**General Electric Canada Inc.:**
**Application for the renewal of the**
**operating licence for the Toronto**
**nuclear fuel facility**

**05-H24.1 / 05-H24.1A**
**Oral presentation by**
**General Electric Canada Inc.**

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

Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, Members of the Commission.

I do have a short presentation to give you an overview of the General Electric company, its extensive EHS policies and procedures and systems, and then talk a little bit about the facilities.

As Madam President pointed out, it is a common presentation, but we do have specific information for each site. So I will delay the specific data for the Peterborough site until that particular hearing.

Earlier this year, the General Electric Company, which is a global $160 billion company, restructured its organization into six fundamental businesses, and you can see there the GE Healthcare. That's GE Capital arm which constituted 45 per cent of its revenues, was split into two organizations, and then one

which you may well recognize, the NBC and Universal Studios is our media and communications arm. And the one at the bottom, GE Industrial was really a consolidation of, shall we say, our legacy businesses like lighting, appliances, motors, industrial systems, that type of thing.

The business that we are in is called GE Infrastructure. As you can see on the expanded part of the slide there, the infrastructure business covers the oil and gas industry, the rail transportation business, aircraft engines and water with water treatment, water chemistry, that type of thing.

The part of the business that we're in is GE Energy, formerly known as Power Systems, and there, GE has a broad portfolio of products for the power system or energy business, everything from solar, wind, right through to nuclear, and we are part of that nuclear segment.

If we now turn to the next page and look at the Canadian nuclear operation, as I said, the General Electric company is a $160 billion business. We are a $60 million business. So you can get the perspective of where we are.

You can see our locations. The Toronto site is where we manufacture precision natural uranium

pellets. In Peterborough, we take those pellets and the components that we manufacture in Arnprior and assemble them into fuel bundles. The fuel bundle that you see a little diagram of there is about 533 millimetres long. It comes in either a 28 or 37-element bundle, and it's equivalent -- energy-equivalent to about 500 tonnes of coal. We make about 8,000 of those a year.

You can see on the map there some of the customers that we serve.

The next slide, I thought it was important to outline to the Commission the commitment, the very serious commitment, of the General Electric company globally to environmental health and safety. The two fine gentlemen that you can see up there on the right-hand side is Jeff Imelt, our CEO, and on the left-hand side, Steve Ramsay, our Vice-President of EHS. In fact, Steve has been responsible over the last 15 years for establishing many of the environmental health and standards and the rigour with which the company tracks, implements and monitors its EHS performance.

You can read some of the items on there, but I think it's important to perhaps point out that the company is committed to full compliance with environmental laws and regulations. We apply world-class standards for compliance and safety no matter where we do business.

If you think, we have 9,000 PNLs around the world with over 300,000 employees, it's important that we drive the same sort of standards throughout the world.

In my experience with the General Electric company, managers can be forgiven for not making the numbers or making poor business decisions, but what they are not forgiven for is an integrity violation or a compliance violation. So one thing that we learn very quickly is that this is top of the agenda in terms of GE management.

If I go into some of the comprehensive systems that we have for managing Environmental Health & Safety within GE, it starts off with those very policies and goals that I talked about in the previous slide and many of the policies then get reviewed in terms of country-specific requirements.

We then have a very detailed Health and Safety and also Environmental -- what we call Framework -- and it indeed a framework by which anybody coming into the company can quickly understand and be involved in and where we acquire companies we can very quickly implement a very standard framework of Environmental, Health & Safety management.

There is training associated with those elements and I will be showing in detail those elements in

a later slide.

We also, I would say, have computerized or digitized most of our monitoring and tracking systems as well as our training programs and we have what we call "digital cockpits" where we have key monitors that can be quickly seen by management and employees.

There are regular audits around the company and, again, I have a better slide to indicate that. What I would like to point out is that every site in GE strives for either VPP recognition if it's in the U.S. or what we call Global Star evaluation if it's outside of the U.S. I am pleased to say that in 2002 all three sites in Canada received Global Star recognition and we have maintained that; in fact, built on it.

And then we have our regular basis reviews. On an annual basis, I have to present a complete review of our EHS performance to Steve Ramsey as closing the circle in terms of our management system. It's a very effective process and I have seen it in operation in a number of businesses.

Some of the -- I won't go into these in detail but these are just some examples of the computer tools that we have available to our employees and to management to track compliance, to track the training of their employees. It's linked both to our learning portal

and also to our HR database so that not only can we track that the training has been done but also who requires the training and when it needs to be updated.

We also have a really important audit tracking system. We have a whole range of audits that take place on regular intervals. The findings of those audits get entered into the system and we have a company-wide goal where 90 per cent of regulatory findings should be closed in less than 30 days. Certainly, all findings have to be closed within 180 days. Sometimes, technically, it's not possible within 30 days so it does go over.

But this tracking tool gives management the visibility of tasks that have to be completed, who is responsible, what the status is, et cetera; a very effective tool.

The next slide is about the Health & Safety and Environmental Frameworks. I mentioned earlier that this is really the foundation of what we put in place in every facility and what we get reviewed on. You can see through some of the titles -- can give you an idea of the range of items that we have to address in terms of both health and safety and environment, everything from employee involvement through to very detailed lockout/tag-out procedures and implementation.

What happens here is that every facility is evaluated on a regular basis and at a maximum score of 21 points to achieve VPP or global status the score has to be over 19 points out of the 21.

The next slide is peculiar to our own business unit and I won't read through all of it, but I think it important to read the highlight of our EHS mission:

> "A primary goal of GE Canada nuclear products is to eliminate or control both known and potential environmental safety and health hazards which could impact our employees and the communities in which they live. In order to do so we must adhere to the following..."

And there we layout for the benefit of our employees what we are trying to do but, basically, it is really to get across the message that although it's management's job to facilitate and drive Environmental Health & Safety, it is every employee's responsibility and part of their job to strive to improve the health and safety environment and also our environmental management as part of their day-to-day jobs.

I am pleased to say that we have been very

successful in engaging all our employees in participating in that. I recall our review last year, our mid-term review, and I explained to you some of the cultural changes we were initiating to facilitate the involvement of employees in that goal.

I think it is worth explaining our organization. Because of the size of General Electric we have a matrix management organization based on a global business and a country management.

The President of GE Nuclear is based in the U.S., Andrew White, and I report directly to him. Also reporting to him is the Manager of Environmental Health & Safety for all of GE Nuclear's facilities around the world. That individual has a direct, or I should say a dotted line to our Manager of Environmental Health & Safety Quality, Mr. Henry Hann, who is on my right-hand side here today.

Also, from a country-management perspective, because it is the legal entity, we have a Vice-President of Environmental, Health & Safety for all of GE Canada. So we have a dotted line from that person through to Henry as well. That's a good balance of the Canadian perspective versus the global perspective.

Henry has the functional responsibility for EHS in all of our sites.

This year, we also implemented a new position called "Regulatory Compliance Leader" and that's the person on my left, Paul Desiri. Paul is really a source of expertise for the entire organization in terms of regulatory compliance.

Then, at the bottom of the page, you can see are various sites. In addition to our joint Health & Safety Committees which are very active, we also have our ALARA committees which I think, as you will see from the results as we talk to our specific sites, we have been fairly successful over the years to continuously improve our processes.

In terms of auditing, most of the people on that organization are involved in some level of auditing. We have at the bottom of the pyramid there the facility inspection involving everyone from shop floor employees right through to myself.

We have some business audits. We have business level audits where we have a team from our business come through and audit our difference processes; obviously, our government inspections.

Finally, we also have a corporate review. This is quite an intensive review where experts from various parts of the General Electric Company are brought together with the head office leadership and they do an

in-depth audit of our facilities.

If you now turn to the Toronto site-specific information, our Toronto plant, as I mentioned earlier, we make precision dimension pellets. We take natural uranium. We compress it. We sinter it and increase the density by about tenfold. We then grind it into a precision pellet which then at a later stage gets inserted into a zirconium tube.

There are approximately 50 employees there. Actually, it's 46 at the moment, and we run a three shift, five day a week operation. The plant was built in 1907.

**MR. MASON:** We started producing these pellets in the plant in the early 1960's, and I think we have an excellent record there with our community during that time.

If we take a look at the next slide which deals with radiation dose, our ALARA committee has over recent years made a 50 percent reduction in exposure to our employees. There's some fluctuation there that you can see, but essentially a 50 percent reduction, and we continue to work on ideas to improve our process.

In terms of our environmental measures, if we look at air emissions, if we take the derived emission limit we are about .04 per cent of that limit as far as air emissions are concerned, and as far as the water

effluent is concerned .0015 per cent of the limit.

You can see some fluctuation there in terms of the air releases; there was a volume increase in `01 -- well, right through to `03, actually, but we were able to -- as we saw it rise we were able to control that.

The water releases, the increase there, we implemented a process to reduce solid waste. We then went back and further improved our water treatment facility and you can see our estimated release for this year is going to be a substantial reduction over the previous two years. So again a continuous improvement in our processes.

As far as our injury data is concerned I'm really pleased with the performance that we have had there. At the beginning of 2004 we had a communication campaign with our employees. We really challenged them to zero (0) OSHA recordable injuries in our manufacturing sites.

Our feeling, our philosophy, was that in a modern manufacturing facility there is no excuse for injuries, and we should all work to achieve that. We have had one OSHA reportable in 2004, and one in 2005, but I would like to quickly point out that neither of those injuries was on the shop floor.

The one in 2004 was a salaried person that slipped during an ice storm out in the car park and hurt

her wrist, and the one this year was a salaried employee who cut his finger and had one stitch in the cut. But we have had no injuries in the manufacturing area since 2003 at any of our sites, so I'm very pleased with that performance.

In terms of lost time we have had no lost time injuries in the last two years.

I think I will halt there. I'll leave the Peterborough site-specific information to there, but I would just like to reinforce what I've said in that I believe that we have engaged all of our employees to embrace an environment of compliance, and also an environment of continuous improvement both in safety; exposure to hazards; processes and procedures and, indeed, the quality of our product.

I think it's worth pointing out that in 15 years there has been no defect in our fuel in any reactor that we have supplied fuel to, and I think that is a tremendous record considering we manufacture approximately 8,000 bundles per year.

We are proud of our facilities, of our professionalism and the role that we play in the communities that we exist, and we believe that we are worthy of re-licensing.

Thank you.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much, sir.

We'll move now then to the presentation from CNSC staff, as outlined in the CMD document 05-H24, and I'll turn to Mr. Barclay Howden who is the DG responsible for this area. Mr. Howden, you have the floor.

**05-H24**

**Oral Presentation by CNSC staff**

**MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you.

Madam Chair, members of the Commission, for the record my name is Barclay Howden. I'm the Director General of the Directorate of Nuclear Cycling Facilities Regulation. With me today is Ms. Adriana Nicic, Director of the Organization and Management Systems Division; Mr David Werry, Project Officer in the Processing Facilities and Technical Support Division, and the rest of our licensing teams for this facility.

CNSC staff have reviewed the operation of General Electric's Toronto facility, and the application from GE Toronto to renew the facilities operating licence.

I will now ask Mr. Werry to continue with our recommendations. Thank you.

**MR. WERRY:** Good morning. For the record, my name is David Werry.

CNSC staff's assessment of the licence renewal application is documented in CMD 05-H24. This includes a recommendation that the Commission renew the proposed processing facility licence for a period of five years.

Our presentation will include the following sections: A brief overview of the facility will be presented, a review of General Electric's application to renew the licence -- General Electric will be referred to as GE or GE Toronto for this presentation -- a discussion on GE's programs and performance during the current licensing period; a summary of additional items including decommission planning, financial guarantee, and the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, the overall conclusions from the reviews performed and, finally, recommendations from the staff to the Commission.

The uranium powder conversion facility that GE operates is located in Toronto, Ontario. The facility process uranium oxide powder to produce uranium oxide pellets used in CANDU reactors. There has been one amendment to the licence since the renewal in 2000. This was outlined in CMD 05-H24.

The facility has been ranked by CNSC staff as being low to moderate. The risk associated with the use of hazardous chemicals, and the safety analysis

demonstrates that the risk to the workers, the environment and the public for normal operations and accidents in areas are reasonable.

General Electric has applied to renew its Fuel Fabricating Operating licence. The Application was provided in a timely fashion and CNSC's staff's review of the Application found that it meets the applications requirements described in the applicable regulations. The current licence expires on December 31st, 2005, and GE has requested that the licence -- that the renewed licence be issued for a period of five years.

General Electric is required to have various programs in place with respect to the operation of the nuclear facility. CNSC staff have evaluated various safety areas. They are outlined on the slide and in CMD 05-H24.

The overall assessment ratings for the various programs are that they meet requirements, with the exception of the Quality Management Program which is yet to be fully documented and assessed. CNSC staff expects this program to be fully documented later this year. The latest round of revisions is anticipated by the end of September, and an onsite compliance audit will follow the document review. We anticipate the audit to be completed in this fiscal year.

Note that the information on the security program is prescribed information, and is found in CMD 05-H24.A.

GE has demonstrated improvements and programs, and their implementation in several areas during the licensing period. The areas of improvement are radiation protection, environmental protection and the Public Information Program.

Continuing on to the topic of the licensee's performance, CNSC staff has carried out a review of GE's performance with respect to the operation of the facility during the current licensed term. The review comprised of routine inspections that are carried out quarterly, several additional inspections including emergency preparedness, radiation protection, quality assurance, fire protection, and physical security, and also a review of annual reports.

The inspection found some minor deviations from expectations but were such not to pose an unreasonable risk to the health and safety of persons, to the environment, nor to national security. There are several indicators that the facility has been operated safely during the licensing period. The radiation doses to the workers and to the public, along with the radioactive emissions to the environment are well below

the regulatory limits, and there have been no safety-significant events reported during the licensing term.

CNSC staff concludes that the risk to the public and workers over the current licence term has been low, and the overall performance of GE meets requirements.

The preliminary decommissioning plan was accepted by staff, and a financial guarantee is in place.

General Electric has requested a five-year licence period with the renewal of the licence. Based on the information that has been outlined in CMD 05-H24, staff is recommending a five-year licence period.

CNSC staff proposes that a midterm interim report be provided to the Commission midway through the licence period. The Commission will also be informed if any situation develops that could impair GE's ability to meet its obligations with respect to the protection of health and safety; and the environment; the maintenance of security; and compliance with international obligations.

CNSC staff concludes that an environmental assessment pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* is not required for the renewal of its licence, and that General Electric is qualified to carry -- carry on the licensed activities that the proposed licence will authorize.

Further, GE has made adequate provisions

for the protection of the environment; the health and safety of persons; and the maintenance of national security; and measures required to implement international obligations to which Canada has agreed.

In addition, CNSC staff also concludes that General Electric is meeting regulatory requirements, and although there is some deviation from CNSC staff's expectations on certain programs the deviations do not represent an unreasonable risk to the environment; to the health and safety of persons; and to national security.

Finally, CNSC staff recommends that the Commission accept CNSC staff's assessment that GE is qualified to carry on the activities that the licence will authorize and will make adequate provisions to carry on the activities. That the commission accept CNSC staff's assessment that environmental assessment pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* is not required for the renewal of the licence, and approve the renewal of the operating licence for a period of five years valid to December 31, 2010. This concludes this staff's presentation.

**MR. HOWDEN:** Madam Chair, CNSC staff is prepared to respond to questions. Thank you.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much, Mr. Howden. And I would like to start with Mr. Graham please.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you and good morning.

A couple of questions I have with regard to the licence. In reading the documents, you talk about the licence has;

*"The facilities is currently able to produce up to 150 tons per month."*

That is of pellets; how much powder is permitted to be on site in production, or is this -- does this mean powder or is this just the pellets? Am I clear? What I am saying is, the powder is brought in and is manufactured into pellets, and the licence is to produce to produce 150 tons of pellets a month. I am wondering how much powder can be on site at any known time?

**MR. MASON:** That amount would -- that 150 tons is the total amount that would be allowed.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** And just to clarify how the process goes, the pellets are ground down and there is powder produced from the grinding, and so on. Is that reused or is that -- is the powder all -- inevitably at the end reaches -- is put into pellets even though the ground materials and so on is reused, or what is done with the excess powder?

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** That should be a question to the licensee.

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

The ground powder which actually comes out in a slurry form from the grinder is recovered, returned to chemical and recycled.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** And to clarify, the 150 ton permit on the licence is for pellets, so you could have more in excess, with slurry and pellets you could have more than 150 tons per month of material or not?

**MR. DESIRI:** For the record Paul Desiri, Regulatory Compliance Leader.

The 150 tons per month is the value that is applied to what is produced in pellet form.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** So just for clarification, roughly how much of the powder would you have on site all the time of raw material before it goes in the pellets? Is there a licence condition on that? That is maybe the CNSC staff.

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry for the record.

We'll come back to the Commission with that.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you. Another question; there is a considerable amount of water used, I believe, in this fabrication, and so on. How is that water handled and treated before it goes into the regular sewer systems, and so on?

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

In actual fact, it is not a great deal of water. The only place we use water is for cooling of the grinding, but that water is treated, first of all, in a centrifuge to remove the uranium. The water is then collected in storage tanks together with other wastewater in the building. The water is settled. It is then flocculated to remove as many particles as possible. It is then tested, and only then when we verify that it is below acceptable limits to put into the sanitary sewer, we discharge it to the sanitary.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Another question I have with regard to fire. Sprinkler systems if they were activated and so on; where does the water from the sprinkler systems, where would they go? Would they go into floor drains, or would they go into the sanitary sewage system, or would they retreat it the same way?

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

The water would go down to the basement and that -- that area is -- would allow the water to rise up until the window well level. I don't have the figure in front of me of how much water that can hold; I could get back to the Commission on that.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** But in emergency preparedness, in the case of fire and so on, has that scenario been taken through to how that water then would

be treated afterwards, and so on?

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

That water would be kept and then reintroduced into our water treatment system that Mr. Mason was talking about.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** And is that water treatment system also in the basement or is that somewhere else that would not be affected by a flood that would take you to the window wells?

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

It is in the basement. The analysis we have is that we would still have -- we would be able to operate the system with three feet of water.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Dosman.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would just like to ask management on the issue of quality management documentation, and the presentation by CNSC staff was that this was not fully documented, and I was just wondering what progress the company was making in fully documenting the quality management procedures.

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

My understanding that what was missing was some of the descriptions, and that should be completed by the end of October.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** May I ask CNSC staff if staff is satisfied that this documentation will be completed?

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry, for the record.

CNSC staff is satisfied that we are making progress; we have had a number of rounds of discussion with the QA leaders, and our own QA specialists, and we are at the point where we are just looking at the latest round or the final round of submissions to be available shortly.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** (inaudible) that you fully expect that -- I am sorry, there is no specific bottlenecks; that you fully expect that this documentation will be completed?

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry for the record.

The answer is yes.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** I would just like to go on and ask staff on the issue of extremity dose, referring to Table 3 on the CMDH-24. The extremity dose for the new personnel, and I wonder whether staff could comment on your views as to this level of extremity dose in newly employed workers, and whether or not there is a training issue here that might be put in place to reduce this type of dose.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** I think there may be a

need to explain the "new" as in "new staff". It is nuclear energy worker, but with that context I will turn back to the staff.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you for that explanation, Madam Chair.

**MR. HOWDEN:** I am going to ask Mr. Kevin Bundy, Radiation Protection Specialist, to respond to that question.

**MR. BUNDY:** Kevin Bundy, Radiation Protection Division.

Those exposures to the extremity are fairly consistent with that type of work, and they are well below the limits. So I would be finding this acceptable.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** I wonder if I might ask the company if you are satisfied with these levels of the highest extremity dose in these workers, and whether or not there is any move to try and reduce those levels?

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

...with these levels of the highest extremity dose in these workers and whether or not there is any move to try and reduce those levels?

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

The limit is 500 milliSieverts per year and we are well below it, but we are never satisfied, I think. For continuous improvement, in particular driven by our

ALARA committee, we are always looking at ways to reduce exposure. In this particular incidence, it really occurs with our workers that manually stack the pellets into rows and so there, exposed there.

And we currently have a project on the table to try and eliminate or, sorry, reduce the amount of exposure that they have within their working environment during their eight hours of work. So, it is an ongoing continuous improvement process.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** Is there no way to have some type of automated stacking for this type of activity?

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

I suppose one could theoretically come up with one, but the reality is that the human brain and eye coordination is superior to robotic equipment in terms of multiple selection of pellets and stacking them into appropriate blanks. So, at this stage, there is no plan to eliminate those jobs.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** In their presentation, staff referred to, I might say "some minor deviations" from what you might expect and I am just wondering whether staff would like to enlarge on what some of these minor deviations might be.

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry, for the record.

The type of things that we have found or

noted when we have been onsite have been, for example, in one area a door requires to be closed, we have noticed that the door has remained opened while individuals have gone through.

Similarly, on a return through that area we found the door to be shut where -- as required by the regulations and the operating practice. We have noted that, we have discussed that with the licensee and they have made an action and followed up with a training effect and another notice to their staff.

Similarly, the type of thing that we looked at is where there might be an improvement to exposures in terms of how they handle things. They have been -- they have addressed that requirement and with documentation through their ALARA Committee and they have tried to reduce their exposures.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** I am wondering, Madam Chair, if I might ask the Company to comment on these, albeit minor, deviations?

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

I think in any manufacturing process -- or certainly I have found in my auditing experience that you can walk around the same facility a hundred times and you will find a hundred things, one each time possibly. In fact, I do monthly inspections of my facilities and I

always find something. It is an opportunity for continuous improvement but, certainly, where we find the deviation, we correct it.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** I was just wondering. The report card from staff is all "Bs" and that is exemplary, and that is good, but I note that although it is all "Bs" that the trends are all horizontal.

I was wondering whether a company like yours with its tradition and resources might not have some of those "B" headings even higher and whether it was possible in your plan, for example, although the individual radiation doses are within limits that it is obviously with some exposures.

I wonder whether your company could see some of those arrows heading upwards on the report card?

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

Well, I think it would be interesting to know what we would have to do to achieve an "A". So I would throw the question back.

**(LAUGHTER)**

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** The questions don't work that way.

**(LAUGHTER)**

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** But I do come back to it again that you seem to have a very well-run company,

obviously, wanting to set industry standards and it would be interesting to see if at some point your company did achieve some "As" in certain areas.

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

I certainly take your point. It's certainly our intent and our desire to continuously improve.

In fact, I have asked the same question to myself of staff of what can we do to get to an "A" and I think, seriously, I think that is something that perhaps we should discuss with the CNSC and see what can we do to move from a "B" to an "A". It is certainly something we would desire to do.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you. I come back again, however, and say that it is not up to staff to set the standards. It is not up to staff to achieve the standards; it is up to the Company to achieve the standards and up to staff to observe the standards.

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

I would agree with you, but I think, in order to achieve the standard one has to fully understand what the standard is.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Perhaps I could help here a bit is to, first of all, acknowledge what Dr. Dosman said is "B" is fully satisfactory as far as the Commission

is concerned in terms of meeting the requirements. So I think it is important to understand that.

I think the issues of moving from "B" to "A" is something that is not just discussed with GE Canada, but a number of Companies in terms of these issues and clearly, I think the Commission's stated view has been that Companies should have their own standards which you have talked about which should exceed regulatory standards -- that is generally the way it goes.

Regulatory standards are not necessarily -- they are not the best that can be achieved. They are what are needed for health and safety of Canadians, but that certainly understanding that the rating system comes from staff, not from the industry and so that some dialogue is warranted in terms of what is exactly those levels.

But the Commission does worry a little bit sometimes that the rating system is used as a sort of absolute and that is not what it is meant to do. It is meant to be a communications tool that is more easily understood than DRLs or things like that in terms of broad areas and should not be looked at some sort of absolute, that there is an absolute level.

But I think, as Dr. Dosman said, I think the view of the Commission is that we are expecting industry -- mature industries to be setting a standard

that is above the requirements of the industry -- of the regulator -- and we should be, on the other hand, be transparent as a regulator in terms of what those standards are. So there is that dual tension, I think.

Dr. Dosman.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. McDill.

**MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

Your sintering operations are very high pressure, very high temperature. You are running three shifts, five days a week. When are you doing maintenance?

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

Maintenance of the furnaces are carried out on an ongoing basis as needed, but there is also preventive maintenance -- preventive maintenance is done at regular intervals and is scheduled and tracked in an electronic system for each piece of equipment, including furnaces.

**MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you. That was my first question.

The second question is related to your solid waste. I think Mr. Graham started a question too there. How frequently is it shipped, where is it shipped to, how is it handled?

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

Normally we do two shipments a year. All of our solid waste goes to Chalk River.

**MEMBER McDILL:** And it is shipped on -- according to the compliance under the Regulations for Transport of Nuclear Solid Waste?

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

Correct. All shipments are made in accordance with all applicable regulations and GE standards.

**DR. McDILL:** And my next question. It has been recently been announced that GE may be restructuring -- I think it was in the news at six o'clock this morning. Without going into business details ---

**MR. DESIRI:** They may not know about it.

**(LAUGHTER)**

**MEMBER McDILL:** --- is there anything that is likely to affect the licensing issues? I guess that is a question for staff, -- if there were changes -- maybe for both of you, I am not sure.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** The licensee should start.

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

Well, you have me there, because I did not listen to the news this morning and I think a company like GE we are very used to restructuring going on.

I would say that it is unlikely to impact GE Canada Nuclear Products. We are relatively autonomous within the organization. I imagine that restructuring is with the U.S. part of the company.

But until I know the details, I cannot accurately answer your question, but it should not affect anything to do as far as our licence application.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Perhaps, Dr. McDill, it might be worthwhile for staff just to comment because one of the requirements of the licence is stability in some of these areas.

So what would happen if there was a change that affected GE Canada, I suppose -- or any other licensee?

**MR. HOWDEN.:** Thank you. Barclay Howden, for the record.

This has occurred with other licensees, so we have been through this before. So if there was some sort of restructuring that impacted GE Canada as the licensee -- like changing them to another part of the company -- but as a legal entity of that change we would certainly have to go through the process of amending the license to reflect that. At the same time the new licensee would have to demonstrate that all the programs are in place to do the job.

What has happened with previous licensees is they have basically just transferred all the programs wholeheartedly under the new entity. So we would look at it from that perspective.

If it caused changes -- you know, a ripple effect down through the management system -- we would have to take a hard look at their quality management system, which they are in the process of finalizing the documentation now.

Thank you.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Barnes?

**MEMBER BARNES:** Thanks.

First, just a trivial point.

You quoted the first part of the mission, the EHS mission, and I wonder if -- just as a comment -- if you would just entertain an addition to that. It reads:

> "The primary goal of GE CNP..."

This is your slide 10 of 21:

> "...is to eliminate or control both known or potential environmental safety and health hazards which could impact our employees and the communities in which they live."

It might be better phrased in the kind of

interest that the Commission has to read, "that could impact our employees, the communities in which they live and the environment," because one of the things you are doing is putting a certain amount of effluent into the -- through the sewer system into the wider environment.

That is just an observation. I do not need a comment.

You also commented that you have continuous improvement, but I would like to refer to your illustration of your handout of 16 of 21, specifically the "Toronto Air Releases", "Per Cent Derived ELs" and so on, and below that there was the "Toronto Water Releases".

Come back to the two anomalies that you pointed out, the '01-'02 anomalies for air releases and the '03-'04 anomalies in the water releases. So I do not necessarily regard these as -- at least the patterns in those histograms -- as showing continuous improvement. I recognize that you, I think, meant continuous improvement on the whole spectrum of activities that you are reporting on here.

But if I come back to those figures that you have, I wonder how they jive with the data that are reported in both your document and staff document. I will refer to the licensee's document in Table 6 and Table 7, which are the air emission monitoring data for Table 6 and

the liquid effluent monitoring for Table 7.

For example, in liquid effluent monitoring, the increase there is really in '04, as opposed to '03 and in the first quarter reported there, the 1.40 -- I am looking at "average concentrations" here -- in '05 shows more or less the same level as '04, whereas your water releases figures on 16 of 21 shows a very significant drop in the estimate for '05

Sorry, it is possible that I am not correlating the information on your charts in 16 of 21 properly into Tables 6 and 7, but maybe you could help me in that?

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

I am going to defer that question to Paul Desiri, who actually does the calculations. I think he is better qualified to do that.

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

Referring to Table 5, looking at years 2004 and 2005, quarter one, the reason that the average concentration remained more or less the same and yet the -- oh, I am on Table 5 of CMD 05-H24, "Liquid Effluent Monitoring" ---

**MEMBER BARNES:** Table 5 is "Toronto Injuries Cases"; is that right?

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** No, I think we were

referring to your CMD. Dr. Barnes was referring to Tables 6 and 7 of -- it is on page 6 of your CMD -- and correlating that against Overhead 16 of 21 of your CMD.

**MR. DESIRI:** Okay, sorry.

So Table 7 of our CMD -- which is the same as Table 5 in your CMD -- if you look at 2004, the concentration remain essentially the same in 2005, yet the discharges have dropped.

The reason for that is that the top row, the concentration, is measured in-house, using our own equipment and it's an immediate measurement, but it is less accurate than the external measurement, which is done by delayed neutron activation analysis. That analysis, externally, takes about a week. So it is much more accurate, but it is of no use to us as far as operations, because we need to know when we analyze a tank's water concentration that it is well below the limits.

So what we do is, we do an internal measurement on our system which -- and that is how we report our concentration -- that is our actual measurements in-house -- and then the discharges are calculated using the more accurate delayed neutron activation analysis externally.

So there is a bit of a difference in -- but that explains the correlation.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Okay.

But if I take that as your answer then, if I do not focus on the top line, the average concentration, Table 7, but on the lower line, the total discharge to the sewer, then the contrast between '04 and '05 is almost an order of magnitude, right, 2.5 to 0.3; whereas, if I go back to your Toronto Water Releases and your illustration histogram on page 16 of 21, the Power Point figure, it may be the order of half, contrasting the histogram values of '04 and '05.

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

Looking at '05, that is only for one quarter, so you would have to multiply that by four to get the estimate.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Oh, okay. That is right. Sorry.

I wonder -- I have this as a separate observation -- we are obviously into quarter three here and we are only getting quarter one results -- for day two could we try to also have quarter two and quarter three, basically the first three quarters?

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

We will have that data available.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Because I would just add, Dr. Barnes, that that would extrapolate quite a bit higher

so it would be actually increasing this year.

What else do you have in the basement?

**MR. DISIRI:** For the record, Paul Disiri.

The basement is generally not a processing area. The majority of the processing is done on the main floor, which is one floor above the basement and the third floor. Fourth floor is offices.

So in the basement it is mainly a maintenance area, a waste handling area. There is two rooms out of about 20 or so that have some production in them, but it is limited.

**MEMBER BARNES:** So if you have got 10 per cent of the area doing processing and waste handling what would be the impact of a flood to the order of three feet on this and the potential contamination of that water?

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

All of the waste is kept in sealed drums. I believe in the short term there would be no impact from the waste. From the production, it is essentially two processes. One is taper grinding, which is quite a, relatively speaking, low volume of product. And it is kept actually at table level, so I think the contamination aspects of the water filling up in the basement would be limited.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Where are the pumps that

would pump out this water in the basement?

**MR. DESIRI:** Well, the pumps are -- we have pumps kept in the warehouse in Building Nine, and we also have some pumps in Building Seven as well.

**MEMBER BARNES:** And how long would it take to activate those pumps?

**MR. DESIRI:** Well, just doing an estimate, the time for the operator to get on the scene and find the pump and initiate it, I would estimate within possibly an hour or so, but I would have to check what the actual time is.

**MEMBER BARNES:** And if that water was being pumped where would it be pumped to?

**MR. DESIRI:** The water is released as a batch process. We have two tanks. They are 3,300 litres each.

**MEMBER BARNES:** I am talking about the water in the basement.

**MR. DESIRI:** Yes. So what we would do is we would pump the water into our water treatment tanks.

**MEMBER BARNES:** And those tanks are large enough to hold the area up to -- the volume up to three feet in your basement?

**MR. DESIRI:** No, they are not. It would have to be done in a batch process over a period of

possibly a day or two to clear out the whole volume.

So basically, you would fill a tank, treat it; release it and then continue on filling, treating, releasing until all the volume is gone.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Staff, is this an adequate system for treating sprinkler water systems, given the aspects of what is going on in the basement and the time required to treat it? Is this an appropriate device, if you like?

**MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.

**MEMBER BARNES:** I could accept it ---

**MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.

The overall answer to your question is "yes". We are not armed with the detailed information to provide you the details.

What we have done with this facility, you can see in the Fire Protection Program, there was an assessment done and part of the assessment is done against the National Fire Code, which I think is where Mr. Graham was going, was that the requirement for containment of runoff water from sprinklers and hoses and that has been assessed as being adequate.

But the focus on that is containment, to hold it so that you have time to think about how you are going to then treat it and get rid of it. At this desk

right now, we do not have the details for that, but we can bring that back on Day Two if you wish, Dr. Barnes.

**MEMBER BARNES:** I think so, thank you.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, I think that the issues of emergency preparedness are much more on everyone's minds, and I think the CNSC is part of that, and I think the Commission is very interested in making sure that we are focusing and learning from perhaps issues that have happened in other places, including the United States, in terms of things like pumps failing and preparation being inadequate, et cetera. So I think it is reasonable that we have a certain focus on these events in general, but specifically in this case with flooding.

I think it would be worthwhile for both the licensee and the staff to provide some details of what were some of the scenarios that were looked at in terms of emergency preparedness, in terms of some of the risks that we had looked at. It could be fire, but it could be just genuine flooding that had nothing to do with fire and use of water.

So just some sort of sense of the scenarios that you have used and the resultant impact on the operations and, clearly, on the part of the operation that involves nuclear materials. I think if I could put it that way that would be helpful on that.

I have a couple of questions. My questions are a little bit about -- I am always quite interested in work charts, so thank you very much for providing that.

On your Overhead 11 of 21, you have outlined the organization chart and, understanding that General Electric is a very large company -- and I appreciate that having met Mr. White, I understand the size of the company -- I am kind of interested in the matrix organization, understanding that you feel it is working quite well. I have been a manager in a matrix organization receiving directions from a number of different areas.

I wonder if you could just expand a little bit on how the manager of QA would receive direction, line direction from the General Manager and matrix direction, functional direction I gather, from the VP and the Manger, and just kind of some sense of -- not necessarily in great detail but some sort of sense of how that would work and how that would, I suppose, impact the areas that are covered by the CNSC?

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

Well, I think in terms of if we first of all take my direct connection with the manager of QA and the EHS, that direct reporting is in terms of the day-to-day operations of the business, performance management,

that type of thing.

In terms of the functional link through to the General Electric Nuclear global manager of EHS, that is really a source of information of company initiatives, of directives from an EHS perspective that gets managed down through the organization. The local manager then takes that information and advises the Operations management in the location.

In terms of the country vice-president of EHS there is a, as I say, a Canadian perspective looking at all the businesses and ensuring that we are in compliance with Canadian legislation and also ensuring that functional link to the global business and also to the operational management is working correctly. So it is another crosscheck.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

I also found it very interesting that there were As Low as Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) Committees because, staff will correct me if I am wrong, I don't normally see ALARA committees. We certainly see, and expect to, health and safety committees. So I am just interested from a point of view about the relationship between the two and how they work together or do they have separate mandates, et cetera?

How do the committees work together?

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

Well, they are very separate committees, although I am sure if we looked into the Toronto site you would find some of the same volunteers on the ALARA committee that you have on the Health & Safety committee.

I think the ALARA committee focuses more on operationally what can be done to improve the process in terms of exposure and that type of thing. The Joint Health & Safety Committee has a much broader scope in terms of what they are looking at. I would say, and would agree, that there is communication between the two committees where that makes sense.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would the staff have any comment on that?

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry, for the record.

The staff is satisfied with General Electric's organization and the way the communication and documentation is shown with the two committees.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Please correct me if I am wrong. It is somewhat unusual, though? I don't remember seeing on org charts ALARA committees per se. Do they exist and they just aren't on the org charts of most of the organizations that we see here?

**MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking, for the record.

Yes, these types of committees are required or something that performs functions like this are required as part of an ALARA program.

But, yes, you normally don't see it on the org chart.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** I have a question for the licensees. I am famous for my questions about safety culture and I note that there is a lot of elements in your discussion of the mission, et cetera, and adherence to EHS principles for GE, particularly on 10 of 21.

Would you like to comment in general about what the management of the organization, particularly in GE Canada, sees as its responsibility with regards to the discussion of safety and safety culture permeating the organizations.

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

Well, I think it is management's responsibility to inform employees and to engage employees in actively creating a safe working environment because, certainly in my experience, the people that will see or in a position to recognize the hazards on a day-to-day basis are the people that are actually working on the equipment rather than those of us who sat in the office.

Therefore, by engaging them in the process we get much more valuable information which enables us to

derive continuous improvement. In fact, I think we now have got to the stage where we are involving employees and investigating first aids and near misses rather than actual injuries. I think we have got to the stage where people have taken that as a normal part of their job just as much as learning to operate a machine, knowing the hazards and the implications and trying to improve the process is part of their job.

So I think that's a management responsibility and it will only happen if it is being driven by top management down. It won't happen by just telling people that they have to do it. I think we have been very successful in that regard.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Does the staff have any comments with regards to safety culture observed or programs, et cetera, of GE Canada?

**MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you. Barclay Howden, for the record.

First of all, just to let you know we have not done a formal safety culture assessment on these facilities but as the Commission is aware, we have been working with industry on trying to come up with ways of assessing safety culture and getting their input.

Having said that, David Werry is our inspector that is there four times a year plus to assist

with the specialists when they go down for specialists assessments. I would like to just ask him to make a couple of comments on his observations.

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry, for the record.

Some of the things that I look at when I am there is for the interaction and the empowerment of the staff to actually make a comment regarding safety culture as well as the leadership capabilities or the leadership responses and actions of the management.

If I am correct in this, I believe that GE conducted special sessions within their own staff to look at indicators specifically along the lines of safety culture, and this was independent of the CNSC staff's -- or CNSC Safety Culture Program and mandate. One of the things they were looking for were indicators of trust and leadership capabilities in trying to build a commitment and empowerment of their staff in order to further that ability to address the issues.

**Mr. MASON:** For the record, Madam President, we conducted those culture workshops in all three facilities and it was just part of our communication and culture change program that we had been conducting.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

Are there further questions? Mr. Graham.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes, I had several other

questions, and I look for direction, Madam Chair, with regard to not jeopardizing security but a site plan.

You indicated the pumps would be brought from a certain building to a certain building and so on. Can that be provided or will that jeopardize security to have more or less a site plan of the facility or not? I would look for direction there.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** We will get back to you.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Okay.

And the next question I have is in relation to that: In what proximity is your facility to neighbourhoods where people are living?

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

It is interesting how the area is developing. If we take the Lansdowne Road part it's an old GE facility which is now being developed and I imagine within the next few years we shall have fashionable condos and lofts so we could regard that as residential.

To the north of the premises we have a residential area; to the south of the area we have residential apartment blocks and to the east of the facility we have commercial warehousing -- commercial units.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** So on three sides you are really -- you are getting residential or the potential

residential occupancy.

Approximately what distance away would that be? Would it be a kilometre or a half a kilometre or so on?

**MR. MASON:** For the record, it would just be a distance across a normal street in Toronto.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** My other question was with regard to disposal of materials like hepa filters are used in the stack in the filtration of air in your stacks and so on.

What do you do and how are those disposed of and what -- materials like that in the plant how are they disposed of, how often and where do they go?

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

You are correct. We do use hepa filters in our plant and these are collected regularly. What we have is a system to compact the material to keep the volume of waste down. As I mentioned earlier, we do two shipments a year to Chalk River.

So basically, the hepa filters would be brought to a certain area, disassembled, compacted into a drum and then the drums would be prepared for shipment.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** And would they go at the same time to Chalk River with the slurry mixes that you referred to in my earlier questions?

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

The material that goes to Chalk River is actually contaminated waste objects like hepa filters or scrap metal. The slurry material goes back to the supplier.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** And both those shipments are done on or about semi-annually; is that correct, the slurry to the supplier and the other material to Chalk River?

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

The waste shipments are twice a year to Chalk River. The slurry shipments happen less frequently. They are actually about once every -- well, there is actually two types of waste. There is special waste that goes about once every two years to Blind River and then there is normal scrap that goes back to Port Hope on a monthly basis.

So there is really two categories of recycled waste.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you.

A question to CNSC staff with regard to licensing addition 7; it goes from 7.1 to 7.4 or 7.5. Is that a completely new license condition? I didn't have the old license to compare it. I couldn't find it at home in my files. So I was wondering, is that whole license

condition with regard to fire, is that all new?

**MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden, for the record.

No, those five conditions existed previously. The only change is to 7.1 where we have added the "NFPA801-2003 addition standard for fire protection for facilities handling radioactive materials". That's the only change. That condition has existed since 2000.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** A question I have to the licensee with regard to training of fire fighters. In this area of Toronto I would presume that this is not a volunteer fire department. This is a trained fire or a regular fire department. How often do they make visits and how often do you do on-the-site training with the local fire department, the nearest detachment to your facility?

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

We have exercises at least once a year and, typically, we have firefighters in -- or emergency response teams in about three times a year for training.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** All those firefighters are trained to work with hazardous and radioactive materials?

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

In the Toronto facility, part of their

visit to the site includes a two-hour orientation where we do a presentation and review the radiation hazards in normal and accident conditions and then we do a tour through the facility where we review the hazards in the plant.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** You work a five-day week, 24 hour/5. What is the procedure if a fire broke out on the week ends when you are not working?

What the procedure with the fire department in assisting staff, assisting firefighters in the facility?

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

That is in our Emergency Response Plan, the protocol for a safe -- an alarm was activated on the weekend -- and it has been reviewed with the fire department.

Essentially, there is an automatic notification that happens anytime there is a sprinkler flow or some detector is activated and our security monitoring company will send out an immediate page to two different responders: one from engineering, one for EHS.

Once they are notified, they are on their way to the plants. The fire department's preference is to have a live person to talk to and the responders have cell phones and all of the numbers that the fire department

would need to contact us are in the Emergency Response Plan that they have a copy of.

So the way it would happen is you would have an activation and the security monitoring company would send out a page. The page would respond and we would get the page to make their way to the plant and establish contact with the fire department en route if there were issues.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** What you are saying is you have -- on the weekend you have security monitoring hired, but there are no -- really no people, nobody at the plant at all on the weekends or not?

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

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** I just want -- I am getting concerned ---

**MR. DESIRI:** Okay.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** --- about the nature of these. It is really important -- and I was going to mention it at the end of this questioning -- this is a commercial operation that has competitors, number 1, and this is a secure operation as well.

So the nature of the questions has to be watched. I do not want people who should not know things, know things, okay? So let's be a little careful here about the nature of the questions.

And you should feel comfortable in saying you do not wish to answer that, that there will be a discussion with the security of CNSC and if it is necessary for us to separate out information for Day Two, what should be known or not.

But I am concerned about this, Mr. Graham. We are getting into things that I prefer not to be on the record. Okay?

If it is necessary for us to know that we can discuss that and the operator can talk to our security staff and decide what can or not be discussed in public. Okay?

Thanks.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you.

Well, really what I was coming to is I want to make sure that at all times firefighting -- the firefighters in the Toronto fire department had adequate training to address a fire onsite, whether it be on the weekend or not, and I guess my question should be to CNSC staff.

Has that been reviewed and are you satisfied?

**MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.

I am going to ask Grant Cherkas, our fire specialist, to respond to that question.

**MR. CHERKAS:** For the record, my name is Grant Cherkas.

CNSC staff performed an inspection on February 2004 at the facility and following that has engaged in some -- in a number of conversations and discussions with the Toronto fire service. We are satisfied that there is adequate fire response in the facility and that they have adequate training and equipment to deal with the hazards at the facility.

**MEMBER GRAHAM:** That would be whether it be on the weekend or on the regular work period?

**MR. CHERKAS:** For the record, Grant Cherkas.

Yes, 24 hours a day, seven days a week there would be -- we are satisfied there is no issue.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, Doctor Barnes.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Just two questions.

Coming back to the old chart, 11 of 21, the VP of EHSG Canada, you may have mentioned in responding to President Keen's questions, but who does that person report to? It is not shown.

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

That person reports to the President and CEO of GE Canada, which is the legal entity for our

business in Canada.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Okay. Does that person also in a matrix way report to other VPs of EHS?

Is there a system of EHS within GE? Is there more of an international linkage?

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

Yes, both the VP of EHS for GE Canada and the Manager of EHS for the GE Nuclear global business have a dotted line to the GE head office, Fairfield Operation, and Steve Ramsay who is the overall VP for General Electric.

**MEMBER BARNES:** And the second question for the staff. In the, to some extent, unresolved issue of quality assurance you have indicated that we will be having more information this year. So I assume we are going to get that for Day Two.

One aspect of the quality assurance which -- well, could you also indicate that in that discussion of analysis of quality assurance that you will also address issues of an organization that is running three shifts and how you maintain quality assurance when the thing is totally operational 24 hours a day?

**MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.

Do you want to have that as an update for

Day Two or do you want to comment on ---

**MEMBER BARNES:** Well, I notice that the QA is not yet fully resolved and you are going to -- that is, as I understand it, going to come back to you in September. Therefore, I understood that we would get a more complete report on QA.

I am just -- I guess I am asking within what you are referring to in QA, is the issue of an organization that is running three shifts, will that -- is that involved in what you are considering quality assurance which, I assume, has some additional challenges when you are running it on a three-shift basis?

**MS. NICIC:** For the record, Adriana Nicic.

Yes, you are perfectly right. We are really interested and this is why we are pushing in the area of documentation of an adequate quality assurance problem because he considers it having a good documented program which includes the procedures starting with -- the first level is the quality assurance manual and supporting procedures. He is going to provide a good basis for procedure adherence for all the people who are involved in the operation.

So this is both the lessons he and ourselves we are trying to achieve this goal, having a good foundation for ensuring compliance.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Maybe on that issue to GE, the night shift, how many people would be on that normally?

You have indicated there are 46 employees and an 'X' number of those would be on sort of general management and other. So could you just give me an idea of how many people would be working in the plant during the wee hours?

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

Approximately 11.

**MEMBER BARNES:** And who is the position -- is the person who is essentially responsible for that whole shift should anything go wrong?

**MR. PETER MASON:** Peter Mason.

It would be the production supervisor and that person would be on call.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Which person onsite has -- is the leader of the group onsite?

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

The senior person onsite is the group leader.

**MEMBER BARNES:** That is not the person that is on call then?

**MR. DESIRI:** No. The group leader reports

to the production supervisor.

**MEMBER BARNES:** And to staff, this is an adequate system for any emergency issues that come up?

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry, for the record.

It is usual in 24-hour operations, seven days a week, that the actual shift is supervised by the group leader and then reports ultimately up through a day shift supervisor who has the responsibility, yes.

**MEMBER BARNES:** Thank you.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Dosman.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, thank you.

I was just noting the Public Information Program and I am wondering whether the company would be willing to share with -- some of the aspects of that program.

What is it that you do in terms of public information?

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

Typically, we do not share a great deal of information with the public for security reasons.

In terms of this licensing application we have notified political leaders in the area, we have placed advertisements in local newspapers, and we also have spots in the local radio media as well.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** And staff -- presumably it is the view that this is an adequate public information program?

**MR. WERRY:** David Werry for the record. Yes, the program has been reviewed by CNSC staff, and they have accepted the program.

**MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are there any further questions?

Well, thank you very much then. Mr. Secretary?

**M. LEBLANC:** Merci. This hearing is being continued on December 1st, 2005 here in the CNSC offices. The public is invited to participate either by oral presentation, or written submission on Hearing Day Two. Persons who wish to intervene on that day must file submissions by October 31st, 2005.

The hearing is now adjourned to December 1st, 2005.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** So thank you very much.

Our next hearing is scheduled for 11:00 o'clock.

So we're going to have to start at 11:00 o'clock then on the application by General Electric Canada for the renewal of the licence of the Peterborough

facility. So we'll see you at 11:00, thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 10:06 a.m.

--- Upon resuming at 11:02 a.m.

**THE CHAIRPERSON:** Good morning. The next item on the agenda today is Hearing Day One in the matter of the application by General Electric Canada Inc. for the renewal of the licence to operate the Peterborough Nuclear Fuel Fabrication facility.

**M. LEBLANC:** The Notice of Public Hearing 2005, H-13 was published on June 10th, 2005. August 15th, 2005 was the deadline set for filing by the Applicant, and by CNSC staff.

September 7 was the deadline for filing of supplementary information. I know that supplementary information has been filed by the Applicant. CMD 05-H25.A is a confidential appendix to CNSC staff's CMD, dealing specifically with security matters, and as such will not be discussed in public.

As indicated by President Keen earlier this morning, the Commission is conducting today two parallel hearings on the General Electric Toronto and Peterborough facilities. The Commission notes that the facilities are similar and may share a number of safety programs.

Therefore, to reduce repetition and ensure there is a complete record for both hearings, the

Commission in making its decisions will consider any relevant information regarding those common elements that may be presented during the course of either of these hearings.