

1 **HEARING DAY TWO**

2 **Cameco Corporation: Application for a licence to**
3 **operate the Port Hope Nuclear Fuel Facility**

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: We will now
5 more to Item 3 of the agenda which is Hearing Day
6 Two on the matter of the application by Cameco
7 Corporation for a licence to operate the Port
8 Hope Nuclear Fuel Facility.

9 The first day of the public
10 hearing on this application was held on November
11 15, 2001. The public was invited to participate,
12 either by oral presentation or written
13 submission, on Hearing Day Two.

14 December 14th was the deadline
15 set for filing by intervenors. The Commission
16 received eight requests to intervene. The Notice
17 of Public Hearing 2001-H15 was published on
18 September 6, 2001. The Commission Members
19 present for Day One of the Hearing included Mr.
20 Graham, Dr. Giroux, Dr. Barnes, Ms MacLachlan and
21 myself.

22 Presentations were made on Day
23 One by both the applicant, Cameco Corporation,
24 under CMDs 01-H32.1, 01-H32.1A, and by the
25 Commission staff under CMD 01-H32.

1 I note that the applicant, Cameco
2 Corporation and the CNSC staff will present
3 supplementary information today.

4 I would like to begin by calling
5 for the oral presentation by Cameco Corporation
6 as outlined in CMD Document 01-H32.1B and turn it
7 over to Cameco to make the opening remarks.

8 I believe Mr. Chad will do that.

9

10 **01-H32.1B**

11 **Oral presentation by Cameco Corporation**

12 MR. CHAD: Good morning, Madam
13 Chairman and Members of the Commission. For the
14 record, I'm Garry Chad, Senior Vice-President,
15 Law and Regulatory Affairs and Corporate
16 Secretary of Cameco Corporation.

17 I'm pleased to be here today in
18 support of my company's request for renewal of
19 its operating licence for our Port Hope
20 facilities for a period of five years.

21 I have with me today, to my
22 right, Bob Steane, Vice-President of Fuel
23 Services. As Vice-President of Fuel Services,
24 Mr. Steane is the General Manager of our Port
25 Hope operations, and he oversees the Blind River

1 operations of Cameco.

2 He will be making our
3 presentation today.

4 To my left is Hess Carisse,
5 Manager, Technical Services at Port Hope.
6 Sitting behind us from right to my left are John
7 Jarrell, Vice-President, Environment and Safety;
8 Tom Smith, Specialist, Environmental Initiatives
9 from our Port Hope operations, and Franko Dobri,
10 Superintendent, Quality Assurance at Port Hope.

11 I will now turn over the
12 presentation to Bob Steane. We would be pleased
13 to answer any questions that you may have after
14 our presentation.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. STEANE: Thank you, Garry.
17 Good morning, Madam Chair, and Members of the
18 Commission. For the record, my name is Bob
19 Steane, and I am the Vice-President of Cameco
20 Fuel Services Division.

21 My presentation this morning will
22 provide an update on relevant activities since
23 the Day One Hearing in November, provide
24 additional information on the subject of uranium
25 and soil, as that was of particular interest to

1 the Commission at the Day One Hearing, and lastly
2 provide a five-year outlook for the facility.

3 There have not been any
4 significant operating problems in the intervening
5 time. The site met the production targets and
6 there were no environmental events.

7 The third quarter environmental
8 monitoring report was presented to the town
9 through the Protection of Persons and Property
10 Committee of the Town Council. The preliminary
11 decommissioning plan was completed and submitted
12 to the CNSC staff late in December.

13 Implementation of various aspects
14 of the CNSC Security Order 01.D1 continued.
15 There was an inspection of the facility by an
16 individual from the CNSC's Non-Proliferation,
17 Safeguards and Security Division and items raised
18 from this inspection were promptly addressed.
19 Lastly, we presented an Environmental Seminar to
20 a local high school Environmental Club.

21 The preliminary decommissioning
22 plan was revised according to the recommendations
23 and guidance received from the CNSC Commission
24 staff. Essentially, these were to present a
25 practical plan that was doable with sufficient

1 detail presented in the plan such that it was a
2 stand-alone document that did not require a
3 reader to cross-reference other documents to gain
4 an understanding of the plan.

5 The revised plan recognizes the
6 advent of the establishment of a local low-level
7 reactor waste management facility, and the
8 provision in the design and agreement for this
9 facility for 150,000 cubic metres of Cameco
10 decommissioning waste.

11 This is recognized in the plan by
12 outlining a timeline that will incorporate a
13 significant reclamation of the historical
14 material on the site at the same time as the low-
15 level reactive waste initiative is proceeding.

16 The cost of the decommissioning
17 plan is estimated at \$33.8 million. Financial
18 guarantees in the form of an irrevocable Letter
19 of Credit will be submitted to the CNSC on
20 receipt of notification of acceptance of the plan
21 by the CNSC.

22 Now, coming up to the subject of
23 uranium and soil. This is an issue that has been
24 the subject of much discussion with some
25 different interpretations of the data from some

1 of the tests.

2 I will present this subject in
3 three stages. First, the review of some recent
4 modelling work that has been done to relate plant
5 emissions with soil depositions.

6 Second, a review of the results
7 from the various field tests, more commonly known
8 as the soil plot tests, and finally some
9 conclusions from the information presented.

10 Uranium emissions from our
11 operation mainly come from two sources: The
12 uranium hexafluoride plant in the northwest
13 corner -- I point to it here with this mouse --
14 and the uranium dioxide plant which is located in
15 the south end of the property, here.

16 The emissions are measured and
17 recorded. A computer modelling of the emission
18 data with the wind direction of velocity data for
19 the period of 1996 to 2000 was done to enable a
20 prediction of uranium dispersion and deposition.
21 It can be seen that the prevailing wind ranges
22 from the north-northwest to west-southwest.

23 A comparison of the predicted
24 uranium in air concentration derived from the
25 model with actual measured results from the high-

1 volume air samplers for this five-year period
2 show quite excellent correlation.

3 Using these derived air
4 concentrations and making some assumptions on the
5 settling velocity based upon the particle size of
6 the dust, the computer models predicted the
7 average uranium deposition rate in milligrams of
8 uranium per square metre per month.

9 These results have been plotted
10 on a map of the area surrounding the plant and
11 are illustrated in isoplots shown on the map of
12 the town.

13 Cameco has sample stations
14 measuring the dustfall and the uranium air
15 concentration at various locations around the
16 facility. This is a picture of, on the left, the
17 dustfall device, and on the right, the hi volume
18 air sampler. There are three hi volume sample
19 stations, one at Location 1, one at Location 5,
20 and one at Location 9. There are eight dustfall
21 sample locations. These are at Locations 1, 2,
22 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

23 There are also five soil plot
24 test locations. Two of these are the Ontario
25 Ministry of the Environment's and three of them

1 are Cameco's. The two MOE sites are at the
2 Marina which is south of Location 7 and the Town
3 Hall which is slightly north of Location 5. The
4 three Cameco plots are at the Waterworks,
5 Location 1, Shuter Street, Location 9, and the
6 Beach, Location 11.

7 The predicted dustfall from the
8 computer model was converted to a predicted
9 change in the uranium and soil concentration by
10 assuming that all of the deposited uranium would
11 accumulate in the top-five centimetres of soil,
12 and that there was no removal mechanisms.

13 The total change predicted over
14 the five-year period was determined for each of
15 the soil plot test location. These range from
16 0.17 to 1.59 ppm increase over five years, or
17 0.03 to 0.3 ppm/year depending upon the location.

18 A prediction of the accumulation
19 for 60 years was derived and can be seen in the
20 table. Comparing these with the background of
21 soil concentrations that have been measured at
22 each of these locations shows that uranium
23 concentrations will not rise in any appreciable
24 amount and will be far below any observable
25 effects level. This with the assumption that

1 there is no removal mechanism during the period.

2 Another item of note is the
3 history of uranium dustfall data. There has been
4 a concerted effort made at the Port Hope facility
5 to reduce uranium emissions and it's clearly
6 illustrated in its 24-year history.

7 Now, coming to the field test.
8 As I mentioned, there are five soil plot tests in
9 the area, two operated by the Ontario Ministry of
10 the Environment and three by Cameco. These were
11 installed to try to differentiate between uranium
12 in the soil from historic waste practices, and
13 that from deposition from current emissions.

14 A typical soil plot test consists
15 of rows of soil plots buried in the soil. Each
16 plot consists of ten rows of three plots. Each
17 year one row of three plots is harvested and the
18 soil contained in the plots analyzed.

19 Again, the soil plot locations
20 are shown on this map. Now, the result from the
21 soil plot tests up to 2000 show the following
22 average deposition rates. In looking at these
23 results it was interesting that the uranium in
24 the soil surrounding the test plots is more
25 revealing than the soil plots themselves.

1 Each year, when the plots have
2 been harvested, a sample has been collected from
3 the soil surrounding the plot area. If one
4 assumes a 50-year period, then the background in
5 the area should approximate the predicted rate
6 times the 50-year period.

7 In fact, with the exception of
8 the Town Hall plot, at none of the test plot
9 locations do the background soil samples agree
10 with what would be predicted from the plot
11 samples. The soil plots are overestimating the
12 accumulation of uranium in the soil.

13 At the accumulation rate of
14 slightly over one ppm/year reported at the
15 Marina, it should not be possible to find any
16 soil in this area less than around 55 ppm, given
17 50 years of deposition and that coupled with the
18 known deposition of historical waste material in
19 that area.

20 Most of the soil plot tests are
21 in areas of known contamination from past waste
22 practices. It would appear that the soil pots
23 are not yet in equilibrium, which was initially
24 projected to happen in the first two to three-
25 year period.

1 Some conclusions. The soil in
2 the plots is increasing, but the reason for the
3 increase is not obvious. What is not known is
4 the mechanisms for the increase. There may be
5 things like resuspension of material in the area,
6 differences in the soil composition from the
7 surrounding soil, and soil mechanics that are not
8 understood.

9 The actual changes over time of
10 the background soil samples is in much closer
11 agreement with the predicted deposition modelling
12 result than the soil plot test.

13 Now, this is consistent with the
14 fact that computer modelling is the recognized
15 tool to set standards and monitor environmental
16 compliance.

17 In summary, it is our opinion,
18 based upon the information presented, that the
19 measured soil plot data is overestimating the
20 actual accumulation of uranium in the soil from
21 current emissions from the Port Hope facility.

22 Coming now to the issue of a
23 five-year outlook. There are no significant
24 changes currently planned. We can see production
25 volumes rising as additional CANDU reactors come

1 online. Pickering and Bruce are both planning
2 restarting units and as a demand for conversion
3 to uranium hexafluoride increases, this from both
4 a reduction in world inventories as well as the
5 withdrawal of British nuclear fuels from the
6 conversion business.

7 There are a number of activities
8 to implement such as a new internal dosimetry
9 program and the links between the existing Port
10 Hope Quality Assurance Program and the Corporate
11 Quality Assurance Program as it develops.

12 There will be continued
13 improvement in the safety and the environmental
14 systems at the site to perpetuate the continual
15 improvement mandated by corporate policy and
16 ISO 14001 registration.

17 Certainly Cameco will continue to
18 optimize the existing operations and investigate
19 new business opportunities as the market demands.

20 If a new opportunity presents
21 itself that is outside the scope of the existing
22 licence, then application for a licence amendment
23 would be made. It would be supported by all of
24 the necessary assessment and documentation
25 required for the decision which would vary

1 depending upon the nature of the change.

2 Again, at this time, no changes
3 of this nature are currently planned. One item
4 mentioned at the Day One Hearing was that the
5 Crane Property Lease is dated to July 1, 2005.
6 The fact around this property is that it is
7 intimately tied into the Port Hope area
8 initiative, and until the environmental
9 assessment being done by the Low-Level
10 Radioactive Waste Management Office is complete,
11 and the construction of a waste management
12 facility is done, little can be done with the
13 property.

14 These activities are currently
15 expected to take five to seven years. This
16 property is specifically included in the Port
17 Hope project description.

18 In the meantime, Cameco is making
19 provisions to relocate our uranium dioxide
20 product storage onto the main site and plans to
21 have this activity completed by mid-2005 to
22 facilitate any options that may present
23 themselves during the clean-up project
24 assessment.

25 We feel in the context of the

1 five-year licence period a mid-licence
2 comprehensive review before the Commission would
3 be appropriate. This would give the Commission a
4 review of our performance relative to the licence
5 and the public a chance to formally comment.

6 We believe that the regulatory
7 system is sufficiently flexible to deal with mid-
8 term changes, if required, and that segregating
9 issue-specific amendments from the general
10 licence activities and renewal would be
11 beneficial.

12 In conclusion, we believe that a
13 five-year licence should be granted. The
14 regulations and regulatory process are such that
15 any item significant enough to require a licence
16 amendment needs to come to the Commission and the
17 public through formal hearings.

18 This is the case whenever the
19 circumstances change which is independent of the
20 licence term.

21 There are a no issues in front of
22 us now that should preclude a five-year term and
23 issuing such a licence would give both the
24 licensee and Commission staff more time to focus
25 on activities other than licensing for a long

1 period.

2 Thank you. I would be pleased to
3 take questions now or later, as the Commission
4 desires.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
6 much.

7 Any further comments, Mr. Chad,
8 before...?

9 MR. CHAD: No, Madam Chair.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

11 With the permission of the
12 Commission Members, before I open the floor for
13 questions to the licensee, I would like to call
14 upon the staff for their presentation.

15 So what I would like to do is,
16 therefore, turn to Ms Cait Maloney. Before you
17 start, Ms Maloney, the Commission would like to
18 acknowledge your new position as Director General
19 of Fuel Cycle & Facilities Regulation, and also
20 congratulate the new Vice-President of
21 Operations, Mr. Pereira.

22 So with said, Ms Maloney.

23

24 **01-H32.A**

25 **Oral presentation by CNSC staff**

1 MS MALONEY: Thank you very much.
2 Good morning, Madam President and
3 Commission Members. I'm Cait Maloney, Director
4 General of the Nuclear Cycle & Facilities
5 Directorate.

6 The supplementary CMD before you,
7 01-H32.A, on the topic of CMD 01-H32.A on the
8 topic of Cameco's application to renew the
9 licence for operation of its Port Hope Nuclear
10 Fuel Facility serves two purposes.

11 It provides information on topics
12 outstanding from Day 1 of the hearings and
13 provides an update on the response by the
14 licensee to the Security Order issued on November
15 16, 2001.

16 The information that it does
17 contain does not affect the conclusions of staff
18 that were set out in CMD 01-H.32, which was
19 presented at Day 1 of this hearing in November
20 2001.

21 The outstanding topics that are
22 addressed are as follows: preliminary
23 decommissioning plan and associated financial
24 guarantee, fire safety, staff intentions for
25 reporting on the facility's performance during

1 the requested term, outlook for changes during
2 the requested licence term, off-site emergency
3 response and environmental monitoring.

4 With me today are Barclay Howden,
5 Director of the Uranium Facilities Division and
6 Michael White, Head of the Uranium Processing
7 Facilities Section within that division. Other
8 staff members are also here to respond to your
9 questions.

10 Mr. White will now present the
11 CMD.

12 MR. WHITE: Thank you, Ms
13 Maloney.

14 For the record, my name is
15 Michael White, and I am head of the Uranium
16 Processing Facilities Section.

17 Madam Chair, Members of the
18 Commission, my presentation will recapitulate the
19 key points of CMD 01-H32.A and the
20 recommendations made in CMD 01-H32.

21 Since Day 1 of the hearing CNSC
22 staff has reviewed the revised version of the
23 preliminary decommissioning plan submitted by the
24 applicant and has come to the conclusion that the
25 estimated cost to decommission the facility of

1 \$33.8 million is reasonable.

2 The applicant is committed to
3 have an appropriate form of guarantee for this
4 amount in place by March 1, 2002.

5 Accordingly, CNSC staff
6 recommends that the Commission accept the
7 proposed guarantee of \$33.8 million and approve
8 the inclusion of the condition in the licence as
9 recommended in the CMD, subject to one change,
10 namely that the date of the preliminary
11 decommissioning plan not be specified in the
12 condition.

13 The reason for this proposed
14 change is to facilitate the updating of the plan,
15 should it be considered warranted during the term
16 of the licence, without having to amend the
17 licence at that time. This is regarded as a
18 minor consideration because the preliminary
19 decommissioning plan is not relied on for
20 compliance purposes.

21 With regard to fire protection at
22 the facility, the applicant has completed certain
23 of the improvements needed to bring it into
24 compliance with the requirements of the National
25 Building Code and the National Fire Code.

1 Work is under way to make the
2 other modifications needed to achieve full
3 compliance. These are more substantial in
4 nature, requiring design changes, the procurement
5 and installation of new equipment. They are
6 scheduled to be completed in 2004.

7 This timing is acceptable to
8 CNSC staff.

9 CNSC staff will inspect this work
10 as it progresses and will take any actions which
11 may be warranted in light of the findings from
12 those inspections.

13 The condition included in the
14 proposed licence requires compliance with the
15 National Building Code and with the National Fire
16 Code, as mentioned. CNSC staff believe that it
17 would be prudent to augment the requirements of
18 those Codes with additional measures derived from
19 the U.S. National Fire Protection Association
20 Standard 801.

21 This proposal is being considered
22 by all the uranium processing facilities at this
23 time. CNSC staff is to meet with them in early
24 February to determine which provisions of the
25 standard are appropriate to their facilities and

1 operations and which are not.

2 The Council of the Municipality
3 of Port Hope, which came into being in January
4 2001 following the amalgamation of the former
5 Town of Port Hope and the Township of Hope, has
6 established a committee to provide advice on
7 matters of environmental concern. The membership
8 of this committee is nine local resident plus one
9 councillor.

10 It should be noted that the
11 applicant has been requested to continue
12 reporting to the Protection of Persons and
13 Property Committee, which is a subcommittee of
14 the Council, rather than this advisory committee
15 however.

16 CNSC staff recognizes the
17 Commission's and the public's wish to be kept
18 informed about the facility's performance as
19 regards protection of the environment, the health
20 and safety of workers and the public and the
21 facility itself in the interests of national
22 security.

23 If the Commission approves the
24 term of five years for the proposed licence, CNSC
25 staff will make a available a report on the

1 facility's performance at the mid-term point.
2 The content of this report will generally follow
3 the model set out in the appendix to the CMD.

4 For the record, I should add that
5 the CNSC staff will carry out regular compliance
6 inspections and program audits during the course
7 of the licence term to monitor the facility's
8 performance.

9 It is reasonably probable that
10 changes to some aspect of the licensed
11 activities, or to the regulatory requirements
12 will be warranted during the term of the licence,
13 whatever its duration. The applicant has
14 presented its views in this regard.

15 The only development which CNSC
16 staff anticipates at this time is a possible
17 amendment of the licence condition to require the
18 implementation of additional fire safety measures
19 derived from the U.S. National Fire Protection
20 Association Standard 801, as referred to earlier.

21 Other changes may be proposed,
22 either by the applicant or the CNSC staff.

23 In most instances the effect of a
24 change is to reduce the risks posed by the
25 facility. However, it might be that a change

1 could increase the risk or be perceived to
2 increase the risk as, for example, an increase in
3 the production rate.

4 Any change of that nature,
5 together with any change which constitutes an
6 additional regulatory requirement, will be
7 reported to the Commission.

8 The status of arrangements for
9 dealing with emergency situations was questioned
10 at Day 1 of the hearing. Since that time CNSC
11 staff has confirmed that the applicant has made
12 suitable arrangements for off-site emergency
13 response.

14 The applicant's emergency plan
15 meets the CNSC's requirements.

16 In support of this plan, the
17 applicant is a member of the Port Hope Community
18 Awareness and Emergency Response initiative known
19 as CAER. This collective of the major industrial
20 establishments and operators in Port Hope has
21 implemented a computerized telephone warning
22 system which can be used to make people aware of
23 emergency situations in the community.

24 The municipality's Emergency
25 Response Plan meets the criteria of the essential

1 level established under the Partnerships Towards
2 Safer Communities program.

3 We are happy to take note that
4 representatives of Emergency Measures Ontario are
5 present today to provide additional information
6 on this topic should Commission Members so
7 desire.

8 Scope and adequacy of the
9 applicant's environmental monitoring program was
10 of interest at Day 1 of this hearing also.

11 The existing program goes back
12 many years. During the course of its existence
13 it has been subjected to several reviews by CNSC
14 staff. Its purpose was to monitor and measure
15 sources of radiation exposure to provide data for
16 estimating doses to members of the public and, in
17 addition, the fluoride emissions from the
18 facility and concentrations in the air and
19 vegetation.

20 This information has been used
21 for assessing the impacts of the facility on the
22 environment.

23 The effluents released from the
24 facility to the Port Hope harbour and Lake
25 Ontario comprise primarily cooling water which is

1 used on a once-through basis. Under normal
2 conditions, barring any leakage from heat
3 exchanges, the composition of the water is the
4 same as that drawn from the lake. The effluents
5 are monitored for contaminants which may come
6 from process operations.

7 The uranium concentrations in the
8 harbour water are such that no harm is likely to
9 occur to aquatic organisms.

10 It is possible, however, that
11 contaminants in the effluents could accumulate in
12 sediment. This is an open question because
13 currently no samples are being taken to monitor
14 the sediments and organisms living in them.

15 In the absence of relevant data,
16 CNSC staff are not able to ascertain whether any
17 effects are actually occurring and the magnitude
18 of impacts on species which might be affected.

19 To remedy this situation, CNSC
20 staff considers that an environmental effects
21 component should be added to the existing
22 monitoring program. This component would be
23 designed taking into account the risk to the
24 environment based on the data currently
25 available.

1 Releases of uranium and other
2 hazardous substances from the facility to the
3 atmosphere are relatively low, as was reported in
4 CMD 01-H32.

5 The data from the air quality
6 monitoring stations shows that the uranium
7 concentrations are low and are unlikely to be
8 harmful to non-human species.

9 The fluoride concentrations are
10 also low, less than the criteria set by the
11 Ontario Ministry of the Environment to protect
12 animals grazing in the local area and thus do not
13 damage vegetation.

14 The accumulation of uranium in
15 soil is of potential significance with respect to
16 the well-being of humans, organisms living in the
17 ground, plants and wildlife due to its toxicity.

18 The significance has to be
19 assessed in terms of the current uranium
20 concentrations, the rate of accumulation and thus
21 the increase in those concentrations and the
22 levels at which harm might be expected to occur.
23 There may be some locations of limited area at
24 which the concentration is greater than these
25 so-called benchmark values.

1 The information on uranium
2 concentrations at different locations in the Port
3 Hope area is presented in the figure attached to
4 the CMD. There is quite wide range in these
5 values, from the very low number of
6 .07 micrograms per gram of soil to a high of
7 135 micrograms per gram. The average is
8 32 micrograms per gram.

9 The mean rate of accumulation is
10 also highly variable, from 0.01 micrograms per
11 gram a year to 1.29 micrograms per gram per year.

12 Different soil benchmark uranium
13 concentrations have been suggested for different
14 purposes.

15 For the protection of human
16 health the value is 1,200 micrograms per gram.

17 For the protection of plants two
18 values have been put forward by different
19 authorities. These are 300 micrograms per gram
20 and 64 micrograms per gram.

21 For the protection of the
22 invertebrates living in soil the value is
23 100 micrograms per gram.

24 Taking those benchmark values
25 into account, CNSC staff has concluded that the

1 uranium concentration in the soil is not
2 sufficient currently to cause harm to soil biota,
3 nor would it be expected to do so if uranium
4 continues to accumulate for 100 years at the
5 current rate.

6 CNSC staff believes that two
7 conclusions can be drawn with respect to
8 environmental protection.

9 These are, first, that the
10 applicant's existing environmental protection
11 program is effectively preventing unreasonable
12 risks to the environment.

13 Second, that there is a need to
14 augment the existing monitoring program to focus
15 on the environment in its own right by adding an
16 effects monitoring component.

17 Three changes to the draft
18 licence attached to CMD 01-H32, which was
19 presented at Day 1 of this hearing on
20 November 15, 2001, are proposed at this time.

21 The first of these is to include
22 the condition on the maintenance of the financial
23 guarantee to cover the costs of decommissioning,
24 as set out in the CMD 01-32.A, but without the
25 reference to the data of the preliminary

1 decommissioning plan for the reason explained
2 earlier.

3 The second change is to require
4 the applicant to maintain the measures which have
5 been established to protect the facility and the
6 nuclear substances on-site as approved by CNSC
7 staff.

8 The third is to change the date
9 the documents referenced in Appendix B of the
10 proposed licence. This change is needed because
11 the applicant submitted revised versions of the
12 documents in question after the original
13 CMD 01-H32 was prepared.

14 These documents have been
15 reviewed and accepted by CNSC staff.

16 With respect to the physical
17 security of the facility, this facility was
18 considered in Phase 2 of the CNSC staff's
19 assessment of all licensed activities. It was
20 subject to the requirements prescribed in the
21 Designated Officer's Order 01-D1 dated
22 November 16, 2001.

23 The applicant has complied fully
24 with those requirements.

25 In conclusion, Madam Chair, I

StenoTran

1 should like to reiterate the recommendations
2 which CNSC staff made to the Commission on Day 1
3 of this hearing in CMD 01-H32. These are as
4 follows:

5 (a) accept CNSC staff's
6 assessment that the applicant is qualified to
7 carry on the activities that the licence will
8 authorize and will, in carrying on those
9 activities, make adequate provision for the
10 protection of the environment, the health and
11 safety of persons and the maintenance of security
12 and measures required to implement international
13 obligations to which Canada has agreed;

14 (b) accept CNSC staff assessment,
15 pursuant to section 3 of the exclusion list
16 regulations and section 2, Part 1 of Schedule 1
17 of those regulations, an environmental assessment
18 pursuant to the Canadian Environmental Assessment
19 Act is not required;

20 (c) consider issuing the proposed
21 operating licence FFOL-3631.0/2007 for a period
22 of five years.

23 That completes my presentation of
24 this CMD, Madam Chair.

25 Thank you.

StenoTran

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you
2 very much.

3 Any further comments, Ms Maloney?

4 MS MALONEY: No further comments
5 at this time.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Before I open
7 the floor for questions, I would just like to
8 acknowledge the presence of officials of
9 Emergency Measures Ontario, the Ontario Ministry
10 of the Environment and the Nuclear Liability and
11 Radioactive Waste area of Natural Resources
12 Canada and thank you for taking the time and
13 coming in for this hearing today.

14 I will acknowledge that questions
15 may be addressed to all or any of these guests as
16 we proceed.

17 With that, I would like to open
18 the floor for questions from the Commission
19 Members to either the applicant or to CNSC staff
20 at this time.

21 Dr. Giroux.

22 MEMBER GIROUX: Thank you.

23 I would like to start by
24 addressing a question to the applicant.

25 You presented to us a graph of

1 the computer modelling, the results of computer
2 modelling where you had the isoplots or something
3 of accumulation at the furthest distances from
4 the plant.

5 My question is: This is a
6 computer modelling of course. Did you try to
7 establish a similar graph with actual data as
8 measured in the field and see how the modelling
9 agrees or doesn't agree with the data?

10 MR. STEANE: The computer model
11 was generated using the plant emission data and
12 then the results of that computer model were
13 compared with the field results that we have,
14 which is the high volume air sampling and the
15 dustfall results.

16 That comparison between what the
17 computer was predicting with our experience at
18 those sample locations where we have the data was
19 good agreement.

20 MEMBER GIROUX: Did we see that?
21 Did I miss something?

22 MR. STEANE: Yes, it is in --

23 MEMBER GIROUX: I would have been
24 interested -- and this is asking for more
25 information -- but to have the same sort of

1 presentation for the actual data as for the
2 computer modelling to see how closely they agree.
3 I may have missed something.

4 MR. STEANE: I don't know if it
5 is possible to get the slide on the screen.

6 This is a comparison of the
7 predicted uranium and air concentrations from the
8 model with the -- where we have the high volume
9 samplers, which is at those three locations.
10 That is over that five-year period.

11 There was also in there a
12 presentation which compared the results of --
13 there is a comparison that was giving, we felt,
14 credibility to the modelling. It was in
15 agreement with our field measurements.

16 MEMBER GIROUX: I realize that.
17 I agree, I had seen these results.

18 I was looking for a presentation
19 of the same graphical strategy as isoplot, seeing
20 how close the lines are. It is interesting when
21 you are comparing things to have the same type of
22 presentation as what have here, in columns.

23 MR. STEANE: But the limitation
24 on that is that there is not sufficient field
25 data to generate the isoplots.

1 MEMBER GIROUX: I think that is
2 more like the answer I was wondering about.
3 Thank you for that.

4 Could I address another more
5 general issue of all this source data that we
6 have been presented with?

7 The question that comes to my
8 mind -- and having in mind what we have just been
9 presented by Mr. White about the levels of
10 detrimental effects on humans and biota and all
11 that, and all the numbers we have are quite below
12 that, but then there is great -- as you mentioned
13 of Cameco in your presentation -- uncertainty in
14 the models.

15 It appears that the models for
16 measuring accumulation of uranium in soil are not
17 very reliable. As you say, there are some
18 effects which are not taken into account.

19 My question is -- both to you and
20 staff -- is that the right conclusion, that the
21 models are not adequate and, if not, is it
22 worthwhile -- that is the key question -- to try
23 to improve them to get a better fit between what
24 is predicted and what is actually measured in
25 those experimental plots? In view of the level

1 of the measurements taken, is additional effort
2 warranted to improve the model and get a better
3 fit?

4 MR. STEANE: If I could start the
5 answering on that.

6 I apologize, because I must have
7 not -- my presentation, I think it was the
8 opposite, that the computer models we feel are
9 quite reliable. The uncertainty that we see is
10 in the soil plots.

11 The soil plots, the model is
12 agreeing with our field sampling, it is of hivol
13 and of dustfall. It is not agreeing with these
14 five soil plot locations. Those soil plots in
15 each of those locations, with the exception of
16 the Town Hall plot where the model -- everything
17 does agree, the soil plots are located in areas
18 of known historical waste practices.

19 What we are saying is, we believe
20 that there are mechanisms in soil mechanics,
21 resuspension, things happening at those soil plot
22 locations that are giving rise in those soil
23 plots but is not consistent with what is really
24 happening.

25 The one of particular interest we

1 really noted was that each year the soil plot
2 pots are harvested and a sample is taken of the
3 surrounding area and those samples of the area
4 surrounding the soil pots is consistent with the
5 model, that is it is not changing appreciably.

6 So something is happening with
7 the soil pots that we don't understand.

8 We think the use of these
9 computer models is well accepted for setting air
10 regulations, air quality regulations and for
11 assessing compliance. The compliance is assessed
12 on the basis of a computer model half-hour POI
13 prediction and so defensible in court.

14 So the models are quite accurate,
15 we think the soil pots are not.

16 MEMBER GIROUX: I will clarify my
17 question.

18 I was referring to a potential
19 model for analysing the soil plots, not about
20 your computer model for looking at dispersion and
21 accumulation, but analysing the soil plots.

22 As you say yourself in your
23 presentation, there are some factors there which
24 may be acting which we don't know about which
25 have not been taken into account.

1 That is my question: Is there
2 much hope in devoting much more energy to
3 understanding what is happening in the soil
4 plots?

5 Maybe staff could respond to
6 that?

7 MS MALONEY: Certainly. I will
8 ask Dr. Thompson to comment on the soil plots.

9 DR. THOMPSON: I will try. I
10 guess this is working now? Just the light isn't
11 on, I'm sorry.

12 For the record, my name is Patsy
13 Thompson and I am Head of the Environmental
14 Protection Section.

15 What CNSC staff did was to look
16 at all the soil plot data that has been collected
17 by both the Ontario Ministry of the Environment
18 and Cameco. We chose to only consider the
19 uranium in soil data in the top centimetres
20 because of the uncertainty of movement of uranium
21 between the soil pots and the surrounding
22 environments, with water and other activities
23 that affect uranium movement in soils.

24 The data is presented in the
25 supplementary information CMD.

1 What we did in addition to that
2 was to look at modelling results of model
3 deposition rates and at the soil plot locations
4 where the highest deposition rates are predicted,
5 we get consistency -- if we use those deposition
6 rates and calculate accumulation rates in soil,
7 we get general consistency with what is being
8 observed in the soil pots.

9 So that sort of gives us an
10 indication that the soil pots, at least in the
11 short term, are in general agreement with
12 deposition rates.

13 The extension we are making is
14 that given the fact that the soil data is quite
15 variable, also given the fact that it is likely
16 that a lot of leaching has taken place over the
17 short period that the pots have been in place,
18 the assumed or predicted accumulation rates over
19 an extended operation period appears to be a
20 conservative estimate, or should be a
21 conservative estimate. It is probably in the
22 high range of what we expect to see over
23 continued operation.

24 So from that point of view the
25 conclusions are that it is unlikely that we will

1 be having unpredicted or unforeseen accumulation
2 in soils that would potentially cause either
3 effects on people or the environment.

4 In terms of improvement of what
5 is being conducted currently, CNSC staff have
6 given a contract to a consultant to initiate a
7 study focusing on the site-specific information
8 in Port Hope.

9 One of the difficulties we have
10 with modelling results of soil accumulation is
11 that we have little information on the soil
12 characteristics in Port Hope at the different
13 locations.

14 So one of the objectives of the
15 research project that has been initiated -- the
16 project started in November 2001 -- is to look at
17 what can be done to improve what is being done
18 currently to look at the long-term accumulation
19 of uranium in soils.

20 The other objective is to also
21 try to obtain more information on uranium
22 toxicity to invertebrates where we don't have a
23 lot of information.

24 But certainly when the research
25 project is finished, we should be in a better

1 position to see what can be done to better track
2 that issue over long term.

3 MEMBER GIROUX: What is the
4 timeframe for that contract?

5 DR. THOMPSON: The contract
6 was started in November and it is for a
7 two-year period.

8 MEMBER GIROUX: We have somebody
9 from the Ministry of the Environment for Ontario
10 here. Could we hear your comments about your
11 analysis of the data from the soil pots and
12 whether on the basis of those results the
13 ministry is concerned at the present time?

14 MS MORRA: For the record, my
15 name is Laura Morra from the Ontario Ministry of
16 the Environment.

17 I would like to start by
18 apologizing that Dave McLaughlin is not here
19 today. Dave McLaughlin has been the ministry
20 representative for the Port Hope facility for the
21 past, well, 20 or so years. He was not able to
22 attend today.

23 I have been taking over the
24 project since last March. I have looked at the
25 soil data, I have worked with Cameco in

1 developing the soil data, looking at it, and we
2 are seeing the same trends in the ministry soil
3 plots and the Cameco soil plots.

4 We don't think it is unexpected
5 that the soil variability is as such. We see a
6 lot of variability in our soil sampling
7 throughout the province.

8 Port Hope is a unique situation
9 in that we were unable to find a location that
10 was not historically contaminated, which is why
11 the plots are located where there is historical
12 contamination.

13 The reason why those pots were
14 installed the way they are is because we could
15 not find a tract of land large enough to install
16 an in situ soil monitoring site that is available
17 in, like, the Blind River facility.

18 We don't think the accumulation
19 is anything that will be of human health concern.
20 The concentrations are below what would affect
21 the soil, plant -- or the plant biota.

22 We are in the process of
23 developing an air standard, uranium and air
24 standard that is using all of this soil plot
25 data. That standard is in draft form right now.

1 It will be released later this calendar year for
2 public comment and CNSC can comment on it during
3 that time as well.

4 But, as we see it, the current
5 accumulation is below what would cause a human
6 health concern.

7 Does that answer the question?

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Barnes.

9 MEMBER BARNES: I, too, just
10 wanted to follow up on some questions on the soil
11 plot issue.

12 I noticed on page 6 -- perhaps a
13 question to Dr. Thompson:

14 "Therefore potential
15 toxicological effects on
16 non-human biota are the
17 limiting effect for uranium
18 accumulation at Port Hope
19 soils."

20 Yet in the paragraph before:

21 "Toxicity of uranium to soil
22 invertebrates has been
23 studied in a single
24 investigation.

25 So there obviously is very little

1 background information on the effects of uranium
2 on soil invertebrates.

3 Is this in total or just in the
4 Port Hope facility, Port Hope area, the single
5 investigation?

6 DR. THOMPSON: The statement that
7 the uranium in soil is limiting for biota is
8 based on the fact that the human health benchmark
9 is above 1,000 and the terrestrial plant
10 benchmark is certainly well below that.

11 There is only one study that was
12 conducted to test the uranium toxicity in soils.
13 That is the only study we have been able to
14 locate in quite an extensive literature search.

15 That study essentially -- the
16 controls in that experiment weren't very good,
17 but for the part of the study that was properly
18 designed and for which the data was valid
19 indicates that the toxicity that they measured
20 was at quite a high level. It is quite a bit
21 higher than -- it is about 10 times the 100.

22 So what we did to make sure that
23 we were -- considering the fact that there is
24 only one data point and that some of that work
25 was not -- the quality assurance in that work

1 wasn't the best it could be, we applied the
2 safety factor on it. So we went from something
3 that would be barely toxic to earthworms at
4 1,000 micrograms per gram, applied the safety
5 factor to bring it down to 100. So with that
6 safety factor we feel pretty confident that the
7 benchmark is protective of biota.

8 But the fact that there is
9 limited data is one of the reasons that this is
10 being dealt with in the research project that
11 staff has initiated.

12 MEMBER BARNES: And the scope of
13 that research project you think is sufficient to
14 give you the answers that you need here?

15 DR. THOMPSON: It is certainly
16 sufficient to give us answers in terms of the
17 soil characteristics in Port Hope that drive the
18 uranium chemistry in soils. The scope is
19 certainly sufficient to collect good quality data
20 on a limited number of soil organisms, but we
21 have made sure that the data we will be acquiring
22 would meet the Canadian Council of Ministers of
23 the Environment requirements when they use such
24 data to develop guidelines.

25 MEMBER BARNES: A question from

1 me to the Ministry of Environment representative,
2 Ms Morra.

3 I remember the time when the soil
4 plot testing was implemented. Looking back on
5 this, do you still think this is a valid
6 enterprise?

7 Could you also comment on why you
8 think we are getting this overestimation of
9 uranium values? Are we seeing much micro
10 organisms within the actual -- the pots
11 themselves, the artificial ones that contain
12 potting soil? Is it the fact that you perhaps
13 have more clays in here which are absorbing more
14 uranium?

15 MS MORRA: Again, this is Laura
16 Morra for the Ministry of the Environment.

17 We do feel that it is a valid
18 enterprise to do the soil plot study. There
19 aren't that many soil plot studies being
20 conducted in Ontario, aside from Blind River and
21 Port Hope, but it is a valid experiment because
22 it gives you an idea of accumulation in soil from
23 atmospheric deposition and it also gives you an
24 idea of re-entrainment.

25 Now, the bottom of these soil

1 plots are not lined. They were dug and the pots
2 with potting soil were placed into this
3 entrenched area. There are holes in the bottom
4 of these pots, so whatever uranium may be at the
5 bottom of the soil plot can specifically move up
6 into the pot as well. That is why when these
7 pots are sampled we take the top 5 centimetres
8 and then we sample it at 2 centimetre depth
9 increments. What that allows for is to see what
10 the uranium concentration is in each depth.

11 Now, what we are finding out is
12 that as much as the uranium is accumulating in
13 the surface from atmospheric deposition, we are
14 also finding that the uranium concentrations at
15 the bottom of the pot is increasing as well.

16 Now, what will happen over a
17 period of time, we will -- at this time we have
18 an hourglass figure whereby we are having higher
19 concentrations at the top of the pot that
20 decrease and then we are finding higher
21 concentrations at the bottom of the pot moving
22 upwards. What we will find over time is that the
23 pot will be saturated, whereby the soil
24 re-entrainment from the bottom of the pot will
25 eventually meet the soil accumulation from

1 atmospheric deposition at the top of the pot.

2 So those pots are very
3 important to us in our own kind of modelling
4 experiment over time.

5 As far as over accumulation, we
6 don't really think of it as over accumulation.
7 What we are measuring is atmospheric deposition.
8 That is raw data that comes to us. We have no
9 way of knowing at this time if it is over
10 accumulation. We will, once the study has
11 progressed on in more years. It is very
12 difficult to look at four years of data in these
13 pots to determine a solid answer on that. More
14 study will have to be done.

15 Not very much study has been done
16 in uranium movement in soil and at this point
17 those soil pots are really the only way we have
18 of measuring it. So I can't say at this time
19 that it is over accumulation, it is the only
20 information that we have at this point.

21 MEMBER BARNES: Just to follow up
22 one more question then, in terms of what you now
23 know in terms of the migration rates of --
24 potential migration rates down and up within
25 those pots, given that the design of this allows

1 you to have 10 years worth of pots, is this going
2 to be adequate? Do you need to redesign that for
3 further recording beyond 10 years?

4 MS. MORRA: At this point we have
5 to look at the data. We don't have our current
6 five year data yet, unfortunately, but that will
7 give us a good idea because that will be our half
8 way point of the experiment.

9 I have a feeling that the pots
10 may be saturated before 10 years. We may have to
11 redesign it. It is the first experiment of its
12 kind so perhaps the design wasn't the most --
13 wasn't the most useful for this type of
14 experiment. Perhaps we needed larger pots,
15 perhaps we needed to use long tubes, different
16 things that could have been done.

17 At this point it seems to be
18 serving the purpose of monitoring of some type of
19 environmental monitoring that allows CAMECO and
20 MOE to work together to collect data. We won't
21 know really what the -- we don't really know
22 about the set up of the study, if it is accurate
23 for this program until the program is complete,
24 unfortunately. It is research. It is the only
25 thing the ministry has to work on.

1 Because we don't really have this
2 many requests for soil monitoring in this way, it
3 was really the first attempt that was made at
4 soil monitoring.

5 Changes were made for the Blind
6 River facility. That plot was installed later
7 than the Port Hope facility and fortunately we
8 were able to get a track of land large enough
9 where we could sample that over time. It is not
10 a pot study, it is actually an in situ site
11 study. So the process has been amended already.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Graham.

13 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you.

14 My questions are not along the
15 same lines, maybe if someone wants to follow up
16 with those first and then I can come back,
17 because mine is with regard to another part of
18 the licence.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you,
20 Mr. Graham.

21 I think Dr. Giroux has a short
22 follow up question and then Ms MacLachlan with
23 regards to this subject and then I will return to
24 you later.

25 MEMBER GRAHAM: Sure. I think it

1 would be easier.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

3 Dr. Giroux.

4 MEMBER GIROUX: Yes, thank you.

5 Coming back to Ms Morra, I think,
6 you say the data that you have now has an
7 hourglass figure.

8 Do we understand that the
9 concentrations are the same order of magnitude at
10 the top and the bottom?

11 MS MORRA: No. The
12 concentrations at the top are higher than the
13 concentrations at the bottom. Those pots were
14 clean when they were put in. It was a uniform
15 concentration throughout the product.

16 As we are seeing, over the years
17 the concentration at the bottom is increasing
18 higher than the original concentration.

19 MEMBER GIROUX: Could you give me
20 some data for top and bottom?

21 MS MORRA: Just one moment,
22 please.

23 I do have an overhead if there is
24 capability of showing it.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, there is.

1 Staff will come back and get it from you.

2 I think this is an important
3 question that needs to be handled.

4 MS MORRA: It seems I do not have
5 the data after all, I'm sorry. I have the
6 re-entrainment data with me.

7 The concentrations are not of the
8 same magnitude at the top of the pot. That
9 information I can forward to you tomorrow, at the
10 earliest.

11 I know Cameco has seen that data.

12 It is showing an hourglass figure
13 in that the concentrations at the bottom are
14 increasing. I don't know when. I can't really
15 predict at this time when the concentrations at
16 the bottom will meet the top.

17 It does show that movement does
18 occur, both from topwards-down and from
19 upwards-up. When we do sample the soil plots,
20 with reference to the other question that was
21 asked before, it is all potting soil. There
22 isn't clay holding uranium particles together.
23 It is potting soil, and there is evidence of
24 earthworm movement within the pots as well.

25 MEMBER GIROUX: I am satisfied,

1 if I may summarize for my understanding, that you
2 say concentration at the top of the pot is
3 markedly higher than it is at the bottom.

4 MS MORRA: Yes, that is correct.

5 MEMBER GIROUX: Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Just to confirm
7 that we will not need then the data. Thank you
8 very much.

9 The applicant has a comment
10 specifically on this subject?

11 MR. STEANE: If I may, Madam
12 Chair.

13 We have the data that is from the
14 raw data. Looking at the site, going from the
15 top to the bottom, I could read out these
16 numbers.

17 The average reported in 0 to 5,
18 5.68; and then 1.88 from 5 to 7; from 7 to 9, it
19 is 1.55; from 9 to 11, it is 1.68; from 11 to 13,
20 it is 1.73; and from 13 to 15, it is 2.40.

21 Then the greater than 17, at the
22 bottom, is 5.45.

23 That was the data from the 2000
24 sampling.

25 MEMBER GIROUX: Could you repeat

1 the first one on the top?

2 MR. STEANE: Starting again, the
3 average of 0 to 5 is 5.68.

4 MEMBER GIROUX: And you have 5.45
5 at the bottom.

6 MR. STEANE: At the bottom on
7 this table, at the depth called greater than 17,
8 the average is 5.45.

9 MEMBER GIROUX: Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms MacLachlan?

11 MS MacLACHLAN: I guess this
12 question is directed to the company in the first
13 instance.

14 When estimates were made on the
15 soils depositions, where were those estimates
16 derived? Were those estimates derived from the
17 model? What statistics were used?

18 MR. STEANE: This is the
19 estimates in the presentation? The estimates
20 were derived from the modelling of five years of
21 plant emission data. Then the model was compared
22 with our field sampling of our air concentration
23 and our dustfall collections for calibration of
24 the model on that same five-year period.

25 The model predictions were then

1 used to derive an expected soil deposition.

2 Going from an air concentration
3 to a soil deposition, we did a lot of work to
4 measure the particle size of the material being
5 collected in our samples.

6 So with the particle size
7 information, one can calculate settling
8 velocities and derive a dustfall number.

9 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you. Then
10 I guess the question to both MOE and CNSC staff
11 is: Would you please comment on the methodology
12 used to derive those estimates.

13 MS MALONEY: Perhaps CNSC staff
14 will address that first.

15 I would ask Dr. Thompson to
16 comment.

17 DR. THOMPSON: The atmospheric
18 dispersion modelling that Cameco conducted was
19 reviewed by CNSC staff, because it is the basis
20 from which the derived release limits are
21 established.

22 The atmospheric dispersion
23 modelling was found to be acceptable by staff.

24 Models appropriate for the type
25 of facility and for the number of sources in that

1 kind of facility were all found to be acceptable.

2 MS MORRA: Again, this is Laura
3 Morra, Ministry of the Environment.

4 We actually didn't have an
5 explanation of the dispersion modelling. That is
6 not part of the relationship that we have with
7 Cameco. So I can't really comment on that.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: I would like to
9 ask my questions with regard to the environmental
10 quality issues before we go to Mr. Graham, with
11 his permission.

12 We have heard a lot about studies
13 that are under way by MOE and by CNSC staff and
14 also the company. My question is: Exactly what
15 is the degree of co-operation grosso modo? When
16 we look at the work that is under way and we look
17 at models for scientific investigation, the
18 questions that we are asking as scientists and
19 the work that is under way, is there a
20 co-operation that is under way with the MOE on
21 this?

22 I guess it is a question, to
23 begin with, to CNSC staff.

24 Is there any other work that is
25 being done, either in the United States or

1 internationally, that would give one a scientific
2 basis upon which to look at either methodology or
3 other accumulations, either in soil or air, that
4 would give us a sense of where this would be
5 going?

6 I will start with staff, please.

7 MS. MALONEY: Again, I will ask
8 Dr. Thompson to respond to your question.

9 DR. THOMPSON: The CNSC staff and
10 MOE worked quite closely in terms of the
11 establishment of the soil plots. This was an MOE
12 initiative that the CNSC tracked very closely,
13 because it was an important issue from a
14 regulatory perspective for Port Hope.

15 In terms of what is being done,
16 either nationally or internationally, the
17 Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment
18 have issued a draft document in which they are
19 proposing uranium soil guidelines for a number of
20 activities. The soil guidelines are intended to
21 protect either human health or the environment,
22 depending on whether they are for industrial
23 sites or park and residential areas or natural
24 environments.

25 That draft uranium guideline

1 document was issued last year for public comment.
2 The intent from the Canadian Council of Ministers
3 of the Environment is to finalize that document
4 as soon as possible.

5 This will essentially then give
6 us a basis to support the work we are doing and
7 to make it consistent with what is being done
8 throughout the federal government.

9 The CCME is also a
10 federal-provincial initiative, and they have
11 quite an extensive public and peer review process
12 for the documents. So that also ensures a good
13 level of quality to those documents and to the
14 guidelines.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Comments from
16 the MOE?

17 MS MORRA: Again, this is Laura
18 Morra.

19 Dave McLaughlin would have a
20 better idea of this, obviously, because he has
21 been involved in this project much longer than I
22 have been. But since I have been around him, and
23 from what I have seen from Dave and Cameco, there
24 has always been a very close relationship between
25 MOE and Cameco working together.

1 We do an annual vegetation survey
2 together, meaning that I would go with their
3 environmental scientists and we would go to the
4 same spots every year and collect data together,
5 split the samples and share data when it comes
6 available.

7 So there is a very close
8 relationship with Cameco and with the MOE sharing
9 data, doing the projects together, working
10 together. They had a lot of input into our
11 sites. When we developed the plot study, we had
12 input into where the plots were to be located. I
13 am sure in the future it will be the same.

14 As far as CNSC is concerned,
15 because I am new to the project I don't really
16 know the history. But Dave McLaughlin has always
17 been very involved with both the CNSC and Cameco
18 to make sure that the relationship is very close
19 and open.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: A more specific
21 question for CNSC staff -- and clarify if I have
22 misunderstood this.

23 Was there in your report a
24 comment that there isn't good soil data available
25 on these plots with regard to Port Hope -- basic

1 soil data? Is that correct?

2 DR. THOMPSON: That has been one
3 of the difficulties. There has been over the
4 last 20 years -- probably Port Hope is one of the
5 areas where there has been the most extensive
6 soil sampling to look at contaminants like
7 uranium, lead, arsenic and the others.

8 Unfortunately, what is usually
9 reported and what is usually available from the
10 agencies that have done this work are the actual
11 contaminant concentrations.

12 The rest of the information
13 related to soil, in terms of soil density,
14 proportion of clay, organic matter, those types
15 of soil characteristics, have not been reported.
16 They are very important in terms of interpreting
17 the data and also being able to improve the
18 models.

19 The models are useful in terms of
20 being able to predict over the long term, and
21 they are also very useful in terms of being able
22 to give us a good understanding of where we
23 should be looking more closely in the
24 environment, such as soil monitoring locations,
25 for example.

1 That data is missing, and one of
2 the objectives of the research project is to
3 acquire that data for the sites that are more
4 critical in Port Hope.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms MacLachlan?

6 MS MacLACHLAN: Perhaps
7 Dr. Thompson could comment on the comment
8 provided by MOE that there is very little
9 research that has been done on the movement of
10 uranium in soils.

11 Is that correct?

12 DR. THOMPSON: There are several
13 reports talking about uranium chemistry and
14 uranium behaviour in soil. For example, the
15 absorption characteristics of uranium to soil
16 particles, to clay or organic matter, this kind
17 of thing is quite well studied. That is not
18 where the uncertainty is.

19 However, when you take that
20 generic chemical information or geochemical
21 information and try to use it in terms of
22 assessing specific sites or specific forms of
23 uranium, that is where the difficulty comes in,
24 mainly because we have little information on Port
25 Hope soil characteristics.

1 The range of information on
2 uranium behaviour in soil is quite broad. So to
3 be able to narrow that range to make it fit the
4 Port Hope situation has been difficult.

5 There has been internationally a
6 lot of work done in using soil columns to look at
7 the behaviour of radionuclides and other
8 contaminants. To my knowledge, there hasn't been
9 the extensive work done for uranium as there has
10 been, for example, for cesium. Cesium has been
11 extensively studied in all types of soil
12 experimental designs. The same effort hasn't
13 been expanded to uranium.

14 MS MacLACHLAN: Just one more
15 follow-up question.

16 Is it possible that uranium is
17 indigenous to the soils in Port Hope?

18 DR. THOMPSON: Uranium is found
19 ubiquitously in the environment. The lower
20 levels that are reported in the Commission Member
21 documents do report background concentrations.
22 So uranium is present everywhere in background
23 concentrations.

24 The higher values that are
25 reported for Port Hope are a result of historical

1 practices in Port Hope. There is no question
2 that they are not naturally occurring levels.
3 They are the result of industrial operations in
4 Port Hope.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: With that, we
6 will move to the second line of questioning.

7 I thank Mr. Graham for his
8 patience. Over to Mr. Graham.

9 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you.
10 Through the first line of questioning, I thought
11 of one question that I would like to ask, if I
12 may, still on the same topic.

13 Before us we have an application
14 for a five-year licence. We understand this
15 morning, I gather, that there will be increased
16 monitoring, especially in soils and so on; or if
17 not increased, continued monitoring.

18 My question is: If -- and
19 hopefully not, but if there was an increase in
20 contamination, if that level started to rise,
21 where does the flag go up that it comes back to
22 the Commission for information and so on?

23 What I am wondering is: If there
24 is going to be increased monitoring or if the
25 monitoring is going to be more scientific, and so

1 on, is there a guideline that there is a level,
2 and once it surpasses that, when does it come
3 back?

4 MS MALONEY: I would like
5 Dr. Thompson to start on that one, please.

6 DR. THOMPSON: All the work that
7 has been done and all the data that has been
8 collected by both Cameco, the Ministry of the
9 Environment and the work that we have done
10 indicates that with current emission rates and
11 for predicting over a long period, this is very
12 unlikely to happen.

13 Should it happen, then there are
14 mechanisms in place where we look at licensee
15 compliance with environmental objectives and the
16 emission limits.

17 For uranium to accumulate to a
18 significant level in soils, something would need
19 to happen at the facility to cause the emissions
20 to increase. That is where the action levels
21 would be triggered, and the licensee would take
22 action to make sure that this would not proceed
23 over a long period of time.

24 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you. Now
25 to my other line of questioning that I have.

1 We have learned this morning, I
2 believe, that letters of guarantee or letters of
3 financial guarantees have been set at
4 \$33.8 million. Based on other certain things
5 happening, I believe that is correct; and that is
6 construction of facilities to handle 150,000
7 cubic metres of low contaminated soil.

8 First of all, is that correct?

9 MS MALONEY: Barclay Howden will
10 respond.

11 MR. HOWDEN: Yes, the value of
12 the estimate is based on that facility being
13 available.

14 MEMBER GRAHAM: My next question,
15 then, is: What is the time frame of that
16 facility becoming available to ensure that the
17 \$33.8 million is sufficient?

18 If there is a lag of a couple of
19 years in that facility becoming available, then
20 you have to review that. That probably should be
21 in licensing conditions.

22 I would like to hear from you on
23 the time frame.

24 MR. HOWDEN: You are correct that
25 if the facility was not available, it would

1 change the cost estimate significantly.

2 I would like to call upon Dave
3 McCauley at NRCan to comment on the time frame
4 for that facility.

5 MR. McCAULEY: Thank you very
6 much.

7 For the record, my name is David
8 McCauley. I am with the Uranium and Radioactive
9 Waste Division of Natural Resources Canada.

10 The agreement for the clean-up of
11 Port Hope was signed in March of 2001. It is to
12 proceed in two phases. The first phase is a
13 five-year environmental assessment and regulatory
14 review phase that has now begun and is expected
15 to last until 2006.

16 The end point on that process
17 would be an application to the CNSC for a
18 construction licence to build the facility.
19 Assuming that that construction licence is
20 received, we would proceed from then on. The
21 expectation is that the remaining part of the
22 program would last five to seven years.

23 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you.
24 Really, before the facility would be completed we
25 are talking approximately 12 years.

1 Is that correct?

2 MR. McCAULEY: That would be
3 correct. By the time the facility was closed, it
4 could be 12 years.

5 It would be ready for emplacement
6 of wastes in advance of that, however.

7 MEMBER GRAHAM: Approximately how
8 much sooner? If everything went as planned,
9 approximately what date could it start receiving
10 waste?

11 MR. McCAULEY: I don't really
12 have a definitive answer on that. Assuming that
13 we received licence to construct some time in
14 2006, we may anticipate that some two years after
15 that point it would be ready for emplacement of
16 wastes.

17 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you. Then
18 my question to CNSC staff is: In view of the
19 fact that this licence application if it is
20 granted for five years, will expire in 2007 and
21 they can only start receiving material in 2008,
22 the \$33.8 million guarantee is all contingent on
23 a facility is being constructed. If not, then I
24 think in your notes you say that it has to be
25 revised upward.

1 My question is: Should we not
2 ask for a higher amount and then reduce it in the
3 next licensing period in 2007 when the applicant
4 is before us again?

5 MS MALONEY: I will ask Barclay
6 Howden to respond, please.

7 MR. HOWDEN: Right now the
8 facility has given us a five-year outlook and has
9 given no indication that they are going to be
10 planning to decommission the facility in the near
11 future. That is one thing to tell us that there
12 are not plans coming very shortly -- and Cameco
13 can correct me if I am wrong on that.

14 The second thing is the
15 preliminary decommissioning plan and the
16 financial guarantees are reviewed on a regular
17 basis. Two criteria are on licence renewal and
18 when some significant change could occur to the
19 facility or some significant change in plans for
20 the facility. We would use that as a trigger to
21 change the financial guarantee.

22 Our basis right now is that we
23 are not anticipating decommissioning that
24 facility for a long time into the future.

25 By going with the lower figure

1 Cameco -- I will turn it over to them, and they
2 will probably argue that it all has to do with
3 dealing with their bank for their letter of
4 credit. They prefer to go with the lower value.

5 Right now, we have no indication
6 that they are going to decommission in the near
7 future.

8 MEMBER GRAHAM: Fine. I realize
9 that, because a letter of credit really comes
10 right off your bottom line.

11 My concern to CNSC staff is: Is
12 the \$33.8 million that you have come up with
13 sufficient? Do you feel it is sufficient to
14 cover the period of this licence?

15 MS MALONEY: I would like
16 Dr. Richard Ferch, who has been responsible for
17 the review of the plan, to comment.

18 DR. FERCH: Thank you. For the
19 record, I am Richard Ferch from the Waste and
20 Decommissioning Division at the CNSC.

21 The alternative that you speak
22 of, Mr. Graham, of the site that is presently
23 planned for not being available in Port Hope, if
24 that alternative became unavailable it would be
25 impossible to dispose of waste arising from

1 decommissioning for an even longer time. There
2 is no way that there would be something available
3 more quickly than that.

4 Therefore, there would be ample
5 time, if that started to develop, to review the
6 situation, to review what the cost would be, and
7 to increase the size of the financial guarantee
8 at that time.

9 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you. One
10 question I have for the applicant. The 150,000
11 cubic metres that is mentioned as the amount of
12 low level contaminated soil, is that a scientific
13 figure? Has that been fairly well put together
14 that that is roughly what is required and it will
15 not increase over time?

16 MR. STEANE: The short answer to
17 that question is yes. That number is based upon
18 information that we have on the site and, as
19 well, has contingency provisions in it to allow
20 for errors in estimation.

21 I will ask Tom Smith, our
22 environmental specialist responsible for the
23 development of that plan, to talk a bit more to
24 the contingencies and provisions.

25 MR. SMITH: Thank you. Tom

1 Smith, Cameco.

2 The projected amount of material
3 that would arise from decommissioning the
4 facility that would have to be managed as low
5 level radioactive waste is estimated at
6 approximately 107,000 cubic metres.

7 As a result, we think that there
8 is sufficient contingency there, given that we
9 have an allocation for 150,000, to deal with
10 anything that might arise on site that we haven't
11 put into our PDP.

12 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you. I
13 just have one other question to Cameco.

14 What is the life expectancy of
15 the facility that you have there now without
16 doing major modernization or upgrading, and so
17 on?

18 MR. STEANE: I would say that the
19 facility life is at least 15 years. The two
20 operating facilities are relatively new
21 facilities. UF6 was constructed in 1984 and the
22 new south EO2 plant was in the 1970s. There is
23 nothing other than replacement of equipment on an
24 ongoing basis.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: With

1 Mr. Graham's concurrence, I would like to give
2 the applicant an opportunity to comment with
3 regard to the costs and the decommissioning plan
4 and costs.

5 I would like your view, if you
6 agree, with regard to the questions that
7 Mr. Graham asked earlier with regard to
8 decommissioning costs and guarantees and plans.

9 MR. STEANE: Again, Bob Steane
10 with Cameco.

11 I concur with the answer from the
12 CNSC specialist. First, we don't have any
13 anticipation of decommissioning, of closing that
14 plant in the near future.

15 The other is that the only
16 disposal facility that is oncoming is the
17 initiative in Port Hope.

18 Further, we do have allocated
19 volumes in that. We have a memorandum of
20 agreement in process with NRCan. There is an
21 agreement between the Government of Canada and
22 the Municipality of Port Hope. Specifically,
23 those volumes are in that plan.

24 We feel that \$33.8 million is
25 robust. We have a lot of contingency in there,

1 both on volumes and on assessment process. We
2 think that that is a very robust plan to deal
3 with the Port Hope decommissioning.

4 Also, I would point out that this
5 is a preliminary decommissioning plan. It is not
6 the detailed decommissioning plan. But given the
7 nature of the regulations and the requirements of
8 a preliminary decommissioning plan, in the areas
9 of estimation we feel quite good about that
10 \$33.8 million being adequate, more than adequate.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there
12 further questions?

13 Dr. Giroux.

14 MEMBER GRAHAM: Just as a
15 question to staff, in reading the very last line
16 in one of your notes in the paragraph, it said,
17 in talking about the financial guarantees:

18 We feel that it is not
19 unreasonable and staff
20 recommend that it be accepted
21 on an interim basis.

22 On mechanism on how this works,
23 this \$33.8 million will be in the licence, I
24 presume.

25 What does interim basis mean? If

1 it is changed, does it come back to the
2 Commission? Or is it just reviewed by staff?

3 MR. HOWDEN: The intention would
4 be that it would be just reviewed by staff. Our
5 expectation is that we would complete our
6 detailed review in about one month's time.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Giroux.

8 MEMBER GIROUX: If I may, I will
9 begin by a follow-up on this question of
10 decommissioning.

11 I have heard all the answers with
12 much interest. The question is: Assuming we did
13 not have the agreement in place for the low level
14 waste, is there a figure for the decommissioning
15 guarantee that would have been required?

16 Is there a feasible scenario for
17 decommissioning without the waste depository?

18 MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden
19 speaking.

20 The initial number that was used
21 on the Day 1 CMD was \$60.1 million.

22 I would have to pass the second
23 part of the question to Richard Ferch of the
24 Waste and Decommissioning Division.

25 DR. FERCH: Thank you. At the

1 moment, there really is no site within Canada
2 that is already established to accept this kind
3 of waste. A site would have to be found, an
4 environmental assessment process would have to be
5 gone through, and the site would have to be
6 constructed, and so on.

7 One can expect that would take at
8 least as long as the current project and would
9 presumably cost something comparable.

10 The actual cost to any individual
11 licensee such as Cameco would probably depend on
12 what other material might be included in that
13 site, the size of the site, and so on. It is
14 very difficult to estimate what it might be
15 without hypothesizing.

16 The most expensive would probably
17 be to assume that a "purpose built" site had to
18 be found by the licensee for this site only.
19 That would be more expensive than making use of
20 another site that is already planned.

21 MEMBER GIROUX: Thank you. That
22 is very clear. And thank you for reminding me of
23 the \$60 million figure.

24 The question I would like to
25 address now is emergency measures. Since we have

1 somebody from Emergency Measures Ontario here, I
2 think it would be interesting to have some
3 comments on the interface that you have between
4 EMO and the Town of Port Hope and Cameco in terms
5 of dealing with an emergency, both in terms of
6 paper and in terms of actual logistics.

7 MR. MCKERRELL: Neil McKerrell,
8 Emergency Measures Ontario.

9 Perhaps before responding to the
10 question, I could take a few moments to give you
11 a little bit of an update. A number of things
12 have changed since I was last before the
13 Commission.

14 At that point in time there was
15 some question raised about the status of
16 Ontario's nuclear emergency plan and the approval
17 thereof. Since the last time we were here, the
18 Cabinet of Ontario has reviewed the plan and has
19 approved it as an interim plan. We will be
20 returning to Cabinet by the end of 2002 to seek
21 their approval to remove the interim nature of
22 the plan and have it completed. That will be
23 contingent on a couple of details worked out. So
24 that has been done.

25 Also, there was a question raised

1 about the resources of Emergency Measures
2 Ontario. They are being increased somewhat,
3 considerably. Also, there is a bill before the
4 Ontario legislature at the moment that will
5 introduce a new act that will replace the
6 Emergency Plans Act with a new Emergency
7 Management Act, which, if approved, will raise
8 the bar, if you like, on the requirements for
9 emergency management programming and planning.

10 Sir, would you mind repeating
11 your question for me, please.

12 MEMBER GIROUX: Thank you for the
13 update. I think it was subconsciously part of my
14 question.

15 MR. MCKERRELL: I thought it
16 might have been.

17 MEMBER GIROUX: The specific
18 question I put was to describe the interface
19 between the Ontario plan, the Town of Port Hope
20 and Cameco, both in terms of paper, in terms of
21 the plans themselves, and the logistics and
22 interfaces.

23 MR. MCKERRELL: Sure. The
24 Province of Ontario Nuclear Emergency Plan is a
25 very large plan, complex and detailed, as you

1 might appreciate. It is broken into a number of
2 different parts.

3 Part 8 of the plan deals with the
4 non-power generating, non-Chalk River type
5 facilities, which would include Cameco and the
6 other facilities of that nature. So the plan
7 does cover these.

8 The relationship between these
9 types of organizations and Emergency Measures has
10 been considerably less than it is with the large
11 power generators, and also with Chalk River.

12 However, the involvement with
13 these operators is primarily through our field
14 representatives dealing with the municipalities
15 and the municipalities, in turn, dealing with
16 these operators.

17 Currently, there is no
18 requirement in Ontario that municipalities have
19 an emergency plan. That will change if the new
20 legislation is passed. All municipalities will
21 have to have not just an emergency plan but an
22 emergency management program. It will be more
23 robust than just having a plan.

24 The change in legislation will
25 require that these emergency management programs

1 be based upon identified risks in the communities
2 in the municipalities. So it will be necessary
3 for all municipalities to conduct risk
4 assessments, to identify their risks and then to
5 assess the risks and develop emergency management
6 programs that address the specific risks.

7 At the moment, Emergency Measures
8 Ontario -- in fact, most provinces in the
9 country, if not all of them -- have been dealing
10 with what we call an all hazards approach. In
11 other words, you develop an emergency plan that
12 will cover the waterfront.

13 We are moving away from that to
14 requiring the plans be developed based on more
15 specific hazards and risks in individual
16 communities. We think that is more
17 comprehensive, and we think it is in the better
18 public interest.

19 At the moment with Cameco, in
20 particular, they work with the municipality. The
21 municipality has worked with EMO to have our
22 endorsement, if you will, of their emergency
23 plan.

24 The Municipality of Port Hope has
25 done a good job in terms of its role, its active

1 participation in a program that we call
2 Partnerships Towards Safer Communities. That is
3 a program that is endorsed by the Canadian
4 Association of Fire Chiefs. The Fire Marshall of
5 Ontario and EMO promotes it actively in the
6 province of Ontario.

7 It is a program whereby
8 municipalities and their local industries work
9 together to identify risks, to look at what can
10 be done to mitigate those risks, and to develop
11 sound emergency response plans and programs
12 should something go amiss.

13 The Town of Port Hope, in
14 particular, is one the early communities.
15 Currently, there are about 50 communities across
16 the province that are engaged in the program,
17 working toward achievement of the levels.

18 It is a three-level program, by
19 the way.

20 Port Hope was one of six
21 municipalities that in 2001 received a
22 certificate of recognition of having achieved the
23 bottom level, the essential level.

24 The fact is that Port Hope has a
25 number of significant industries in the

1 community, not just Cameco. They have a number
2 of risks based on those industries. It is also a
3 town that is located right beside a major
4 arterial highway. It is also right on the
5 Montreal-Toronto rail line.

6 So there is a lot of traffic,
7 both on the road and a lot of traffic on the
8 rail, that would contain hazardous materials.
9 They have recognized the industrial community
10 around them, plus they have also recognized the
11 transportation issues. The municipality has
12 worked with industry quite effectively to develop
13 some plans to address the situation.

14 They do have a CAER group, which
15 is similar in objectives to the partnerships
16 program. They work quite effectively together.
17 They have an emergency co-ordinator in the
18 municipality who is very tenacious and very
19 enthusiastic.

20 In fact, last summer with the
21 Association of Municipalities of Ontario we
22 encouraged them to invite that lady to make a
23 presentation to them as an example of a community
24 which has recognized the risks and the
25 appropriateness of developing sound emergency

1 management programs and plans.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

3 Dr. Barnes.

4 MEMBER BARNES: A follow-up
5 question to Mr. McKerrell. I think I asked this
6 of the applicant last time.

7 It relates to the system they
8 have implemented in Port Hope of the telephone
9 emergency alert system, which seems to be a very
10 positive entrepreneurial approach.

11 I think the question was could we
12 see it being applied to other situations, such as
13 those municipalities that host nuclear power
14 plants? If it is not inappropriate, Madam Chair,
15 could I ask whether under your new funding and
16 plans do you see this being a potential in those
17 communities?

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: I will let the
19 question go as long as it is clear that it is not
20 with regard to the licence application before us.
21 So as long as that is clear.

22 MR. MCKERRELL: The answer,
23 simply, is yes. The CanAlert system is in use
24 there. It is currently in use in other
25 communities, as well, nuclear communities. It is

1 in use in the Chalk River area. It is in use in
2 Pickering-Darlington. It is in use there.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms MacLachlan.

4 MS MacLACHLAN: I have a specific
5 question for the representative from NRCan. It
6 is about this agreement on the low level waste
7 management facility.

8 I wonder if you could tell me who
9 the parties are to the agreement and who the
10 proponent would be for the construction and
11 management of this low level waste management
12 facility.

13 Also, could you flesh out for us
14 the nature of the agreement that would give
15 comfort to the proponent here today.

16 MR. McCAULEY: Thank you. Once
17 again, my name is Dave McCauley, with Natural
18 Resources Canada.

19 The parties to the agreement are
20 the federal government, the Minister of Natural
21 Resources Canada; the Municipality of Clarington;
22 the Town of Port Hope; and the Township of Hope.

23 The Township of Hope and the Town
24 of Port Hope were amalgamated as of January 1,
25 2001. So we are dealing now with the

1 Municipality of Port Hope.

2 In terms of the proponent, the
3 proponent would be the low level radioactive
4 waste management office. The low level
5 radioactive waste management office is a division
6 of AECL that receives its funding and policy
7 direction from my department, Natural Resources
8 Canada.

9 There is a legal agreement that
10 commits us to this development with the
11 municipalities. It is recognized that in the
12 facility a volume of 150,000 cubic metres of
13 material is designated as being derived from
14 Cameco's operations; its decommissioning and its
15 existing waste.

16 Does that answer your question or
17 was there something else?

18 MS MacLACHLAN: Could you just
19 review that again for me in terms of the
20 acknowledgement that Cameco's waste. Is there a
21 commitment? Is that a guarantee to accept that
22 particular waste from the Port Hope facility?

23 MR. McCAULEY: That's right. It
24 is explicit in the agreement that the waste
25 facility that will be built will accommodate

1 150,000 cubic metres of material from Cameco's
2 Port Hope facility.

3 We are entering into a further
4 agreement with Cameco actually in terms of land
5 ownership on other facilities. Once again, that
6 would be restated in that agreement as well.

7 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: I will
9 entertain some short questions.

10 Dr. Barnes.

11 MEMBER BARNES: Two very short
12 ones.

13 The location of this again is how
14 far from the plant?

15 MR. McCAULEY: The location would
16 be at the Highland Drive landfill, which is just
17 two kilometres north of the existing plant.

18 MEMBER BARNES: This is available
19 to also receive any hot material elsewhere in the
20 town. Is that right?

21 MR. McCAULEY: The facility would
22 accommodate the Cameco decommissioning wastes.
23 It would accommodate certain industrial wastes
24 within the town. It would also accommodate low
25 level radioactive waste or historic waste, as we

1 term it, throughout the town located at various
2 licensed and unlicensed sites within the town.

3 I have to emphasize that this
4 proposal was a community driven proposal. It is
5 the Town of Port Hope that came to the federal
6 government seeking discussions that would result
7 in a local management facility for these local
8 wastes.

9 It was the municipality
10 themselves that identified which wastes they
11 would like to have accommodated within the
12 facility.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
14 much.

15 Ms MacLachlan, a very short
16 question, please.

17 MS MacLACHLAN: Have funds been
18 allocated to the low level waste management
19 office of AECL to actually construct this
20 facility?

21 MR. McCAULEY: Well, funds have
22 been allocated by the Treasury Board, by the
23 Department of Finance, to Natural Resources
24 Canada to proceed with this project. So my
25 department is responsible for the funding.

1 We, on an annual basis, provide a
2 budget to the low level office to carry out its
3 activities. So yes, on an annual basis we
4 provide the funds through to the low level
5 office.

6 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Graham for
8 the last question, please.

9 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you very
10 much.

11 A question for CNSC staff under
12 licensing conditions. I think I brought it up at
13 Day 1, but I am not sure.

14 I didn't see anywhere in the
15 licensing conditions a listing for security,
16 where it is generally always NS1 in licensing
17 conditions.

18 Could you comment.

19 MS MALONEY: That condition has
20 been added to the licence.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

22 Does the licensee wish to
23 comment?

24 MR. STEANE: If I might, Madam
25 Chair, I would just add one comment.

1 Dr. Giroux was asking questions
2 about the decommissioning of CNSC staff and the
3 dollar value. We provided a number of some
4 \$60-odd million. I just want to comment that I
5 think that number is no longer of any validity.

6 One of the criticisms that was
7 levelled at that plan was that it was not based
8 upon a real plan. The existing plan is based
9 upon something that is real and doable. If there
10 was some need to look at something else, then I
11 think that would be to recost it.

12 I think the \$60 million had
13 assumptions that were not based upon some
14 reality. There is always a possibility of
15 another at the site, encapsulating the material
16 at the site, and the cost of building a similar
17 facility to that which has been proposed by the
18 Municipality of Port Hope and is on the board
19 would cost somewhat less than that \$60 million.
20 It would be more than the \$33 million but a lot
21 less than the \$60-odd million.

22 I just wanted to add the comment
23 that that \$60 million is no longer of any
24 meaning.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there any

1 questions from the Commission Members with regard
2 to that comment by the applicant on that matter?

3 Thank you very much.

4 We are going to take a short
5 five-minute break and return to the hearing.
6 Maybe I should be a bit more generous since we
7 have been sitting here for quite some time. We
8 will take ten minutes.

9 It is 10:33. At 10:43 I would
10 like you back in your seats, please. Thank you.

11 --- Upon recessing at 10:43 a.m.

12 --- Upon resuming at 10:55 a.m.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: We will now
14 move to the interventions.

15 I would like to remind
16 intervenors appearing before the Commission today
17 that we have allocated ten minutes for their oral
18 presentation.

19 We would like to begin with the
20 oral presentation by the United Steelworkers of
21 America.

22

23 **01-H32.2**

24 **Oral presentation by United Steelworkers of**
25 **America Local 13173**

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: I believe that
2 Mr. Leavit, the union president from Local 13173
3 is with us today.

4 This is outlined in CMD document
5 01-H32.2.

6 I turn it over to Mr. Leavit.

7 MR. LEAVIT: Thank you, Madam
8 Chair and Commission body.

9 Chris Leavit, U.S.W.A. President
10 Local 13173, Port Hope, Ontario.

11 Members of the Commission, I
12 would like to express my sincere gratitude today
13 that I have the opportunity on behalf of the
14 United Steelworkers of America, Local 13173, to
15 come before the Commission to express our
16 positive approach to alleviate concerns from both
17 the Commission and the public.

18 The following areas that I
19 believe would alleviate both the public and the
20 Commission's concerns are our high emphasis on
21 health/safety and environmental concerns.

22 We have at the Port Hope facility
23 a very well established joint Health and Safety
24 Committee that have the following commitments and
25 goals.

1 (1) to meet as a joint committee
2 for two days each month and address concerns that
3 either party may bring;

4 (2) to assist the employer in
5 investigating, and assessing the exposure of
6 employees to hazardous substances;

7 (3) to participate in the
8 implementation of changes that may affect
9 occupational health and safety, including work
10 processes and procedures;

11 (4) to have full access to all
12 government and employer reports, studies and
13 tests relating to the health and safety of the
14 employees in the workplace;

15 (5) to make monthly workplace
16 inspections, so that every part of the workplace
17 is inspected at least once a year.

18 In addition to the duties that
19 the committee performs, they also receive at
20 their monthly meetings detailed reports from the
21 facility's environmental scientist, the radiation
22 safety officer, and the company's occupational
23 health nurse.

24 At this scheduled monthly
25 meeting, they would give specific reports or

1 findings pertaining to the nature of their work.

2 I would like to assure the
3 Commission Members that we have a very functional
4 Health and Safety Committee that has a very high
5 degree of values towards its employees, as well
6 as the general public that we consider to be our
7 neighbours.

8 There is a commitment from Cameco
9 to assessing and managing health and safety
10 issues, as well as environmental concerns, and
11 also to making continued improvements in these
12 areas.

13 The members that I'm representing
14 today feel quite confident in making an assurance
15 to the Commission that those accomplished
16 relations will continue to grow.

17 There is a commitment from the
18 U.S.W.A. to working with both Cameco and the
19 assigned project officer of the CNSC towards
20 mutual interest of both environmental and health
21 and safety concerns.

22 Madam Chair and Members of the
23 Commission, I wish to conclude that Cameco's
24 performance has been consistently excellent in
25 terms of emissions well below regulatory levels.

StenoTran

1 We have a joint committee to the maintenance of a
2 safe and healthy workplace and surrounding
3 environment.

4 I have been employed as a
5 bargaining member for 23 years, during which time
6 I have worked in almost all major aspects of the
7 Port Hope facility, ranging from operations to
8 maintenance positions.

9 At this time, as President of the
10 USWA Local 13173 at Cameco's Port Hope facility,
11 I am joining the company in requesting that the
12 Commission grant an operating licence for a
13 period of five years.

14 We fully recognize the
15 Commission's right to direct the company to make
16 any changes deemed necessary, at a time within
17 the licensing period.

18 Thank you once again for
19 permitting me to address the Commission today on
20 the licence renewal application.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
22 much.

23 Are there any questions from the
24 Commission Members with regards to this
25 intervention?

1 Dr. Giroux.

2 MEMBER GIROUX: Thank you.

3 What I would like to know, sir,
4 is: Do employees raise concerns about radiation
5 safety to you or to others in the union; and if
6 so, at what frequency?

7 MR. LEAVIT: Those members do
8 make reference to me or to those health and
9 safety members that are posted in all workplace
10 areas at Cameco. They are well posted and are
11 aware of who the health and safety
12 representatives are on the committee.

13 Depending on the severity of the
14 question that the person is asking, if it is
15 something of great importance that we consider,
16 we would take it immediately and I would either
17 talk to one of the pertaining people that it is
18 their area of expertise where I could get that
19 information.

20 But those people do get a direct
21 answer back, either through that; or if the
22 content of the question can wait, it would be
23 referenced to the monthly meeting that we have.
24 We meet twice a month.

25 MEMBER GIROUX: So there are

1 concerns raised on a regular basis.

2 MR. LEAVIT: That's correct, they
3 are raised. Then people always have questions or
4 concerns. I feel Cameco does get that question
5 back to me in a very responsive way, in a timely
6 manner.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Barnes.

8 MEMBER BARNES: I wanted to ask
9 whether the CNSC project officer attends any or
10 all of those meetings.

11 MR. LEAVIT: We have talked to
12 Henry recently, the project officer. We want to
13 have better communication with him. We have
14 talked to him.

15 Up to this point, no, he has not
16 sat on a Health and Safety Committee that I have
17 attended. But we want to start to progress to a
18 more communicative way with him.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the CNSC
20 have any comments with regard to that?

21 MS MALONEY: I think that
22 approach is certainly consistent with our view of
23 a better way to work with the licensee and the
24 workers, and we will be exploring every
25 opportunity to work with them on that.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do you receive
2 now minutes of these meetings?

3 MS MALONEY: I will ask Mr. White
4 to respond to that.

5 MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam
6 Chair. Michael White.

7 Yes, we do, Madam Chair.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there other
9 questions?

10 Ms MacLachlan.

11 MS MacLACHLAN: Does the union
12 keep statistics on health of its members?

13 MR. LEAVIT: You are saying an
14 actual running case study, like a year-by-year
15 case study on its workers?

16 MS MacLACHLAN: Yes.

17 MR. LEAVIT: Not actually. But
18 there is one currently that is in the works.

19 Could I ask for help on this from
20 Bob?

21 MS MacLACHLAN: Yes.

22 MR. STEANE: The study you are
23 thinking of, Chris, is an update of the Eldorado
24 Workers study on morbidity.

25 The question that you have asked

1 vis-à-vis statistics of the health of employees,
2 to the extent we are knowledgeable of medical,
3 the nurse and through our company doctor that we
4 have they do keep records of the health of
5 individuals.

6 We provide medical exams to
7 employees on a scheduled basis, and we do have
8 those records. The employees have their own
9 doctors and their own lives, and there may be
10 things that we are not aware of.

11 MS MacLACHLAN: Then a question
12 to both the union and the company. Are there any
13 trends that are surfacing as a result of these
14 studies with respect to the health of the
15 workers?

16 MR. LEAVIT: At this time I don't
17 personally see any trend of concern to the union.
18 We do, as a union, carry health and safety as a
19 high priority, sitting at almost the top of our
20 list for our workers.

21 We do want our workers to enjoy
22 their retirement and to go home with both arms
23 and both legs at the end of the day, to enjoy
24 life.

25 MS MacLACHLAN: Before the

1 company answers this question, I am concerned not
2 so much with accidents to limbs but longer term
3 incidents of cancer or other longer term
4 diseases.

5 MR. LEAVIT: Bob talked
6 previously about a study that is in the works
7 right now. It is not quite completed. That is
8 in the works.

9 But the steelworkers themselves
10 have not done an actual running study on that.

11 It was years ago. This is an
12 estimated year, I think 1977 or 1978. And it was
13 with Elliot Lake, I believe, in the Miners
14 Guidebook. It was in some magazine that I bumped
15 across.

16 There is no actual study that has
17 been done recently by the steelworkers.

18 MS MacLACHLAN: Before the
19 company answers the original question, what is
20 the nature of the concerns that are raised by the
21 workers at these regular health and safety
22 meetings with the union?

23 MR. LEAVIT: Most of the concerns
24 would be not of a major issue but more of a minor
25 issue. It could concern anywhere of things that

1 need to be repaired, guards, not major issues. I
2 don't see one sitting there right now as a major
3 issue of health and safety directly related to
4 the employees, the longevity of his or her
5 individual life. It is more of a question that
6 concerns coming to get the item fixed or repaired
7 so that it doesn't cause a future accident or
8 immediate accident.

9 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
11 much.

12 We will now move to the --

13 MS MacLACHLAN: Excuse me, Madam
14 Chair. I wanted the company to also respond.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you.

16 MR. STEANE: On the subject of
17 former health studies, we have not conducted -- I
18 don't think we would have the data to do rigorous
19 evaluation of the health of the employees. We
20 do, as I said, through our nurse and doctor keep
21 information. But to the extent that we have sat
22 down and reviewed all of the statistics, we have
23 not done that.

24 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you.

25 The second part of that question

1 is: Are there any concerns that have come to you
2 by the employees that would indicate that there
3 should be studies done? You just told us that
4 you have a study on morbidity. What about rates
5 of cancer, for example?

6 MR. STEANE: There have not been
7 issues raised or concerns raised by employees
8 about incidents of cancer or medical concerns.
9 The things that are raised by employees are
10 workplace related items, health and safety,
11 improvement of facilities, and information
12 vis-à-vis chemicals in the workplace.

13 I have not heard anyone raising
14 anything, whether it is long term health from
15 their employment through either exposure to
16 uranium or radioactive materials or any other
17 materials.

18 MS MacLACHLAN: One more
19 follow-up on that.

20 What about former employees,
21 people who have retired from the company or from
22 the operation? Do you hear concerns back from
23 those people?

24 MR. STEANE: Not to my knowledge.

25 MS MacLACHLAN: I will just ask

1 that of the union, as well.

2 MR. LEAVIT: It is the same
3 answer back as Bob, just restating that there has
4 not been. We do see long-standing members that
5 are retirees locally around town, which is good
6 news. Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: I just want to
8 check. Are there any further questions?

9 Thank you very much.

10

11 **01-H32.3**

12 **Oral presentation by Canadian Nuclear Workers**
13 **Council**

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: We would now
15 like to move to the oral presentation by the
16 Canadian Nuclear Workers Council, contained in
17 CMD document 01-H32.3.

18 I believe Mr. Falconer and
19 Mr. Clark are with us today.

20 MR. FALCONER: Thank you, Madam
21 Chair and Members of the Commission.

22 My name is Peter Falconer. I am
23 an Executive Board Member of the Canadian Nuclear
24 Workers Council.

25 With me today is Keith Clark, who

1 is also an Executive Board Member of the Canadian
2 Nuclear Workers Council. Keith works at the
3 Cameco facility.

4 Our presentation today to the
5 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission in the matter
6 of relicensing of the Cameco Corporation Port
7 Hope Facility.

8 Members of the Commission, the
9 Canadian Nuclear Workers Council is pleased to
10 have this opportunity to come before you. We
11 appear on behalf of the nuclear industry workers
12 in Canada and specifically in support of one of
13 our member organizations, Local 13173 of the
14 United Steelworkers of America, which represents
15 workers at the Port Hope facility of Cameco
16 Corporation.

17 As do all other member
18 organizations of the CNWC, Local 13173 holds
19 health and safety of workers to be paramount.
20 Cameco management and the union have established
21 a good understanding and an excellent working
22 relationship.

23 The union fully endorses and
24 supports the very active health and safety
25 culture promoted and established by Cameco. It

1 works closely with Cameco management to establish
2 safety policies and procedures to maintain a safe
3 and healthy workplace and to protect the
4 surrounding natural environment.

5 The plant Health and Safety
6 Committee consists of both union and management
7 representatives. The Committee has full access
8 to all reports, studies, and tests relating to
9 health and safety of employees. It receives
10 detailed reports from various company officers
11 responsible for the environmental, health, and
12 safety aspects of operations. It meets monthly
13 to address any and all health and safety issues
14 and conducts regular workplace inspections.

15 Its activities provide the
16 workforce with a high level of confidence that
17 the workplace is safe and the environment in
18 which their families, friends, and neighbours
19 reside is protected.

20 Union and management
21 representatives from the Health and Safety
22 Committee work closely and co-operatively with
23 the assigned CNSC project officer during their
24 inspections of the workplace. The Health and
25 Safety Committee has the authority to initiate

1 action and require a response within specific
2 time limits on any matter judged by Commission
3 inspectors to require attention and improvement.

4 Cameco's operations continue to
5 receive positive community and industry response.
6 The many union members who live in Port Hope
7 receive very positive feedback on Cameco's
8 efforts within the community. The company
9 maintains communications with the community
10 through participation in various community
11 initiatives and joint committees.

12 These joint committees ensure
13 that any municipal concerns regarding plant
14 operations are expressed to management and dealt
15 with promptly and effectively. The plant's
16 cleanliness and its health and safety record have
17 impressed delegates from other CNWC member
18 organizations who have toured the plant.

19 Cameco continues to display a
20 progressive and caring approach towards the
21 health and safety of its workers and protection
22 of the environment. Plant performance continues
23 to be consistently excellent with emission levels
24 well below regulatory levels.

25 The CNWC therefore joins with

StenoTran

1 Local 13173 in fully supporting the extension of
2 the company's operating license for five years.

3 With the indulgence of the
4 Commission, unless otherwise requested I would
5 suggest that the rest of the presentation is
6 simply a background in the CNWC. I believe the
7 Commission has heard some of this information
8 before, so I would defer to call this the end of
9 the presentation at this point.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
11 much. Commission Members do have the documents
12 in advance, and we do have an opportunity to read
13 all of the documents.

14 So thank you very much for your
15 presentation.

16 With that, I would like to open
17 the floor to Commission Members.

18 Ms MacLachlan.

19 MS MacLACHLAN: I would like to
20 ask you the same question about health related
21 issues.

22 The Canadian Nuclear Workers
23 Council is in a position to oversee a broad
24 spectrum of nuclear workers. With respect to the
25 Port Hope facility of Cameco, have any concerns

1 come to the workers' council related to cancer,
2 kidney damage or mortality resulting from their
3 employment at the particular Port Hope facility?

4 MR. FALCONER: To my knowledge,
5 no. But I will defer to Keith since he works
6 there, just to make sure that there haven't been
7 any kind of problems related to that.

8 MR. CLARK: The answer to that is
9 no.

10 MS MacLACHLAN: Could you say
11 that once more into the mic? I notice that
12 wasn't on.

13 MR. CLARK: The answer to that is
14 no, there aren't any major concerns. Nobody has
15 brought anything back to us.

16 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you very
17 much.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Giroux.

19 MEMBER GIROUX: I was interested
20 in your statement about the very positive
21 feedback that your members are receiving from the
22 community. We are used to hearing some fairly
23 negative feedback here.

24 Could you give me some concrete
25 examples of what you are referring to?

1 MR. CLARK: We have gone to the
2 high school and have done several lectures on
3 what we are all about, and the students have
4 really come back positive compared to several
5 years ago when they didn't know nothing about the
6 place. Now we are trying to educate everybody
7 and tell them what we are all about, and they
8 seem to respond positively. That's both students
9 and mothers and fathers and other people in the
10 community.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
12 much.

13

14 **01-H32.8**

15 **Oral presentation by Port Hope and District**
16 **Chamber of Commerce**

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: I would like to
18 move forward on the agenda and move to the oral
19 presentation by Port Hope and District Chamber of
20 Commerce, as noted in CMD document 01-H32.8.

21 I believe the President of the
22 Chamber of Commerce is with us today.

23 Thank you very much for coming,
24 Madam. The floor is now yours.

25 MS SAN MARTIN: Good morning,

1 Madam Chair and Members of the Commission, ladies
2 and gentlemen. My name is Sherry San Martin. I
3 am President of the Port Hope and District
4 Chamber of Commerce.

5 On behalf of the Chamber's 320
6 members, who employ over 4,000 individuals, I
7 thank you for this opportunity to reinforce the
8 Chamber's support of Cameco Corporation and the
9 Port Hope Conversion Facility licence renewal
10 application.

11 Our support is based on our
12 confidence that through Cameco Corporation's and
13 your Board's monitoring process, the firm
14 currently complies and will continue to comply
15 with the CNSC regulations and renewal criteria.

16 Our support of the renewal falls
17 in line with our mandate to promote and improve
18 trade and commerce and economic, civic and social
19 welfare of our district. The firm contributes
20 significantly to each of these areas.

21 Economically, Cameco contributes
22 270 jobs to the Town of Port Hope, continuing to
23 represent approximately \$9.2 million in spending
24 power, stimulating the local trade and commerce
25 as reported by the Port Hope Economic

1 Development.

2 As an active member of the
3 Chamber and business community, Cameco
4 Corporation supports local trade and commerce.
5 This is achieved by local purchasing of lumber,
6 hardware, printing, the employment of
7 restaurants, taxi companies, purchasing of
8 employee incentive gifts, and numerous other
9 local businesses and services.

10 Cameco Corporation is a vital
11 component of the Port Hope community.

12 They consistently demonstrate an
13 excellence in corporate responsibility and
14 community through their generous donations to
15 social, cultural and civic activities. Cameco
16 earns the support of communities with which it
17 interacts.

18 In Port Hope they have been
19 nominated numerous times for excellence in large
20 business and community service in the annual Port
21 Hope Business Excellence Awards Program. It is
22 evident through their actions that Cameco cares
23 for, and supports, the communities in which they
24 operate.

25 They support their employees

StenoTran

1 taking part in community activities by the
2 donations made to over 40 non-profit
3 organizations. The significant contributions the
4 firm has made to the local community this past
5 year include the Capitol Theatre, \$75,000; Port
6 Hope Library, \$50,000; Friends of Music, \$2,500;
7 Northumberland United Way, \$23,000 and change;
8 and the New Hospital, \$250,000.

9 Cameco continues to make numerous
10 and diverse contributions to our local community.
11 Just a few of the organizations that benefited
12 this past year from Cameco's generosity include:
13 Ganaraska Sharks Hockey Tournament; Float Your
14 Fanny Down the Ganny; Beaver Athletic Association
15 -- I should have put that one at the end; I'm
16 sorry.

17 Cameco Peewee Rebels; Norac Sea
18 Devils; Kids Help Phone; St. Anthony's Breakfast
19 Club; Northumberland Art Gallery; Port Hope
20 Soccer Club; Cobourg Minor Baseball and Soccer;
21 St. Mary's Robotics; Port Hope Robotics; Junior
22 Achievement; Friends of Music; Northumberland
23 lacrosse; Cobourg Film Festival; Children's Wish
24 Foundation; Northumberland U13 Soccer Team and
25 the U17 Soccer Team; Driftwood Theatre Show

1 Sponsor; Community Training and Development,
2 which is a camp for kids; Agricultural Society;
3 Tim Horton's Camp Day; Port Hope High School Year
4 Book; and a number of others.

5 Cameco supports their
6 professional staff to become members of pertinent
7 professional societies and institutes and their
8 participation in the activities of these
9 organizations. These activities include
10 responsibilities in numerous committees,
11 organizations of technical conferences and
12 seminars, and executive responsibilities in the
13 administration and management of these
14 organizations.

15 Cameco supports the professional
16 staff to visit local schools, participate in
17 events and give presentations on various
18 subjects. Examples are: Trinity College School
19 Science Fair; Kawartha Pine Ridge District School
20 Board Elementary Millennium Science Symposium;
21 Terry Fox Public School Grade 6; Lord Elgin
22 Public School Grades 4 and 5; Howard Jordan
23 Public School Grade 5, Experiments for Chemistry
24 Teacher Symposium.

25 This year Cameco Technology

1 Development, CTD, initiated contacts with the
2 universities of Ontario. Joint activities
3 include providing seminars and lectures given by
4 the employees to the fourth year students and
5 graduate students and initiating research
6 projects. Examples are the Royal Military
7 College, Queens University and Toronto
8 University.

9 Cameco Corporation continues to
10 take a leadership role in development
11 partnerships and strategic alliances to bring
12 many community projects to fruition, including
13 the Community Awareness Emergency Response Group,
14 CAER, and the establishment of the Community
15 Alert Network, CAN, to enhance emergency response
16 capabilities.

17 The firm offers automated
18 external defibrillation training to its emergency
19 medical and response personnel.

20 Cameco works closely with local
21 fire and police departments and provides training
22 jointly with their emergency response teams.

23 Cameco has also recently held an
24 open house to proudly showcase their operations
25 to local population and families of their

1 employees.

2 In closing, Cameco Corporation is
3 a member in good standing and strong supporter of
4 the Port Hope and District Chamber of Commerce
5 and our mandate. As a member they continue to be
6 a consistent contributor to the economic, civil
7 and social wellbeing of our district and our
8 community. Therefore, we are in support of their
9 licence renewal for a five-year period.

10 On behalf of the Port Hope and
11 District Chamber of Commerce, I thank you for
12 allowing us to present an overview of the
13 positive impact Cameco Corporation has on our
14 community and for your attention. Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

16 The floor is now open for
17 questions.

18 Dr. Giroux.

19 MEMBER GIROUX: As you can deduce
20 from some of the questions I have been asking in
21 the past few minutes, we are quite interested in
22 the health concerns of citizens in Port Hope.

23 You are very supportive of Cameco
24 and the operations. That is very clear.

25 But the question is: Do you in

1 your function within the Chamber of Commerce ever
2 hear any concerns raised about the effects of
3 Cameco's operations on the health of citizens?

4 MS SAN MARTIN: I am fortunate to
5 have been in the Port Hope community for
6 approximately four years now. I am also a
7 manager of a local financial institution in town.
8 Therefore, I do have a lot of opportunity to
9 speak with a number of consumers and business
10 people in the town.

11 I haven't heard one thing to do
12 with long-term illnesses or the death rate in the
13 area.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
15 much for your presentation.

16 We will move now to CMD 01-H32.4.
17 Originally, this was slated as an
18 oral presentation by the Port Hope Community
19 Health Concerns Committee. Ms Faye More was
20 scheduled to be with us today and she,
21 unfortunately, phoned this morning. And because
22 we are very interested in presentations with
23 regards to hearings, we have endeavoured to reach
24 her by phone to patch her in by teleconference,
25 but we have been unable to do that.

1 She had also been asked to
2 present the next CMD, which is H32.5, the oral
3 presentation by Port Hope Nuclear Environmental
4 Watchdogs.

5 With our inability to patch her
6 in by teleconference, we are moving then to have
7 32.4 and 32.5 become written submissions to the
8 Commission this morning and, as such, we will be
9 treating them as written submissions.

10 I will note that we did have
11 these submissions in advance, and the Commission
12 Members have had time to read these and to digest
13 the contents thereof.

14

15 **01-H32.4**

16 **Written presentation by Port Hope Community**

17 **Health Concerns Committee**

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: With that, I
19 will move to H32.4, now a written submission by
20 the Port Hope Community Health Concerns
21 Committee.

22 I open the floor for questions
23 from Commission Members. Thank you.

24 Dr. Barnes.

25 MEMBER BARNES: This particular

1 intervenor raises issues that are really quite
2 broad in contrast to the licensing issue that is
3 before us today. Nevertheless, these are issues
4 that have been brought before the Commission in
5 its former guise as the Atomic Energy Control
6 Board and refer to actions that were taken by
7 that Board in terms of some of the broader health
8 studies.

9 I think I have to direct some of
10 my questions to staff.

11 The question I have is: The
12 three reports that are appended to Ms More's
13 report by Drs. Mintz, Bertell and Leece, have
14 these been referred back to the Commission
15 before?

16 I was on the Commission when the
17 initial study was conceived and put in practice,
18 and so on. But I don't recall seeing these
19 reviews.

20 Were they brought before the
21 Commission?

22 MS MALONEY: I will ask Dr. Mary
23 Measures to respond, please.

24 DR. MEASURES: I am going to have
25 to refer that one to Dr. Chatterjee, because I

1 don't know the details. I apologize.

2 DR. CHATTERJEE: For the record,
3 by name is Robi Chatterjee. I am the Head of
4 Radio Biology, Epidemiology and Dosimetry
5 Section.

6 Dr. Barnes, the review was done
7 by Dr. Eric Mintz for the Cancer Incident Study
8 and Dr. Darlington. These peer reviews were then
9 sent to our colleagues in Health Canada who did
10 the study for us, and they have responded to the
11 questions directly to the reviewers.

12 Dr. Mintz's review is repeated
13 here by the PHCHC, and we will be willing to
14 answer questions on that, if you would like to
15 ask us.

16 MEMBER BARNES: I find all the
17 reviews extremely critical of the study,
18 surprisingly critical. Basic things like the
19 study not really having a defined authorship, for
20 example; even questioning -- it is hard to go
21 into all the details, but I think it is pretty
22 evident from the continuing thread throughout
23 these documents that these are extremely cortical
24 reviews of the study.

25 Maybe I could just put in a

1 general sense. We could be here all day
2 answering point by point.

3 How does staff feel about the
4 nature of these reviews on that study?

5 MS MALONEY: I will ask Dr. Mary
6 Measures to respond to that.

7 DR. MEASURES: Thank you. We as
8 a government agency make sure that we use the
9 proper procedures and scientific rigidity when we
10 do a study. In this case, the studies were
11 contracted out to Health Canada, who has a
12 mandate to do this type of study.

13 I think the criticism of them is
14 quite unjustified. Unfortunately, we were not in
15 the position to do what the Port Hope Committee
16 wished, and that was to give them a grant of a
17 couple of hundred thousand dollars so they could
18 do their own study.

19 I think that is part of the issue
20 here: that the results that came out of the
21 Health Canada study are not what were anticipated
22 by the Port Hope Committee. So they are very
23 critical of anything that didn't come up with the
24 right conclusions.

25 I think it is very unfortunate

1 that Mrs. More is not here today to address this.
2 I think it needs to be in the record of who said,
3 or we did or they did, or what. I think there is
4 a gross misunderstanding here.

5 I believe that the CNSC, or then
6 the AECCB, did everything possible to have good
7 studies done and to have them properly peer
8 reviewed before they were published.

9 MEMBER BARNES: If I could follow
10 up, there is an underlying theme throughout these
11 studies that challenged the very structure of the
12 study; that it was inappropriate in many ways to
13 resolve this particular issue.

14 That leads me to wonder, in a
15 sense -- I have to be careful in my phrasing here
16 -- whether enough time or competence was put, not
17 only by Health Canada, but by the former AECCB in
18 defining the study in the first place.

19 What I don't have is any evidence
20 of the competence of these reviewers. I know one
21 can get down to looking at competence of
22 competence of people. These individual reviewers
23 are, in a sense, questioning the competence of
24 the Health Canada reviewers, who remain
25 anonymous.

1 We have before us some documents
2 that don't in fact give us any information on the
3 qualifications of these reviewers. So I am a
4 little in the dark here.

5 We are dealing not so much with
6 Ms More's comments, but Ms More is reminding us
7 that these documents do exist. They are the
8 documents of specialists, supposedly, in the
9 field, and these specialists are raising very
10 serious questions about the structure of the
11 study itself.

12 DR. MEASURES: For the record, it
13 is Mary Measures again.

14 I will just make an opening
15 comment and then pass it to Ms Rachel Lane, who
16 is our epidemiologist and will know the details.

17 The study proposed by the Port
18 Hope Committee was to go around with a survey and
19 ask questions of individuals. They were to ask
20 them: Were you sicker this year than you were
21 the year before? That was the study that was
22 proposed.

23 We had that reviewed and, based
24 on the review, we went into further studies that
25 were a bit more robust.

1 For details on that, I will pass
2 it to Ms Lane, who is the epidemiologist.

3 MS LANE: For the record, I am
4 Rachel Lane. I am the epidemiologist for the
5 CNSC. I work with the Radiation and
6 Environmental Protection Division.

7 First of all, I think you asked a
8 question regarding the competency of the
9 investigators that conducted the Cancer Incident
10 Study.

11 These people have over 20 years
12 individually, and perhaps 50 years combined,
13 experience doing disease surveillance. Health
14 Canada is the national organization responsible
15 for disease surveillance in Canada. I have no
16 doubt about their credentials.

17 With respect to the reviews, we
18 had two reviewers, as mentioned, Dr. Mintz and
19 Dr. Darlington. These peer reviews were provided
20 back to the investigators, and they were given
21 opportunity to comment on the reviews.

22 We were very satisfied with the
23 comments back.

24 With respect to the other two
25 reviewers that were chosen by Faye More's

1 committee, I have seen the reviews and I have
2 criticisms of the reviews.

3 For example, Mr. Leece is a
4 toxicologist, and his comments deal as a
5 toxicologist would to an epidemiological study.
6 He comments about looking at renal failure; that
7 conducting such a study in Port Hope would not
8 have a large enough population, therefore not
9 enough power, to conduct such a study.

10 Second, Dr. Bertell makes lots of
11 criticisms in the study. One concern she had,
12 for example, which we can criticize would be her
13 discussion of not considering such -- she has
14 problems with considering confounding variables,
15 such as tobacco smoking and sort of downplays the
16 role of tobacco smoking.

17 Eighty per cent of lung cancer in
18 Ontario is caused by tobacco smoking.

19 In essence, I think that those
20 reviewers' reviews equally need to be reviewed
21 and taken into consideration in light of the
22 overall quality of the Cancer Incident Study.

23 MEMBER BARNES: Do you know the
24 specialization of Dr. Bertell? What is her
25 specialty?

1 MS LANE: I believe she is a
2 statistician.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Giroux?

4 MEMBER GIROUX: Maybe one final
5 question on this whole question of the health
6 studies. This is one that seems important to me.
7 You have read the peer reviews.
8 A question to staff is: Is there anything in
9 there that might have changed your recommendation
10 concerning the licence here?

11 MS MALONEY: I will refer that to
12 Dr. Measures in the first instance.

13 DR. MEASURES: Thank you. For
14 the record, I am Mary Measures of REPD.

15 No, there is nothing there that
16 would influence the recommendation for the
17 licence.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: I have a
19 question with regard to the non-health study
20 component of CMD 32-4, and that is with regard to
21 "Section II, Cameco Corporation Application for
22 Re-licensing".

23 There are comments there with
24 regard to Waterway Keeper Organization and some
25 areas that are under study or currently under

1 study by this organization and other areas of
2 concern to this interest group.

3 Are there any areas, from both
4 the point of the proponent or with regard to the
5 CNSC staff, that they wish to clarify further to
6 this submission on those specific matters?

7 I am referring to pages 6, 7 and
8 of this CMD document.

9 Would the proponent like to
10 start?

11 MR. STEANE: Madam Chair, Bob
12 Steane from Cameco.

13 There are a number of points in
14 that Section II. I think many of them are not
15 related to this licence application.

16 I am not aware of any of the work
17 of the Waterway Keepers in Port Hope. I am aware
18 of some information that the Lake Ontario Keepers
19 did relative to Port Granby Waste Site, but that
20 is not a topic here. That they have something in
21 Port Hope, I have no knowledge of what that is
22 that they may be studying.

23 When I review that, I see nothing
24 in there. In the recommendations they talk about
25 a conflict of interest with the CNSC, and I leave

1 that to the CNSC to decide on. This is in the
2 recommendations.

3 The issue of uranium emissions, I
4 think we have discussed that. We think there is
5 nothing in those recommendations that would
6 preclude issuing of a five-year licence. I think
7 the issue of uranium emissions are being dealt
8 with, are dealt with, are controlled, and don't
9 present any hazard to the public or the
10 environment.

11 I think those are all the
12 comments I have on that submission.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Staff?

14 MS MALONEY: Thank you. It is
15 Cait Maloney.

16 I would like Dr. Thompson to make
17 some comments on some of the environmental
18 aspects of the concerns raised.

19 DR. THOMPSON: There were several
20 comments in the CMD related to either the Ontario
21 Lake Keepers or some of the issues about zero
22 discharge and zero accumulation in soils.

23 The Lake Ontario Keepers did
24 report issues of toxicity for at least one of the
25 waste sites. Environment Canada, following this

1 information, did an inspection; took samples and
2 did toxicity tests, as well as a contaminant scan
3 on the effluent samples that were taken.

4 The information that we have from
5 Environment Canada is that none of the samples
6 were toxic and none of the samples revealed
7 contaminants that would be unexpected for this
8 type of site.

9 So for us, this is not an issue
10 of concern.

11 Similarly for Port Hope, as far
12 as I know the Ontario Lake Keepers have not
13 issued information related to potential toxicity
14 of effluent or other areas.

15 There is some reference to the
16 MOE air standards sort of giving a permit to
17 pollute. Essentially, the air standard is not a
18 permit to pollute in the sense that you can
19 release amounts of radionuclides or uranium that
20 would accumulate in soils to a given level.

21 It is essentially a back
22 calculation, and a level of conservatism depth
23 should prevent unreasonable risks from happening.
24 In addition to the air standards, there are
25 controls in place on the facility to ensure that

1 the emissions are kept as low as possible.

2 With the information on current
3 emission rates and the controls in place on the
4 facilities, we have not seen, and we don't
5 anticipate accumulation in soils to be
6 significant, even over a very long operational
7 period.

8 I don't believe that the issues
9 that have been raised are a concern in terms of
10 licence renewal for this facility.,

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: There is a
12 comment with regard to the International Joint
13 Commission on the Great Lakes having concerns
14 with regard to "severe radioactive - heavy metal
15 collusion in the harbour".

16 Are you aware of any concerns of
17 the International Joint Commission on the Great
18 Lakes?

19 DR. THOMPSON: This refers to
20 work that was done in the 1980s by this
21 organization, as well as Environment Canada. At
22 the time, Environment Canada had a contaminated
23 sites program. Because of industrial activities
24 and a lot of the organic contaminant presence in
25 the Great Lakes and effects on fish-eating birds,

1 there was a lot of effort focused on the Great
2 Lakes to identify areas of concern that appeared
3 to be contaminated.

4 The harbour is one of those areas
5 of concern, because of the industrial practices
6 that were taking place in the 1930s, 1940s,
7 1950s, and so on.

8 There are unknown levels of
9 contamination in the harbour. There are levels
10 of organic contaminants, as well as lead and
11 radionuclides, and some of the other metals.

12 That information was used in the
13 assessment conducted by Environment Canada of
14 releases of radionuclides, and the Port Hope
15 facility was included in that assessment.

16 The conclusion of that assessment
17 is that Cameco is not contributing significantly
18 to add to the contaminants in place, and the
19 contaminants are bound to sediments and are not
20 being released back to the water column. In
21 effect, they are not a threat to human health or
22 to the environment, more than what is in place
23 now because of those historic practices.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there any
25 further questions?

1 Mr. Graham.

2 MEMBER GRAHAM: Earlier this
3 morning we talked about the figure of 150,000
4 metres, and I believe Cameco indicated that about
5 108,000 metres was the figure to clean up the
6 site.

7 Dr. Thompson was just talking
8 about the harbour. Would the 108,000 metres that
9 you talked about include harbour clean-up also?
10 Or would the 150,000 be sufficient to clean up
11 both harbour and the site?

12 MR. STEANE: Bob Steane from
13 Cameco.

14 The clean-up of the harbour is
15 not part of the 150,000. But the clean-up and
16 volumes for the harbour are specifically
17 identified in the plan that the Port Hope
18 Municipality put forward and the agreement with
19 the government. It is over and above that, and
20 provision is there for the harbour.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
22 much, Commission Members.

23

24 **01-H32.5**

25 **Written presentation by Port Hope Nuclear**

StenoTran

1 **Environmental Watchdogs**

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: We will now
3 move to the written submission by the Port Hope
4 Nuclear Environmental Watchdogs, as noted in CMD
5 document 01-H32.5.

6 As I noted earlier, this
7 originally was to be an oral presentation by
8 Mr. Chris Conti, who called earlier this week and
9 said he was unable to do that. Ms More is not
10 here to substitute for him. So it will be a
11 written submission.

12 Are there any questions or
13 comments by Commission Members with regard to
14 32.5?

15 Mr. Graham.

16 MEMBER GRAHAM: In the issues
17 outlined, I believe a lot of them have been
18 covered already this morning by other questions.
19 But in one of the issues with regard to insurance
20 -- and this goes to Cameco.

21 Maybe I may not be in order,
22 Madam Chair; and if I am not, just say so.

23 My question would be: Do you
24 carry a liability insurance policy; and if so, is
25 it relevant to tell us how much that is, as it

1 relates to Item 5 in the submission?

2 MR. CHAD: Gary Chad from Cameco
3 in answer.

4 Cameco has, in our opinion, more
5 than adequate liability insurance in place for
6 third party damage for loss. Our insurers do not
7 wish us to release the amount of insurance
8 coverage in a public forum in terms of the
9 principal. That could prejudice the insurer in
10 the event of a lawsuit against the insured.

11 We certainly are prepared to give
12 that information to the Commission, if requested.
13 I would suggest that we could provide it on a
14 confidential basis, if that would meet your
15 needs.

16 MEMBER GRAHAM: That is why I
17 prefaced my remarks around that, because I
18 realize that it may prejudice anything that may
19 happen.

20 My question then would be to CNSC
21 staff: Does CNSC staff review the liability
22 insurance coverage by Cameco on this facility;
23 and if so, is it reviewed on an annual basis to
24 see that the policies are up to date, and so on?

25 MS MALONEY: That is not an area

1 that we consider at all. So there is no review
2 of the policy.

3 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you.
4 Another question I have relates to no. 7 in their
5 issues.

6 Again for clarification and
7 timing, and so on, they are referring to the fact
8 that:

9 "...NEW believes that the
10 proposed Highland Drive site
11 in particular is unacceptable
12 because of its location."

13 Are all these interventions that
14 may be coming forward taken into consideration in
15 the time frame that we were given this morning of
16 2008 for a facility being able to receive
17 material?

18 I am not sure who to ask that to,
19 but perhaps CNSC staff first.

20 MS MALONEY: The establishment or
21 the proposal to establish the site will be
22 reviewed through the CEAA process. There will be
23 an appropriate public comment at that time.

24 MEMBER GRAHAM: My only question,
25 then, is: You don't see any delay because of the

1 comment made in 7. You are still confident of
2 the 2008 time frame for receiving material.

3 MS MALONEY: I do not think it is
4 appropriate to comment on the timeliness of that,
5 because there is a process to follow.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms MacLachlan.

7 MS MacLACHLAN: In NEW's
8 submission they suggest that the reports from
9 Cameco are not made available to the public; that
10 they are made available to the municipality's
11 committee entitled Protection to Persons and
12 Property Committee.

13 Is this indeed the case? What
14 are the issues surrounding disclosure of the
15 information or the actual reports to the general
16 public?

17 MR. STEANE: Reporting to the
18 public is at a public meeting. It is a committee
19 of council to which all the public are invited.
20 The presentations are to them, and questions are
21 entertained from the council and from the public.

22 The reports are submitted to
23 CNSC, and I think they say that in here. This
24 committee does receive copies of that report.
25 They are welcome to attend. There are advertised

1 public meetings to discuss the reports. All the
2 information is open to the public.

3 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you.

4 MS MALONEY: Might I add
5 something?

6 MS MacLACHLAN: Yes.

7 MS MALONEY: CNSC staff do
8 actually send copies of that quarterly report to
9 Mr. Conti.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very
11 much. There are no further questions with regard
12 to that document.

13

14 **01-H32.6**

15 **Written submission from The Corporation of the**
16 **Town of Deep River**

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: I will now move
18 to CMD document 01-H32.6, which is a written
19 submission from the Corporation of the Town of
20 Deep River.

21 Are there any questions from
22 Commission Members with regard to this
23 submission?

24 There are no questions with
25 regard to this submission.

1

2

01-H32.7

3

**Written submission from The Corporation of the
Municipality of Port Hope**

4

5

6

7

8

THE CHAIRPERSON: We will move to the written submission from The Corporation of the Municipality of Port Hope, as outlined in CMD document 01-H32.7.

9

10

11

Are there any questions from Commission Members with regard to this written submission?

12

13

There are no questions.

14

01-H32.9

15

**Written submission from Sierra Club of Canada
Nuclear Campaign**

16

17

18

19

20

THE CHAIRPERSON: We will now move to the written submission from the Sierra Club of Canada Nuclear Campaign, as outlined in CMD document 01-H32.9.

21

22

23

Are there any comments or questions with regard to the submission from the Sierra Club of Canada?

24

Mr. Graham.

25

MEMBER GRAHAM: I have just one

1 question to CNSC staff. I believe it should be
2 to them. It is regarding fire hazard.

3 There is a statement in there
4 that I think should be clarified:

5 "CAMECO is not in full
6 compliance with the national
7 Fire and Building Codes. The
8 CNSC staff report does not
9 elaborate on what proportion
10 of the upgrades are
11 outstanding."

12 I wonder if we could get a list
13 of that. Are they in compliance now? This was
14 written back on December 14th.

15 MS MALONEY: I will refer that
16 question to Bob Lojk, our fire protection
17 specialist.

18 MR. LOJK: Bob Lojk, Safety
19 Evaluation Division, Engineering.

20 There are two issues here. The
21 building codes and fire codes are not retroactive
22 documents. We audited Cameco, and our inspector
23 reviewed the facility and made a series of
24 recommendations.

25 We looked at the recommendations

1 for their safety impact, and we requested that
2 Cameco undertake a certain number of
3 recommendations.

4 Most of the recommendations
5 raised by our consultant were reviewed, found
6 doable, and Cameco has undertaken a program to
7 put those in place.

8 The urgent ones, the ones that we
9 felt required the highest priority, were done;
10 things such as systemic upgrades, program
11 upgrades, and small repairs. In some cases there
12 were large repairs, removing buildings and
13 evacuating the contents in order to reduce the
14 hazard; organizing certain items of high hazard.

15 There are other upgrades, large
16 capital works, that are in process: doors, walls,
17 suppression system upgrades, and the like. Those
18 require several years to plan, design and
19 implement.

20 We have looked at the plans put
21 in place by Cameco, and we find the plan for
22 implementation agreeable and acceptable, given
23 the kind of risk and the scope of the work.

24 Briefly, Cameco may not be in
25 full compliance with the current building codes.

1 They are in compliance with the fire code, the
2 operational aspects of the fire code.

3 They are probably in compliance
4 with the building code as was in place at the
5 time that the buildings were originally built
6 starting back in the 1940s, if I am not mistaken.

7 In 2004, I believe, which is the
8 final date in place, the balance of the work will
9 be done.

10 During that time other things may
11 come up, and Commission staff will be inspecting
12 the facilities to ensure that in fact they are in
13 compliance.

14 Furthermore, commencing with this
15 licence that is being proposed now, Cameco will
16 have a clear requirement to comply with both the
17 building code and with the fire code: the
18 building code as of any projects that are being
19 built, proposed or modified; the fire code from
20 the moment the licence goes into operation.

21 We will be reviewing with them
22 and other licensees the applicability of NFP801,
23 which is an American standard which deals
24 specifically with facilities such as Cameco. It
25 may not be fully applicable. We are just trying

1 to find out what portions would be best applied
2 and would provide the highest level of safety,
3 reasonable safety.

4 In the opinion of CNSC staff,
5 Cameco has upgraded where possible, and their
6 program is in place as reasonable. We don't
7 believe that program can be expedited to achieve
8 a closer time frame.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Would the
10 applicant wish to comment?

11 MR. STEANE: No. I think Mr.
12 Lojk has summarized the situation. We do have a
13 schedule. We are submitting frequent reports,
14 quarterly reports to CNSC, on our progress to
15 that schedule. We are so far on schedule and
16 meeting all of our commitments.

17 MEMBER GRAHAM: My other
18 question, then, is to CNSC staff. Are there any
19 of these issues, either under the fire code or
20 the building code, critical enough to be made a
21 licence condition? Or are they all more or less
22 being controlled through regular reports, whether
23 it is monthly or quarterly?

24 MS MALONEY: I will ask Bob Lojk
25 to respond to that.

1 MR. LOJK: We have a schedule
2 that details when the work will be done. We are
3 accepting that as a regulatory commitment. We
4 will be tracking each of the points, and if the
5 schedule slips we will be creating presumably an
6 action item to ensure that the work gets done.

7 At this time, given that there is
8 a requirement for them to meet the fire code and
9 there is a requirement for them to meet the
10 building code, we are tracking it very closely.

11 Nothing has slipped or appears to
12 be such that it would require additional
13 compliance measures.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms MacLachlan.

15 MS MacLACHLAN: What is the time
16 frame for the implementation of the final
17 elements of the schedule?

18 MR. LOJK: We expect all work to
19 be completed by 2004, if I am not mistaken. Most
20 of the work, 99.9 per cent of the work, will be
21 completed by the end of 2002.

22 MS MacLACHLAN: Thank you. I
23 have a supplementary question arising from the
24 CMD.

25 The statements that are made

1 about the codes, the National Fire Protection
2 Association codes not directly addressing nuclear
3 hazards, and that there is a consultation process
4 in place to review the requirements of the codes
5 with a view to applying it to Cameco's
6 facilities.

7 What is the time schedule set for
8 conclusion of that review process?

9 MS MALONEY: Again, I will refer
10 that to Bob Lojk for the detail.

11 MR. LOJK: There is a meeting on
12 February 5th, in a couple of weeks, with all
13 licensees, not only Cameco but the other
14 licensees in the same business line. At that
15 point staff will decide whether in fact it is
16 warranted to implement the conditions of 801 or
17 not.

18 These facilities are large
19 industrial facilities, and unlike reactor
20 facilities we are not talking about high level
21 radiation. We are trying to control the spread
22 of radiation from a fire event by controlling
23 common hazards.

24 So there will not be much
25 difference in these facilities, except for very

1 select and defined instances for anything beyond
2 the building code and the fire code.

3 However, the NFP standard exists.
4 Our consultant has recommended the applicability
5 of the NFP801 to such facilities be looked at,
6 and we are doing that.

7 We would expect, depending what
8 the resolution is at the end of February, that we
9 will be in a position some time in early summer
10 to either decide to implement the entire standard
11 or applicable portions of the standard, or in
12 fact not implement the standard at all, believing
13 that the radiation protection measures that we
14 have as part of other regulations, and the
15 building code and fire code requirements, do
16 cover all areas of concern.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: For the record,
18 could you note which would be the other licensees
19 that would be influenced by this review of the
20 fire code?

21 MR. LOJK: The meeting that will
22 be held on February 5th will be held with Cameco
23 Blind River, Cameco Port Hope, General Electric
24 and Zircatec.

25 We have a meeting tomorrow to

1 deal with the Waste Facilities Division of
2 Ontario Power Generation.

3 We are further dealing with other
4 aspects, such as AECL, and the like, on a
5 sequential basis to see what the applicability
6 would be for them.

7 Since the meeting with OPG is
8 tomorrow, they have prepared a presentation and
9 have hired a consultant to do the comparison. We
10 will be using that information and building on it
11 to have a composite position on this subject by
12 some time in the summer.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there
14 further questions?

15 Thank you very much.

16 MR. LEBLANC: This completes the
17 record for the public hearing --

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry. Do you
19 have a question, Dr. Giroux?

20 MEMBER GIROUX: Yes. I'm sorry,
21 I failed to respond because I thought you were
22 still dealing with the item from the Sierra Club.

23 I have a more general question,
24 and I think I would like to address the
25 recommendation of the five-year licence at this

1 time. This will be more general. It covers the
2 three recommendations that we have on the table
3 today about the three licences.

4 We understand from staff there is
5 a recommendation to present a mid-term report,
6 and you have supplied us in the CMD with the
7 table of contents of what the report will cover.
8 I have no question with that.

9 I am trying to understand what
10 will be the framework in which this would be
11 done.

12 Questions are, for instance:
13 Would the applicant be expected to attend or to
14 make a presentation or send a written submission
15 reacting to your report?

16 The other question is: Would
17 intervenors be not only notified but also invited
18 to come?

19 MS MALONEY: Dr. Giroux, this is
20 a process that has not quite been finalized yet.
21 Obviously any submissions to the Commission are
22 going to be public, and comments can be
23 entertained.

24 The mechanics of whether or not
25 we will have intervenors, I am not aware of that

1 at this stage.

2 MEMBER GIROUX: You say you are
3 in the process of thinking about the mechanics.

4 MS MALONEY: Yes.

5 MEMBER GIROUX: The question
6 which is related to that is: If we go far in
7 terms of suggesting, for instance, that the
8 applicant does make a presentation and that
9 intervenors are welcome to have presentations
10 too, is there still gain in going from a two-year
11 process to a five-year process? Would that be
12 making the process as heavy as it is now?

13 MS MALONEY: For further detail,
14 I will refer this to Barclay Howden to give more
15 detail on some of the savings that we anticipate
16 can be made.

17 MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden
18 speaking.

19 In terms of the savings, we have
20 done an estimate. Right now, we feel that by
21 going to a five-year licence we would save about
22 50 per cent of our current resources being spent
23 on licensing that could be then made available to
24 compliance, plus the mid-year report.

25 As a ballpark figure, that would

1 free up each year 100 to 125 person-days per
2 year.

3 Now, in terms of producing the
4 mid-term report, that would probably, averaged
5 over five years, consumes between 25 to 50 person
6 days.

7 So in essence, our estimate is
8 that we would probably free up about 75 person
9 days per year to be available to comply in other
10 activities, for this particular service line.

11 MEMBER GIROUX: Is that per
12 licensee?

13 MR. HOWDEN: No, it's for the
14 whole service line of the six licensees within
15 this service line.

16 MEMBER GIROUX: And then, to
17 complete my understanding, would the efficiency
18 rates of having applicants present and making
19 comments and intervenors present, does that add
20 to staff's load?

21 MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden
22 again.

23 Having the applicant present
24 probably would not, but certainly the intervenors
25 would add some because we would have to be

1 prepared to respond to their comments. But I
2 don't know how much more effort that would be.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Barnes.

4 MEMBER BARNES: Would you see
5 this as a one or two-day affair?

6 MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden
7 speaking.

8 I would see it as a one-day
9 affair, in terms of just one day during the mid-
10 point of the licence as opposed to a two-day
11 meeting. Was that the question?

12 MEMBER BARNES: I think from the
13 viewpoint of the intervenors, as we see with the
14 pattern of material, we get a lot of material
15 from intervenors once they have had a chance to
16 see and see the effects on Day 1. If you have
17 the mid-term meeting, if it's a one day, I would
18 suspect it might be somewhat of a disadvantage to
19 intervenors. We don't have intervenors here
20 today, at least the principal ones here, so they
21 couldn't necessarily comment.

22 But I think it's worth staff
23 giving some thought as to that.

24 MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden
25 again. We are starting to consider that in terms

1 of we will probably want to consider releasing
2 our information and applicants well in advance so
3 that the intervenors would have an opportunity to
4 comment in time to meet whatever deadlines that
5 the Commission requires.

6 MR. LEBLANC: Since there are no
7 more comments, this completes the record for the
8 public hearing in a matter of an application by
9 Cameco Corporation for a licence to operate the
10 Port Hope Nuclear Fuel Facility.

11 The Commission will deliberate
12 and will publish its decision in due course. It
13 will be posted on the CNSC website as well as
14 distributed to participants.

15 Merci.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: My intention is
17 just to have a very short five-minute break, a
18 stretch break, and to move directly onto the next
19 licence hearing.

20 So if we could just have a very
21 short break and then move onto the next one,
22 please.

23 --- Upon recessing at 12:05 p.m.