefit including those next door.	Wanting to get people out and having easier access to participate it's about the quantity of people	All residents and land owners need to feel included and know that their voices are being heard. Residents need to feel safe in expressing their opinions and that they won't be targeted for having those opinions.
1/2 EVERY South Bruce resident with a valid drivers license with exceptions should be PERSONALLY invited to have their say - aka home mailing, not online survey only.	2/2 (includes higher level high school but not those too young to fully understand all the way up to elderly - if dementia is why no license, probably not able to make an informed decision, but if poor eyesight, then would still be able to make informed decision)	1/2 The willingness to listen is essential on both sides of the issue. Deciding that people who are not part of the yes faction shouldn't be discounted as not knowing enough about the subject matter.	2/2 People may not know much about generating nuclear power but they know whether or not they want a radioactive dump next door. If you're looking to determine willingness, don't discount the "no" side as uninformed.	I think it is important to ask all types of people, not just those who are the loudest talkers and who have already biased nearly everyone's view.
1/2 All South Bruce residents need to be able to voice their opinions.	2/2 Ideally anyone within 50-100 kms should be able to voice opinion since they are all affected but the weight of their vote should be prorated based on their distance from the DGR (e.g., group results for those within 10 kms, 11-25 kms, >25kms) with individuals closest to the DGR site having the most weight.	I think there should be some consideration as to the age of those who get to vote.... There are a lot of elders in the community voicing their opinion on what our community should be, but the reality is, it is up to the younger generations to decide what kind of community we want.	I support processes that consult the whole community. This means that a relatively high degree of approval would need to be established from a large proportion of the population.	

Understand the science/results

A presentation of the borehole results and if the results were optimal to host a DGR	Let's try and follow the science	Explanation of what the borehole samples have determined	Would like to see more study/public knowledge on likely impacts for residents	The science should be known before any determination is made one way or another.
Extensive environmental impact studies	Residents need to see results of the technical and social impact studies before making a decision.	Science needs to be clearly defined. Social impact assessment must be fully complete. Clear understanding of the project benefits including what the CofE would look like for our community.	expert opinions and research	Results from all studies.
Up-to-date information and study results to assess for socioecomonic and environmental impacts	What will impacts be on those in proximity to the site? Lots of benefits and no one should be left behind	When is the "point of no return"?	We need to see results from the research and studies before we can decide willingness	As much information (ex. Borehole) is gathered as possible prior to making a decision
Social, economic, and scientific impacts need to be made public	Interest in the science related to this work. Concerns about how residents can learn more (about these 2 pieces).	Study results should be available before determining willingness	full disclosure of the possible negative events or effects that could be resultant of the town moving forward with this program.	Surveys/studies that produce objective data on the preferred process to determine willingness.
I also think some study results need to be viewed before deciding but those results need to be presented in a manner that is useful to all people.	The "loud talkers" want to see all of the individual data points but they don't know what to do with them and would likely not understand them and take them out of context.	Borehole results, socio economic studies, some "off ramps" for the municipality if we are unhappy with information that appears after we say we're willing - we shouldn't be locked in forever if something life changing is made known.	we need to see results of the environmental studies to be sure that the environment is not negatively affected as well as the health and safety of our residents must be ensured	Need to wait for the testing to be complete, and everyone needs to make there own vote/decision with out the peer pressure of certain groups
Want to understand the monitoring programs being proposed (will is be 24/7/365?) If there were to be an issue, how quickly it will be addressed in a timely manner?	The timing is important - need information on: geological surveys, how risks associated with the rock here is good/ bad/different than Ignace	Understand what the actual economic impact is to our municipality, jobs (unskilled and skilled), and will they be able to source it from the municipality	A chance to see how the concerns are addressed. This is design changes that mitigate the damage a failure could cause the aquifer.	

Comments on measuring "Informed"

If a public vote is used, voters should first be informed by attending a presentation of the "results of technical and social studies before deciding" in order to counter all the misinformation that has been circulated.	Feelings that residents need to be fully informed about these pieces before having a referendum.	How do we measure informed?	Community members want to understand so that they can make an informed decision.	What to know what is willingness.
I'd like to see some sort of "informedness" measured. There is a lot of false information being circulated as true, and sadly many community members are buying into the fear mongering. Those opinions should be counted, but weighted differently when they are not based on facts.	Informed means differently for those for or against the project. It can't be the CLC, NWMO, the municipality or any scientific group associated with NWMO. How do you get people to trust impartial information.			

Comments on meeting the Guiding Principles

The Guiding Principles need to be met by South Bruce and/or NWMO as well as have provisions to renegotiate if there are changes in the storage process.	Guiding principals met by all	Guiding principles are more like dream principles. eg You can't tell people where to live. Consequently whole concept is tainted.	Information from this survey, workshop comments, confirmation that Guiding Principles have been met and other public input must be provided to all residents for review, then hold a Public Referendum.	and all guiding principles are met by both South bruce and NWMO

2 What would you like to ensure is included in the process to determine willingness?

Comments on safety

- Ultimately want to protect what's already here in the community
- There are conflicting views of what is safe.
- Need to know if it can be built safe
- Be sure it is a safe option to bury it
- Current lack of understanding. They haven't told me the fail safes are for the aquifer contamination. Nuclear is built around fail safe.
- All information regarding the safety of transporting nuclear waste on our roads. All long term affects to the land, waterways, animals, and people.
- Ultimately - all want to protect our waterway. Need to engage the community in a way that provides the science so that they can understand
- Have so many questions on the claims that the NWMO is making on safety but they really don't allow other experts with diverging thoughts speakers to come present.
- This stuff is already sitting by the lake being stored. So as time goes on, we need to be looking at something that is better.
- If this is it or not, I'm not sure but there is a certain level of risk associated with is currently going on
- 1/3 All safety criteria must be met. Ongoing financial support of the community and specific infrastructure investments must be agreed to.
- 2/3 Community resources like child care and things like a dedicated bike path from town to the facility for employees needs to be included.
- 3/3 And the centre for excellence must be on the site with the DGR - not at the opposite end of the municipality.
- 1/2 the consequences to the community if there is a spill or a leak during filling the reservoir
- 2/2 and/ or water contamination to the aquifer or the Great lakes
- There are other ways to handle the nuclear waste. Noted about other ways to handle the nuclear waste. Concern about giving up farm land to host/store this waste. Concern about dangers of this project and need to know if this project will be hosted here, if yes residents will move.
- all safety concerns are addressed

Comments on continuing Community engagement activities

- community engagement - listen to dissent and address
- Think about a swipe or a digital signing of a petition. It can be completed in a couple seconds without thought. How can the process be communicated/ engaged in a simpler way
- Meeting in person - will get a better turnout for things like town halls, engagements, etc.
- Are there more in person opportunities? Kitchen tables or corner of the street, coffee, etc.
- More events were community engagement is involved not just town hall meetings with the leaders of the willing to listen and the anti dgr but in the community.
- With Covid large meetings have been canceled. I would like to see meetings with open debate. This would allow everyone to ask their questions to an expert panel. These meetings would need to have a structure and a method to control the debate. i.e. and independent facilitator.
- Leverage social media to report back to the community
- See local service clubs involved (chambers, etc) the proactive and pro development voices. Engage those groups
- some sort of bbq, meeting to help educate
- An independent company with no affiliation to NWMO could do a survey. But the questions need to be worded clearly.
- I think it's important to have clear communication about the steps being taken, evidence that concerns have been raised & heard, and then update on the ultimate decision taken by the leadership and the reasoning behind it. This could take the form of TV & newspaper ads, social media, or direct mail newsletters.
- Community panel should represent everyone - good range of people, not just random

Comments on the community division & safety

- Personal security, public reputation, friendships, while having open dialogue.
- Life has been put on hold, family is interested in the farm, however this put on hold because of the concerns about this project. Concerns about safety of the project. The sooner this referendum takes place residents can decide to move or stay in South Bruce.
- There have been some difficult situations (threatened, intimidation). How can we get them to feel safe and participate.
- We are a small town, everyone knows one another. It has influence over careers, mental health of kids at school, etc. Having it safe, supportive, and respectful.
- We are at a point where neighbours don't talk, family members don't talk, and people don't go to church out of concern that they may sit beside/behind someone with differing opinions.
- The longer we let this fester, the longer it will take for this community will need to heal.
- There are already too many things that have gone wrong. NWMO is big and doesn't care about this community.
- Privacy is also important, so people can vote as they wish without having to worry about being vilified.
- If we want our opinions to be respected, that means we also need to respect the opinions of others.
- Concerned that in an open setting that intimidation (commitment and consent) would have an affect.

Comments on the community benefits

- Local jobs first commitments from NWMO
- Should this go forward - there is a way to collaborate with the agricultural community
- Conditions which have to be met (i.e. maybe jobs going to SB residents first)
- By being a willing host - we have the opportunity to have a say on the terms of the agreement for this Project (example to include or not include nuclear arms or medical waste).
- Concerns over future job opportunities. One persons safe is different than anothers definition of safe.
- The town has a said made by a final vote in council. Make sure it's valued at how much of a rise in infrastructure and tax base the "DGR" will bring to our community.
- There should also be some form of commitment to what NWMO will contribute to the community going forward (municipal tax contributions, continued well being, road maintenance and upgrades)
- Is there a timeline and details on the potential economic spin off?

Comments on Youth Participation

- Depending on the processes selected - youth having representation and a voice
- Youth need a say: they need all the information from a neutral party in the schools to give the good the bad and the ugly. Include students that are away at university.
- Make sure that Youth have a voice because our generation is the one who will ultimately be the one who lives with the outcome
- This decision impacts the youth - quantify the youth opinion in the process
- Given the timeline of the proposed built, I believe it is important that the high school aged citizens are well informed on the proposal and given an opportunity to express an opinion. This will be to their benefit or detriment.
- More important than this, I think people below voting age should have a say. This could include those who have taken Gr. 10 Civics, all high school students, all students, or everyone who can indicate an opinion one way or the other. This is important because the project will have very long-term impacts; most of those who may be affected by it have not been born, but the least we can do is give those who have been born a voice.

Comments on Saugeen Ojibway Nation Participation

- Such was the case when the SON decided on their unwillingness towards the dgr proposed for low-intermediate waste. Why shouldn't the same method be used here in South Bruce?
- Interest in Indigenous voices regarding this project

2 What would you like to ensure is included in the process to determine willingness?

Comments on the continuing education in a way that is transparent, accurate, clear, simple, and factual information

How do we educate people who don't have an interest or just say no	Educate on the good and the bad.	The decision made is an informed one and not an emotional one	The CLC information is too scientific, it is not communicated in my language	community should help educate neighbours	Transparency from both sides (for and against)	Making sure that the goal posts / parameters for what is included and what is not included is very clear for all	If a referendum is selected, need to have enough time to allow factual information and engagement activities to associated	Very important that people are informed of factual details and allowed to form their own opinions.	Accurate information
An understanding of the current situation and how it's being stored	sharing more about the project other then just the DGR	a truly informed and educated decision	making the information shared in a way that ALL kinds of people can understand fully	Simplify, people who are experts can explain it well	A clear understanding that this process is regulated by the CNSC	I would like to see all reports presented in a non bias way to allow residents to form an individual opinion and allow them to vote on their opinion	Important that there is straight forward factual information provided to the community in a way that is easy for all to understand	A very transparent process from all parties.	Full transparency with all processes in all communities.
People need to understand what this is. People don't know what a DGR is.	After ensuring that the residents who wish knowledge of the project, have all of the information, about ALL of the risks and potential benefits, not just those put forth by the NWMO	then a democratic referendum should take place, with a straight-forward, easily understood question, with a simple yes or no answer	Keep it simple - the process	Fact checking of groups and persons	MEASURABLE. Anything other than a measurable activity, such as a vote, cannot fairly determine what community sentiment is.				

Concern with the Willingness Study Process

Equal funding for the people "for" and "against" this project. It seems at the present time that all the money is on one side - where is the funding for the other side so they can provide their info?	The municipality is biased and that is why there is concerned for their involvement.	There has been a lot of wrong-doing from the start.	Concern that municipality does not actually want residents to participate.	Veto rights. Compensation. Remedies for failures.	Asking the community their opinion on how to do your job (GHD)	Hopeful for more participation in the process	Municipality wants to push this forward - Municipality shouldn't be present when our thoughts are shared	Information should be provided on how other communities have determined willingness on projects of this size. (My bet is that 9 out of 10 times it was by way of a formal vote in a referendum or plebiscite.	dont want to have more meetings
Decision on how to “count” those people who don’t care to participate in the process."	Meaningful means that input I provide actually gets taken into account in the decision	It seems to me that 'determining willingness' is just one more way of prolonging the decision. Yes all SB residents should be represented and results of the various studies should be seen, but is it going to make a difference in the end? It is looking like a foregone conclusion.	The Municipality should only receive the input when the community sees the report back	I would like to hear recommendations from GHD consulting after this process on how they think we should proceed. Would like to hear a recommendation from them due to their expertise in consultations.	Consideration of how many people participate in this consultation	Is it right to be asking the community how it should be done, or defer to consultant	If we are defering to consultant, wouldn't that be giving up the right to an opinion	People are tired of doing surveys	Hopeful that at end of this study, that the result/process moving forward is accepted in the community.
Doesn't think that the process is fair because of the involvement from the Municipality from the get-go	Concern for the influence that the Municipality may have on others in the community after hearing what was said in a workshop or other consultation	How are you (GHD) going to get more people involved and give more perspective?	Safe-concerns residents do not feel safe to fill out a workbook as this will be sent to council ans saved.	In my opinion it is hard to not feel that the money donated to the towns and council and the close relationship with NWMO over the last 10 years or so are not indirectly affecting their view of this project.	Doesn't like Municipal staff during the workshop	Don't overburden community on the how - people want to get to the actual discussion/ decision	When results presented, will we know how many participate in the process?	The process to determine willingness has to include a commitment to a referendum which would give all south bruce residents representation. Not all guiding principles are satisfactory, a switchboard survey informed council of this	Could report to Council come sooner than Nov if report back period doesn't turn up major changes/feedback?
It is a decision that individually need to make (including council). Would look to council to support the decision of the community.	The intent of the NWMO and the municipality is to repeat the information over and over again so that the community is forced into accepting it.	Agree with the above and would like this to come from council to publicly announce a broad timeline so that people can prepare to become informed.	It is every community members to investigate further and beyond what's provided in the paper, CLC, NWMO, etc. - it is our duty to dig into the information	Feels like there isn't a lot of trust in the CLC. NWMO speakers have the floor and few that speak out against the NWMO. Very pro-DGR					

2 What would you like to ensure is included in the process to determine willingness?

Comments on Important Considerations for Referendum

AN accurate question on the public referendum.	a large majority of the people need have a say in the final vote and I need to be assured that what the people want is upheld throughout the entire project	a clear yes or no vote referendum	I think before we go any further and get ensnared by the process to the point where we can't back out that a referendum should be held as soon as legally possible.	If a referendum is chosen as the deciding factor at least 80% of South Bruce must vote for any credibility
Everyone needs to have a voice in this decision.	just have a vote and get this over with by the people. I am sure there are other things people can be putting there time to other than fighting the system you have created with this willingness.	Simple clear question: do you want a DGR in South Bruce Yes or no	There needs to be a vote, and available to absolutely anyone within South Bruce, even shift workers who may need extended hours to participate in “in person” voting circumstance.	A simple survey. You either agree to host or not. This survey does not do that.
A third party with absolutely no ties to the situation needs to be called in to count votes, so there is no funny business by either side. Let the people living and raising families in the community decide what willingness means.	The wording for referendum has to be simple	Determine what percentage of people for/against determines willingness, eg 51% gets to decide, or 65% upport is needed to proceed, etc.	Either you want to do it or not. Either yes, no, or can't be bothered	Referendum is one specific question; making it hard to give a yes or no given size of Project
If I knew I had a vote, I would be more at ease. I came on this workshop because I am close in proximity to the proposed project and i am opposed, but there is a lot of common ground on this call.	Referendum needs to be held soon so residents can make the decision to move away from the dangers of this project.	Give your opinion yes or no	Referendum should be dependent on the completion of some of the key studies	Secret ballot (do not have to divulge). We are supposed to be a democratic country but sadly there will be bullying
Understanding this - a referendum allows people to vote if they agree/ disagree individually on if this is the solution	I think you have to ive people the option to vote online or from home.	We should be shooting for far greater than 50% of the population to provide input	Everyone who is entitled to vote can vote - don't see a limitation for those entitled to vote	Agree with the above but would like to see a commitment to a referendum being at the end regardless of other activities. It would take the edge off of the community members
Not sure how they feel on if a vote for referendum should be in the municipality or broader	If the community on whole new that there was a timeline and that even if that needs to be flexible depending on the results of the studies. Can't be a specific date but a timeline that gets communicated/updated to the community by Council.	ie do you want this process to happen in South Bruce? Why? The past survey was worded the people feel informed. That doesn't mean that they want it. It just means they are informed. Why is council so afraid to ask the question plain and simple? Yes or no.	The only true way to have an informed community is if both sides can provide their info and then let the people decide and vote on the willingness on having the project.	Not sure of all the rules around a referendum
How many times do I have to say no	Every ratepayer should have an opportunity to say yes or no - basically a referendum	I dislike the assumptions built into the referendum as presented that the bar for approval is 50% support with 50% turnout and that only people of voting age have a voice. I believe higher turnout should be required, and possibly a higher rate of support as well. 25% support and 50% pathy does not sound like an indication of “willingness” to me.	In the referendum, I think in addition to "yes" and "no" options, there should be a "not yet; insufficiently informed" option.	If the referendum did not pass but many of rejections were of the latter form, the NWMO could keep working with the community and hold another referendum later. This would have the potential to save a lot of time and money by not needing to completely restart the process of finding a host community.
All South Bruce and surrounding municipalities should vote on this as all will be affected by the water	All South Bruce residents must be represented by equal vote. Need to be broad participation in decision. Need to be anonymous. Need to happen in a timely manner. Community is being destroyed.			

Comments with Questions and/or Concerns about the Site Selection Process

I feel that the Liaison Committee and Council have not looked very closely at the cons of this proposed project only the pros.	How will the infrastructure of South Bruce change?	do not burry it - experiment, risk is to big	The opposition speak of the goal posts that keep moving. used the example of only Canadian waste will be here, they go further to say for a price, this will be a world "dump"	Will we be able to satisfy them? Can the government make a commitment?
phone surveys - don't answer the phone if don't recognize the number	Where is the waste coming from? What is the traffic going to be like?	want voice heard that doesnt want this project to happen - shouldn't get burried anywhere	Realization that something needs to be done - there is always a goal. There will always be waste as long as there is nuclear operations on-going.	We need honesty, truthfulness, accountability from local council, provincial and federal governments.
CLC is no longer a good forum	Is there any compensation due to property value loss	I would like gauantees that if this project goes through that anything that goes wrong during and after the project is looked after fairly.		

3 What information do you need to participate meaningfully?

Comments on the results of the borehole drilling, the studies, and the impact assessment

Scientific: the good the bad the ugly	other science from around the world varies from NWMO	Science is constantly evolving- what does the science say today vs. what science say in 15 years? Need for science to review Nobel prize winners from Europe. This will provide more options for what to do with the nuclear waste in questions.	Borehole Results	Wide communication on borehole work	impact analysis	Impact of community in future.	How is my property going to be impacted	Risk assessment plan (Environmental, Socioeconomic)	Information and studies from the experts in the field.
Environmental assessment before deciding	I have seen the research and presentations. I am a science based person, however with something this big, which could effect our people and land for generations, we have to be willing to understand that science has been wrong before, and accidents can happen, regardless of safeguards.	If the geology is not suitable willingness should not matter. Therefore it should be made clear that it will be safe and the science behind that determination shown to the community	Borehole results - what is rock like	Would like to see all the studies published. I assume there will be a community impact study that goes with the bore hole study, ground water study, environmental impact etc.	I want to see information regarding potential impacts on environment, motives behind the participation in the program, and solid proof that the waterways will be protected:	Impacts on South Bruce, County - what are they	Understand how they are protecting the environment	Environmental impact	I want to know what is being considered in terms of the impact on this area re: poverty line, housing, farm land availability and value, socioeconomic status changes and retail impact, number of jobs and whether local individuals who were RAISED (not just currently reside) in South Bruce will be given precedence and training over individuals outside of this area.
More research completed before community says yes/ no	other scientific from other sites made available	Engineer & scientist reports	Same as above. I feel I need to know the borehole results and results from the NWMO to determine it's safe for our community	Borehole results proving the South Bruce geology is optimal	Impact on human health and animal health, key industries example nuclear, economic impact, prosperity, what does South Bruce look like in 30 years	Impact on agriculture, housing, jobs, economy	Any dangers to land, waterways, animals, and people.	Scientific evidence is very important to me and true estimates of employment, not vague promises.	Scientific results, based on research around the world. Need to know what the risks are, and that our community will be safe for many generations to come.
scientific evidence that the geology is safe and that the aquifer is protected	I want to see scientific evidence to ensure it's safe before deciding	Enviro Assessment could change minds.	I would like to see study results, borehole results, and environmental impact assessments completed prior to deciding if we are informed and willing. The community host package would be ideal to have details of as well.	Make a decision after we know about the rock formation.	What are the socio economic impacts of this proposal and how will you mitigate them?	All these studies need to be reviewed and published prior to any decision.	The basic facts on how the geology is safe and aquifer is projected	scientific evidence	Scientific evidence is very important. Humans have changed this planet in many ways, this is called progress.
I would like to follow the scientific evidence	Scientific evidence should be widely available long before any sort of decision is made so safety can be a valid discussion	I think we need the scientific evidence that the repository will ensure the safe storage of the used fuel for a veryu long time	I want to see scientific evidence that the geology is safe	Need to look at what the options are, and what risks are with each. What option is safest	Least risky for longest amount of time. Safest option	The project must be proven to be safe (water and air quality)"	I am sure no one wants to go back to the days when this area was covered in trees and rocks with no roads, homes or having to produce all our own food. We all like our comforts.	All site information needs to be available before the community can make an informed decision, rock make up, aquifers, etc.	Water shelf/source - possibility of contamination being discussed
scientific evidence that the geology is safe	This study should give a sense of level of information, approval/ not in community	I think "more info", more answers, more research needed	Will property value change? Employment (socio-economic projections)	1. How much in property tax will they pay each year?	Sale prices has impacted property values of neighboring farms	What regulatory criteria will be used? How does NWMO ensure it has more than a compelling set of assertions from the licensee?	How contaminated liquids are handled and stored. How do we ensure that the scope of the project isn't increased beyond what South Bruce has agreed to.	retrievability, future research and uses	hearing expert analysis more important than repetitive questions

Comments on More Information on the advantages & disadvantages and the risks

a risk benefit analysis backed up by evidence submitted by both sides	Honest information represented from both sides.	Project positively and negatively impacts children.	Need information on how the project will negatively affect South Bruce. The only information that is currently presented is how safe it is and how wonderful the economic benefits will be.	Conversation surrounding that there is no perfect solution, without risk.	The advantages and disadvantages of the project.	University of Waterloo study of large project impacts on rural communities	Compensation plans for things such as property value declines	I need unbiased information oh both Pros and Cons. I have questions that I would love answered!	stats on all the positives and negatives of the project
discussion about risks about the Project - realistic, plausible	Consider real disadvantages versus perceived disadvantages	impossible to keep the standard of everyone benefitting when there are some who will insist they are at disadvantage	More info on the cons side of such a project in the community - it seems we have only received one side of this project yet.	What percent of waste would come from Bruce Power vs other Ont. plants vs out of province. What timeline would waste be moved on, ie to deal with 'build up', there after? Are we looking at seeing trucks on the road every day? Comparison of 'project' to salt mine at goderich that we can relate to .	What notes were taken in early discussions 2005-2010 by county council regarding this proposal? Other than geological concerns what was the criteria for deselection of other communities that showed interest? Was proximity to the current inventory of nuclear spent fuel a motivating factor to locate in South Bruce? Will processing of spent fuel from smr's be done before disposal in this dgr and will it be done here in South Bruce?	I need to know WHEN and HOW to provide my opinion when it comes time to make that decision.	I want to know what is being considered in terms of the impact on this area re: poverty line, housing, farm land availability and value, socioeconomic status changes and retail impact, number of jobs and whether local individuals who were RAISED (not just currently reside) in South Bruce will be given precedence and training over individuals outside of this area.	We need a guarantee that the drinking water will not be effected by this project	

3 What information do you need to participate meaningfully?

Comments on the factual, reputable, unbiased, independent information

Scientific information by REPUTABLE sources (Universities etc)	Understandable evidence in layman's terms that the geology is appropriate	Facts, info that is basic but complex.. I need complexity dulled down for stupid to understand.	facts without bias must be given to everyone. Misinformation must be dispelled immediately
Peer review: needs to ensure there is no back door interest	Would welcome independent study on socio-economic impacts	I personally believe that an unsafe plan would not be promoted...but I do believe that reliable information should be presented to endorse this.	Minimize emotions, maximize objectivity
would like a much broader cross section of information	A useful summary of scientific evidence that is unbiased, in addition to predicted economic and societal ramifications.	Request for independent study for social and economic for South Bruce. Belief if project does go ahead, no one will want to live beside it.	true data
Scientific data from sources other than those that stand to profit	Reflection of south bruce power and comparison to this project. Need for independent company to complete this study.	Independent means possibility of not paid, school where students are working towards completion of degrees, would be outside of municipality or NWMO, need for good peer review.	Note that only reviewing NWMO science (who are paid to determine this project) is biased. Having other science reports/ scientists provides a full picture, NWMO science in addition to other scientists.
Factual: I've attended meetings. Example: help me understand why this location and the contingencies that are in place. Information should be neutral, from unscientific source, and we should wait until we have the information	Need to come from an objective source, not someone who is looking for your vote	unbiased information	More Factual studies like the nwmo has been doing. Unlike the opposing “No DGR” folk have been doing
I would like all reports to state that in their unbiased opinion the site would safe to store used nuclear products	need accurate information.	fact not fiction - trust.	Facts not fear
Make a decision based on actual information not fear	A measure of "informedness" - facts important	Municipal studies: firms doing the peer reviews should not also be doing the studies, too much overlap, not clear	Continuation from above - True vs. False statements for educating the community.
Experience of other DGRs. More information on risks, for example how an underground leak is handled. Both sides of the reality are to be presented fairly to citizens not just what you want them to hear	Need to come from an objective source, not someone who is looking for your vote	Facts and Science - clear and concise.	Would like the straight goods on why other DGRs failed without embellishment and how they have addressed these problems, lessons learned. Was the technology not there? Was it 20 years ago? Was the rock not solid enough? Also, what are the successful ones (DGRs)? Spoon fed basic information straight goods.
Non-biased peer review of technical studies and scientific data produced and published.	I need the truth. Reading info that is 20+ years old is not reliable, everything changes.	Need 3rd party professionals evaluate and respond to findings	All information should be openly communicated to the residents. Realiable that all will not absorb it.

Comments on trust and transparency

NWMO talks transparency but hide behind privacy of the farm sales	Trust, Balanced, transparent	How can residents trust certain sciences?	How do we get it so that people trust the experts - we trust a physician with our body, etc	Concern that science cannot be trusted- there are different versions of the same science being reported on with different outcomes.	Don't really trust council to do what report says
expectation that council with either be in favour or postpone (at election)	We need lots of knowledge from trusted sources. Who or What is a trusted sources is becoming a problem to determine. ?? For myself --I want to see scientific evidence informing us of the geological structure and it's suitability, Water safety and radiation safety. for the residence and the country.	Transparency will get more trust in an informed voter	Agreements that it is sad, frusturating that residents cannot find out what meetings are about, what the payments are for and who they are for. Council meetings are secretive and creating further distrust.	Community elected council, there is some inherent trust the community trusts them. Concerns that why we do not trust them.	Note that resident wants responsibility of voting yes or no on this project. Council/ panel, etc. does not have the right/trust to make the decision on residents behalf.
Not sure funding in the community is right way to proceed	gaining/regaining trust of NWMO, CLC and current council	issue of trust comes with NWMO affiliated speakers at CLC	we need to have trust in the people we voted in, without trust nothing gets done properly.	Concern that council intimates residents. Distrust in council.	Distrust happens when council has closed meetings, residents request that council meetings are recorded, meeting minutes are published but not filled out properly. There are some meetings that meeting minutes are not published.
Transparency means that I'm seeing the whole picture. There are ways to make information word because of the optics.	there has been mistrust garnered + of misinformation...an informed community has to address those issues in a non threatening way	buidling back trust starts with NWMO in non-confrontational way. Clear up misconceptions	Concerns that council is silenced by NWMO. Residents feel that there is a need for pushing to receive proper answers for their questions. Distrust that council does not provide answers and directs residents to research for their own information. Concern about who needs to be nice to receive answers.	If consultation/talks are dragged along, damage of trust, frustration, need for consultation to be over soon to begin to repair this damage. Frustration of divisiveness.	How can we trust our Council to interpret what is going on with these workshops
I need to see that concerns are taken seriously enough to make design changes required. There needs to be transparency to show fairness in where the money is spent	note that more objective NWMO are; greater mistrust... try to get NWMO offstage and trustworthy source onstage	Closed session meeting council has had has created further divisiveness. Why has council hidden these payments, discussions, etc. This creates further distrust of council for residents.	In the strategic planning 2014-2018 there were a number of economic dev activities that never came into being. Council is totally focused on the project as being the answer for the next 50 years and we don't want to take that risk .	Transparency means leaving it to the professionals	Transparency as information becomes available, it is shared in a timely manner, understand the why
Also, South Bruce council will not hear of anything against the proposed DGR. This council is biased, all personnel with the Community Liaison Committee have to be PRO DGR to be involve. If one asks a question they are asked to leave.Concerned	The CLC is too closely intertwined with the NWMO	Need more speakers at CLC that have different opinions on the Project	Comprehensive overview “courses” of the project should be provided prior to a decision being made. SBCLC meetings tend to deal in-depth with particular aspects of the project. While this can be helpful, it often leaves people without a thorough understanding of what the entire project involves.	Council and municipal staff (administration) are too cozy with NWMO and there is a conflict of interest and is worry-some. NWMO staff is now working at the municipality. If you follow the money...	How can NWMO think the residents could/ should decide where Project should be?
feels being held hostage for a long period of time without answers	Lots of issues with the CLC committee - have brought in over 60 speakers and only 1 with a different viewpoint and that the NWMO is apart of each of the CLC meetings.	Concerns about the approach be undertaken by the NWMO and our Municipality	Anyone that watches the CLC would think it's pretty sad as they just go through the motions. It's a failure	Where is the money going from NWMO: land purchases, but no titles have changed? What companies are getting money for doing the borehole drilling? Show the trail of money spent and going forward, presented in a format that we can understand.	Farms that have sold have a competitive advantage because they can rent more farms with the NWMO money
Being honest with the people	All land acquisitions should have had it written into contract that the transaction is public	Money can’t be the only factor, however having Bruce power near by already puts us in a spot that we should want to do something better than what is being done now.	We want to know that money is actually being spent locally as promised		

3 What information do you need to participate meaningfully?

Concerns with the NWMO Site Selection Project

NWMO always positive in explaining risk. Important to see both sides	Have experts who are not from NWMO to provide unbiased information (not pro-nuclear or anti-nuclear)	Many speakers have been from NWMO or industry.	NWMO commitment to upgrading our infrastructure - make these timelines clear	Money being thrown at municipality - is it the right way
If NWMO selects SB, and Council opposes - can govt. impose Project?	What is NWMO's timeline	Has council considered the proposal by OPG/SCL/Canadian Nuclear Laboratories to bring all candu waste back to Canada and if so is the site it is coming to? (from 12 countries)	Council should defer decision for a few years - based on COVID	information on what properties have already been purchased and for how much money, as well as any monetary transactions or agreements that have been made with the NWMO for anything related to the dump, including monies given to the government(s).
too much information from just NWMO	only 1 speaker non NWMO or regulator	Have to be able to understand the question being asked	Feels conflict for consultants because salary is paid by NWMO	Will it be a binding decision?
every time NWMO or Council is approached they say learn more	should be balanced scientific information available to the public - not just NWMO	best thing for Council is say we are deferring decision until 2030	Can the Project come down to a Yes or No question?	Are there opportunities for the municipality to say no in the future if we initially say yes?
Note about frustration on this call. Commitment will provide relief/piece of mind that a decision will be made, meaningful to residents that they have been heard.	Concerns that council had an illegally closed meeting. Other meetings that activity that is not being disclosed to the public- people stepping down from roles, having meetings.	Aware that the NWMO and South Bruce have a vested interest so want to hear both sides. Ideally there would be no vested interest but that does exist	We have done a lot of research. We have read the NWMO materials and more than what they have to offer.	If the 36 Principles are to be met - what are the timelines for them to be made?
Ease of access to all information. Regular updates on all studies being completed.	Set rule that if you do a study call, you should not do future studies, it's a conflict of interest	Why did the Municipality think a DGR sounded like a great idea?	Move your nuclear place somehwere else	34 conditions - resolution passed - would like to see a timeline on how those conditions would be met
I do not support this project. Simple as that. I have read the information and understand the process. My answer is no.	Although I am not completely on board on burying	What level of 'softening' has OPG put into this already (money to hospitals, First Nations, wining and dining council members, etc.)"	None. Nuclear depositories, concentrating waste, is an idea which has not been proven in practice. It is only a theory.	We do not need this experiment in south bruce. Are we so stupid and greedy to accept this arrogent idea that it will be safe and not harm the environment or water
This whole process has been very misleading and ever changing. The adaptive phased management continually changes or adapts to meet NWMO needs (eg 1500 acres of land, now 1650 acres...)	Often NWMO does not have answers to questions that are asked of them. This does not give the community trust in this process. (Environmental risks, health risks, sfety now and in the future, transportation, monitoring of the DGR).	I want to stop hearing CKNX radios sports reports sponsored by the NWMO. I want to stop hearing about all the money the NWMO has been giving everyone with no strings attached. Water is our most valuable resource and our wells and water cant help but be effected by the DGR.		

Concerns with the Willingness Study process

I would like an opportunity to review a summary of all public thoughts from surveys and workshops, along with any geological findings, before I could feel completely informed to make a final decision.	GHD is a part of many of the future studies	Does the municipality have access to this meeting right now? No - only GHD	Will GHD be involved in the process following this Willingness Study? If you are allowed to bid on work in the future - there is a real/ perceived conflict	how do we count the people not involved/ don't care
Has GHD ever worked for NWMO?	I am a resident of South-Bruce and I wish to make a comment on the Willingness Study in our municipality. We the citizens of South-Bruce were on the understanding that we would have an unbiased study of what willingness is.	You hear what you want to hear	Concerns with Municipal Staff being on the call	silence may not be negative
is disinterested in favour or opposed? What does undecided mean	Who pays the GHD? The Municipality The NWMO provides funds to the Municipality which funds the Willingness Study	However, when participating in the study members of the municipality staff and NWMO personnel where present. So I declined. So therefore this study is of no value whatsoever.	asking do you support the project isn't a fair question - ask if you support the process	want to know # of participants at the end of this
Concerns if these workshops/expressions of determining willingness will be translated by Council appropriately	In GHD's interest to make the Willingness process drag out as long as possible therefore not making it a fair process	Concerns with Participation at Workshop	Conflict of interest of council to be involved because they are financially incentivized. They don't need to work to find economic development for the municipality.	Will there be Municipal staff at the in-person workshops? Yes, at registration and welcome with the caveat that we may ask them to leave
Independent, neutral, not happy with Municipal staff being a part of the session	People are not participating - tough part of community engagement	Want to be informed about the process at Ignace site. If Ignace site isn't viable, we have more responsibility to make this work. Need to do something with the waste.	lack of confidence that community can fully understand process - so someone else make decision for them	Those that are vocal sign up for workshops

3 What information do you need to participate meaningfully?

Comments on need to continue to inform and engage the Community

Fireside chats with council: what keeps you awake at night, peer to peer, smaller, e.g.,: could be at the Mildmay pavilion every Wednesday evening	engage in a friendly atmosphere - accept differences and have a party	Guiding principle studies on economic, and cultural and societal impacts need to be well communicated	Could the newspaper be the third party neutral	Everyone should have basic knowldge of how fuel is currently stored
put conversations together with community.	Task group that's representative, objective (e.g., no familial relations), there to collect information and report back out	Concise reports on the facts. Small, step by step.	Bridging the gap between the specialized technical information (ex. geology) and the lay person	Newspaper accepts all articles written - allows all to voice their opinion. If there are people giving incorrect information that the challenge.
engage neighbours; social not shouting	Other opinions should be shown if this is an engagement path	Monthly newsletter from task group or CLC more communication not from council or NWMO, transparent, respectful, and filtered comments	Most of the information sessions are too heavy to comprehend and are very one sided considering there really isn't any guaranteed no damage result down the road	Discuss with neighbours - experts in industry, and not experts.
Town hall meetings could be the way to go; or smaller groups	Communicate information at town hall meetings, where people can talk	Maybe more small business and families need to have both Municipal Nuclear Exploration Staff and NWMO Staff have "one on one" dialogues in citizens homes or workplace environments (covid relaxations removed of course)	nuclear waste. I am willing to listen and explore the possibility, at this point.	Open and honest discussion with community members voicing their opinions.
Need to look at different communities of interest (ie people on Conc 8)	High level short summary with infographic/common language with a link to the long technical reports (economic, geologic, etc.)	The history of the industry	Implications of the project (i.e. what happens if it comes vs. if it doesn't) - such as taxes	Tour of current used fuel storage at the Bruce.
controlled q&a (at community meeting) would be better. send q in sooner	word of mouth to simplify information for the public	deal with communities of interest at a micro-level	All stakeholders in this DGR process have to have scientifically backed and international peer reviewed information to be supported in a "willing outcome process"	feels not properly informed

Comments on engaging many to have broad representation

Representation from multiple sides at the vote so that no question that it wasn't swayed in one direction or another.	What would it look like to include youth/ children	I need to know that I will have a say in the process	Younger people impacted by what they hear from elders	Children will live with this - is there a way they get a say?
Engage Youth / Younger people	Concerns for kids/ grandkids... address other hazards, if not stored properly	everyone should have a voice, but at what point are you qualified to learn/know enough	Aware that my answers influence children - they know opinions of adults	consider impact on children/grandchildren ....they should have a say. They will be ones benefitting from it

Comments on a variety of ways to inform and engage in a clear, simple, and accessible way

This decision cannot be decided by council or municipal employees as there is too much bias.	new information	Would like to see more in the newspaper providing information to the community	Keep information simple	Give people the option of detailed or high level
would like to check the sources of where the information is coming from so that you can do your own research and make your own informed decision.	Up-to-date information on test holes and communicating the process when the information is available	Diagrams	direct mail	Info in mail
Publicized question and answers, not anonymous, all questions asked	Prefer digital information, searchable by keyword (x2)	Executive summaries for those that aren't going to read	Printed information available as an option	Based on facts, not emotions
Prefer digital information, searchable by keyword (x2)	We should have access to as much as possible. The vote can be scheduled after the learning process but it's very important that there is a vote.	Report even if there is nothing to report this eliminates assumptions that they are not meeting or are not withholding	Letters to the editor from new sources	transparent, accountable correction of misinformation
More informal than CLC - very proceduralized. Hard to have conversations, ask, challenge.	Would like broader CLC speakers	Information on the measures that will be put in place to protect waterways and aquifer is important.	newspaper column - if you hear something ask it and get a response (anonymously)	take opportunity to gather socially - open panel discussion
crowd can ask questions to panel; wide cross section of experts.	Protect Our Waterways would like to suggest speakers	help people understand and build confidence - there is fear that people can't understand depth of Project	Having a single complete course (or several versions of variable detail) would help people to get a sense of the entire scope of the project, each of the pieces that would be included (e.g. construction, transportation, packaging, on- and off-site monitoring, etc.), the timeline for each stage of the project, and the full set of worse-case scenarios with estimates of their impacts.	

3 What information do you need to participate meaningfully?

Comments on understanding the Saugeen Ojibway Nation process

very important that we know the Saugeen Ojibway Nation's perspective on the project, as well we need to be assured that the aquifer is protected.	All of this could be for nothing if they say no. Having said that, what information is being provided to them before they make a decision and what process is being used to determine their willingness?	I feel we do need to know the opinions of the SON as they have the power to say no and overrule South Bruce saying yes.	What is the basis for asking SON? Because of the river? because they don't have a presence in the community? Need to explain their traditional territory	I think the Saugeen Ojibway Nation should be heard, why the are against it.
Get consent from SON, lots of effort and turmoil when they haven't decided.	The SON is correct - we need the scientific information to back up the plan.	There is no site that would be acceptable. If SON is not in agreement it cannot proceed.	Saugeen Ojibway Nation perspective	The Saugeen Ojjbway Nation and the local Conservation Societies - need to be involved. We need to hear from them rather than stay in the background.
What local Indigenous communities are doing for their willingness process.	if the SON has final say, they should be first to sign on otherwise South Bruce willingness doesn't matter and all of the community divide could stop.	What is the methodology for SON to determine Willingness	Indigenous voices and science background for DGR	An update of the SON's willingness consultation and how the SON will determine if they are also a willing host
Ojibway Nation perspective	We should know what the SON perspective is as well as federal government thoughts.	How will the SON express their willingness to this proposal?	Want to know more about SON	Scientific data, geological results, SON opinion
Proof of water protection, would be nice to make the decision in collaboration with SON, rather than each community doing what they want with no consideration of the other.	Does the SON need to sign off on this before it can proceed??	The studies need to be complete and good discussion with SON	All parties get a vote including indigenous groups.	How can $3.2 million be given to a community with out the municipality feeling "obligated" to say yes to the to say yes to the DGR? Will our government punish us and the SON if we vote no?

Comments on the community benefits

Conversation about nuclear power and its benefits. Why project needs to happen	see that the broader community will benefit (tax base, spending, etc)... but this is moot if someone next door is losing their farm	let's not kill Project too soon while benefits continuing and decade away from construction	longer presence of NWMO will benefit community	More specifically how will the NWMO provide guidance, advice, and funding to ensure that South Bruce is prosperous for years to come
jobs: who is getting them in the future and who's got them already? Are they jobs for locals?	How will the NWMO support and assist the Municipality of South Bruce if selected to host the DGR?	Great potential to positively impact the community	Community benefit package, what is in it for us	What's in it for us?
jobs: who is getting them in the future and who's got them already? Are they jobs for locals?	Dividends - if nothing in return, then lets see what the "apple" is that residents will be getting	need to see host community agreement	2.Would there be any research and development center created in south bruce and if so how many jobs would it create?	advantages beyond SB - so Council should seek input from neighboring communities (13)
knowing all aspects of what this project will bring to the community, not just the site itself	No one should be disadvantaged in our community - improvements/ opportunities for everyone (with Project)	I would also like assurance that only the minimum acreage (perhaps 250 acres) of farmland would be taken out of production and that the remaining land could be cropped.		

Comments on the importance of this decision within the Community

How similar decisions have been made in other areas.	The other municipalities surrounding South Bruce should be fairly satisfied with the decision too.	DGR is a big deal; not sure I am an expert to make a generational decision - don't think many are expert enough	If it will stay a municipal matter/decision or will go to the Provincial/Federal level afterwards and this process won't even matter.	Addressing that something has to be done
Decision of such a magnitude is still difficult for entire population - are you qualified to decide on behalf of Canadians	Someone has to make a decision - affects all Canadians, but who makes decision	If I am not smart enough to make a decision, I shouldn't be	Also wouldn't want someone external deciding what is good for us (South Bruce)	This "Permanent Solution" is not a situation where a Best Management Practice is acceptable."
Final approval from a regulatory body for the project, not just studies and research.				

Comments on community division and concerns of community participation

Have to make a community decision, but we are so divided... need to come back together to go forward	People are afraid that participating in the workshops will show that they are willing.	That the community comes back together. The best possible willingness process to satisfy the largest percentage of the community.	More of the community need to not be hindered and intimidated about participating in input and questions about the process and relevant studies that contribute to the willingness decision.	truly concerned how it affects business long term - division
some of the hostility will hopefully die down	Lots of division, harassment, don't want to speak up to not cause problems in the community or for their children. To keep the peace, they are busy.	Do not want to destroy this community.	must address dividends for our community	difficult to have intelligent discussion when there is animosity/divison
No positivity; only seeing negativity	Note that this does not feel safe because of involvement of municipality, council, NWMO. Reflection that it is not safe to be investigated by study members, investigation should be done on council members.	the people in it (opposition) are relatives neighbours and friends	At this point, I'm broadly supportive of the DGR and of this ongoing process. I think that, despite the occasionally divisive nature of this public policy debate, good evidence should inform a decision (however controversial) of the democratically elected officials. Thank you for listening to my perspective!	community gathering of some kind would bring people together - no sitting on sides.
Openess	At previous workshops, participation was documented as interested but not as voiced as opposition. So people gave up on attendance. Attendance doesn't mean they are willing to have the project.	willing to listen to critics - if reciprocated	About a year ago, the community wasn't allowed to ask a question and that's why they have spoken up	Comment that opposition well funded and coached - remind all that dialogue starts with us

3 What information do you need to participate meaningfully?

Comments on Referendum

Referendum being completed soon would assist to repair damage that has been done because of this project (emotional divisiveness between community members). There will be a winner and a loser no matter what decision is made.	Residents need commitments to referendum.	Note that having a referendum will save money - no need for further studies, surveys, etc. If referendum determines yes, then surveys, etc. can take place. Note that community is not willing.	Need for 50% of voters to be sure of their vote for this project, thus referendum is only option for determining. The process of registering the vote, residents need to be informed and complete research. If 50% of eligible voters are not willing to vote this is a serious issue and will not be a true reflection.	The only information needed in the Willingness process is a confirmed date for a referendum
Need commitments to a referendum. Not keeping residents stringing along and dragging consultation along.	if you're opposed, you will say so. Should be a vote of opposed, not a vote of in favour	We have enough information to make a decision through a referendum.	with vote of council, what happens if new council are "no DGR"	I do not need more Information for I'm NOT willing to host this experiment on our ancestors, current and future generations lands. REFERENDUM
If project goes ahead it encompasses more than SB, circle goes beyond so should reach out for "yes or no" from communities.	Council Commitment to a referendum	2023 isn't the right year to do it/ decide	It's better if people are not informed, that they don't vote. We need to figure out how to get the people informed.	can council change the date of 2023 w/ NWMO
Meaningful participation require commitment and date of referendum	We understand the rules and deadline, we are ready for the referendum	Yes or no question - all they need to know	who determined 2023 date?	Will they be able to access to the votes from early County Council 2005, 2010, 2012 (discussion regarding the project)
I want to hear the thinking that will inform the opinions of council & the mayor. For instance, does council consider the project economically beneficial? Does the mayor believe the Great Lakes will be irreparably contaminated by the DGR? If a vote were held today, how would council vote?	People will have spoken with a vote of Council	Everybody deserves a voice and a vote	You can put me in the group of people who's vote can be bought."	Has heard from their son that if they had to vote today that they wouldn't because they don't feel like they are informed enough.
How do seasonal residents can captured in a referendum?	Get a fair vote, then determine next steps. No study will determine long term effects as there is no precendence.	This is not a scientific decision, this is a decision that will plague this region of Ontario for the next 100,000 years		

Comments on the Community being informed

After eight years of listening to the NWMO tell us what they think I think we are informed enough to be able to decide whether we want this to go ahead or not.	I am informed.	I have enough information.	engaged, informed	The more time they give us to research, the more we find reasons that this shouldn't happen anywhere.
I am participating by filling this out.... for me to participate meaningfully is to ask for a referendum....let the Community of South Bruce vote.	None I have listened to both sides for years and am ready to make my decision on what is best for my community!	We are saturated	so much available for those that want to learn more - this has been going on a long time	How long do they have to learn more before a willingness decision can be made
don't know what you need to learn	now is an appropriate time to make a decision	Is the 1500 acre piece of land not a demonstration of willingness?	Individually we choose what knowledge we need to make our "informed decision". Being overwhelmed by technical information presented by engineers and scientists who often answer questions with "This is something we are working on" "We are not there yet" leads to the question "what is informed" and maybe importantly "WHO is informed"	I feel that I have gathered and learned info in this regard to make an informed decision.

Comments on concerns with how to determine willingness

Concern with internet access (polls, surveys, consultation) that are online	For the community panel, what would happen if the randomly selected people didn't care enough to take the time to make the decision	could get a good cross section with random calls (to form community panel). Need to indicate interest in participation.	Panel - would be non experts, but still take project seriously	How do you pick the 40 people on a panel? How do they get a feel of the community? How do they interpret the information
Groups of 30-40 together to point out pros/cons	In the past Council has determined that they are not willing hosts, without public meeting	Candidates can put forward points for and against for the project - natural process	A definition of willingness before we continue to do test boreholes etc.	