

**Canadian Nuclear
Safety Commission**

**Commission canadienne de
sûreté nucléaire**

Public hearing

Audience publique

December 9th, 2010

Le 9 décembre 2010

Public Hearing Room
14th floor
280 Slater Street
Ottawa, Ontario

Salle d'audiences publiques
14^e étage
280, rue Slater
Ottawa (Ontario)

Commission Members present

Commissaires présents

Mr. Michael Binder
Dr. Ronald Barriault
Mr. André Harvey
Mr. Alan Graham

M. Michael Binder
M. Ronald Barriault
M. André Harvey
M. Alan Graham

Secretary:

Secrétaire :

Ms. Kelly McGee

Mme Kelly McGee

Counsel:

Conseillère:

Ms. Lisa Thiele

Ms. Lisa Thiele

(ii)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Opening Remarks	1
GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy Canada Inc. (GE-Hitachi): Application for the renewal of the Licences for its Toronto and Peterborough facilities in Ontario	4
10-H17.1B / 10-H17.1C Oral presentation by GE-Hitachi	6
10-H17.B Oral presentation by the CNSC staff	16
10-H17.2 Oral presentation by Tyler Vandermolen	46
10-H17.3 / 10-H17.3A Oral presentation by Zach Ruiter	52
10-H17.4 Oral presentation by Matthew Laing Gibbard	60
10-H17.5 Oral presentation by the Canadian Nuclear Workers' Council And the Communications, Energy & Paperworkers Union, Local-599-0	67
10-H17.6 Oral presentation by Amanda Lickers	72
10-H17.7 Oral presentation by the Council of Canadians, Peterborough-Kawarthas Chapter	79

(iii)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
10-H17.33 Oral presentation by Daniel Adaszynski	92
10-H17.8 Written submission from Leah Simms-Karp	104
10-H17.9 Written submission from Carol Winter	105
10-H17.10 Written submission from Victoria Wood	106
10-H17.11 Written submission from Molly MacDonald	106
10-H17.12 Written submission from Aaron Alexander Campbell	107
10-H17.13 Written submission from Hanah McFarlane	108
10-H17.14 Written submission from Sheila Nabigon-Howlett	108
10-H17.15 Written submission from Tegan Moss	109
10-H17.16 Written submission from Jo Hayward-Haines	109
10-H17.17 Written submission from Darlene Buckingham	110

(iv)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
10-H17.18 Written submission from Evan Brockest	111
10-H17.19 Written submission from Mike Facey	111
10-H17.20 Written submission from Ian Cameron	112
10-H17.21 Written submission from Patricia Morris	112
10-H17.22 Written submission from Susan Dymont	114
10-H17.23 Written submission from Paul Longhurst	115
10-H17.24 Written submission from Shane Hartman	115
10-H17.25 / 10-H17.25A Written submission from Sally Goodwin	115
10-H17.26 Written submission from Stuart Morris	116
10-H17.27 Written submission from Liat Mandel	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
10-H17.28	117
Written submission from Emily Mask	
10-H17.29	117
Written submission from Megan Dochuk	
10-H17.30	118
Written submission from Matthew Beal	
10-H17.31 / 10-H17.31A	118
Written submission from Jane Scott	
10-H17.32 / 10-H17.32A	119
Written submission from Carla Dempsey, Matt Vilder, Julie Cosgrove, Megan Meyer, Cathrine VanHoof, Melanie Buddle, Anna Tennent-Riddell, Caroline Tennent, Julian Tennent-Riddell, Kevin Siena, Erica Martin, Andrew Griffin, Lara Griffin, Peter Harris, Pete Woolidge, Stephanie Melles, Christina Warne	

Ottawa, Ontario

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

--- Upon commencing at 1:19 p.m. /

L'audience débute à 13h19

MS. MCGEE: Bonjour, Mesdames et Messieurs. Bienvenue aux audiences publiques de la Commission canadienne de sûreté nucléaire.

Mon nom est Kelly McGee. Je suis la secrétaire-adjointe de la Commission et j'aimerais aborder certains aspects touchant le déroulement des audiences.

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is about to start the first of two public hearings. We will start this afternoon with Day-2 of the GE-Hitachi hearing on the application for the renewal of the licences for its Toronto and Peterborough facilities in Ontario.

Demain matin nous aurons le Jour 1 de l'audience publique portant sur la demande d'Hydro-Québec pour le renouvellement des permis de la centrale nucléaire de Gentilly-2 et l'installation de gestion des déchets.

During today's business, we have simultaneous translation.

Des appareils de traduction sont disponibles à la réception. La version française est au poste 3 and the English version is on channel 2.

1 Please keep the pace of your speech
2 relatively slow so that the translators have a chance to
3 keep up.

4 Les audiences sont enregistrées et
5 transcrites textuellement; les transcriptions se font dans
6 l'une ou l'autre des langues officielles compte tenu de la
7 langue utilisée par le participant à l'audience publique.

8 I'd also like to note that this proceeding
9 is being video webcasted live and that the proceeding is
10 also archived on the CNSC website for a three-month period
11 after the closure of the hearing.

12 Les transcriptions seront disponibles sur
13 le site web de la Commission dès la semaine prochaine.

14 To make the transcripts as meaningful as
15 possible, we would ask everyone to identify themselves
16 before speaking.

17 As a courtesy to others in the room, please
18 silence your cell phones and other electronic devices.

19 Monsieur Binder, président et premier
20 dirigeant de la CCSN, présidera l'audience publique
21 d'aujourd'hui.

22 Mr. Binder.

23 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Kelly and good
24 afternoon and welcome to the public hearing of the
25 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

1 Mon nom est Michael Binder, je suis le
2 président de la Commission canadienne de sûreté nucléaire.

3 Je souhaite la bienvenue aux gens ici
4 présents and all of you who are coming to us through
5 webcast, welcome.

6 I'd like to begin by introducing the
7 Members of the Commission that are here with us today.
8 Starting on my right with Dr. Ronald Barriault; my left
9 Mr. Alan Graham and M. André Harvey.

10 You've heard from Kelly McGee, the
11 Assistant-Secretary of the Commission, and we also have
12 Ms. Lisa Thiele, General Counsel to the Commission, with
13 us here today.

14 So before adopting the agenda, please note
15 that 12 supplementary Commission Member Documents (CMD)
16 were added to the agenda after publication on November 10,
17 as listed in the updated agenda.

18 So let's now call for the adoption of the
19 agenda.

20 Do I have concurrence?

21 For the record, the agenda is adopted.

22

23 **10-H20 / 10-H20.A / 10-H20.B / 10-H20.C**

24 **Adoption of Agenda**

25

1 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So let's proceed to the GE-
2 Hitachi application.

3 Kelly?
4

5 **GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy**
6 **Canada Inc. (GE-Hitachi):**
7 **Application for the renewal of the**
8 **Licences for its Toronto and**
9 **Peterborough facilities in Ontario**
10

11 **MS. MCGEE:** This is Day-Two of the public
12 hearing on GE-Hitachi's application.

13 The first day of the public hearing on this
14 application was held on September 30th, 2010.

15 The first Notice of Public Hearing 2010-H-
16 08 was published on July 7th, 2010. Revisions to the
17 notice were posted on the CNSC website to announce changes
18 in the dates of the hearing.

19 The public was invited to participate
20 either by oral presentation or written submission.
21 November 8th, 2010 was the deadline set for filing by
22 intervenors.

23 The Commission received 48 requests for
24 intervention. Four requests were received shortly after
25 the deadline and were accepted on the agenda.

1 Seventeen (17) other requests were received
2 last week, significantly after the deadline. Taking into
3 consideration the level of public interest in this matter,
4 together with the length of the requested licence, a panel
5 of the Commission has taken the exceptional decision to
6 accept these late submissions as written interventions and
7 has grouped them together under Commission Member
8 Documents (or CMDs) 10-H17.32 and 17-H32A.

9 The Commission strongly urges all parties
10 to file their submissions within the deadlines set in the
11 public notice of hearings, in compliance with the CNSC
12 Rules of Procedure.

13 After hearing from GE-Hitachi and CNSC
14 staff on their Commission Member Documents, the focus for
15 today will be on the submissions from the intervenors.
16 The oral interventions are scheduled based on the
17 chronological order of receipt.

18 Presentations were made on Day 1 by the
19 applicant, GE-Hitachi Nuclear Energy Canada Inc., under
20 CMDs 10-H17.1 and 10-H17.1A and by Commission staff under
21 CMDs 10-H17 and 10-H17.A.

22 December 1st, 2010 was the deadline for
23 filing of supplementary information and I note that
24 supplementary information has been filed by CNSC staff,
25 GE-Hitachi and intervenors.

1 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, let's jump right into
2 the presentation from GE-Hitachi, as outlined in CMD 10-
3 H17.1B and 17.1C.

4 I understand that Mr. Peter Mason will make
5 the presentation. Please proceed, the floor is yours.

6
7 **10-H17.1B / 10-H17.1C**

8 **Oral presentation by**

9 **GE-Hitachi**

10
11 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason,
12 President and CEO of GE-Hitachi Nuclear Energy Canada Inc.

13 Good afternoon, Mr. President, Members of
14 the Commission and members of the public.

15 Our presentation today, we would like to
16 first of all review the updates from the first day and
17 then in light of all of the interest shown since that day
18 we would like to present an analysis of the submissions
19 from intervenors and make some comment to that.

20 We'd also like to review the performance
21 during the licence period and then actually conclude with
22 a summary of that.

23 So if we turn to a review from Day 1 and
24 the scope of our request. The licence is requested for a
25 10-year period and GE-Hitachi has based that on -- because

1 we have demonstrated good performance in all safety
2 control areas and operated the facilities safely for over
3 50 years with zero health impact to the public and
4 demonstrating continuous improvements in all aspects of
5 safety, environmental protection and hence the public.

6 Our licence request, there are no changes
7 requested to the licence activity, i.e. no changes to fuel
8 production levels and no new public or environmental
9 impacts.

10 The additional information that was
11 requested by the Commission was submitted on November the
12 8th and that was with regarding to additional information
13 on our water treatment processes; an update on this year's
14 worker injury performance and also security information
15 which was submitted confidentially.

16 If we turn to -- look at the comments that
17 we have received since the September 30th meeting and
18 certainly some of the comments that we received in a
19 public meeting that we held on November 30th, we have
20 produced a Pareto chart which you can see here, where we
21 have analyzed all of the different comments, many of which
22 were repetitive.

23 The sources of the comments were from eight
24 Peterborough local residents, 12 Trent University students
25 and six non-residents. And I would point out that this

1 was information up to December 1st, when we had to --
2 which was the deadline for our submission.

3 There are some comments that we would like
4 to make because we have witnessed a fair amount of
5 misinformation in the public domain.

6 First of all, in no facility do we enrich
7 uranium. For the benefit of the public, Canada is a
8 signatory of the *Non-Proliferation Treaty* and forbids --
9 strictly forbids the enrichment of uranium anywhere in
10 Canada and so we do not enrich uranium in our facility.

11 We do not and will not process enriched
12 uranium in our facility.

13 The licence amendment which has attracted
14 the attention of so many people is for the assembly of low
15 enriched uranium fuel bundles.

16 I would say that we had what was an
17 extremely good meeting on November the 30th. We were
18 cognisant of some of the emotions behind some of the
19 comments and a sincere request from local residents for
20 more information, both on our nuclear facilities, but also
21 on the nuclear power in general and at that meeting we
22 committed to provide that.

23 And we will -- in the coming year we will
24 hold some seminars in the school on different topics that
25 would be of interest to the public. Because clearly there

1 is an appetite, a desire for more information about the
2 nuclear industry and what we're doing.

3 It also became clear -- and you can see
4 from the Pareto chart, that the real issue was around the
5 concern over the assembly of low enriched uranium bundles.
6 And if we think of what's happening in the nuclear
7 industry today, I think it fair to say that we do not see
8 in the foreseeable future, a demand at all for low
9 enriched uranium fuel bundles for the ACR-1000 reactor.

10 And therefore, for our residents we commit
11 to -- that should be ever in the future be required to
12 make low enriched uranium fuel bundles, we would repeat a
13 full public consultation before making any decision to
14 move forward with any type of production for low enriched
15 -- the assembly of low enriched uranium bundles.

16 Turning now to our safety performance, the
17 details on our safety control programs were given in our
18 licence application. Our detailed performance from Day-1
19 was in the written submission. And the overall
20 performance summary was given during our licence period
21 hearing in Day-1.

22 In this presentation I would like to repeat
23 the summary of environmental performance in particular for
24 those who did not attend on Day-1.

25 First of all, at the Peterborough facility

1 we do use a small amount of beryllium, approximately 27
2 kilograms a year. It's in a very closely controlled
3 environment.

4 The chart shows the emissions that are
5 measured in our stack, it's 100 percent monitoring all the
6 time, and the latest Ministry of Environment environmental
7 limit for the content of beryllium in the emission.

8 You can see that the limit is .03
9 micrograms per metre cubed of air, or you could say 30
10 billionths of a gram per metre cubed. And measurements in
11 the stack are .2 of a billionth of a gram per metre cubed,
12 which is less than .7 percent of the limit.

13 And in short, in terms of health impact, it
14 would be safe to breathe the air coming from our stack.

15 If we turn our attention to uranium air
16 emissions, I would first like to point out that in
17 Peterborough we deal with uranium oxide in the form of
18 ceramic pellets.

19 These are extremely hard centred ceramic
20 pellets with a very, very low propensity for the creation
21 of dust. And that's reflected in our results.

22 You'll recall in Day-1 we talked about the
23 limits. And in consultation with the CNSC, we have in
24 fact proposed a much lower limit than the regulatory
25 limit, such that the exposure to the public can be

1 regarded as a trivial dose, i.e. less than 50
2 microsieverts per year.

3 If we look at the chart, with that proposed
4 limit, it would be 550 grams per year. Our measured
5 release to the air is in the order of 6 milligrams per
6 year and in terms of percentage of the new limit, is .001
7 percent, and the new limit is 5 percent of the actual
8 regulatory limit.

9 So you can see that there is practically
10 zero impact to the environment or the public around -- in
11 terms of uranium.

12 Turning to Toronto, as far as our liquid
13 discharge to the sanitary sewer, we've also imposed a
14 similar limit to ourselves equivalent to a 50-microsievert
15 exposure, which is 5 percent of the actually -- the
16 regulated limit.

17 And you can see in the chart on the left-
18 hand side, that in 2009 there was a release to the sewer,
19 a total of 2 kilograms compared to even this reduced limit
20 of 9,000 kilograms.

21 I would like to comment on this chart
22 because it's a story of our continuous improvement to
23 improve our facilities. You can see that there is a
24 gradual increase into 2008 in terms of the discharge,
25 beginning to decrease in 2009.

1 And I'm pleased to report to the Commission
2 that our estimate for the end of this year will be less
3 than .6 of a kilogram.

4 The story behind that is one of, again,
5 continuous improvement and that through the period of 2007
6 and 2008 we introduced a program where we scrubbed all of
7 the component parts that we use in manufacturing which
8 perhaps attract uranium dust.

9 That washing increased, in fact, the output
10 that was trapped in our water processing plant but then we
11 implemented a six sigma project to significantly improve
12 our water treatment facility and that was fully
13 implemented in January of this year.

14 And so you can see a significant
15 improvement in terms of the discharge which even though
16 we're well below the regulatory limit, we continue to
17 strive to use modern technology to strive towards a zero
18 emission level.

19 Turning our attention to the air emissions
20 at the Toronto facility, again using the principle of
21 trivial dose level of 50 microsieverts or 5 percent of the
22 regulatory limit, it's equivalent to 760 grams.

23 Our air release in 2009 was measured at
24 12.7 grams and you can see that that is 1.7 percent --
25 less than 1.7 percent of the new limit and .09 percent of

1 the regulatory limit.

2 If we just turn to the Peterborough
3 community, as we pointed out in Day-1, the GE industrial
4 site was established in 1891 by Thomas Edison and has been
5 a support to the community in terms of the largest single
6 employer for over 120 years and a long-term supporter of
7 some of the institutions in the Peterborough society.

8 And I think the -- it's fair to say that
9 the community has prospered and grown around that
10 industrial site over the last 120 years.

11 The next slide -- and we put this in
12 because some of the concerns that were raised in our
13 public meeting was that there was concern that we had not
14 adequately notified the public of our application for the
15 licence amendment, and we felt it was necessary to review
16 the process that we went through.

17 The public open house, which we had great
18 attendance, well over 120 people, was in May the 15th of
19 2007. Prior to the meeting it was advertised on the local
20 radio and also in the local press. We also -- as part of
21 that process, we arranged with yourselves for a tour of
22 our facility with some of the key leaders in the
23 community, including the mayor, council members of that
24 time, the then the principal of the Prince of Wales School
25 and other community leaders.

1 We sent a newsletter to 650 neighbours of
2 our facility notifying them of the meeting and what we
3 were doing, and we also put out a website providing
4 information and soliciting input on matters of interest as
5 far as the -- or concern as far as the environment.

6 In 2008, we sent out a newsletter by hand
7 to 3,600 of our local residents and we also sent out to
8 relevant First Nations. We received 14 responses of the
9 3,600 and we replied to each individual of those 14
10 responses.

11 The other meetings in 2008 were with the
12 Peterborough Emergency Preparedness Department, the fire
13 department, the Ontario Ministry of Environment.

14 We also had the -- met with the principal
15 and in particular the education board's EHS specialist,
16 and we also met with the Prince of Wales School, both the
17 parents and teachers, to tell them what we were doing and
18 what it was all about.

19 In short, we followed all of the guidelines
20 for public consultation. Indeed, we went above and beyond
21 what was expected or required. We collected all of the
22 concerns and we responded to each individual person.

23 Our public information is an ongoing thing
24 as part of our licence and as far as our public hearing on
25 September the 30th we placed notices in the local

1 newspapers, we did notify stakeholders, including
2 municipal, provincial and federal representatives.

3 We did have a councillor saying that he
4 wasn't notified but I would say that there has been a
5 recent election in Peterborough and that could have been
6 before he took his place.

7 And then we had the meeting that I referred
8 to earlier at the Prince of Wales School and you can see
9 the list of other notices. But basically, we conducted
10 open communication in terms of our licence and our
11 performance.

12 In summary, the past and current safety
13 programs are both effective and robust, resulting, as you
14 have seen, in a long history of safe and compliant
15 operation of the GE-Hitachi facility, over 55 years; no
16 environmental issues or impacts to the environment or the
17 public throughout the licence period or indeed our 55
18 years of operation, and zero impact to the public health.

19 The record shows that we have continued to
20 strive to be best in class in our industry by exploiting
21 technology and international best practices to be a world-
22 class nuclear facility in terms of safety, performance and
23 environmental impact.

24 Thank you.

25 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

1 Before opening the floor for questioning,
2 I'd like to hear from CNSC and I understand Mr. Elder, you
3 have a presentation to make.

4 Go ahead, please.

5
6 **10-H.17B**

7 **Oral presentation by**

8 **CNSC staff**

9
10 **MR. ELDER:** Good afternoon, Mr. President
11 and Members of the Commission. My name is Peter Elder.
12 I'm the Director General, the Directorate of Nuclear Cycle
13 and Facilities Regulation.

14 With me today are Mr. B.R. Ravishankar,
15 Director of the Processing and Research Facilities
16 Division, and Mr. Gerald Crawford, Project Officer for GE-
17 Hitachi Nuclear Energy Canada's licensed facility.

18 In addition, we have members of our
19 licensing and compliance team present who will be
20 available to answer questions.

21 Please note for the rest of this
22 presentation we will refer to the licensee as GE-HC.

23 GE-HC is part of the larger international
24 nuclear services company which is in turn part of the
25 worldwide General Electric Group of companies.

1 Canadian subsidiaries of General Electric
2 Group have been making nuclear fuel pellets and fuel
3 bundles at the two sites of Peterborough and -- Toronto
4 and Peterborough since 1965.

5 GE-HC, as part of this well-established
6 organization, is responsible for producing CANDU reactor
7 fuel used in Canadian nuclear power plants.

8 The safety and management processes used to
9 manufacture the fuel are also well established and, in
10 this case, GE draws on its corporate practices.

11 This licence renewal has been requested by
12 GE-HC to allow them to continue to produce nuclear pellets
13 in Toronto and assemble nuclear uranium fuel bundles in
14 Peterborough.

15 It should be noted that GE-HC has not
16 requested any change to the new licence conditions for the
17 potential use of low enriched uranium at Peterborough.

18 In January 2010, the Commission amended the
19 current licence to allow GE-HC to assemble fuel bundles
20 with up to five percent enriched uranium under certain
21 conditions.

22 Note that GE-HC has not yet fulfilled those
23 conditions and is currently not allowed to possess any
24 enriched uranium in the facility and that a future
25 decision by the Commission will be required before full

1 production of LEU bundles can start.

2 During this presentation, CNSC staff will
3 provide the Commission with an overview of GE-HC's licence
4 renewal requests, noting that our Day-1 CMD H10-17
5 contains a comprehensive assessment of the application.

6 This presentation will provide a summary of
7 that staff review, information requested by the Commission
8 at the Day-1 hearing, clarification on some issues raised
9 by the written interventions, and staff's conclusions and
10 recommendations to the Commission.

11 I will now pass the presentation over to
12 Mr. Ravishankar.

13 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** Good afternoon, Mr.
14 President, Members of the Commission.

15 At the hearing Day-1, CNSC staff presented
16 CMD 10-H17 which described the licensee's performance in
17 the 14 safety and control areas referred to as SCAs.

18 Twelve (12) SCAs were considered to be
19 satisfactory and two others, conventional health and
20 safety and environmental protection, were considered to be
21 fully satisfactory.

22 The hearing Day-1 CMD concluded that GE-HC
23 was qualified, had adequate measures in place to protect
24 health, safety and the environment, and recommended
25 renewing the facility licence for 10 years.

1 At the hearing Day-1, the Commission
2 Members requested some clarification on how the CNSC
3 regulates this licensee's releases to the environment, the
4 difference between a licence limit and an action level,
5 the workforce dose limits for whole body, skin and hands,
6 and the dates of the next review of the preliminary
7 decommissioning plans.

8 CNSC staff has provided this clarification
9 in CMD 10-H17.B. The following slides will summarize this
10 information but I would like to note that none of this
11 supplemental information changes the CNSC staff assessment
12 that GE-HC has operated the facility safely and has
13 necessary programs in place to continue the safe operation
14 in the future.

15 CNSC regulates environmental releases
16 through a combination of layered protection comprised of
17 three elements.

18 First, licence limits are normally based on
19 federal regulations. These provide overall protection of
20 the public and the environment and do not normally change
21 during the licence period.

22 Second, the licensee must establish action
23 levels based on operational performance. They are an
24 early warning mechanism of a possible loss of control. If
25 an action level is exceeded, the licensee must notify CNSC

1 staff within 24 hours and provide a written investigation
2 report to CNSC staff within 21 days.

3 Action levels are much lower than licence
4 limits. If they have been effectively set, CNSC staff
5 would only expect a small number of action level
6 exceedances during a licence period and no exceedance of
7 the licensed limit.

8 Third, the licensee must apply the ALARA
9 principle. ALARA stands for "as low as reasonably
10 achievable". This is the nuclear equivalent of continuous
11 improvement.

12 The licensee is expected to continuously
13 explore ways of reducing emissions so that they are as low
14 as practicable.

15 The use of these three elements at the GE-
16 HC facilities has led to very well controlled and
17 monitored environmental releases so that there is no
18 measurable impact on the public.

19 The current limits for releases to the
20 environment are based on ensuring that any radiation dose
21 to the public will not exceed the CNSC legal limit of 1
22 millisievert per year. This is called the derived release
23 limit or DRL.

24 The proposed new licence has release limits
25 based on 5 percent of the DRL. This is 20 times lower

1 than the previous limit and closer to the actual
2 performance at both the Toronto and Peterborough
3 facilities.

4 The next part of this presentation will be
5 given by Mr. Crawford who will give more details about
6 these releases.

7 **MR. CRAWFORD:** Good afternoon, Mr.
8 President and Members of the Commission.

9 This slide shows the current uranium
10 release limits in red to air for both Toronto and
11 Peterborough. It also shows the proposed release limits
12 in blue and more importantly, it gives the actual annual
13 dose from the releases of uranium to the most exposed
14 members of the public who live near these facilities.

15 Note that the limits in the slide are in
16 millisieverts per year and in the licence in grams of
17 uranium since it's the weight of uranium that GEH-C
18 actually measures during its operations.

19 As mentioned during the Day One Hearing,
20 the dose to the public from these releases to the
21 environment cannot be directly measured so these are --
22 the numbers you see on the slide are actually calculated.
23 This is 0.009 millisieverts from 13 grams of uranium
24 released to the Toronto facility per year and 0.000006
25 millisieverts from 0.7 grams of uranium from the

1 Peterborough facility.

2 These calculated dose levels are too low to
3 be -- to low to be measured and when compared to the 3
4 millisieverts per year background dose to the Canadian
5 public are extremely low.

6 Similarly, in Slide 8, the release of
7 uranium to the -- shows the release of uranium to the
8 sewer at Toronto and Peterborough.

9 This is -- and again, at the bottom of the
10 slide, you see these very low numbers for Toronto and
11 Peterborough. This is 0.0001 millisieverts from 2
12 kilograms of uranium released from the Toronto facility
13 and .07 millisieverts from .001 kilograms of uranium
14 released per year from the Peterborough facility.

15 Again, these calculated doses are too low
16 to be actually measured in the environment and when
17 compared to this -- the 3 millisieverts of background dose
18 to the public as a whole, they are extremely low.

19 At the Day One Hearing, the Commission
20 asked for clarification on the whole body, the skin, and
21 the hand doses to the workforce. The following three
22 slides summarized the radiation protection limits that
23 GEH-C described in Tables 3 and 4 of the Day Two CMD 10-
24 H17.B. These doses are well below the regulatory limits.

25 This slide shows the 50 millisievert

1 regulatory limit for whole body dose and the action levels
2 of 15 millisieverts per year for Toronto and 12
3 millisieverts per year for Peterborough.

4 The actual dose received by the workforce
5 averaged over the current licensing period is 3.7
6 millisieverts per year at Toronto and 1.8 millisieverts
7 per year at Peterborough. These are well below the 50
8 millisievert limit for the workforce.

9 Note that the action levels for the two
10 facilities are different because they are based on
11 operational performance.

12 In the CMD 10-H17.B, staff explained that
13 the radiation dose to the hands of the workers is
14 potentially high. This is because the hands-on
15 inspections performed on pellets and fuel bundles at both
16 Toronto and Peterborough facilities.

17 Slide 11 shows the regulatory limits for
18 the radiation dose to workers' hands and the current
19 action levels and the hand dose to the workforce averaged
20 over the current licensing period. These doses to hands
21 are well below the regulatory limit of 500 millisieverts
22 per year.

23 Slide 12 shows the skin dose to the
24 workforce. Again, the dose limit here is 500
25 millisieverts per year. The average dose to the workers

1 over the current licence period is less than 5 percent of
2 the limit at Toronto and less than 1 percent of the limit
3 at Peterborough.

4 These slides and the previous two slides
5 show that the average doses to the work force are well
6 below the safe working limits.

7 Again, as with the other dose action levels
8 and the action levels for the two facilities are different
9 because of the nature of the operations are different.

10 At the Day One -- at the Day One, the
11 Commission asked for clarification on the next update of
12 the financial guarantee for commissioning -- for
13 decommissioning. GE-HC currently has a preliminary
14 decommissioning plan for each facility and a financial
15 guarantee that covers both facilities.

16 The current preliminary decommissioning
17 plans consist of several documents produced over the
18 previous 10 years and remain valid. GE-HC has agreed to
19 completely revise and consolidate these preliminary
20 decommissioning plans for both facilities in 2011 and
21 bring to the Commission any revised financial guarantee
22 for approval by the Commission. In the meanwhile, the
23 current financial guarantee remains in place and is
24 acceptable.

25 The Hearing Day One CMD 10-H17 and the

1 licence condition handbook contain the requirements to
2 revise the preliminary decommissioning plan in 2011.

3 At the Day One Hearing, CNSC staff reported
4 there had been no lost-time accidents at the Peterborough
5 facility during the current licensing period.

6 Unfortunately, following the Day One, there was a lost-
7 time accident at Peterborough; however, this did not
8 involve any nuclear material.

9 GE-HC have completed their investigation
10 and have provided a written report to CNSC staff on this
11 event. The Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
12 accident investigation is still ongoing for this event.
13 This incident is the only lost-time accident that has
14 occurred in the current licence period and CNSC staff
15 still considers that the conventional Health and Safety
16 Program to be fully satisfactory.

17 I would now like to update the Commission
18 on Aboriginal consultations since Day One. As noted at
19 Day One, all known Aboriginal groups in Toronto and
20 Peterborough area were contacted. Following this, some
21 requests of further information were received from the
22 Aboriginal community. This was provided by CNSC staff and
23 consequently, there have been no requests to intervene --
24 for intervenor status from the Aboriginal community.

25 This concludes the updates from Day One and

1 I would now like to turn to the public interventions.

2 CNSC staff have reviewed the written
3 interventions and note the most -- that most concern about
4 the continuation of fuel bundle fabrication in
5 Peterborough is in Peterborough.

6 The Peterborough community concerns can be
7 grouped into seven areas: Environmental releases and
8 their effects, limited public involvement in the EA
9 process and for low enriched uranium, enriched uranium
10 fuel bundling fabrication at Peterborough or in
11 Peterborough, flood control, fuel bundle fabrication in
12 Peterborough, decommissioning, and low property values.

13 The following four slides provide some
14 additional information on the issues raised.

15 The written interventions have raised
16 concerns about releases of uranium, beryllium, PCBs and
17 BPAs from the fabrication of fuel bundles in Peterborough.

18 Section 3.9 of the Day One CMD 10-H17,
19 Section 2.1 of the Hearing Day Two CMD 10-H17.B, and
20 Slides 7 and 8 of this presentation address the issue of
21 releases of uranium into the Peterborough environment.

22 The release of 1 gram of uranium to sewer
23 and 70 milligrams uranium to air are too small to be
24 measured in the environment; therefore, GE controls and
25 measures the release at the stack and the sewer release

1 points.

2 The licence requires GE-HC to continue with
3 these controls so that the releases to the environment
4 remain below the background levels in Ontario.

5 The release of beryllium to the environment
6 has been assessed in 2005 by the Ontario Ministry of the
7 Environment.

8 This study concluded that beryllium
9 emissions, if they occur or are occurring at the
10 Peterborough facility, are too small to measure in the
11 soil and foliage around the facility.

12 One of the sample locations chosen for this
13 study was in front of the Prince of Wales School.

14 CNSC staff considered these releases of
15 uranium and beryllium to the environment to be well
16 controlled.

17 Polychlorinated biphenyl's and biphenol A
18 are not used and never have been used in the fabrication
19 of nuclear fuel bundles. If they are present in the
20 environment they must have come from some other industrial
21 activity in the Peterborough area.

22 As mentioned by Mr. Elder, in January 2010
23 following a public hearing, the Commission granted a
24 licence amendment to allow GE to fabricate low-enriched
25 uranium fuel bundles at the Peterborough facility.

1 A number of intervenors raised a concern
2 that there was insufficient public consultation during the
3 environmental assessment carried out for this project.
4 The CNSC provided four opportunities for public
5 consultation during this environmental assessment; two
6 were in 2008, the first during the preparation of the EA
7 Guidelines and the second for the approval of the EA
8 Guidelines at a public hearing of the Commission.

9 Then in 2009 the EA Screening Report was
10 issued for public comment and finally in 2010 the
11 Screening Report was presented at a public hearing of the
12 Commission.

13 The CNSC has followed the public
14 consultation requirements of the *Canadian Environmental*
15 *Assessment Act* and the public consultation procedures of
16 the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission during the
17 licensing process.

18 The environmental assessment concluded that
19 the fabrication of low-enriched uranium fuel bundles would
20 not increase the releases from the facility.

21 The licence was amended to contain a series
22 of conditions that must be met to allow GE to process
23 enriched uranium.

24 The proposed new licence has the same
25 nuclear criticality safety program conditions as the

1 existing licence. These are described in Part IV, Section
2 16.2 to Section 16.4 of the proposed new licence.

3 These conditions are based on international
4 standards that have been shown to provide safe operation
5 for the handling of enriched uranium.

6 Whilst the environmental assessment
7 concluded that there will be no increase in release if
8 enriched uranium fuel bundles are produced at
9 Peterborough, a follow-up program has been included in the
10 proposed licence. This is in Part VI, Section 10.5 of the
11 proposed licence. This condition requires the annual
12 compliance report containing details of releases will be
13 publicly available for three years following the start of
14 any low-enriched uranium fuel bundle fabrication.

15 The purpose of this is to publicly confirm
16 that there is no increase in releases.

17 As discussed in January, full production of
18 LEU bundles requires the Commission to declare the
19 Peterborough facility a nuclear installation under the
20 *Nuclear Liability Act*, so another decision by the
21 Commission will be required before GE-HC can proceed with
22 full production.

23 The written intervenors also raised
24 concerns about the following issues: Flood control, the
25 continuing fuel bundle fabrication, decommissioning, and

1 low property values.

2 The City of Peterborough has, during the
3 current licence period, improved the flood water
4 management system in and around the town to reduce the
5 risk of future flooding.

6 GE-HC has increased the floor height of its
7 fuel storage building as an additional flood protection
8 and has built fixed berms in the fuel bundle fabrication
9 area that will keep flood water away from these areas.

10 It should be noted that if fuel bundles are
11 completely submerged in flood water for a long period of
12 time no uranium will be released. This is because fuel
13 bundles are designed to be immersed in extremely hot water
14 inside a reactor or a period of years.

15 The fabrication of fuel bundles at this
16 facility began around 1965 and has continued ever since.
17 There has been a licence condition limiting the amount of
18 fuel that can be fabricated in any month in the current
19 and the proposed licence.

20 The licensee has not asked for any increase
21 in the total amount of fuel bundles it can fabricate in
22 any month.

23 Slide 13 gave details of the requirements
24 to have a preliminary decommissioning plan and financial
25 guarantee to cover the cost of decommissioning. This is a

1 requirement of all Class 1 facilities licensed under the
2 *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*.

3 An up to date decommissioning plan is
4 required for these facilities as a licence condition, and
5 GE-HC has an acceptable plan and a financial guarantee in
6 place.

7 Finally, the property values in
8 Peterborough is a local community issue but it's not
9 something that can be addressed in the *Nuclear Safety and*
10 *Control Act*.

11 This concludes the technical part of the
12 staff presentation and I will now pass the presentation
13 back to Mr. Elder.

14 **MR. ELDER:** CNSC staff have reviewed the
15 request for the licence renewal for GE-HC's facilities.
16 Staff have assessed the operating performance during the
17 current period and concluded that GE-HC is qualified to
18 continue to operate both facilities.

19 The current operations meet the CNSC
20 requirements for a Class 1 nuclear facility and the
21 resulting releases from these facilities have no
22 measurable impact on environment, nor the public who live
23 around these facilities. The public can be assured that
24 the security at these facilities meets all CNSC
25 requirements.

1 All the CNSC requirements are in place to
2 produce low-enriched fuel arrangement except for the --
3 sorry -- in turning to the low-enriched uranium fuel we
4 note, as beginning, that there are conditions in the
5 licence that have to be met before this can proceed, and
6 obviously one of the key ones is the approval of the
7 nuclear criticality safety program, which has not yet been
8 received.

9 Furthermore, full production of this type
10 of bundle requires a decision by the Commission under the
11 *Nuclear Liability Act*. CNSC staff recommend that that
12 decision be done at a public hearing.

13 The licence renewal application requested a
14 10-year licence and CNSC staff are supporting this request
15 on the basis of the satisfactory performance and the
16 consistent operation of the two facilities over several
17 decades.

18 In addition, CNSC staff has concluded the
19 management and operating programs are basically the same
20 and therefore support the request to consolidate the two
21 facilities under one licence.

22 CNSC staff continue to recommend that GE-HC
23 should come back to the Commission and present a
24 performance report to the Commission at about the mid-term
25 point of the proposed new licence period.

1 This concludes our presentation. CNSC
2 staff are now available to answer any questions from the
3 Commission.

4 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, thank you.

5 I'd like to start the question period here
6 with Mr. Graham.

7 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 First of all, in Day One I had questions
9 with regard to flood and water treatment and so on and
10 those have been answered and I thank you.

11 Also, I had concerns with regard to
12 security and some certain security matters which I believe
13 have been addressed so that we don't have to go into the
14 *in camera* as far as I'm concerned and the decommissioning
15 also has been addressed.

16 To get probably to the lightning rod in
17 this whole presentation is the operation of your facility
18 to produce LEU.

19 And I appreciate your comments that you
20 said that the assembly of LEU in bundles -- assembling of
21 LEU over the -- in the near -- in the not -- in the near
22 future is not envisaged.

23 I guess my first question to you, Mr.
24 Mason, is when would you see, at the earliest, that you
25 would need to have that permission? You have it now with

1 conditions, but when would you need to use that?

2 **MR. MASON:** Well, as I said earlier that --
3 sorry, for the record, Peter Mason.

4 As I said earlier, I think it's -- we don't
5 see a demand in the foreseeable future. I think the -- we
6 initially applied for the amendment to the licence to
7 assemble low enriched uranium fuel as part of development
8 program for the fuel for the AECL advanced CANDU reactor.

9 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** M'hm.

10 **MR. MASON:** I certainly don't see a demand
11 for that fuel any time soon, if ever. So all I can say is
12 that we have no plans for the foreseeable future and if
13 there was an announcement for building an advanced CANDU
14 reactor at some time in the future; perhaps, in five, ten
15 years time; there would be more than adequate time then
16 for us to address that.

17 But as I say, I don't think anyone sees
18 that on the cards.

19 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Well, that was leading in
20 my next question. Even if there was an announcement soon,
21 it would still be five or ten years before you would need
22 to provide that fuel.

23 My question then is to AECL staff. Is --
24 is there a need or can this be the 16-2 to 16-5, I think
25 it is, in the licence; could that be removed now to

1 address the concerns of some of the intervenors on the
2 fact that there has been a commitment today on the record
3 by Mr. Mason that within the next year there's going to be
4 considerable consultation with people and so on,
5 substantiating the need for LEU in the future, but not in
6 the foreseeable future? Could that not be removed from
7 the licence at this time and that we proceed with the
8 licence without the part of using LEU or processing LEU?

9 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for CNSC staff.

10 Yes, what we propose is a -- you know, it's
11 a proposed licence. It's you, the Commission, that
12 actually issues the final licence ---

13 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** M'hm.

14 **MR. ELDER:** --- and those conditions could
15 be removed.

16 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** I realize that, but what I
17 guess I'm getting from you is is that -- would that -- and
18 I guess maybe I should go to Mr. Mason first. Does that
19 cause any -- without that -- which would solve a lot of
20 the problems here today -- without that does that encumber
21 your planning down the road -- your major planning in the
22 future for 5-10 years, 15 years? Or can this wait until
23 it's resolved and then come back to the Commission?

24 **MR. MASON:** That would not cause a problem
25 to running our existing operations. And as I said, we see

1 no need for it in the foreseeable future. So to answer
2 your question, I don't think it would cause us a problem.

3 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Just to be clear, we're
4 already talking about academic exercise here because staff
5 already recommending there will be a full public hearing.

6 So the day -- if whenever you need to get
7 back into this, you'll have to go through full public
8 hearing anyhow so I don't see the papers of this close and
9 we will take all of this under advisement when we issue
10 the new licence. Thank you.

11 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** That's -- I just want to
12 get it on the record that in the Commission making a
13 decision, that we didn't overlook anything.

14 And I guess what I need from Mr. Elder and
15 from you, Mr. Mason, is; are we overlooking something in
16 being too simplistic about this? And if we are, now is
17 the time to tell us. If not, we will deliberate on that.

18 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for the record.

19 As you may remember from January, there was
20 two phases to the approval. One was to allow GE to pre-
21 test a very small amount ---

22 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes.

23 **MR. ELDER:** --- of low enriched uranium to
24 make a few test bundles. That did not require a change
25 under the *Nuclear Liability Act*. So I can just tell you

1 that would be -- if you take it out, they would lose that
2 ability as well. It's up to GE-HC to tell -- you know, to
3 comment on whether they need that ability to make -- have
4 very small amounts or not.

5 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Okay.

6 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason.

7 Well, I repeat again, we see no
8 requirements in the foreseeable future. To me it's a --
9 it's not a complex issue because we will have to go
10 through, as you pointed out, Mr. President, that we will
11 have to go through a full public hearing. And there is
12 also the Commission's decision in terms of making us a
13 nuclear facility to go into production.

14 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you very much.

15 One other question I have which I didn't
16 cover in Day 1 and I apologize, but I'd like to cover
17 today and that is fire protection in both Toronto and
18 Peterborough with regard to training; local fire
19 departments being able to address the needs of your
20 facilities if there are -- if there ever happen to be
21 fires. And also are you meeting all the national codes in
22 an up-to-date manner?

23 So I'll ask you and then I'll ask CNSC to
24 comment.

25 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.

1 The first question; with regards to
2 training, we do train the fire fighters at least every two
3 years. We bring a cross section of the entire district
4 into our plant. We give them a tour. We give them a
5 presentation on the particular hazards of the facility and
6 we also review the emergency response plan with them.

7 On the issue of meeting codes, we have two
8 aspects to our fire safety program that include a third
9 party assessment. One is the annual review -- third party
10 review that has to be done at both sites. And secondly is
11 a requirement to do a fire hazard analysis and that was
12 completed this year for all our facilities.

13 **MR. CRAWFORD:** For the record, Gerald
14 Crawford.

15 The CNSC carried out an inspection last
16 year at both facilities by our fire specialists and they -
17 - the results of that -- the fire specialists were very
18 happy, I guess, as happy as a fire specialist can be ---

19 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Why don't you say
20 "satisfied"?

21 **MR. CRAWFORD:** Satisfied, yes, on the
22 operational performance of both facilities and their fire
23 equipment and installed sprinkler systems and all the
24 other fire prevention and mitigation controls. They -- at
25 that time, the fire hazard analysis had not been

1 submitted.

2 Subsequent to then, a fire hazard analysis
3 both for Toronto and Peterborough has been submitted and
4 it's currently under review.

5 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Monsieur Harvey?

6 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Merci, Monsieur le
7 président.

8 In your presentation you -- I am addressing
9 to the staff -- you talk about regulatory limits.
10 Normally, we've got in front of us -- well, derived
11 limits and action levels. And now you've got the proposed
12 limit; I suppose that proposed limit would become a
13 regulatory limit? And why are you proposing such limit?

14 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for the record.

15 This -- what we presented today was a
16 continuation of a discussion at Day One where we were --
17 we said very clearly we felt that when you just used the
18 normal method for derived limit, it gets -- because of the
19 pathways and everything for the -- through a sewer, you
20 get a very large number.

21 And we felt that number was unrealistic,
22 that you would have to have a very major -- almost
23 accident, to go over that limit. So we looked at trying
24 to set a new limit that balances something that is more
25 strict, but not being overly limiting (sic) on their

1 facility.

2 And that's why we've got a proposed limit
3 which if you accept it would become the limit.

4 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Thank you. And you are
5 satisfied with that new downsized limit?

6 **MR. MASON:** Peter Mason, for the record.
7 Yes, we're very satisfied; we support it.

8 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Thank you.

9 In p10 of the staff presentation, and 11,
10 when you're showing the annual average, how do you get to
11 that annual average?

12 **MR. CRAWFORD:** For the record, Gerald
13 Crawford.

14 On these histograms that we showed on the
15 presentation we took the four year's doses for each
16 facility, for whole body, hand doses and skin doses and
17 did just an arithmetical average of the four years which
18 is why the numbers are slightly -- they're not quite the
19 same as the GE presentation where they gave the individual
20 year's doses.

21 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Well what is the variation
22 between numbers?

23 **MR. CRAWFORD:** The variation is for whole
24 body dose and skin dose and hand dose, probably 10-15
25 percent at the most, across each year. They're fairly

1 low.

2 In the -- if you look in the Day One CMD it
3 gives the actual figures for each year for skin dose and
4 hand dose and whole body dose.

5 **THE CHAIRMAN:** How does -- sorry, how does
6 it recorded? Is it recorded on event by event? I'm
7 trying to understand how do you get -- during the year,
8 how do you record the actual dosage?

9 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.
10 In the case of whole body doses the exposed
11 workers wear TLDs (Thermoluminescence dosimeters) and
12 there's different monitoring periods; Toronto's is a
13 monthly monitoring and Peterborough's is a quarterly.

14 So at the end of each period the data are
15 collected, they're sent away to an external farm and they
16 send us the numbers back.

17 And so in the case of Toronto we have
18 monthly doses and at the end of the year we sum them up to
19 get an annual number.

20 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I meant when you -- when you
21 do skin for example, how do you zero into the skin, rather
22 than the TLDs?

23 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.

24 In the case of skin doses a TLD actually
25 has four different chips in them and one of those is for

1 measuring skin dose from betas for example.

2 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So it's not like an event
3 when there's a particular spill or a particular
4 interruption, you actually measure hands or ---

5 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.

6 That's correct, it is continuous, it is a -
7 - the whole time they're in the workplace, they're at the
8 exposed work station, they're wearing their TLDs and
9 picking up exposure.

10 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So what happened if there is
11 a spill or contamination, how does that -- is the TLD
12 still picks it up?

13 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.

14 That's correct. In the case of uranium the
15 possibility of high excursions is not credible.

16 So even with a large spill you wouldn't
17 expect a spike in either external gamma fields or external
18 beta fields.

19 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

20 Monsieur Harvey?

21 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Merci.

22 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Dr. Barriault?

23 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Merci, monsieur le
24 président.

25 I'd like to thank you for a copy of your

1 occupational health program; I think it's a good program.

2 And having said, really I was looking for
3 any section on fitness for duty. Do you have a fitness
4 for duty program with your employees?

5 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.

6 Yes we do. I'm sorry that I didn't provide
7 that with you. I can certainly send that to you.

8 We do have a fitness for duty program and
9 it's based on -- each particular job in the factory has
10 what's called a job safety analysis and also has a job
11 demands analysis which lists the tasks that must be done
12 and the required strength, if you will, to accomplish that
13 task.

14 So when a new employee is hired there's an
15 assessment of whether that person can actually do that
16 task.

17 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** As part of that do you
18 do also psychological assessment or just physical
19 assessment?

20 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.
21 Just physical.

22 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Thank you.

23 I'm sorry to hear about your lost time
24 injury; I hope it's not too serious that you encountered.

25 **MR. MASON:** It was very serious, actually.

1 The employee, an experienced machinist, was operating
2 vertical mill and was -- unfortunately he was wearing
3 gloves which he should not have been. His gloved hand was
4 caught into the spinning bit and tore off the top of his
5 index finger.

6 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Thank you.

7 With regards to the community, at least
8 from some of the preliminary documentation that we've
9 received, there seems to be a communication gap with the
10 community and I'm assuming that you're going to be
11 addressing this in the future and I'm sure you probably
12 have a proposal for it as to how you want to accomplish
13 that. Have you been putting any thought into that, to
14 increasing communication with the community?

15 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason.

16 Yes, one of the suggestions that came out
17 of our meeting at the Prince of Wales School is that a
18 number of the residents would like to learn more about
19 what we do, nuclear fuel and in fact the nuclear industry
20 in general and we would be delighted to participate in
21 that.

22 The point that was made by one of the
23 parents was that just by having one meeting there's a
24 tremendous amount of information to try and absorb and
25 there was a preference to having a series of meetings

1 where we might deal with one topic at a time.

2 And as I say, we'd be delighted to do that.
3 We will take the initiative on that suggestion and work --
4 continue to work with the principal of the Prince of Wales
5 School in order to organize those information sessions.

6 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Thank you.

7 Just one brief question again. On the
8 issue of applying ALARA principles to the -- I guess
9 limits to the sewers, did you want to look at those ALARA
10 principles to other things, for example, and exposures
11 because your levels are lower than the action levels.

12 Do we want to look at those also and see
13 what we can do, CNSC?

14 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for the record.

15 One of the things that we have put into the
16 handbook on the licensees on ALARA, especially for RP is
17 that there be review of those action levels on a routine
18 basis, so every two years or so.

19 So yes, we are actually with the handbook
20 structure that allows us to put more detail are putting
21 some of those requirements so that we can monitor and see
22 that they are reviewed.

23 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Thank you.

24 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I think that many other
25 issues will come through as we hear the intervenors so I

1 think it's time to move to hear some intervention and they
2 will have ample opportunity to get into some other issues.

3 So what I would like to do is I would like
4 to start and remind everybody that we've allocated 10
5 minutes per intervention and then there's time for
6 questions and answers if need be.

7 And so I would like you to be helpful.
8 There's a lot of intervenors we've got to go through.

9 And also the second thing is, please
10 understand we've read each intervention, so if there is no
11 question does not mean that we have not read it. We have
12 read each intervention in detail.

13 So I'd like to move by starting with
14 intervention from Mr. Tyler Vandermolen as outlined in CMD
15 10-H17.2

16 The floor is yours, please proceed.

17

18 **10-H17.2**

19 **Oral presentation by**

20 **Tyler Vandermolen**

21

22 **MR. VANDERMOLEN:** Hello, so I guess I'll
23 start with my name. My name is Tyler Vandermolen and in
24 light of some of the stuff that was brought up through the
25 presentations I guess I'm going to take some time during

1 my presentation to just go through the points because some
2 of this stuff has been asked.

3 So I'll start by just reading through some
4 of the stuff that -- some of the concerns that I've
5 written down and then there's probably some stuff in there
6 that I can disregard as I go.

7 So I'm a Trent University student in
8 Peterborough and I've been there for about a year and a
9 half and I feel that as a student I represent or am
10 indicative of some of the student perspectives that you
11 might find at the university.

12 And although that's a transient population
13 so I probably won't live there for more than say four
14 years, there's a continual renewal of student population.

15 And so today initially and in my written
16 address some of the stuff I spoke about was potential
17 health effects and in particular I want to talk about --
18 or am concerned about the public comfort surrounding those
19 health effects and say how those are being taken care of.

20 So to start off with, there was -- in a
21 little bit of research I went through, there was a concern
22 about low-dose radiation, and largely those things were
23 unspectacular. I couldn't find much about how that
24 affects anyone.

25 However -- yeah, so eventually I did come

1 across some that said that it can bio-accumulate, certain
2 types and I'm not sure exactly which ones, but that's a
3 definite concern, that those could bio-accumulate and turn
4 into something along the lines of high-dose radiation.

5 As well, reading through some other like
6 academic or scientific articles primarily out of -- I
7 think it was like around the Port Hope kind of incidents
8 which I realize are somewhat unrelated, the -- actually, I
9 can't remember what exactly that one was.

10 But I guess within that, I'm concerned a
11 little bit about bias, so I feel like there's a bit of
12 doubt that comes out of studies that are finding -- or
13 suggesting that there's a correlation between some of the
14 things that we're seeing in Peterborough and potential
15 health effects. And so where there's doubt, I guess I see
16 there kind of being a need to take a little bit more time
17 to assess those, the doubt that's brought about by them.

18 Things that could assist those is potential
19 bias in the science that's being done on both sides. I
20 guess you see a lot in science, or at least I have noticed
21 and along with other people engaged in studies that bias
22 tends to come about in a certain way by funding sources,
23 and so if -- in this case, I guess, depending on where the
24 funding is coming for those -- those articles that are
25 supporting no negative conclusions.

1 Okay, so reassess that.

2 I guess the concern for bias is just noted
3 in it, some of the independent research that I saw coming
4 out of Port Hope was suggesting negative findings and
5 answering that most of that science could have been funded
6 by people with invested interests, I guess.

7 I guess when I went about to find out what
8 other people in the community were thinking about this, I
9 found a lot of people who were saying the scientists say,
10 and this kind of shows a reliance on delivery information
11 from either GE or whoever or the CNSC.

12 And I guess I just feel the need to state
13 that science tends to be a public discipline, so it's
14 meant to be interpreted by the public and I feel like that
15 doesn't always come through, so there is a need there to
16 make that information accessible to the public so that
17 they can interpret it without conclusions drawn by anyone
18 else.

19 And then when I spoke to other -- like
20 other people who were involved in academics, so it's
21 beyond me, like they're involved in Masters and PhD
22 programs and in related disciplines, so things like
23 biology as far as health effects go, what their stance on
24 or knowledge of was very limited as far as nuclear fuel
25 bundling went.

1 Most people responded with things like "I
2 don't know much about it" or "I don't know enough about
3 it", and there was a hesitancy noted there. And within
4 that, I don't feel that there was anything coming from as
5 far as permission to go through with the project.

6 So some of these things I feel like may
7 translate into stress on the community about lack of
8 information or lack of comfort and -- yeah, let's move on.

9 I guess most of the people that I talked to
10 had heard about, yeah, through word of mouth or from
11 interest groups, so there was very little reliance on
12 things like the paper or the radio and much more on things
13 like the internet, which -- so I feel like there's, I
14 guess, more impact there that could be assessed. And I
15 feel like some of the accreditation given to radio and
16 paper can be -- is discredited a little bit by that.

17 So I guess what I see as a conclusion or to
18 kind of quell some of these like concerns I have is to
19 give a little bit more time in the renewal for the
20 licence. To renew right now and then commit to giving
21 more public consultation kind of makes it more of an
22 educational exercise as opposed to leaving anything open
23 to -- you know -- potentially impacting further operations
24 at the GE facility or the nuclear development in
25 Peterborough.

1 I guess, actually, I'll wrap it up with
2 that. I have a bunch of notes, but it's pretty hard to go
3 through it after I've kind of seen the rest of the
4 presentations.

5 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.
6 Questions? Mr. Graham?

7 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes. First of all, I
8 congratulate you as I believe your first-time intervention
9 and it's not always easy to appear before a tribunal like
10 this.

11 Anyway, my -- from listening to you, I
12 guess accountability and lack of information to the public
13 is your major concern, other than the process that we've
14 talked about this morning, or this afternoon with regard
15 to LAU and so on.

16 My question would be, is what would you
17 like to see CNSC, staff, the scientists, the -- all of the
18 nucleus of resource people that we have at our disposal,
19 what would you like to see them doing in the community to
20 bring some of the answers that seems to be wanting at this
21 time?

22 **MR. VANDERMOLEN:** So yeah, I guess
23 delivering information in more basic forms. So as far as
24 we got -- what the limitations are, like how those are
25 developed because that information is somewhat difficult

1 to come by.

2 And then -- so not only having more
3 consultation but not necessarily going through with the
4 licence renewal and then having consultations. I feel
5 like that's permissive.

6 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** You are aware, though, that
7 their licence expires at the end of this month, so there
8 is a necessity for some sort of a licensing to continue or
9 they cease operation.

10 But in the interim before certain aspects
11 or phases are taken, would you be satisfied as seeing that
12 staff do more information -- provide more information to
13 the community?

14 **MR. VANDERMOLEN:** I guess I wouldn't be
15 personally satisfied with that, although, you know, I
16 understand.

17 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.

18 **MR. VANDERMOLEN:** Thanks.

19 **THE CHAIRMAN:** The next submission is an
20 oral presentation by Mr. Zach Ruitter and is outlined in
21 CMD-H17.3 and 17.3A.

22 The floor is yours. Please proceed.

23

24 **10-H17.3 / 10-H17.3A**

25 **Oral presentation by**

1 **Zach Ruiters**

2

3

MR. RUITERS: Hi. Sorry. Maybe some of you
4 are noticing that my hair appears a little green, so don't
5 worry, it's not because of low-level radiation from the GE
6 plant. It's actually a Halloween residual because I dyed
7 it bright midnight green on Halloween and now it's faded.
8 It's only been about a month and a bit, so no cause for
9 concern.

10

 But there is a cause for concern here
11 today, and I'll start with addressing the comments that
12 were made to you today by Peter Mason.

13

 For someone who was at that November 30th
14 meeting and who's followed Peter Mason here to this
15 meeting, I'm a little bit upset that the CNSC did not come
16 to that meeting, even though they were invited, because it
17 seems that there may be hearings and there may be public
18 consultations, but there is very little listening that's
19 going on by the GE Corporation to the community that
20 houses them.

21

 So when I hear Mr. Mason show graphs and
22 talk about best practices, I think are these best
23 practices in the sort of ISO 9000 qualifications that I
24 don't necessarily understand, or are these best practices
25 across the board, which include public consultation, which

1 include its role here today? And I would argue that they
2 are not.

3 So we have this issue about the amendment
4 and this sort of slippery debate about no foreseeable
5 plans, yet why do we need it.

6 And Commission Member Graham very
7 succinctly asked him if there are no foreseeable plans and
8 you said you do a full public consultation, then could you
9 get rid of it; and then Mr. Mason sort of replies sort of
10 very ambivalently and saying by repeating there are no
11 foreseeable plans.

12 So what the community was really asking for
13 because they felt that they were not consulted at all was
14 that this be stayed and it go through a public
15 consultation. But there was a press release from the GE
16 Vice-President and it said, you know, this has been
17 previously accepted and we may do this in the future for
18 an approved amendment.

19 And the thing is -- that I wanted to ask is
20 to clarify later on if that full public consultation is
21 not just the public consultation part that's already gone
22 on that they may repeat, but a whole other hearing and a
23 whole sort of Commission acceptance.

24 So another point that I'd like to bring up
25 is that Peter Mason said that there was a member of local

1 council who stood up and said, you know, "I am on the
2 local council and I haven't heard any of this." And he
3 said that's probably because, you know, there was just an
4 election, council just changed.

5 The mayor did change but the member
6 specifically introduced himself as Dean Pappas as an
7 incumbent; he also runs Pappas Billiards on George Street.
8 He's quite a champion of the community and he said "Look,
9 I've got to be somewhere else but I just want to say and
10 to put it out there that I'm Dean Pappas and I've sat in
11 council for more than two terms and I've heard nothing
12 about this."

13 So now, I'm lucky enough that I have the
14 oral presentation. It's been great to meet and make
15 connections with the parents at Prince of Wales School
16 because this is really sort of educated them as it
17 educated us. And they're in the business of raising their
18 kids and educating them but also looking out for their
19 kids.

20 So, what I want to say, is first of all in
21 terms of best practices, I would like to point to the
22 nuclear waste management organization advisory panels,
23 consultation process which is much more wide-ranging, much
24 more inclusive and it deals with the relationships between
25 different stakeholders and different levels of governments

1 and ensures that elected politicians and public officials
2 are well informed. But also engages in multi-party
3 dialogues, citizens' panels, youth engagement and
4 aboriginal engagement activities.

5 So if you've invited the aboriginals but
6 they didn't get back to you, that's not aboriginal
7 engagement. So, basically, I'll go into just highlighting
8 what some of the parents asked me to say for them.

9 The first one is Kevin Siena of Walnut
10 Street whose five-year old son attends kindergarten at
11 Prince of Wales and he says that the CNSC was satisfied by
12 GE's attempt to educate the community. But they were
13 woefully too low. He said there was a message up on the
14 board in the library for 30 days. He says that, from the
15 outset, it's a conflict of interest to have the person
16 who's applying do the public noticing because they're not
17 going to be sort of interested in having people intervene
18 such as myself. And his comment, which I thought was very
19 -- a good pun was that the citizens of Peterborough were
20 intentionally left in the dark, which is quite scary.

21 And the thing is is that Kevin Siena is one
22 person. So I know Peter Mason stands in front of you as a
23 corporation but also one person, and he says, "There was
24 proper public consultation." But with the late
25 interventions that came in after the deadline, we've now

1 got 15 maybe 20 and I can bring you more. You know, we
2 can bring you tons more.

3 So, the next one is Peter Harris and I've
4 brought in a picture of Peter and his family here. And I
5 guess from left to right, it's Lydia, the oldest daughter,
6 Peter, Amelia and Janet. And Peter has been actually
7 quite vocal and quite interested in this issue. And he
8 has a quote from Peter Mason saying that we have an
9 excellent relationship with the parent/teacher's
10 association there keeping them regularly informed on what
11 they're doing and that type of thing.

12 But he says that in the past eight years
13 that his wife was a member of the parents' school council,
14 not the PTA as Mr. Mason asserts. There were no written
15 presentations and that the chair of the Prince of Wales
16 council hasn't seen anything in the past three years that
17 she's been chair.

18 And then, there is this woman named
19 Stephanie and her husband Trevor who live on Park Street.
20 And I'd just like to share with you her corroboration that
21 Peter Mason stated on September 9th that we also keep
22 people within half a kilometer around the facilities
23 informed of what we are doing. But this is simply not the
24 case.

25 Her brother-in-law, Kevin Middle and their

1 friend Myra Hursbourg live on Chamberlain which is just
2 between Monegan and Park Street, one street sought of GE's
3 fence, had no idea about the amendment or licence renewal
4 and yet they're well within a half kilometer radius of the
5 plant fence.

6 And Stephanie asked, "How did GE measure
7 their half kilometer radius?" And I'd also ask when GE
8 put those flyers out, were they written on invisible ink
9 or were they slipped into -- like in Peterborough this
10 week -- I mean in Peterborough, we're inundated with
11 flyers at the door. They're like pounds of flyers, like
12 hundreds of pages, so if you slip that in there and you're
13 calling that sufficient, it really defies the spirit of
14 informing the public. It's like they wanted to sort of
15 pull one over on us.

16 And it just so happens that that
17 neighbourhood itself is what the Peterborough residents
18 saved to the southeast of the plant. The rule of thumb is
19 not to live in the southeast of the plant.

20 And that's why at the Prince of Wales
21 School, within the last three years, 29 percent of its
22 parents and population moved and within the last 10 years,
23 about 50 percent have moved.

24 So that portion there is somewhat
25 marginalized and I think that works to GE's advantage in

1 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

2 For you -- for GE, I just want to
3 understand, for -- you've been operating there for 50
4 years, in January, nobody came, no interventions, nothing,
5 zip. What, you know, between now and, you know, what
6 happened in January until now, how do you explain that?

7 And by the way, as an aside, did you get
8 that kind of reaction from Toronto crowd?

9 **MR. MASON:** For the record, I think Mr.
10 President, you can only speculate as to why we've -- we
11 didn't receive the attention before and we've received the
12 attention now. I think the last presenter is a good
13 example of why we've heard about it just recently.

14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.

15 The next presentation is by Mr. Matthew
16 Laing. Sir, the floor is yours.

17

18 **10-H17.4**

19 **Oral presentation by**

20 **Matthew Laing Gibbard**

21

22 **MR. GIBBARD:** Ah, okay. It's Matthew Laing
23 Gibbard.

24 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Matthew Laing Gibbard, I'm
25 sorry, I stand corrected.

1 **MR. GIBBARD:** Thank you.

2 Before I begin my introduction, I just want
3 to stress Zach's first point that it's very disappointing
4 that the CNSC was not present at every meeting. I
5 personally think the CNSC should be present at anything to
6 do with the use of uranium specially if the province, I
7 take it, is not responsible for such things.

8 I'm a resident of Peterborough where I go
9 to the University of Trent. I am majoring in culture
10 studies and environmental biology. Some of my friends and
11 colleagues who could not be here today asked me to speak
12 on their behalf.

13 The first thing I want to talk about is the
14 natural uranium. The GEHC says that the uranium they're
15 dealing with is natural uranium and that they are -- the
16 emissions are extremely low and that this is already
17 existing in the environment.

18 But I would like to point out that the
19 natural uranium in the environment also includes quantity.
20 So when you increase the quantity, it's not exactly
21 natural any more.

22 For the other emissions, such as beryllium,
23 PCBs, BAPAs, and if I may add tritium also, which for some
24 reason you did not mention today but you did mention at
25 the Prince of Wales meeting, I think we can agree that

1 these are not -- these others are not natural at all.

2 So any emissions, even if it is very low
3 and untraceable, this is not natural and more than enough.

4 The area of Peterborough, a lot of water
5 basins around the area, the Otonabee flows into the Great
6 Lakes eventually and these are the largest freshwater
7 reserves in the world and I think we need to protect these
8 as best we can, better than we're doing. And then this
9 flows into the St. Lawrence. So this is a huge concern
10 area that will be affected.

11 In regards -- also I take it the mining of
12 uranium in Peterborough has been banned. So you can see
13 there is -- you can see there's a lot of concern right
14 there but I take it that there is mining of uranium north
15 of Peterborough.

16 So any calculations of the uranium that is
17 added, that is emitted to Peterborough from the GE plant
18 is a little bit -- the footprint is going to be much
19 greater and uncalculated due to the uranium already in
20 there, both through mines and naturally.

21 Sorry, I don't know how much time I have
22 left because this thing is not on.

23 Another thing I would like to mention is
24 the positive, you say, of uranium, that it produces no CO2
25 or at least less. After hearing these other emissions, I

1 think they by far overcompensate for not producing any
2 CO2.

3 So I don't really see how that makes
4 uranium or this project any -- at all environmentally
5 friendly.

6 I'm going to move on to the non-metabolism
7 -- how uranium is not metabolisable. So any of these
8 emissions at all cannot be metabolized by either the human
9 body or anything else in the environment, just about so
10 even the small doses is still quite a bit.

11 I guess I'm just about done. Before I
12 conclude, I would like to address the CNSC specifically,
13 that regardless of whether General Electric is operating
14 far below the limit, the public, I assure you, is still
15 very concerned and there's quite a lot of distrust.

16 We kindly request that all General Electric
17 operations, either present or future, be reconsidered.

18 Many of the people -- and I think I'm just
19 about to end -- and many of residents in Ontario in fact
20 are quite opposed to the uranium industry as a whole and
21 in general and would like to see that it not be
22 subsidized.

23 Thank you for your attention.

24 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

25 Questions?

1 Monsieur Harvey?

2 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Just reading your written
3 submission, you were mainly naming the LEU production and
4 all your presentation was based on that.

5 Is it always the case or is it only the new
6 production that would concern ---

7 **MR. GIBBARD:** Sorry, could you repeat that?
8 I didn't get the first part.

9 **MEMBER HARVEY:** I mean in your written
10 presentation, your written document you submitted to the
11 Commission, the major point was the production or the --
12 not the production but the use of enriched uranium and it
13 was the main concern in your presentation.

14 So is it always the case and can we link
15 all you said to that point there?

16 **MR. GIBBARD:** Well, I would say it's all a
17 concern and I guess I don't have enough time to address
18 everything so I chose to address just the things I did
19 today.

20 In my written submission I don't just talk
21 about the low enriched uranium but also mining and
22 disposal and any use in general. So in my oral
23 presentation, I more talked about just what we're talking
24 today as opposed to everything else.

25 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Okay.

1 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you very much.

2 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Just another question.

3 There was a concern that the staff was not present to the
4 presentation at the school there and could you just
5 comment that? What is -- do you have any obligation or
6 are you invited or what's the normal process for that?

7 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** Ravishankar, for the
8 record.

9 As you know, CNSC has the mandate to
10 disseminate objective information and we do that quite
11 frequently.

12 CNSC staff is usually invited and when
13 invited, we do consider going and we have attended. For
14 example, back in 2007, there was a public meeting that was
15 organized in a hotel and we were invited to it by GE and
16 we did attend it.

17 In this case in 2010, the meeting -- public
18 meeting was organized by the school. We were informed by
19 GE but we were not invited by the school to attend.
20 Therefore, we just noted that public meeting took place
21 but we did not attend.

22 **THE CHAIRMAN:** You were not invited.

23 That's what I want to hear. Did you ---

24 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** That's right, we were
25 not.

1 **MEMBER HARVEY:** But you said by the school.

2 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** By the school.

3 **MEMBER HARVEY:** By the school but neither
4 by GE?

5 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** That's correct.

6 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Okay.

7 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Graham?

8 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** As the Chair said at the
9 outset of these hearings that we take all of the
10 presentations, whether oral or written, very seriously,
11 and a comment that was made a while ago and I would like
12 to get on the record whether it's correct or not, which I
13 wasn't aware of, about uranium mining in Ontario.

14 Can CNSC confirm, is there uranium mining
15 in Ontario?

16 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for the record.

17 There are no operational uranium mines in
18 Ontario. There was ---

19 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** There hasn't been for
20 years?

21 **MR. ELDER:** There has not been for a decade
22 or over a decade, yes.

23 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes. Thank you.

24 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.

25 Let's move on to the next submission which

1 is an oral presentation by the Canadian Nuclear Workers'
2 Council and Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union,
3 Local-599-0, as outlined in CMD 10-H17.5.

4 Mr. Shier, the floor is yours.

5
6 **10-H17.5**

7 **Oral presentation by the**
8 **Canadian Nuclear Workers' Council**
9 **and the Communications, Energy &**
10 **Paperworkers Union, Local-599-0**

11
12 **MR. SHIER:** Thank you and good afternoon,
13 Mr. President and Members of the Commission.

14 As indicated, my name is David Shier. I am
15 the President of the Canadian Nuclear Worker Council.

16 With me today is Mr. Robert Fleming. Mr.
17 Fleming is an Executive member of the Communications,
18 Energy and Paperworkers Union local at the Peterborough
19 facility, and he is a long-term employee. He's been there
20 well over 30 years; so very experienced in the operation.

21 What we would like to do is kind of give a
22 quick update of our written submission. We indicated in
23 there, there is a -- it is a highly unionized workforce at
24 the Peterborough site.

25 There's another Local there of the Canadian

1 Auto Workers which in discussions have joined our Council.
2 And there's also another Local of the International
3 Federation of Professional Employees which represents the
4 drafts people there which is not a member of our Council.

5 The Canadian Auto Workers, we had
6 discussions with them since our written submission. I
7 just have two sentences here which they have sent and
8 asked me to read here as well. It's directed to me in
9 regards to the submission and it says:

10 "We have reviewed the written
11 submission of the Canadian Nuclear
12 Worker Council and CEP in regard to
13 support for the GE-Hitachi CNSC
14 operating licence. CAW Local-524 is
15 in full support of the submission. We
16 have 53 members working at the nuclear
17 division at GE-Hitachi facility in
18 Peterborough. The CAW also has
19 members on workplace committees at the
20 Peterborough facility. Our members
21 live in the vicinity of the plant and
22 we have not received any concern from
23 our members in regards to any
24 community concerns being raised with
25 them or their families."

1 So I submit that to you.

2 As we indicated in our written submission,
3 there's a very good safety culture in the plant at
4 Peterborough. There is an occupational health and safety
5 committee, there is an ALARA committee, and there's other
6 committees as well which the unions -- both unions appoint
7 people to and they provide input to the safety and
8 environmental concerns in the particular plant.

9 For example, Mr. Fleming sits on the ALARA
10 committee and lots of their ideas have been utilized to
11 reduce, for example, radiation exposures and other issues.

12 We took a look at some of the concerns --
13 surprise to us the number of intervenors from the
14 community and we asked Mr. Fleming's union and also the
15 auto workers to kind of do a bit of a straw poll amongst
16 their members to see if they have had any concerns raised
17 to them, bearing in mind that this facility has been in
18 the Peterborough area for many, many years and enjoy the
19 workers who live in the community.

20 What we find in workplaces is if the public
21 is concerned lots of times they will address their
22 concerns to workers.

23 From our straw poll we find that nothing
24 has been raised; none of the neighbours or friends have
25 actually expressed any issues of concern.

1 And I guess to the intervenors, what we
2 would suggest is that this is a very strong unionized
3 facility. The unions are involved with the whole
4 operation and as we say in the labour movement, if there's
5 a safety concern in a plant before that gets out to the
6 environment or to the public then the workers would be the
7 ones exposed and we haven't had workers exposed. As we
8 see the exposures are very low, so on and so forth.

9 So they can be assured that if there is any
10 major concerns the unions would definitely bring it up to
11 the employer and as we stated in the past, if need be to
12 the CNSC.

13 So in conclusion we are in full support of
14 the licence renewal and urge you to grant the licence.

15 Thank you.

16 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

17 Question?

18 Can you -- your union also covers the
19 Toronto facility?

20 **MR. SHIER:** The Toronto Local is not
21 currently a member of our council. We are expanding
22 membership and we will be contacting them in the near
23 future to bring them under the fold of the Canadian
24 Nuclear Worker Council.

25 So our submission is basically on the

1 Peterborough facility.

2 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So can you shed any light as
3 to why in Toronto it's not an issue and all of a sudden in
4 this community it became a big issue?

5 **MR. SHIER:** Well, we don't know. I find
6 that surprising too.

7 I think -- I'd suggest that there's more
8 nuclear issues in the public domain; we're hearing more
9 about it. I know from our perspective we get more
10 questions from different groups.

11 So some of it would be -- my one opinion
12 would be, some of it would be because if it being in the
13 public domain, more people are coming interested and
14 starting to ask questions.

15 It could also be some undermining issues as
16 well, as we've seen with some other nuclear issues.

17 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

18 Anybody else?

19 Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you
20 for this intervention.

21 So the next oral presentation is by Ms.
22 Amanda Lickers as outlined in CMD 10-H17.6.

23 The floor is yours.

24

25 **10-H17.6**

1 **Oral presentation by**
2 **Amanda Lickers**

3

4 **MS. LICKERS:** For the record, Amanda
5 Lickers.

6 I would like to say, first of all, that I
7 do feel that public consultation was insufficient. Like
8 everyone has pointed out, there was a lot of interventions
9 that came in past the deadline; I think that's indicative
10 of GE's ability to communicate with the public.

11 I'd like to comment on three main issues;
12 the first being Aboriginal consultation, issues
13 surrounding the decommissioning report and I'd like to
14 give a bit of a radiation ontology in regards to low-dose
15 radiation and ionizing radiation exposure; so that's going
16 to cover health effects.

17 First I'd like to say as a status
18 Aboriginal myself I feel that the attempts that were made
19 to contact Aboriginal communities were actually quite
20 appalling.

21 The 15 Aboriginal communities that were
22 contacted were not actually given a copy of the
23 Environmental Assessment Screening Report and were simply
24 given a document outlining how to participate in public
25 hearings which I feel is misleading and does not provide

1 sufficient information for local First Nations to act
2 properly.

3 As well, in terms of the four Aboriginal
4 First Nations, including Métis of Ontario, Ojibway of
5 Hiawatha, Curve Lake First Nations and the Alderville
6 Ojibway, I would like to point out that it is not in -- it
7 is not actually the Band Council who have Treaty rights,
8 it is the community members living on the Reserves and if
9 General Electric took Aboriginal sovereignty seriously
10 they would have sent out notifications to all of the
11 residents living on those Reserves, as well as would have
12 scheduled a meeting to meet with Band Council and provide
13 an information session before public deadlines -- public
14 hearing intervention deadlines were met.

15 As for the decommissioning report, I feel
16 that it is problematic to not have a sufficient
17 decommissioning on a low-enriched uranium fuel bundle
18 manufacturing project.

19 From what I understand there are amendments
20 to the CEAA in the April 2010 budget that allowed for this
21 circumstance and I -- as far as I understand the CEAA --
22 no is that that -- no, the EA -- environmental assessment
23 -- sorry -- Act.

24 Sorry.

25 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I think you got it right,

1 the CEAA is the right ---

2 **MS. LICKERS:** Yeah, it is the right one,
3 okay. Sorry. I'm just a little nervous; it's my first
4 time presenting at a public hearing.

5 Anyway, so yeah, the CEAA -- I believe
6 their annual review is coming up and that legislation
7 might actually be reviewed and may not hold.

8 So I think that would be -- it would prove
9 to be problematic if the licence amendment were to be
10 upheld despite proper decommissioning report on that
11 project if there was amendments to the CEA that were
12 passed in the 2010 budget were actually changed.

13 As well, as I feel -- like in terms of
14 public consultation that the project, the scope of the
15 project, operation of 2012 to 2047, I feel that that
16 message was not communicated to the public whatsoever.

17 It was listed in the Environmental
18 Assessment Screening Report but in no other way was that
19 addressed.

20 And this is also problematic in terms of
21 the decommissioning because it doesn't really lend itself
22 to an understanding of -- if the project is planned, is
23 going to be planned -- is going to be phased out and
24 further to having no proper decommissioning in regards to
25 the LEU fuel bundle assembly it lends itself to unforeseen

1 fiscal, environmental and health concerns because there's
2 no assessment as to what types of emissions or
3 contaminants would be released during that process.

4 And so in terms of health effects I'm a
5 Bachelor of Science Environmental Chemistry and physics
6 and I've come up with a lot of information about the
7 effects of low dose radiation and ionizing radiation
8 exposure.

9 I'd like to first mention that
10 radionuclides which are radioactive isotopes which is the
11 fundamental difference between natural uranium and
12 enriched uranium is the percentage of U-235.

13 So radionuclides or radioactive isotopes
14 are non-metabolic which means that they don't actually
15 process through your physiology and so the longer that
16 you're exposed to even the most minute concentrations the
17 higher that that concentration becomes in your body over
18 time.

19 So if you're someone who's drinking -- if
20 you're breathing the air or drinking the water and you do
21 that for 10 years, 5 years, especially if you're a child
22 because your cells are still changing, you know, you're
23 very susceptible to those effects.

24 Even if it's a very, very low, not
25 measurable rate over time it does -- it does provide an

1 impact.

2 So I looked at a number of studies, peer
3 reviewed studies and basically the observations that have
4 been illustrated very contemporarily -- most of the
5 studies were published in early 2010 -- illustrate the
6 inherent variation of cellular response observed in low
7 dose radiation exposure and adds to the uncertainties
8 associated with evaluating potential hazards at these low
9 doses.

10 So for example -- the main issue is that
11 non-targeted effects are associated with low dose or
12 exposure. So what that means is cells that are not
13 directly irradiated exhibit a number of different effects.
14 For example, a bystander effect which is observed in cells
15 that were not irradiated but were either in contact with
16 or received soluble signals from irradiated cells, these
17 non-hit bystander cells exhibit damage typical to that of
18 direct radiation exposure. Death-inducing effect is it
19 severely reduces the survival rate of unirradiated cells
20 via radiation-induced chromosomal instability, and this is
21 seen after many generations of cells.

22 So chromosomal instability is a cell's
23 ability to reproduce itself healthily, and when you have
24 chromosomal instability, that is a very strong factor
25 contributing to the proliferation of cancer cells as well

1 as we see radiation-induced genome instability, which is a
2 delayed induction of large-scale chromosomal changes which
3 can affect reproduction and overall health of a cell,
4 again leading towards cancer, development of cancer cells
5 as well as trans-generational responses.

6 This point is really important because it
7 also affects future generations of children who are the
8 offspring of parents who have been exposed to low-dose.
9 It becomes a generational, a genetic issue. Mutation
10 induction -- and so trans-generational response is
11 mutation induction by ionizing radiation associated with
12 long-term genetic risk. Not only are the genetic risks
13 greater than previously thought, but mutations and
14 associated genomic instability likely increase radiation-
15 induced carcinogens, so that's very hazardous even though
16 it's just a low dose.

17 As well, as you probably are aware, the
18 25th anniversary of Chernobyl is this year -- well, it's
19 this coming year. And there's been some information
20 regarding the effects, the -- sorry, the cognitive and
21 neurological behavioural effects of children who are
22 exposed to low-dose radiation who were in the womb.

23 And largely, it was seen that children
24 exposed in utero and who did not differ in areas of
25 contaminant levels had various cognitive and neuro

1 behavioural effects that were recorded relating little
2 variation in scores of the Raven Standard Progressive
3 Metrics Test, which measures general intelligence and
4 ability to reproduce information using spatial and pattern
5 recognition exercises, as well as the Connors Continuous
6 Performance Task Test, which measures sustained and
7 selected attention and impulsivity.

8 So there are notable health effects that
9 are very relevant concern, and I request that the licence
10 renewal be postponed until the time that the LEU amendment
11 is revoked. And that is my presentation.

12 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Anybody have
13 questions?

14 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Just one question. You
15 mentioned that you -- at the end of your presentation -- I
16 was trying to make a link between -- you touched many
17 points in your presentation and make a link between what
18 you said and the plant itself ---

19 **MS. LICKERS:** Right.

20 **MEMBER HARVEY:** --- the facility itself.
21 So am I right to think that the last point you make is the
22 major one?

23 **MS. LICKERS:** For the record, Amanda
24 Lickers.

25 Yes, my primary concern, although

1 indigenous sovereignty and the means by which Aboriginal
2 consultations are performed are of great interest to me,
3 being a Status Aboriginal myself, the health effects
4 associated with enriched uranium are of obviously very
5 great concern.

6 However, I'm not a big fan of the nuclear
7 industry on the whole. I feel that having an
8 environmental assessment passed on a substance like
9 uranium where the waste management and waste disposal
10 aspects are still being worked out is a little
11 problematic.

12 Does that answer your question?

13 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Yes. Thank you.

14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Any other questions? Okay.
15 Thank you very much.

16 The next submission is an oral presentation
17 from the Council of Canadian Peterborough-Kawarthas
18 Chapter as outlined CMD10-H17.7. I understand Mr. Brady
19 will make the presentation.

20 Go ahead, sir.

21

22 **10-H17.7**

23 **Oral presentation by**

24 **The Council of Canadians,**

25 **Peterborough-Kawarthas Chapter**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. BRADY: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity this afternoon.

I am Roy Brady from -- the Chairperson of the Peterborough and Kawarthas Chapter of the Council of Canadians. I'm also a member of Safe and Green Energy Peterborough, which is a funding participant in the CEAA environmental assessment for the Darlington nuclear new build. And I'm a concerned citizen, as intervenors and others have been cited this afternoon.

My presentation will be entirely on public consultation. I found this to be a very difficult thing to research because the consultation has been so limited and very inadequate, and I had to do a lot of searching to find what I did.

Apparently it's up to we, the people in Peterborough, to actually spread the word as to what is going on with this, and it doesn't seem to have been the responsibility of General Electric. So unfortunately, the responsibility seems to be directed at the Commission to check that public consultation was actually done.

Now, this is a nuclear issue; pretty serious stuff. In fact, the Commission approvals so far have occurred without the public being aware of them.

Now, just to go to the situation now. Most

1 people in Peterborough are actually unaware of the
2 amendment that has been approved. They're also unaware of
3 the late submissions that were allowed to come to this
4 hearing.

5 There is a clear suspicion out there,
6 especially at that one meeting cited, that General
7 Electric may produce enriched uranium in Peterborough. A
8 comment has been made that people in the neighbourhood,
9 especially, feel a powerful sense of betrayal. And that
10 has been published.

11 So why? Well, parents. There was a
12 parents' meeting on November 30th. It was not directed to
13 the public, although word really spread and quite a few
14 people did show up. But it was directed to the parents of
15 that particular school, and it was well after the deadline
16 for submissions.

17 General Electric have commented that, "We
18 have not heard any concerns expressed in the public until
19 very recently." Of course not. Hardly anybody knew what
20 was going on over this period of three years.

21 Now, recently -- we're talking this week,
22 actually -- General Electric has hit the media. This
23 flurry of responsibility after the fact -- well, is it?
24 Is it GE actually carrying out their sense of
25 responsibility or is it really political cover because a

1 lot of pressure came on?

2 There also is a certain amount of ambiguity
3 out there in the public in the last week where, first of
4 all, it was cited that, well, we might scrap this
5 amendment. And then the second media thing said, "Oh, no;
6 no, we're not scrapping it. We'll carry on, but we'll
7 have public consultation after the approval."

8 In my view, the public consultation is a
9 mess. It is the responsibility of General Electric. Any
10 consultation there has been, has been under pressure and
11 has been after the fact.

12 The public feels unconsulted, especially
13 the neighbourhood, and they currently are in an uproar at
14 the time of this licence extension.

15 Now, just reviewing the process that we've
16 gone through, we apparently are to rely on the Commission
17 website; and they have, for example, a request for public
18 comment. So this is the Commission, it's not General
19 Electric doing this.

20 For the benefit of the population, General
21 Electric has to inform, consult proactively, alert. I
22 hope that the Commission agrees with that and responds
23 accordingly, agreeing that it is not happening
24 appropriately.

25 General Electric is relying, I think, on

1 the Commission website and that -- you just wonder from
2 the perspective of people, when they get up in the
3 morning, do they all of a sudden rush to the computer,
4 turn on the computer, get onto the website of the CNSC and
5 look for breaking news?

6 No, no; people don't do that. We're not
7 consulting the website of the Commission all the time, so
8 we cannot expect people to keep track of what is going on
9 unless they're being told.

10 Now, on January 25th, 2008 regarding the
11 environmental assessment draft guidelines, they ended on
12 February the 22nd. Now, where were these advertised?
13 Where was the notification?

14 Our concerned people right now, the people
15 who are at the meetings, still don't know about that.
16 Also, a small point, participant costs. The Commission
17 has legal authority to provide participant funding for the
18 purpose of preparing, submitting or presenting an
19 intervention. Well, who knew about that? Certainly not
20 the intervenors who are here today.

21 Now, last January 2010 there was an
22 important hearing. We were barely, if at all, informed.
23 This was important because it was the completion of the
24 application in 2007. December the 14th was the deadline.
25 January 13th was the hearing, the approval on February the

1 13th. Hardly anybody knows.

2 The documentation said no intervention.
3 Why? We weren't informed. General Electric did not
4 inform us. What they did report to the CNSC is they sent
5 a copy to the library, so it's laying on somebody's desk.
6 It wasn't posted or known.

7 They also cited it's on the website of the
8 Commission. They said they held an open house, but that
9 was in May 2007 and no such public open house until
10 November 30th, 2010.

11 I might just backtrack a bit to mention
12 that the open house was an interesting one. It was a
13 sense of responsibility. They held it. They took lots of
14 questions. They did cut it off after an hour, but at
15 least it was something.

16 But again, that was -- that was a long time
17 ago and since then they have had actually a meeting
18 on November 25th, 2008; again, to the parents only. I
19 found out because one of the activist parents called me so
20 I was able to get a few other people out. It was not a
21 public meeting and there was low attendance accordingly.

22 Now, what I'm afraid of is the Commission
23 is accepting the GE reporting of their consultation.
24 Although I did detect in the document months ago that
25 there was some concern expressed at the first hearing for

1 this particular application so I encourage that. So that
2 kind of improvement is good.

3 There was a certain amount of what I felt
4 was a little bit of investigating and I think that's very,
5 very important. I would like to see a lot more of that
6 rather than just believing General Electric which has been
7 unreliable in informing the public.

8 There were some references to ads in The
9 Examiner and The Toronto Star. Well, I subscribe to both
10 those publications. I did not see them. Perhaps they can
11 be brought -- they can be brought out.

12 I mentioned that there were some
13 responsible questionings at that particular hearing and
14 Peter Mason was the gentleman who would obviously answer
15 the questions and Peter is not a fool. Yet, here are some
16 of the responses.

17 First of all:

18 "We also keep our population
19 within half a kilometre around the
20 facilities informed of what we are
21 doing."

22 No, I think we've heard a lot of comments
23 from the neighbourhood that is not happening and the
24 meeting that has been referred to was last week, November
25 the 30th.

1 The second outcome is some shortcomings
2 that were brought up by the Commission. They talked about
3 procedures. Response: "We updated those procedures."
4 What evidence is there of that?

5 Another one was the website lacking. The
6 response: "We'll check on that one." So General Electric
7 is still relying on the Commission's website, directing
8 the responsibility elsewhere.

9 Also, there is a reference to the lack of a
10 media analysis. Apparently, General Electric did send
11 this, but it came from Toronto, not Peterborough.

12 The third item is the 0.5 kilometre
13 correspondence. Response:

14 "When we make changes where
15 things are happening." Yes.

16 To the question how often:

17 "Really it's
18 associated with changes so probably
19 once every two to three years."

20 Another one:

21 "It's only when we have
22 something to say." Really?

23 So from 2007 to 2010, for three and a half
24 years, General Electric's poor record contradicts its own
25 statements that I just quoted.

1 The last one, the fourth one, was in
2 response: "We had several public hearings ---

3 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Can you please wind up the
4 presentation, please?

5 **MR. BRADY:** Okay, I am winding up.

6 "So the population are well aware",
7 they said. They're well aware of the
8 sort of thing that we do there."

9 Now, that is completely untrue. They're
10 not well aware. So what I found was that GE was providing
11 casual almost flippant responses. They didn't seem to be
12 concerned. It wasn't a priority with them. It was
13 actually -- it was a total disregard of the entire
14 process. So I don't think the Commission should accept
15 that as public consultation.

16 So in conclusion, if all of us cannot rely
17 on General Electric as a large community industry to
18 consult its own people, how can we possibly rely on the
19 corporation to guarantee the health and safety of this
20 same population?

21 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

22 **MR. BRADY:** General Electric claims ---

23 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, that's enough.

24 **MR. BRADY:** --- must be rejected.

25 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I think I would like to have

1 an opportunity for GE to reply and I also ask CNSC about
2 the adequacy of the consultation -- this process started
3 2007. Here we are 2010. I want to hear all sides.

4 Mr. Mason?

5 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason.

6 I think in my presentation we outlined the
7 communication that had taken place with the community. We
8 certainly did advertise on the radio and in the newspapers
9 and our public meeting in May of 2007 was well attended by
10 the public.

11 It's certainly been questioned as to
12 whether we informed the Council. A letter went to the
13 clerk of the Council May the 8th of 2007 to inform the
14 Council what was happening and we had members of that
15 Council including the Mayor visit our site and we talked
16 about what we were doing in our expansion plans.

17 And I go back to the -- to the point about
18 the 3,600 leaflets that were hand delivered to the
19 residences in our area. They weren't stuck in some flyers
20 or what have you. They were hand delivered individually
21 and we had 14 responses and we responded to each
22 individual taking the trouble to respond to us.

23 And so with that sort of response, I think
24 it's quite natural to think that the public is satisfied.

25 We're now in the fall of 2010. The

1 amendment was approved at the back end or early of this
2 year. There has been no reason for communication since
3 the environmental assessment screening that we went
4 through. So why would we communicate when we had nothing
5 to communicate?

6 But as soon as we were aware that there
7 were some concerns being raised by the activism that was
8 going on in the community and we were invited by the
9 principal of the school to attend a meeting, we took the
10 opportunity and would do so in the future willingly.

11 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

12 Staff? Dr. Thompson, do you want to add
13 something?

14 **MR. ELDER:** I'll just start. Dr. Thompson
15 will go on the environmental assessment. I have
16 additional facts on what we did for the licensing hearing
17 as well. So Dr. Thompson will talk to the environmental
18 assessment process.

19 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Go ahead.

20 **DR. THOMPSON:** I'm Patsy Thompson, for the
21 record. I'm the Director General responsible for
22 environmental assessments at the CNSC.

23 I'd like to start by saying that of the
24 several hundreds of screening assessments done under the
25 Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency 99 percent of

1 them have no public consultation whatsoever, nor public
2 hearings.

3 The CNSC recognizing the public interest
4 related to nuclear issues have consulted on screening
5 reports ever since we've been doing environmental
6 assessments.

7 In the case of the environmental assessment
8 conducted for the GE project, the CNSC consulted on both
9 the guidelines and the screening report. The consultation
10 on the guidelines was done essentially in several steps.
11 The CNSC staff sent letters and hard copies of draft
12 guidelines to First Nations including the Hiawatha First
13 Nation, the Curve Lake First Nation and the Alderville
14 First Nation.

15 Comments on the guidelines -- guidelines
16 were also -- comments on the guidelines were sought from
17 the City of Peterborough. Notices of the public comment
18 period were placed on the Canadian Environmental
19 Assessment registry, on the CNSC website and copies of the
20 draft environmental assessment guidelines and notices were
21 sent to and posted in the Peterborough and CNSC libraries.
22 At that time, three comments were received.

23 In terms of the screening report, in
24 addition to the workshop, for example, that was conducted
25 on the valued ecosystem components to help us finalize the

1 assessment, there was a 30 public comment -- 30-day public
2 comment period on the draft screening report and that
3 period was extended at the request of members of the
4 public who wanted more time to be able to comment.

5 And so the period was extended. Instead of
6 finishing on October 16th, it finished on October 23rd,
7 2009, and interventions for the public hearings were
8 accepted afterwards.

9 On September 11, CNSC sent letters and hard
10 copies of the draft screening reports inviting the
11 following First Nations and Métis to comment and these
12 were the Curve Lake, Alderville, Ojibways -- Ojibway of
13 Hiawatha, the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nations and the
14 Métis Nation of Ontario.

15 Follow-up phone calls were made and
16 correspondence by email with the Curve Lake and Alderville
17 Ojibway First Nations took place.

18 Notices for public hearings on the
19 screening report and the licence were posted on the
20 Canadian Environmental Assessment Registry, the CNSC
21 website, posted in the Toronto Star on August 3rd, 2010,
22 the Peterborough Examiner on July 30th, the Express --
23 l'Express de Toronto on August 3rd and ads were placed in
24 the Windspeaker website, the Leader Board between August
25 6th and September 29th.

1 And so we feel that there were ample
2 opportunities for public and First Nations to be engaged
3 and be informed and consulted on the environmental
4 assessment for this project.

5 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, thank you.

6 Mr. Brady, you've got the last word on
7 this.

8 **MR. BRADY:** In response to Peter Moore, he
9 hardly responded to any of my specific concerns, just
10 continued his points from before.

11 But the final comment, "no reason to
12 communicate" I think that proves the point I've been
13 trying to make. There was no reason to communicate so
14 they didn't.

15 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, thank you for this
16 intervention.

17 We'd like to move on to the next oral
18 presentation by Mr. Daniel Asaszynski, I don't know if I'm
19 pronouncing properly, excuse me for that.

20 Go ahead, sir.

21

22 **10-H17.33**

23 **Oral presentation by**

24 **Daniel Adaszynski**

25

1 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** Okay, yes, you have
2 pronounced it correctly. My name is Daniel Adaszynski;
3 I'm also the last intervenor on the list today. Everyone
4 wants to breathe a sigh of relief.

5 I'm not a university student, I do have
6 university training, particularly environmental geography.
7 I've lived in Peterborough for a year and a half and I run
8 a small -- I run and operate a small manufacturing
9 business.

10 So I -- when I started hearing about this
11 issue I wanted to look at the history of GE. Generally I
12 look at the history of a company's actions or any group's
13 actions to sort of get a sense of what to expect.

14 It's of course is an industrial plant, the
15 largest in Peterborough; it's also still the largest
16 employer. And as an industrial plant, of course, it comes
17 with industrial history which if we all fondly remember
18 the 1960s and seventies of course, there's some mistakes;
19 we banned PCBs, things like this and things were cleaned
20 up.

21 Anyways, I've taken a look at GEC-Hitachi's
22 history of safety and contamination. And while I'm quite
23 happy that CNSC has lowered the limits -- the allowable
24 limits considerably, there is the gambling adage "Know
25 your limit, play within it." And I've -- this history

1 shows that GE has a tendency not to play within its
2 limits.

3 So to just go through some of the more
4 serious accidents -- my information is sourced from
5 archived newspaper information and additional information
6 of the Public Library, the people quoted are often GE
7 officials, retired employees, medical officials while a
8 clinic was held in 2005 regarding asbestos poisoning and
9 municipal authorities.

10 So just regarding this safety record where
11 none of the public has ever been harmed, which is a bit of
12 an evasive statement, because workers have certainly have
13 documented harm.

14 In 1982, 20 gallons of cyanide is
15 accidentally dumped into the sewers. GE acknowledges had
16 any acid been effluent -- been in the sewers enormous
17 quantities of hydrogen cyanide gas would have formed.

18 In 1992, preparing to sell a lot adjacent
19 to the facility for a new hockey arena, soil testing was
20 done, it was found that PCB contamination was so strong
21 the area had to be cordoned off and paved over.

22 In 1993, a fire broke out in the facility
23 along Monaghan Road.

24 In 1998, a water main broke and soaked 400
25 fuel bundles, it didn't say if any pellets had not yet

1 been inserted into these bundles, had been exposed.

2 And particularly disturbing to me, because
3 this is quite recent, is in 2004, the nuclear operation --
4 an area where the fuel is bundled, the plant evacuated 80
5 workers. Only what it would comment is a technical issue.
6 And the evacuation stayed for 72 hours.

7 No information was given to the union at
8 the time nor to the municipality and the Mayor was quoted
9 in the paper as saying, "Normally, in any occurrence such
10 as this, I get a phone call; I'm informed of what's going
11 on", so I wouldn't exactly call this an impeccable record
12 and it does raise some concerns for me.

13 In terms of -- these are sort of more
14 common industrial practices, you know, before people had
15 safety equipment and the like introduced as common
16 industrial practice.

17 From the 1940s to the 1980s it has been
18 confirmed by some GE officials but denied by other and
19 confirmed by employees, that asbestos was sold or given to
20 workers for home use right up to the 1980s despite its
21 hazards being scientifically proven by the 1960s.

22 There was some medical testing done in 2005
23 on retired workers of the facility. Fifty (50) of 120
24 retirees tested had serious cancers; 27 of them with
25 asbestosis, 23 with lung cancer and of course there's some

1 overlap in the numbers here. And a further 14, I found
2 this interesting, had developed a hyper sensitivity to
3 beryllium which is used in part of the welding process in
4 assembling the fuel rods.

5 Sorry, for a bit of attraction there.

6 So for asbestos respirators weren't
7 deployed until about the late 1970s, quote, "Because the
8 rubber would melt onto workers' faces."

9 So it is just -- it was quite a touchy
10 issue, there was a lot of fighting over the eighties and
11 nineties, a lot of strikes going on, fighting for
12 pensions, fighting for compensation.

13 And ever since -- after this fight GE has
14 denied that they've ever sold asbestos to any workers.

15 The other prime issue which many residents
16 are aware of in Peterborough, is PCB -- PCB contamination.
17 It was used from the thirties to the 1970s in the
18 facility.

19 And again some General Electric officials
20 confirmed that PCB laden waste solvents were sprayed over
21 the -- a dirt parking lot at the time to keep dust down.

22 So even when they later turned to sell this
23 land as a public arena, they were quite aware that it was
24 heavily contaminated and -- sorry, one moment here.

25 There has also been testing -- a little

1 while ago a little lake was drained and PCBs were found
2 there which confirms another statement here saying that
3 PCBs were regularly mixed with the solvents and the oils
4 on the factory floor and poured down the sewage. And
5 these PCBs later accumulated in the little lake which is
6 more or less in the heart of the city.

7 So those are two fairly large concerns,
8 asbestos and -- sorry -- PCBs have gotten sort of the most
9 public awareness.

10 The other thing I was quite -- I noted that
11 there is no mention of tritium, tritium production going
12 on at the facility, though during the public meeting held
13 on the 30th, this was mentioned. And I did a bit of
14 research into the analysis and where tritium is showing
15 up.

16 It was found in a -- involves as far as 16
17 kilometres away, there is 100 becquerels per cubic metre
18 of a tritium producing radioactivity, which was cited as
19 being 15 times higher than the levels from when tritium
20 was dumped into the Ottawa River.

21 Additionally, much closer to the facility,
22 on Prince of Wales grounds, 100,000 becquerels found in
23 the soil around the facility.

24 Tritium isn't -- I assume isn't part of
25 this licence, it might fall under the scope of something

1 else. But it certainly gives an indication of how far
2 contaminants from GE have been spreading and essentially
3 where they've been accumulating over time.

4 To my knowledge, tritium is used for
5 producing certain signs. Peter Mason said that they're
6 producing a certain sign using tritium elements.

7 So finally uranium of course is the largest
8 concern here. And I see something on the environmental
9 assessment that struck me as rather odd. Operating at a
10 50 -- the GE current bundling process is operating at
11 around 50 to 75 percent capacity. And the assessment
12 quoted that from 1998 to 2007 the effluent leaving the
13 waste treatment centre, so that's after all filtering, and
14 after all dilution, was at 11 micrograms per litre.

15 And as we know that the Health Canada
16 drinking objective is 20 micrograms per litre, so this is
17 under the limit.

18 But this doesn't take in account the
19 natural uranium that is already present in the Otonabee
20 River from existing tailing ponds and the like from
21 residual uranium mining.

22 But of course, this is still within norms,
23 so what really concerns me is with this LEU proposal, the
24 EA itself says that the substance itself is five times
25 more radioactive and if it were produced to par with the

1 natural uranium bundles, it would greatly overshoot the
2 drinking limit and contaminate the water beyond
3 drinkability.

4 And the answer ---

5 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Can you please wind up? Can
6 you just finish?

7 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** Sorry. Of course.

8 So, yeah, okay. To wrap it up quickly, my
9 concern is that even though we may set out these
10 regulations, I don't know if they're going to be followed
11 to T. And I guess I'll just leave a few hopefully helpful
12 comments.

13 In terms of public consultation, it might
14 be beneficial in the future to ask workers themselves to
15 spread the words as they are the ones most directly
16 affected by any changes going on at the facility. It
17 might be effective to get feedback from the community if
18 you request workers to spread the word themselves.

19 This may be difficult because I understand
20 it is common practice for workers not to speak out of
21 their particular departments. It is not ---

22 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. We get it. We get
23 it.

24 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** Okay.

25 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Anything else you want to

1 say? Last comment.

2 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** Just that GE's track
3 record previously has been very good for consultation;
4 they've almost seemed to step out of their way from 1950s
5 and 1970s to make sure the public is aware and that
6 they've seemed to have fallen considerably from that
7 standard. That's all.

8 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.

9 Quick rebuttals from staff and GE?

10 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason.

11 I certainly would like to take exception to
12 some points. First of all, as far as the nuclear
13 operation is concerned, we would certainly wouldn't want
14 to comment on any of the past issues that do not relate to
15 our nuclear operations.

16 The one comment I will refute, that GE
17 shows a history of playing with the limits. And I think
18 the history of our operation shows very clearly that we
19 have been consistently below the limits and continuously
20 in fact to drive our levels down below the limits. And it
21 was indeed on our own recommendations that we lower the
22 limits to what was described as a more realistic level.

23 One more point I would make in terms of
24 tritium. The reason that the subject of tritium came up
25 in the -- at the meeting, was one of the activists

1 mentioned about tritium and I said that -- I informed the
2 meeting of how tritium is produced in a CANDU reactor.

3 We do not produce tritium; we do not handle
4 tritium; there is no tritium on site whatsoever. What we
5 do do and what was presented at the meeting, is that we
6 design and build equipment that nuclear utilities can use
7 for the extraction of tritium from their heavy water on
8 site.

9 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

10 **MR. MASON:** Thank you.

11 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Staff?

12 What about PCB? I hear the story about
13 PCB. Did we in all the staff monitoring, did you come
14 across PCB here?

15 **MR. ELDER:** This is at the -- there is no
16 PCB used in the facility but that's as -- as GE pointed
17 out in their original slide, this has been an industrial -
18 - it's located in a wider General Electric facility that
19 has been there for 110 years.

20 So it's well-known that some of the other
21 operations on that site in the past did use PCBs.

22 **THE CHAIRMAN:** But it's not part of their
23 nuclear ---

24 **MR. ELDER:** But it's not part of the
25 nuclear, no. It's a legacy, you know, well, legacy, it's

1 a problem from other operations that site, it's got
2 nothing to do with the nuclear operations on the site.

3 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.
4 Anybody else?

5 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Same question for
6 asbestos. I don't know of any asbestos used in nuclear
7 plants. Is there any use of asbestos at all?

8 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.
9 We do not use asbestos in our operations,
10 no.

11 **THE CHAIRMAN:** And do you want to -- just
12 as an aside -- do you want to shed light on the so called
13 "evacuation mystery" or not?

14 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason.
15 Actually, we discussed that. I've been the
16 CEO there for -- since 2003. I do not know of any
17 evacuation other than our normal drills and certainly not
18 one that lasted for three days.

19 And certainly, our employees would have
20 been fully informed had there been because we have joint
21 health and safety committees which have to address those
22 sorts of issues.

23 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** Yes, last words, they do
24 all resolve around nuclear topics. One is that CNSC
25 itself has pointed out that GE has twice gone over its

1 limits in sending nuclear material through the drain; once
2 in the vicinity of potentially 20 percent and the second
3 time perhaps 300 percent beyond limits.

4 As far as these joint committees, there was
5 a protest action by workers in 1985 saying that GE had
6 disbanded these joint committees and that there was
7 essentially no effect of hierarchy for workers to make
8 complaints ---

9 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Are you talking about 1985?

10 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** That's when this complaint
11 was made. It's just ---

12 **THE CHAIRMAN:** That's -- we're talking
13 about -- that's quite a long time ago.

14 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** A while ago. My hope is
15 just ---

16 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Can we just ---

17 **MR. ADASZYNSKI:** This is how historically
18 things have been handled. And that points to how things
19 will be handled in the future.

20 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.

21 I think this wraps up the oral
22 presentation.

23 Is that correct, Kelly?

24 And we'll now move to written submissions.
25 The Assistant Secretary to the Commission will identify

1 the name of the intervenor and the CMD number and the
2 Commission Members will have the opportunity to ask
3 questions after each written submissions.

4 Kelly, over to you.

5 **MS. McGEE:** We will move to the first
6 written submission from Ms. Leah Simms-Karp as outlined in
7 CMD 10-H17.8.

8
9 **10-H17.8**

10 **Written submission from**

11 **Leah Simms-Karp**

12
13 **MS. McGEE:** Are there any questions from
14 the Commission Members with regard to this written
15 submission?

16 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I have one comment and I
17 think it's repeated in many intervenors that says here on
18 the second paragraph that, "The change made to the EACC
19 during the last budget negating the needs for a
20 decommissioning report." I've no idea where this came
21 from. I've no idea what it means. And it ain't true.
22 Can somebody actually confirm what I've just said?

23 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for the record.

24 First of all, the only clue that I can come
25 with was changes to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment*

1 Act that were in last budget and just confirmed that they
2 in no way touched the CNSC's authority and requirements on
3 decommissioning. We will continue and the *Regulation Act*
4 requires that there be decommissioning plans and financial
5 guarantees.

6 **THE CHAIRMAN:** And the decommissioning,
7 that's how I understand it, decommissioning is totally
8 independent of the environmental ---

9 **MR. ELDER:** That's right.

10 **THE CHAIRMAN:** --- the requirement for any
11 operators or any nuclear facility.

12 **MR. ELDER:** The requirements for
13 decommissioning are under the *Canadian Nuclear Safety and*
14 *Control Act* and have no impact or no relation to the
15 *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.

16 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

17 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
18 from Ms. Carol Winter as outlined in CMD 10-H17.9.

19
20 **10-H17.9**

21 **Written submission from**

22 **Ms. Carol Winter**

23
24 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
25 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

1 The next written submission is from Ms.
2 Victoria Wood as outlined in CMD 10-H17.10.

3

4 **10-H17.10**

5 **Written submission from**

6 **Ms. Victoria Wood**

7

8 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
9 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

10 The next written submission is from Ms.
11 Molly MacDonald as outlined in CMD 10-H17.11.

12

13 **10-H17.11**

14 **Written submission from**

15 **Ms. Molly MacDonald**

16

17 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
18 Members with regard to this written submission?

19 **MEMBER HARVEY:** No. I just want to
20 underline the fact that because we don't have any
21 questions is not to say that we haven't read that. I
22 mean, most of the time, the subjects that are raised in
23 those other documents are the same than the -- that have
24 been previously discussed.

25

 So this is the reason why we don't ---

1 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** And they all seem to
2 have a common denominator of the LEU with the concern
3 about ---

4 **THE CHAIRMAN:** And the PCB. GE has a
5 record of PCB contamination.

6 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** That's right.

7 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I mean we just discussed
8 that. So we don't have to repeat every comment.

9 Okay?

10 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
11 from Mr. Aaron Alexander Campbell as outlined in CMD 10-
12 H17.12.

13

14 **10-H17.12**

15 **Written submission from**

16 **Mr. Aaron Alexander Campbell**

17

18 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
19 Commission Members with regard to this written submission.

20 The next written submission is from Ms.
21 Hanah McFarlane as outlined in CMD 10-H17.13. Are there
22 questions from Members with regard to this written
23 submission?

24

25

1 **10-H17.13**
2 **Written Submission of**
3 **Ms. Hanah McFarlane**

4

5 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Just a brief comment,
6 really, on the flood plan which she was talking about.

7 And I understand that you do have a flood
8 plan?

9 **THE CHAIRMAN:** But I think it requires some
10 further emphasis. There is a flood plan. You did modify
11 the plant itself to deal with floods. Is that correct?

12 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason.

13 Yes, and also the Municipality of
14 Peterborough has done extensive work around the City of
15 Peterborough in order to address the flood issue.

16 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

17 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
18 from Ms. Sheila Nabigon-Howlett as outlined in CMD 10-
19 H17.14. Are there questions from Commission Members with
20 regard to this submission?

21

22 **10-H17.14**
23 **Written Submission of**
24 **Ms. Sheila Nabigon-Howlett**

25

1 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
2 from Ms. Tegan Moss as outlined in CMD 10-H17.15. Are
3 there questions from Commission Members with regards to
4 this submission?

5

6 **10-H17.15**

7 **Written Submission of**

8 **Ms. Tegan Moss**

9

10 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
11 from Ms. Jo Hayward-Haines as outlined in CMD 10-H17.16.
12 Are there questions from Commission Members with regard to
13 this written submission?

14

15 **10-H17.16**

16 **Written Submission of**

17 **Ms. Jo Hayward-Haines**

18

19 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Just you get some -- I think
20 there's a piece of advice to GE here. "If only from
21 concern of public relations, GE should consider a plant --
22 should reconsider its plans and relocate to an industrial
23 park."

24

25 I thought you were already in an industrial
park. Are you not near -- I mean, what is the probability

1 of you relocating? Let me put it this way.

2 **MR. MASON:** At this point in time and for
3 the foreseeable future, there is no plan to relocate. We
4 are on an industrial zoned industrial campus, and GE has
5 been there for, as we said earlier, 120 years.

6 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So when -- there was a lot
7 of real estate level kind of a concern. You've been
8 around there for 100-plus years, so I'm trying to
9 understand those recent events will not have a new impact
10 on real estate property value, would it?

11 **MR. MASON:** For the record, Peter Mason.
12 I'm really not qualified to answer that,
13 Mr. President.

14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.

15 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
16 from Ms. Darlene Buckingham as outlined in CMD 10-H17.17.

17

18 **10-H17.17**

19 **Written Submission of**

20 **Ms. Darlene Buckingham**

21

22 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from the
23 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

24 The next written submission is from Mr.
25 Evan Brockest as outlined in CMD 10-H17.18.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

10-H17.18

**Written Submission of
Mr. Evan Brockest**

MS. MCGEE: Are there questions from Members with regard to this written submission?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry. There's a misunderstanding about the role of provincial government. Provincial governments do not get involved in licensing nuclear facilities. It says, "Most recent decision by the provincial government to process," okay.

That's a clarification.

MS. MCGEE: The next written submission is from Mr. Mike Facey as outlined in CMD 10-H17.19.

10-H17.19

**Written Submission of
Mr. Mike Facey**

MS. MCGEE: Are there questions from Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

The next written submission is from Mr. Ian Cameron as outlined in CMD 10-H17.20.

1 **10-H17.20**

2 **Written Submission of**

3 **Mr. Ian Cameron**

4

5 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
6 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

7 The next written submission is from Ms.
8 Patricia Morris as outlined in CMD 10-H17.21.

9

10 **10-H17-21**

11 **Written Submission of**

12 **Ms. Patricia Morris**

13

14 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from the
15 Members with regard to this written submission?

16 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** The only question I
17 have, really, I don't know in New Brunswick of any uranium
18 bundling facilities.

19 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** There was a heavy water
20 facility back about 30 years ago for a very short time.

21 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** That was in Nova Scotia
22 in ---

23 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** No, that's Scoudouc, it
24 was.

25 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Okay.

1 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** But it only -- it's been 30
2 or 40 years since that, 30 years at least.

3 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Yeah.

4 **THE CHAIRMAN:** But I would like to ask, do
5 we know were there any health effects felt all over the
6 region? I mean, there's a statement to that effect.

7 Do we know, is anybody -- any staff would
8 be aware of any regional health issue associated with that
9 facility?

10 **MR. ELDER:** I'll ask Dr. Thompson if she's
11 aware of anything. Certainly we're not, but she may have
12 a wider view.

13 **DR. THOMPSON:** Patsy Thompson, for the
14 record.

15 I am not aware of any health studies done
16 on community members around Point Lepreau, but NB Power
17 workers are included in the Canadian Nuclear Power Worker
18 cohort on which we've done health studies, and the health
19 studies on workers who are generally more exposed than
20 members of the public show that the workers are as healthy
21 as the Canadian population.

22 In a region similar to Point Lepreau, one
23 reactor, which is Gentilly-2, there has been a study done
24 in the area, and there's no difference in the health
25 status of the population around Gentilly-2 comparable to

1 Point Lepreau and the rest of the province.

2 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thank you.

3 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Just as a clarification,
4 there was a fuel bundling facility in Scoudouc for about a
5 year at the time Lepreau was built, but that was -- only
6 lasted about a year because it was consolidated by the
7 other companies.

8 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** So there was?

9 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yeah, and there was a heavy
10 water plant in Nova Scotia, but that was at the very start
11 of Point Lepreau.

12 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

13 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
14 from Ms. Susan Dymment as outlined in CMD 10-H17.22.

15

16 **10-H17.22**

17 **Written Submission of**

18 **Ms. Susan Dymment**

19

20 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
21 Commission Members with regard to those written
22 submissions?

23 The next written submission is from Mr.
24 Paul Longhurst as outlined in CMD 10-H17.23.

25

1 **10-H17.23**

2 **Written Submission of**

3 **Mr. Paul Longhurst**

4

5 **MS. McGEE:** Are there questions from
6 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

7 The next written submission is from Mr.
8 Shane Hartman as outlined in CMD 10-H17.24.

9

10 **10-H17.24**

11 **Written Submission of**

12 **Mr. Shane Hartman**

13

14 **MS. McGEE:** Are there questions from
15 Members with regard to this written submission?

16 The next written submission is from Ms.
17 Sally Goodwin as outlined in CMDs 10-H17.25 and H17.25A.

18

19 **10-H17-25 / 10-H17-25A**

20 **Written Submission of**

21 **Ms. Sally Goodwin**

22

23 **MS. McGEE:** Are there questions from
24 Commission Members with regard to these written
25 submissions?

1 The next written submission is from Mister
2 ---

3 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Sorry. On the last one,
4 again, this is from Ms. Jane Scott. Just to clarify, in
5 the third paragraph -- I'm looking at the 25A, "If a
6 criticality accident occurs..." I just want to make sure
7 that everybody understands there is no possibility -- just
8 tell me is there such an event possible in the GE plant?

9 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.
10 Criticality is not possible with natural
11 uranium.

12 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

13 **MS. MCGEE:** The next written submission is
14 from Mr. Stuart Morris as outlined in CDM 10-H17.26.

15

16 **10-H17.26**

17 **Written Submission of**

18 **Mr. Stuart Morris**

19

20 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
21 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

22 The next written submission is from Ms.
23 Liat Mandel as outlined in CMD 10-H17.27.

24

25 **10-H17.27**

1 **Written Submission of**
2 **Ms. Liat Mandel**

3

4 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
5 Members with regard to this written submission?

6 The next written submission is from Ms.
7 Emily Mask as outlined in CMD 10-H17.28.

8

9 **10-H17.28**

10 **Written Submission of**
11 **Ms. Emily Mask**

12

13 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
14 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

15 The next written submission is from Ms.
16 Megan Dochuk as outlined in CMD 10-H17.29.

17

18 **10-H17.29**

19 **Written Submission of**
20 **Ms. Megan Dochuk**

21

22 **MS. MCGEE:** Are there questions from
23 Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

24 The next written submission is from Mr.
25 Matthew Beal as outlined in CMD 10-H17.30.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

10-H17.30

Written Submission of

Mr. Matthew Beal

MS. MCGEE: Are there questions from Members with regard to this written submission?

The next written submission is from Ms. Jane Scott as outlined in CMDs 10-H17.31 and H17.31A.

10-H17.31 / 10-H17.31A

Written Submission of

Ms. Jane Scott

MS. MCGEE: Are there questions from Members with regard to these written submissions?

The next submission is outlined in CMDs 10-H17.32 and H17.32A. This is from members of the public who filed late interventions last week. This submission includes interventions from the following individuals: Carla Dempsey, Matt Vidler, Julie Cosgrove, Megan Meyer, Cathrine VanHoof Melanie Buddle, Ann Tennent-Riddell, Caroline Tennent, Julian Tennent-Riddell, Kevin Siena, Erica Martin, Andrew Griffin, Lara Griffin, Peter Harris, Pete Woolidge, Stephanie Melles and Christina

1 Warnes.

2 Are there any questions from Commission
3 Members on these written submissions?

4

5 10-H17.32 / 10-H17.32A

6 Written Submission of

7 Carla Dempsey, Matt Vilder, Julie Cosgrove

8 Megan Meyer, Cathrine VanHoof, Melanie Buddle

9 Anna Tennent-Riddell, Caroline Tennent,

10 Julian Tennent-Riddell, Kevin Siena,

11 Erica Martin, Andrew Griffin, Lara Griffin,

12 Peter harris, Peter Woolidge, Stephanie Melles,

13 Christina Warne

14

15

16 **MEMBER HARVEY:** I just want to point out
17 that this is a submission from Andrew Griffin in the fifth
18 paragraph, can read: "I live 50 metres from the plant" --
19 not 50 but 500.

20 "I have lived there for 17 years and I
21 have not had a single mailing. None
22 of the people I have talked to report
23 receiving a mailing. I found out
24 about the licence application only
25 last week".

1 Just want to say, maybe your distribution
2 company is missing something; I don't know what. This is
3 what's conveyed here.

4 Can you comment on that?

5 **MR. MASON:** Peter Mason, for the record.

6 We can only speculate what happened to the
7 person's flyer. I suspect that it ended up in the garbage
8 with many of the other flyers.

9 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I think Mr. Harris, Peter
10 Harris, in his submission raised the licensing period
11 question and he mentioned that by far too lengthy to this
12 point.

13 Staff (a) you want to comment on it and (b)
14 remind me again, you are suggesting a mid-point
15 presentation?

16 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for the record.

17 In terms of -- there are two things I want
18 to comment about -- the information to the public over
19 this period. One is a formal report we were recommending
20 to the Commission by GE-HC at about the mid-term so about
21 five years.

22 We've also included a licence condition
23 requiring them to actually -- this wasn't there before --
24 to actually have and implement their public information
25 program. And part of that is movement to a more proactive

1 disclosure by licensees will require them to put their
2 annual compliance report, so environmental monitoring
3 reports on their website.

4 They've already started to do that but this
5 will also mean that they will have to continue to make
6 sure that there is routine information on the activities
7 of the facility available on their website and to the
8 public.

9 In terms of our comments on -- and there
10 was some noting that we were critical of their public
11 information program at Day One. We are now satisfied with
12 their program but it has to be implemented and that will
13 also require them to investigate what the public wants out
14 of the public information program.

15 So studies and focus to make sure that the
16 information that they making available to the public is
17 actually material the public needs or desires to have.

18 But at minimum it will include the annual
19 reporting, routine reporting, as well as reporting on any
20 events and make sure those are publicly available.

21 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, thanks.

22 My very last question, I promise and that
23 is -- Christina Warnes. She makes the statement that
24 transportation of the fuel rods, the GE bundles "is
25 something that I feel is a danger."

1 Any comment from GE? When you're in
2 transport of those fuel bundles, what kind of risk we're
3 looking at?

4 **MR. DESIRI:** For the record, Paul Desiri.

5 The shipment of fuel bundles is done in
6 accordance with our approved procedures and all applicable
7 regulations, including transportation of dangerous goods
8 and of course the CNSC Regulations, IAEA Regulations.

9 The bundles themselves are quite robust;
10 they're designed to go inside a reactor. They are leak-
11 tested before being shipped offsite. The pellets
12 themselves have a very hard consistency, similar to a
13 coffee mug and all of the bundles are wrapped tightly
14 inside a box that meets a transport standard.

15 So the risk of any impacts from any
16 accident, first of all, are very low; there are many, many
17 layers of controls in place to prevent any impacts from an
18 accident.

19 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Do you want to make any
20 comment on this?

21 **MR. ELDER:** I think as the Commission is
22 aware, we have quite strict packaging transport
23 regulations that GE-Hitachi must meet, along with
24 everybody else, and there has been talk at previous --
25 this morning that there are also requirements set forth in

1 Transport Canada's Regulations on transportation of
2 dangerous goods.

3 Both the CNSC and Transport Canada do do
4 inspections of their packaging at these facilities and
5 make sure they are meeting all of the regulations.

6 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

7 Any other question?

8 This concludes this session. Thank you
9 very much.

10 It also concludes the interventions, all
11 the interventions.

12 Commissioners, you have a chance for one
13 last round of questions to GE or staff.

14 Okay, go ahead.

15 **MS. MCGEE:** This brings to a close the
16 public portion of this hearing with respect to this
17 matter. I propose that the Commission confer with regards
18 to the information that has been considered today and then
19 determine if further information is needed or if the
20 Commission is ready to proceed with a decision. We will
21 advise accordingly.

22 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So the Commission will
23 reconvene tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock for the public
24 hearing on the application by Hydro Quebec for the renewal
25 of the licenses for Gentilly-2 Nuclear Generating Station

1 and Radioactive Waste Management Facilities.

2 So I'd like to thank everybody and have a
3 good evening.

4 --- Upon adjourning at 4:07 p.m./L'audience est ajournée à
5 16h07

6

7

8

9

10