

**Canadian Nuclear
Safety Commission**

**Commission canadienne de
sûreté nucléaire**

Public Hearings

Audiences publiques

November 29, 2006

Le 29 novembre 2006

Town Park Recreation Centre
62 McCaul Street
Port Hope, Ontario

Town Park Recreation Centre
62, rue McCaul
Port Hope, Ontario

Commission Members present

Commissaires présents

Ms. Linda J. Keen
Dr. Moyra McDill
Mr. Alan Graham
Dr. Christopher Barnes
Mr. James Dosman
Mr. André Harvey

Mme Linda J. Keen
Dr. Moyra McDill
M. Alan Graham
Dr. Christopher Barnes
M. James Dosman
M. André Harvey

Secretary: Mr. Marc A. Leblanc

Secrétaire: M. Marc A. Leblanc

General Counsel : Mr. Jacques Lavoie

Conseiller général : M. Jacques
Lavoie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening Remarks	1
06-H18.8 Written submission by Rose Bungaro	439
06-H18.9 Written submission by Rod and Joan Parrott	439
06-H18.10 Written submission by Ray Morand	439
06-H18.13 Written submission from Arie Ashkenazy & Associates	438
06-H18.16 Written submission by Gary Donais	439
06-H18.17 Written submission by John Belle	439
06-H18.18 Oral presentation by Juliet Fullerton	339
06-H18.24 Oral Presentation by Alderville First Nation	4
06-H15.26 Oral presentation by Bart Hawkins Kreps	18
06-H18.27 Written submission by Nina Murchie	436

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.28	
Oral presentation by Tom Lawson	25
06-H18.29	
Oral presentation by Audrey Levtov	34
06-H18.30	
Oral presentation by Patricia Lawson	40
06-H18.31	
Oral presentation by Andrew Johncox	59
06-H18.32	
Oral presentation by Nola McDonald	349
06-H18.33	
Oral presentation by Ian R. McDonald	357
06-H18.34	
Written submission by Farley Mowat	439
06-H18.35	
Written submission by Stephen B.H. Smith	439
06-H18.36	
Oral presentation by G. Albert Barraclough	72
06-H18.37	
Oral presentation by Louise Barraclough	86
06-H18.38	
Written submission by Port Hope Yatch Club	442

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.39 Oral presentation by Phill Boyko	98
06-H18.40 Oral presentation by Janet Fishlock	106
06-H18.41 Oral presentation by Limelight Advertising & Design	126
06-H18.42 Oral presentation by Robert J. Neville	366
06-H18.43 Oral presentation by Port Hope & District Chamber of Commerce	134
06-H18.44 Written submission by Glynnis Tomkinson	439
06-H18.45 Written submission by James T. Hunt	437
06-H18.46 Oral presentation by Miriam Mutton	138
06-H18.47 Oral presentation by Bill Crowley	154
06-H18.48 Oral presentation by Municipality of Port Hope	157
06-H18.49 Oral presentation by Steve Kahn	374

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.50	
Oral presentation by Holly Blefgen	193
06-H18.51	
Written submission by Celeste Stewart-McNamara	439
06-H18.52	
Oral presentation by Lake Ontario Waterkeeper	203
06-H18.53	
Oral presentation by Derrick Kelly	439
06-H18.54	
Written submission by Port Hope Nuclear Environmental Watchdogs	442
06-H18.55	
Written submission by Pat McNamara	439
06-H18.56	
Oral presentation by the Canadian Nuclear Workers	223
06-H18.57	
Written submission by Ian W.M. Angus	439
06-H18.58	
Oral presentation by CAIR	229
06-H18.59	
Oral presentation by Robert Lang	380
06-H18.60	
Oral presentation by Faye More	331

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.61 Written submission by Aslea Tombs	439
06-H18.62 Oral Presentation by Diane Tayler	428
06-H18.63 Written submission by John Floyd	428
06-H18.64 Oral presentation by Peter M. Blecher	391
06-H18.65 Oral presentation by Louise Ferrie-Blecher	407
06-H18.66 Oral presentation by Karen Colvin	280
06-H18.68 Oral presentation by Stephen Sneyd	416
06-H18.69 Oral presentation by Danielle Sneyd	420
06-H18.70 Oral presentation by Sanford and Helen Anne Haskill	303
06-H18.71 Oral presentation by Sierra Legal Defence Fund	315
06-H18.72 Written submission from Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility	442

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.73	
Written submission from Brian Parr	436
06-H18.74	
Written submission from Lou Rinaldi, M.P.P., Northumberland	436
06-H18.75	
Written submission from Ian P. Tate	436
06-H18.76	
Written submission from Diana and Matt Flesch	433
06-H18.77	
Written submission from Anna Mosher	433
06-H18.78	
Written submission from George Harvey	436
06-H18.79	
Written submission from Lynda Hook	436
06-H18.80	
Written submission from Nor-Ag Resources	438
06-H18.82	
Written submission from Brett Stephens	433
06-H18.83	
Written submission from Gerhard Heinrich	434
06-H18.84	
Written submission from David Doherty	436

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.85	
Written submission from Cynthia L. Adams	434
06-H18.86	
Written submission from Wayne Byers	436
06-H18.87	
Written submission from Stewart Raynor	436
06-H18.88	
Written submission from Barry Sanders	434
06-H18.89	
Written submission from Laurie B. Johnson	434
06-H18.90	
Written submission from Christa Ingalls	434
06-H18.91	
Written submission from David Ingalls	434
06-H18.92	
Written submission from Bob Routly	434
06-H18.93	
Written submission from Marilyn Routly	434
06-H18.94	
Written submission from Tom Fraser	434
06-H18.95	
Written submission from Ed Lloyd	436

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.96	
Written submission from Doug Westlake	434
06-H18.97	
Written submission from Chris Watt	434
06-H18.98	
Written submission from Gordon N. Walter	436
06-H18.99	
Written submission from Paul Macklin	436
06-H18.100	
Written submission from Robert and Jean Adams	436
06-H18.101	
Written submission from Sarah vanSteijn	436
06-H18.102	
Written submission from Shane Watson	434
06-H18.103	
Written submission from Mikhail Ioffe	434
06-H18.104	
Written submission from John Mulligan	434
06-H18.105	
Written submission from Carl Griese	436
06-H18.106	
Written submission from Michael Murchie	434

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.107	
Written submission from Edna Bosnell	437
06-H18.108	
Written submission from Rob Brulé	434
06-H18.109	
Written submission from Laurie Batchellor	434
06-H18.110	
Written submission from Lori Altman	434
06-H18.111	
Written submission from Lori Cater	434
06-H18.112	
Written submission from Doug Hodgins	436
06-H18.113	
Written submission from Robert A. Wallace	436
06-H18.114	
Written submission from Ed Lam	434
06-H18.115	
Written submission from Doug Choiniere	434
06-H18.116	
Written submission from Debbie Hoselton	434
06-H18.117	
Written submission from Robert and Helen Hennessy	436

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.118	
Written submission from Barbara and Lloyd Blanchard	436
06-H18.119	
Written submission from Sam Fleming	434
06-H18.120	
Written submission from Habitat for Humanity Northumberland	438
06-H18.121	
Written submission from Gillian McNamee	436
06-H18.122	
Written submission from Marleen Campbell	436
06-H18.123	
Written submission from Rebecca Peters	436
06-H18.124	
Written submission from Community Awareness and Emergency Response	438
06-H18.125	
Written submission from Margaret Bradley	434
06-H18.126	
Written submission from Fraser Mumford	434
06-H18.127	
Written submission from Rick Norlock	436
06-H18.128	
Written submission from Anna M.V. Mutton	439

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.129	Written submission from Mike Wladyka	435
06-H18.130	Written submission from Betty Finnie-Hunt	437
06-H18.131	Written submission from Dave McElroy	435
06-H18.132	Written submission from Darren Clarke	435
06-H18.133	Written submission from Gioulchen Tairova	435
06-H18.134	Written submission from Russell Boate	437
06-H18.135	Written submission from Northumberland United Way	438
06-H18.136	Written submission from Terry Highfield	435
06-H18.137	Written submission from Sharon and Mike McBride	435
06-H18.138	Written submission from Wm. Oliver Excavating and Grading Ltd.	438
06-H18.139	Written submission from Neil Pemberton	435

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.140	Written submission from Vandermeer Toyota	438
06-H18.141	Written submission from Colleen and Jim Dobie	437
06-H18.142	Written submission from Michael Marsh	437
06-H18.143	Written submission from Roldano Dalla Rosa	437
06-H18.144	Written submission from John Krause	435
06-H18.145	Written submission from Rose Campbell	437
06-H18.146	Written submission from Myron Szalawiga	435
06-H18.147	Written submission from Liz Stewart	437
06-H18.148	Written submission from Jackie Brimblecombe	437
06-H18.149	Written submission from Marc Boucher	435
06-H18.150	Written submission from Aldo D'Agostino	435

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.151	Written submission from Residents of Northumberland County	437
06-H18.152	Written submission from Elizabeth Benne	437
06-H18.153	Written submission from Hill and Dale Manor	438
06-H18.154	Written submission from Anita Blackwood	437
06-H18.155	Written submission from Esther Valliant	435
06-H18.156	Written submission from Peter Wieczorek	435
06-H18.157	Written submission from Simon J. Reid	435
06-H18.158	Written submission from Carol Kirton	437
06-H18.159	Written submission from Wakely Transportation Services Limited	438
06-H18.160	Written submission from Raymond Foote	435
06-H18.161	Oral presentation by Northumberland Manugacturers Association	327

TABLE OF CONTENTS

06-H18.162

Oral presentation by
Port Hope Community Health Concerns Committee 262

06-H18.163

Written submission from
Mary Birkett 439

06-H18.164

Written submission from
Roger N. Carr 437

1 Port Hope, Ontario

2
3 --- Upon commencing on Wednesday, November 29, 2006
4 at 8:34 a.m.

5 **Opening Remarks**

6 **MR. LEBLANC:** Welcome to this hearing of
7 the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. Mon nom est Marc
8 Leblanc. Je suis le secrétaire de la Commission et
9 j'aimerais aborder certains aspects touchant le
10 déroulement de l'audience.

11 We will continue today with Day Two of the
12 Public Hearing regarding the application for renewal by
13 Cameco Corporation for its Port Hope facility. This is
14 not only the second day but Day Two of the hearing. Day
15 One was held on October 4th, 2006.

16 Today, we are going to continue with the
17 interventions where we left yesterday, that is with the
18 submission 06-H18.24.

19 The Public Hearing being held today does
20 provide for simultaneous translation. Des appareils de
21 traduction sont disponibles à la réception. La version
22 française est au poste 8 and the English version is on
23 channel 7.

24 We would ask you to please keep the pace of

1 speech relatively slow so that the translators have the
2 chance of keeping up.

3 The plan today is to continue, as I
4 mentioned, with the interventions. We are going to go
5 until dinner tonight, after which we're going to have a
6 dinner break and we will resume at seven o'clock in the
7 evening for a session that will allow the people who had
8 requested to intervene in the evening to so present.

9 If we have not gone through all of the
10 interventions by the end of today, we will adjourn to a
11 date to be set later to continue this hearing and allow
12 all the intervenors to make their presentations.

13 Madame la présidente?

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Good morning, and as the
15 Secretary has said, this is Day Two of Day Two of the
16 hearing with regards to the application by Cameco Port
17 Hope for a licence renewal.

18 This is, as I mentioned yesterday, an
19 opportunity for us to hear from the community, to hear
20 from people that are interested in this renewal and to
21 have an opportunity to be heard by all of you.

22 This is an opportunity for you to hear from
23 each other, as well as Cameco to hear the issues that have
24 been put in front of you -- in front of them and for the
25 staff as well. So this is an opportunity to listen for us

1 and to ask questions.

2 Your written submissions have already been
3 read by the Commission. We have had them for a couple of
4 weeks and had an opportunity to read them and the written
5 submissions are important to us. Whether they result in
6 an oral intervention here today or if people choose just
7 to put in a written submission, they're all equally
8 important to us and we treat them all equally.

9 We have allocated about 10 minutes for each
10 of you, the oral interventions, and this is to allow us to
11 have a chance to hear as many people as possible, and we
12 thank you for your cooperation to make sure that everyone
13 that is put on the list has the chance to be heard, if
14 possible, here in the community. That's why we're here.

15 So with that, we'll move on for a very full
16 day of listening and for the Commission Members to ask
17 questions of this submission.

18 I'll turn it back to the Secretary now.

19 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

20 I would also want to remind many of the
21 intervenors who have filed similar interventions with
22 respect to the Cameco Port Hope hearing, as well as for
23 the Zircatec hearing, we would ask you to indicate to us
24 and we will consider what is said in today's hearing that
25 is relevant to Zircatec, for the record of the Zircatec

1 matter.

2 So if some intervenors are satisfied with
3 the presentation they have made today, please indicate
4 whether you will come back tomorrow to emphasize key
5 points pertaining to Zircatec or perhaps that have been
6 made today because they were of a more generic nature.

7 With this, we will start with the
8 interventions. We will move to the first intervention of
9 the day which is an oral presentation by the Alderville
10 First Nation as outlined in CMD 06-H18.24. Mr. Randy
11 Smoke is here to present this submission on behalf of the
12 Alderville First Nation.

13 Mr. Smoke, the floor is yours.

14

15 **06-H18.24**

16 **Oral presentation by**

17 **Alderville First Nation**

18

19 **MR. SMOKE:** Can you hear me? Boy, what a
20 start. I forgot what I was going to say now.

21 Randy Smoke and (native language),
22 Alderville First Nation (native language). My English
23 name is Randy Smoke. I come from a First Nations called
24 Alderville. They've asked me to come here and share a bit
25 about our ways, the way our ancestors lived and the way we

1 lived to the present.

2 I come for a Bear Clan. That's a clan of
3 medicine people. That's how we live in this clan. And
4 like I say, I was asked to come and share some things with
5 you about our ways and how we make decisions and I feel
6 very honoured to have this opportunity to share with this
7 Panel of Commissioners because you have a great
8 responsibility today and tomorrow to listen.

9 I'm going to talk about listening for a
10 little while first because the old people that I spent my
11 time with, the first thing they taught me is how to listen
12 and not just listen with your ears but listen with your
13 eyes and listen with your heart. And that's what I'm
14 going to focus my talk today upon that.

15 It is hoped that you will use these gifts
16 that you were given to listen to a little bit what I have
17 to say.

18 I never thought I'd have to talk about this
19 ever in my life, but I've heard it many times from the old
20 ones. When I was young, I would spend a lot of time with
21 the old ones. My first five years was spent with my
22 great-grandfather and lots of other old people would come
23 and visit him. When they came and talked at these
24 circles, they talked a lot of times about the changes that
25 were to come and the changes that have already come.

1 Since I was a child, all I can remember and
2 I recall is that all of these changes they were talking
3 about were things that I would never believe. Forty-eight
4 (48) years ago, they talked about a time when we'd be
5 having to drink out of these containers, our water, and
6 I'm going to talk about the water today.

7 They talked about other changes, about
8 things that were going to hurt our people and hurt all
9 creation because of the changes that were going to come
10 with our non-native brothers when they come to this land,
11 changes that we could not see. We could not imagine the
12 impact that it was going to have on our people and on
13 Mother Earth.

14 Some of these changes that I'm going to
15 mention, like I say, have come true; this bottled water,
16 people breathing through bottles and tubes, people's skin
17 burning but they don't know why, because of what's in the
18 air. All of these things, no one has the answers to and
19 never had the answers to at that time either. But they
20 talked about them 48 years ago when I was just a little
21 one.

22 And the old people around the circle, some
23 snickered, some laughed, but today, just about all of
24 these changes have already been experienced by my life
25 here in earth. Some of these changes have yet to come and

1 there's one that I haven't -- I was here yesterday and I
2 never heard anything mentioned about it.

3 There is a change that's going to happen
4 here on the shores of Lake Ontario in the form of
5 earthquakes and I don't know if this plant that we are
6 talking about, I don't know much about it, but are they
7 prepared for such a disaster? Because if a disaster like
8 that comes and we're not prepared, then the decision we're
9 going to make today could be a decision like you're the
10 Creator.

11 You're going to decide what my life is
12 going to be, because I don't plan on going away. I'm
13 going to live here and I'm making decisions today based on
14 my grandchildren and their children and so on. Most of my
15 decisions today are based on seven generations and most of
16 you have probably heard that phrase, the seven generations
17 when decisions are being made.

18 But we don't only go seven generations
19 ahead. We go back seven generations and find out what the
20 decisions, what the effect it had on us today, were those
21 good decisions. These are the kinds of things that you're
22 going to have to think about when you make your decision
23 in the next few days.

24 Anyway, I will carry on.

25 From my experience throughout my somewhat

1 50-some odd years -- I'm not going to give you my real age
2 because I'll just let you guess on that one -- but I've
3 noticed that all of these changes have a strong relation
4 to money and pollution. They come one on one and they
5 work together, and it's because of these changes, and I
6 use money as a pollution also because a lot of our people
7 have died because of these pollutions whether in the form
8 of money or changes to the environment.

9 A lot of our people have died; not just our
10 people but all people, and they don't know why. They're
11 still trying to figure it out today why.

12 I somewhat get emotional about this because
13 I see what's happening to our earth today. And I will
14 talk a little bit about that today too.

15 The end result is that pollution has come
16 upon us. It's here.

17 There is a lot of sadness amongst our
18 people because of what is going on and then our First
19 Nations communities throughout Canada, the United States,
20 we've never had a say on any of the decision-making
21 processes of plants similar to this.

22 And I often think that if we were given the
23 opportunity, our old people were given the opportunity to
24 share their visions, to share their prophecies before
25 these plants were created, these nuclear plants -- I'm not

1 against nuclear energy. In no way am I saying this,
2 because as a society we demand energy. We have been
3 conditioned to use this energy. We need it. It makes
4 life easier. It's very convenient.

5 There is a negative to that because now we
6 won't go out and chop out a few cords of wood in the
7 woods. That's too hard a work. It's easier to press a
8 button. That's where our society is going. We've
9 forgotten how to work. We've forgotten how to respect
10 these gifts that we were given to live on this earth.
11 We've forgotten our responsibilities. A little bit of
12 that is going to happen today too when you hear these
13 speeches.

14 But along with the suffering and sadness
15 that our people are experiencing today also comes a
16 suffering of mother earth because of environmental changes
17 and the pollution, things that we don't even know are
18 still happening.

19 I brought some notes because yesterday I
20 had everything prepared what I was going to say, but after
21 hearing all the presentations, I threw them away. They
22 weren't applicable because I was coming here ready to
23 fight for something I knew very little about; the nuclear
24 -- the radioactivity. But today I'm not going to do that.
25 Today, I'm just going to share the native perspective on

1 how we make decisions and maybe some of it can help.

2 I want to share an experience with you that
3 I have gone through throughout my life. When I was young,
4 we used to do a lot of fishing. My family came from
5 families of providers where we provide food for the
6 mothers, single mothers, and the families that didn't have
7 very skilled hunters and providers. So my family was
8 pretty good at this.

9 So when I was young, I remember when we
10 walked in the waters and did our fishing. It was very
11 hard because we would have to fish in swift currents and
12 it was slippery, but we created the skill and we got good
13 at it. It was difficult but we could do it.

14 And when I started going back to this way
15 of life a few years later -- just a few years later -- I
16 went back into these same waters and it was even slipperier
17 but it wasn't because of the swift current because the
18 water table has gone down. The water is moving a lot
19 slower. It was slipperier because of the slimes and the
20 slimes are on everything. And this was an indication to
21 me that the water is suffering, and we need water to
22 sustain life.

23 That is so important to us, and when I see
24 these stacks through all these plants and I see these
25 emissions coming out, it really -- it affects me in a way

1 that -- because I have no control of this nor have I had
2 any input or has our people have input on the creation of
3 these facilities.

4 And when I see these great clouds of
5 emissions going into the air, I'm wondering if that has
6 some impact on the water.

7 They talk about a safe amount of
8 contaminants going out that's tolerable. I believe none
9 is because we have upset that balance. By using fossil
10 fuels, we have reversed the natural balance of mother
11 earth.

12 So what we have to ask by using these
13 nuclear plants, are we putting an ease on the use of
14 fossil fuels? No one knows yet. I don't think enough
15 research has been done.

16 I think more has to be done. They talk
17 about spending millions of dollars to clean up this
18 immediate area. That's a bandaid. That's just a bandaid.
19 What about the surrounding communities? Because all of
20 this stuff that comes out of these stacks, it's got to
21 come down somewhere. What about those communities?

22 I've noticed already the decline of fish,
23 the decline of all aquatic life. I'm not saying it's
24 because of this plant but it could be accumulative of
25 several changes with the pollutions that come with it.

1 Another example to do with water is when we
2 were young we'd have to walk for about a mile to get --
3 we'd put these old milk cans on a bobsled and dragged them
4 to the creek where you could just scoop the water and
5 drink it. And then they put these deep wells in, so we'd
6 go there and just pump this water into our containers and
7 dragged them home.

8 But after a while these containers were
9 getting that same slime scum built up on them and we're
10 drinking this stuff, you know? What are we doing to our
11 bodies? They're talking about cancers and diseases, all
12 blowing out of proportion now. It could be a multitude of
13 everything that's causing this.

14 So we have a chance to slow it down. We
15 have a chance to do more research. So let's spend some of
16 them millions of dollars and not trying to undo the damage
17 but prevent further damage to mother earth. That is more
18 important, is preventing damage, further future
19 destructions.

20 Don't be in such a hurry to make the money
21 because soon we will have nothing to spend it on. There
22 will be nothing here.

23 You know, in Canada and I think throughout
24 the world it's an illegal act to commit murder or plan a
25 murder. So it should be illegal for what we are doing to

1 mother earth. We're killing her; we're killing her.

2 Our old people had these special gifts when
3 they made decisions. They would look far ahead into the
4 future before they made their decisions. They seen this
5 coming when I was a child. They seen all of this. How
6 they know, I don't know, but I think that's what this
7 Panel of Commissioners have to do, today and tomorrow, is
8 look way beyond today, use that seven generations, maybe.
9 Just think about it. What's going to happen to our
10 grandchildren's children because of decisions that we're
11 going to make today?

12 Some say go back to nature. You know, why
13 do we need all this? Go back to nature, that's what
14 people tell us. Our people have never left nature. Our
15 people where we live, we have a very close connection to
16 all nature, all natural things, all natural environments.
17 We still have that.

18 When the non-natives came here to this
19 country the old ones would talk about this. They had a
20 lot of good ideas in their minds. One that I'm not so
21 favourable is they wanted to change native peoples. Some
22 of our people, in fact a lot of them, fell into this way.

23 There's very few of us that live a
24 traditional life with that closeness to the environment,
25 that closeness to mother earth and all our relatives.

1 When I talk about our relatives I should
2 explain that a little bit. We refer to the earth as our
3 mother. We refer to the plants and all that lives on this
4 earth as our sisters. We refer to the sun as our elder
5 brother. The moon, we refer to as our grandmother. These
6 are our relations.

7 So when I talk about my relations that
8 gives a little bit of perspective on what I'm referring
9 to, and because of the way we refer these things we are
10 taught to respect all our relations as we live. And we
11 must live in harmony. We're always taught that.

12 Today, to live in harmony has somewhat
13 fallen on the wayside and that harmony is all but gone.
14 But even so, our people continue to live in a traditional
15 way, with that close respect for all our relations.

16 If we could share with the rest of the
17 world just a little bit about how we live, how we make our
18 decisions then perhaps if we all got together we might
19 last a lot longer on this mother earth.

20 We can live without our mothers and our
21 fathers, as they pass on. We can live without our
22 sisters, our aunts, and our uncles but we can't live
23 without our mother earth. So we have to find some way to
24 get together so that we can stay here a lot longer.

25 As First Nations peoples and not only that

1 but as peoples, we have a lot of considerations to think
2 about when we make decisions.

3 That seven generations I was talking about,
4 go back to -- look at the decisions we've already made,
5 even as much as 50 years ago, and look what we're having
6 to live through today, the impact that it's had on us.

7 Something that I've often thought about is
8 if our seven years -- or seven generations ago if those
9 decisions, if those people making those decisions had the
10 ability to see how it would impact us today, would they
11 have made those same decisions? We don't have that
12 ability but we do have the ability to listen; with our
13 hearts, with our ears; with our eyes and that might help
14 us make a really great decision.

15 As I was saying before, our old ones,
16 somehow they knew. They knew enough to look ahead, but I
17 think that's because they had faith in what they were and
18 who they were and how they got there. I think that's
19 what's happening today in this world as a lot of our
20 people all over the world has lost faith in their
21 responsibility of why they're here and that is -- and a
22 lot is happening because of money, pollution. It all goes
23 hand in hand.

24 In closing, I hope that I have not offended
25 anybody because that is not my intent when I sit here. I

1 also hope that you will consider some of these things that
2 I have talked about. I could go on for days but I'm told
3 I only have 10 minutes so I had to really sum a lot of
4 stuff up.

5 But Alderville is not very far away from
6 here, it's only about 25 miles. I'm extending an open
7 invitation for anyone who wants to come out and just have
8 a cup of tea and talk with us. There's a lot of good old
9 people out there and a lot of good young ones that have
10 the same knowledge as those old ones because they have
11 been brought up by them.

12 Miigwetch for listening to me, and I hope
13 you all do well with your decision.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Well, thank you very
15 much, sir. You could have heard a pin drop in this room
16 and I think it's because not only the Commission but
17 everybody here was listening too.

18 Are there any questions for Mr. Smoke?

19 I'd actually like to know a little bit more
20 about the Alderville First Nation. For example, you
21 talked about fishing. Does your First Nations -- do any
22 of your First Nation members fish in Lake Ontario now?

23 **MR. SMOKE:** Yes. A lot of our members --
24 because of the fish population declining in our own
25 territories we have an alliance with Iroquois Mohawk

1 Nations and we fish with our Mohawk Brothers in the
2 Tyendinaga area and that's where we've noticed the changes
3 in the waters that are so drastic.

4 Even if we leave our canoes in the water
5 for overnight there's a slime build-up on the bottom of
6 our vessels.

7 So we fish the Lake Ontario waters quite a
8 bit, only because we have to. We never had to before,
9 there was an abundance of everything when I was young.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** As well as the water
11 quality which you've mentioned and changes in water
12 quality -- so these would not have been your traditional
13 fishing grounds, but is there a comment on changes to Lake
14 Ontario in any other way in terms of other areas, except
15 for water quality? I was thinking in terms of fish
16 abundance or not, or other areas.

17 **MR. SMOKE:** For the last 25 years or so we
18 have tried not to fish -- take any fish from Lake Ontario,
19 because about 25 years ago our people were going to Lake
20 Ontario and the fish were bigger, but our people were
21 getting sick from consuming these fish, so we stayed away.
22 So we had to re-educate our people on how to identify
23 health and non-healthy fish because our young ones, they
24 got egos and they want to take that big old lunger and
25 bring it home and be proud. So we had to teach them how

1 to be responsible.

2 So to make a story short, we're scared of
3 this lake now because of what is happening to the fish.
4 And our people, the old ones have told us that it was the
5 water. When the fish are gone man will be gone soon
6 after.

7 So we're kind of scared of Lake Ontario
8 fish right now.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Any further questions?

10 Thank you very much, sir, for coming. We
11 do appreciate this. It's the first time you've been
12 before the Commission so we hope it wasn't a bad
13 experience, and I hope we see you again.

14 Thank you.

15 **MR. SMOKE:** Thank you.

16 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
17 submission which is an oral presentation from Mr. Bart
18 Hawkins Kreps as outlined in CMD 06-H18.26.

19 Sir, the floor is yours. Welcome.

20

21 **06-H18.26**

22 Oral presentation by

23 Bart Hawkins Kreps

24

25 **MR. KREPS:** Thank you for this opportunity

1 to address the CNSC.

2 Like many citizens who have asked to
3 intervene, I have no formal expertise in nuclear science
4 and I have never worked in any branch of the nuclear
5 industry.

6 Like many citizens I am deeply concerned
7 about what our society is doing to our environment, both
8 in our own lifetimes and in the lifetimes of our children
9 and our grandchildren.

10 With those concerns in mind, I have become
11 a registered supporter of environmentalists for nuclear
12 energy and I add my voice in support of the important
13 points made by Rod Anderson in his presentation yesterday.

14 Since having the good fortune to move to
15 Port Hope two years ago I have been raising a family just
16 a few hundred metres from Cameco's conversion facility.

17 As a close neighbour of Cameco I'd like to
18 focus on two specific issues but two issues which have
19 broad implications here and in other places.

20 The first is the issue of emissions from
21 Cameco's conversion facility. As you might guess, before
22 I made a decision to buy a house in the neighbourhood of
23 the plant I did my own research because I wanted to be
24 sure that the activities at Cameco were not going to
25 threaten the health of me and my family. If evidence of

1 unsafe emission levels ever emerged I would certainly
2 expect the CNSC to enforce safety regulations to bring
3 those levels down.

4 But I urge the CNSC not to adopt a zero
5 emission standard for the Cameco plant. I believe a zero
6 emission standard would be pointless, unfair and
7 unreasonable. Further, I believe a zero emission standard
8 for Cameco and Zircatec would most likely result in
9 unintended but serious damage to the environment for
10 future generations.

11 Regarding uranium in particular, I've
12 studied, with great interest, the data about the
13 concentrations of uranium in the air that I breathe as a
14 close neighbour of Cameco. This data shows that uranium
15 concentrations are far below levels at which any damaging
16 effects have ever been documented, either in humans or in
17 animals studied in lab tests.

18 To consider just one guideline, the minimal
19 risk level for inhaled uranium for chronic exposure is
20 reported by Health Canada to be three-tenths of a
21 microgram in every cubic metre of air. How does this
22 compare to the air I breathe everyday? There is a
23 monitoring station on Shooter Street, just a block away
24 from my home. Over the past two decades this station has
25 measured uranium concentrations at the high end of those

1 measured in residential areas of Port Hope, and yet these
2 readings are far below the minimal risk levels. For the
3 past five years they have averaged about four thousandth's
4 of a microgram per cubic metre of air, 75 times lower than
5 the minimal risk levels.

6 With these facts in mind I reached the
7 conclusion that changing to a zero emission standard would
8 be of zero benefit to public health and safety. With
9 uranium emissions already just a tiny fraction of minimal
10 risk levels mandating further reductions would be
11 pointless. The negative consequences of imposing a zero
12 emission standard for the nuclear industry, on the other
13 hand, could be severe.

14 In the next generation or two, I believe,
15 we will have an increasing need for nuclear power.
16 However, the imposition of a zero emission standard for
17 Port Hope's nuclear industry might not only hobble the
18 industry here but it would set a precedent which would be
19 eagerly seized upon by anti-nuclear groups around the
20 province and across the country. If such developments
21 impede the switchover to non-fossil fuel sources of energy
22 the results will be tragic.

23 With each passing year there is more
24 evidence that the safety record of the nuclear power
25 industry is far superior to that of any other major

1 industry. Also, with each passing year there is more
2 evidence of the staggering death toll caused by fossil
3 fuel emissions.

4 To take just one example, the Ontario
5 Medical Association estimates that smog contributes to the
6 premature deaths of 5,800 people each year in Ontario
7 alone.

8 Also, with each passing year, the
9 scientific consensus grows stronger that our fossil fuel
10 consumption not only damages our own health but now
11 threatens our children and our grandchildren with
12 catastrophic climate change.

13 So it would be ironic in the extreme if
14 Cameco were expected to reduce its already safe levels of
15 emissions to zero while thousands of cars and trucks
16 continue to spew their smog and greenhouse gas emissions
17 in and around Port Hope everyday.

18 I am not suggesting that Cameco should be
19 allowed to cut corners on emissions. I think Cameco
20 should maintain and should be required to maintain their
21 emissions at levels well below the levels at which any
22 health dangers have ever been documented.

23 But let's keep this in perspective. The
24 emissions which are a clear and present danger and the
25 emissions which must be drastically reduced are not

1 nuclear industry emissions but fossil fuel emissions.

2 Finally, I'd like to briefly address an
3 issue in regard to Zircatec. There have been calls in
4 recent weeks for this assessment process to be expanded to
5 a full panel review. As a local citizen, a taxpayer and
6 an environmentalist, I believe that a full panel review of
7 the Zircatec proposal would be a great waste of resources
8 and focus.

9 In Port Hope we have already gone through
10 years of public information sessions and public debate on
11 issues around the processing of slightly enriched uranium.
12 Thousands of hours of time on the part of citizens,
13 private industry and government regulators have been
14 devoted to this subject in Port Hope alone. If a full
15 panel review were to be called now, we would devote months
16 or years more to this subject. Another significant
17 improvement in the efficiency of the nuclear industry
18 would be delayed indefinitely and therefore made more
19 costly, perhaps to the point that the project would be
20 cancelled.

21 Antinuclear groups elsewhere would see this
22 as a precedent and call for full panel reviews every time
23 the nuclear industry proposes to introduce any new or
24 improved process.

25 The major greenhouse gas-free method of

1 energy production would be impeded and public attention
2 would be diverted from the urgent priority of our age, the
3 decommissioning of the fossil fuel economy.

4 The cost to taxpayers of just one panel
5 review might well be in the millions of dollars. The cost
6 to Port Hope residents would be that for another year or
7 two or three far more pressing issues of public health,
8 safety and sustainability would be short changed.

9 Thank you.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much, sir.
11 Are there any questions for this
12 intervenor?

13 Thank you very much for your presentation
14 today.

15 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission, which is
16 CMD 06-H18.27 was to be an oral presentation from Miss
17 Nina Murchie. However, she cannot attend today and asked
18 us to consider her submission as a written.

19
20 **06-H18.27**

21 **Written Submission by**

22 **Nina Murchie**
23

24 **MR. LEBLANC:** So we will move to the next
25 submission which is an oral presentation from Mr. Tom

1 Lawson, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.28.

2 Mr. Lawson, the floor is yours, sir.

3

4 **06-H18.28**

5 **Oral Submission by**

6 **Tom Lawson**

7

8 **MR. LAWSON:** Can you hear me?

9 My name is Tom Lawson. My wife became
10 deeply involved in the seventies when Eldorado's massive
11 contamination of the town was discovered and a school had
12 to be closed for a year. Hundreds of homes had to be
13 decontaminated over the ensuing years.

14 I became involved in 1995 when I initiated
15 the Citizens Coalition that derailed the Crazy Caverns
16 scheme to bury a million tonnes of radioactive and toxic
17 waste right under our waterfront.

18 Since then, three citizen groups; the
19 Health Concerns Committee, the Watchdogs and F.A.R.E.,
20 have raised crucial issues and helped Cameco to try to
21 cleanup its act. At no time has Cameco been willing to
22 debate these issues. You are the closest we have come to
23 a genuine debate and we see you in something of a
24 straitjacket. We need you to ask for a full panel review,
25 with all due respect to Mr. Kreps.

1 Before I go on, I'd like to bring up the
2 rosy picture painted by Mr. Kreps and particularly by Rod
3 Anderson and Chris Levtoy about a nuclear renaissance to
4 stave off climate change. Both of them are -- all of them
5 are 100 per cent right, that civilization faces its
6 greatest crisis ever, but even Bruno Combi, the French
7 leader of environmentalists for nuclear energy, admitted
8 in our library, that to bring about the nuclear
9 renaissance and save mankind from this climate crisis, we
10 would need about 5,000 nuclear reactors.

11 At present we have what is it, 500? And
12 even 100 per cent switch to nuclear power, if it were
13 possible, which it isn't, would not make 10 per cent
14 difference to global warming. Let's get real. 5,000 new
15 reactors and why will no one but government anywhere
16 invest in a nuclear reactor?

17 I just want to say this. If you forget
18 everything I say and everything that everybody else says,
19 I hope -- I hope you will take home what Randy Smoke said.
20 I hope you will see the great wisdom in what he is saying.

21 Our problem is not a problem between
22 different forms of energy. Our problem is the way we
23 think. We've got to change the way we think and the way
24 we live and we've got to begin to talk about a thing
25 called conservation instead of just more energy of one

1 kind or another.

2 I have four reasons why you should not
3 give, even a two-year licence, to either Cameco or
4 Zircatec.

5 Number one is the location. You've heard
6 it before; you'll hear it again. No one disputes the fact
7 that Port Hope's waterfront is the wrong place for this
8 facility.

9 No one disputes the fact that there are
10 alternatives, one close enough to ensure no loss of jobs.
11 Cameco can move but Cameco can move only if by doing so
12 they can maximize profits or if they're forced to do so by
13 losing their licence to operate here.

14 Cameco's radioactive emissions are not its
15 only problem. Just one case: The large-scale use of
16 lethal hydrofluoric acid at the facility makes another
17 Bhopal in our community a distinct possibility. It could
18 be mechanical breakdown. It could be human error. It
19 could be terrorist activity, but things that can happen
20 eventually do happen. No community should be subjected to
21 such a threat, however unlikely.

22 With the construction of such a facility on
23 our waterfront to be proposed today, it wouldn't receive
24 even cursory attention. Should not renewed licensing
25 include instructions to start plans now for relocation?

1 Our second concern: This fall only - or at
2 least our three citizen groups held a forum on health
3 issues related to this industry. Cameco declined to
4 participate. They will not debate. Instead, it held its
5 own forum involving a panel of eight distinguished
6 experts. All morning we were reassured in many ways by
7 this panel that Cameco poses no significant health hazard
8 in Port Hope.

9 In the afternoon question period, I asked
10 the panel the following question: All morning you have
11 been reassuring us that Cameco poses no real health threat
12 here and, yet, here we are spending over \$250 million of
13 taxpayers' money to try to cleanup just our historic
14 waste. What sense does that make; \$250 million for
15 nothing?

16 If, on the other hand there is a hazard,
17 why on earth are we spending over \$250 million cleanup
18 while the facility goes on polluting and at an elevated
19 rate? What sense does that make?

20 I pleaded for any one of them to enlighten
21 me. Not one had a word to say. They just sat there
22 speechless. What sense does that make?

23 I'm asking you people, you Commissioners.
24 What sense does that make to you?

25 My third concern is Cameco's public

1 relations campaign this past year. Last year's 105
2 interventions over the proposal to process enriched
3 uranium here revealed an extraordinary degree of knowledge
4 of nuclear issues among the informed citizenry. In the
5 face of F.A.R.E.'s questions leading up to the recent
6 municipal election, Cameco ran an unprecedented campaign
7 to marginalize mounting criticism, to get a submissive
8 council elected and to convince the town and you that our
9 future depends on Cameco's continued presence among us.

10 In particular, they waged an intense
11 campaign to discredit an extremely able councillor who had
12 just won a prestigious international award for his work to
13 protect and enhance our Ganaraska River watershed. Why
14 did they do this? Because more than anyone else, he kept
15 Cameco on its toes with penetrating questions.

16 I ask you to compare the substance of
17 interventions on behalf of Cameco with the critical
18 interventions of concerned citizens. Of course, Cameco
19 employees praise their employer. They're the best-paid
20 people in town. The bulk of the townspeople are, as
21 usual, uninvolved. They just want the problem to go away.
22 It won't.

23 Only a dozen or so not connected to either
24 Cameco or informed citizen groups turned up at our health
25 panels. I decided to join 13 other candidates for four

1 council seats, simply to give voters a chance to say we
2 want our waterfront back. 469 voters bypassed 10 other
3 worthy candidates to make that statement. Why? Because
4 they see that our waterfront is a potential goldmine, the
5 key to a genuine Port Hope renaissance.

6 The closest proposal to counter this stand
7 is Cameco's 2010 scheme to beautify the plant for the
8 benefit of families wishing to enjoy the waterfront again.

9 It's a whitewash. Have a look at the
10 place. For 60 years this massive eyesore has dominated,
11 defaced and contaminated not only our waterfront but the
12 town itself at an enormous cost to the whole community.
13 You can't heal a boil with a Bandaid. The emperor has no
14 clothes and the town is more divided than ever.

15 My fourth concern is studies verses
16 testing. Many questions have yet to be answered. Surely
17 no licence should be granted before these questions have
18 been addressed, especially those dealing with a need for a
19 genuine health testing, not studies, testing of those who
20 have lived here all these years. Contrary to what you've
21 heard from Bliss Tracy we have had to date nothing but
22 studies that have been inconclusive by design. If there
23 were no health hazard why would Cameco not be demanding
24 genuine testing of the people who have lived here to clear
25 the air and silence widespread citizen concerns? Is there

1 a government fear of billions of dollars in lawsuits if
2 such tests should prove positive? Donations to the local
3 theatre and other worthy causes do nothing to answer these
4 questions.

5 My conclusion is the issue is not
6 essentially between FARE and Cameco. It's rather between
7 concerned citizens and you, the regulator. Cameco is
8 simply doing its thing to maximize profits.

9 But our town is deeply, deeply divided. We
10 will remain divided until we get our waterfront back.

11 Thank you.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Mr. Lawson.

13 Are there questions from the Commission
14 Members for this?

15 Yes, Mr. Harvey.

16 **MEMBER HARVEY:** My question goes to Cameco.
17 Could you inform Commission on the nature of the risk of
18 the use of the hydrofluoric acid within the plan?

19 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

20 Hydrofluoric acid is a toxic chemical and
21 because of that reason we have the hydrofluoric acid
22 systems in place to contain. We contain it at all stages
23 of its use, monitor it, detection and control of it. So
24 the risk of escape of hydrofluoric acid from the facility
25 is controlled very -- it's very controlled such that it is

1 a very unlikely un-credible event to happen.

2 **MEMBER HARVEY:** But if an accident would
3 happen what could be the impact? If a leak -- well, an
4 accident is an accident, so what would be the nature of
5 the impact if it would happen?

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Perhaps we could broaden
7 the question to talk about what are the accident scenarios
8 that have been examined by Cameco. And I think, Mr.
9 Harvey, it would be a question for staff too afterwards.
10 And what are the scenarios and the possible mitigation for
11 those areas to reassure the public?

12 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

13 The most -- the scenarios that we have
14 looked at, and we have examined accident scenarios, and it
15 is the time of greatest potential for an accident to
16 happen, is during the transfer of the hydrogen fluoride
17 from the railcar into the storage tanks. We have dealt
18 with and put in place those scenarios of a catastrophic
19 failure of the hose and also control, and then we have
20 designed -- and the systems are in place that will contain
21 those quantities of material. We'll put it through
22 emergency scrubbing systems and neutralize that material.

23 We also have -- and it comes back to our
24 Emergency Response Team, and we have the Emergency
25 Response Team members who are capable and competent and

1 trained to go into such a scene and also mitigate anything
2 that's happening. And when we're offloading and dealing
3 with -- doing that transfer, that only happens when the
4 Emergency Response Team is available during the daytime.

5 **MEMBER HARVEY:** And to staff?

6 **MR. HOWDEN:** Yes. Barclay Howden speaking.
7 I'm going to ask Mr. Marty O'Brien to
8 comment on our assessment of the HF hazards at this
9 facility.

10 **MR. O'BRIEN:** Marty O'Brien for the record.
11 Yes, I believe as mentioned somewhat
12 yesterday, CNSC staff evaluates this aspect primarily
13 through the safety report that's issued for the facility.
14 It's a licensing requirement and they have to assess all
15 potential scenarios such as potential leaks of
16 hydrofluoric acid in the plant and that they have
17 sufficient safeguards in place to deal with such a leak,
18 things like detection systems, emergency shutoff systems,
19 diversion of any leak into standby scrubbing systems so
20 that they don't get released unmitigated to the
21 environment, containment systems, emergency response
22 systems, et cetera. And our view is -- reviews they have
23 done today have concluded it's satisfactory.

24 Thank you.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Other questions?

1 Well, thank you very much, Mr. Lawson, for
2 taking the time to put in a submission and being with us
3 today.

4 **MR. LEBLANC:** We'll move to the next
5 submission which is an oral presentation from Ms. Audrey
6 Levtov, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.29.

7 Ms. Levtov, the floor is yours, ma'am.

8

9 **06-H18.29**

10 **Oral presentation by**

11 **Audrey Levtov**

12

13 **MS. LEVTOV:** Good morning, Madam Chair, and
14 Members of the Commission. We are really pleased to have
15 you in Port Hope. It's lovely to see you face-to-face.

16 My name is Audrey Levtov. I live on Dawson
17 Street West. I am a grandmother and a happy, positive,
18 optimistic person. So when I tell you that my fears for
19 the children of this town haven't been allayed; I feel
20 worried enough to put myself through this ordeal of
21 speaking to you again.

22 I am part of Cameco's buffer zone. I am a
23 proud member of FARE. And although I disagree with Mr.
24 Miller on Cameco's location, because of the way our world
25 has changed so dramatically with threats of terrorism and

1 dire climate change predictions, I feel there is no place
2 for Cameco in our town.

3 Here we are with them once more asking for
4 a long licensing period. I strongly oppose this. This is
5 a company operating in our beautiful town without a buffer
6 zone and not prioritizing its emissions which continue to
7 rain down on us in increasing amounts.

8 They have no grey days on your report card,
9 but they do have the temerity to ask for a long operating
10 licence. They are still not compliant with the Fire Code.
11 You gave them a "C", hardly a passing grade on fire and
12 emergency. They don't meet the municipal safety
13 standards, yet you keep giving them more and more time to
14 be compliant. Why does your staff recommend giving them a
15 five-year licence renewal?

16 You were told in 2005 about our concerns
17 with neutron radiation outside the plant and you dismissed
18 this as of no concern. It certainly concerns us and still
19 concerns us.

20 They are embarked on a massive PR campaign
21 which is supposed to give us factual information about
22 them and their plant operations. Public relations is not
23 public information. We resent being massaged by them.
24 The money they are spending would be better spent making
25 our town safer, investing in emission control systems and

1 meeting municipal requirements on safety and security as
2 set out in Mr. Rostetter's memo to council, which as I
3 remember was unanimously endorsed by council. Did the
4 staff take this into consideration?

5 Our town will shortly be undergoing a
6 massive cleanup of historic low-level radioactive waste
7 during which Cameco will decommission certain of its
8 buildings. Will the company be up and running and able to
9 operate even up to their non-compliance standards during
10 this upheaval? Who knows?

11 Should they be licensed to operate for more
12 than a year at a time during this uncertainty? Did your
13 staff give this enough consideration? If you allow Cameco
14 a five-year licence, will you be operating in the best
15 interest of Port Hope citizens?

16 I ask for your consideration in this
17 matter. Thank you very much.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much,
19 ma'am. We realize that it takes full effort to come here.
20 So thank you very much. We realize that.

21 Are there any questions? Dr. McDill.

22 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you very much. I
23 understand sometimes people on the far side of this room
24 have trouble hearing me. So wave your hands and I'll
25 know.

1 I wonder if I could ask staff to define
2 what a "B" rating is and what an "A" rating means, and
3 perhaps just in rough numbers how many "As" we actually
4 see in a year?

5 **MR. RABSKI:** With respect to the -- Henry
6 Rabski for the record.

7 The "B" rating issued on our assessment of
8 programs and implementation of programs means meeting
9 requirements and the intent of the objectives of CNSC
10 requirements and performance expectations. This rating is
11 given when we evaluate programs and perform inspections of
12 facilities based on specific safety program areas.

13 And during the course of those types of
14 inspections and evaluations, there are issues that are
15 raised and there are improvements and directions given by
16 staff to continuously improve programs based on what we
17 see in the field and what we're evaluating.

18 So that's -- meeting our requirements means
19 that we will find those things from time to time and the
20 response of the licensee is adequate to bring those things
21 back into compliance or to address those significantly and
22 not pose any risk in terms of compliance in those
23 particular safety program areas.

24 When you speak of an "A" rating, you're
25 talking about an assessment of again the same types of

1 programs, evaluations, inspections that consistently
2 exceed applicable CNSC requirements and performance
3 expectations. So it's going well above and beyond
4 consistently in a program area and the implementation of
5 those that can be shown that far exceeds any type of
6 expectation that we would have, going above and beyond any
7 type of expectation.

8 And in the evaluation in my division which
9 looks at and is responsible for licensing, fuel
10 fabrication facilities and production facilities across
11 Canada, we have not issued an "A" rating to any facility
12 in any program area.

13 **MS. LEVTOV:** Madam Chair, I really am sorry
14 for you and the Commissioners when you get answers that
15 are so long that you forget what the question was.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I don't think you should
17 be concerned because we do understand this question and we
18 do understand the answer.

19 I think the Commission asked for these
20 levels to be developed because we felt that it was
21 difficult for citizens to understand at a larger level
22 exactly what was happening in terms of the performance.
23 It would be wrong to say that these levels are considered
24 so quantitatively in a box that there is -- that
25 everything is -- all "Bs" are really absolutely quantified

1 in terms of it.

2 What we believe in the Commission is that
3 there is a standard of health and safety and protection of
4 the environment and safeguards in a number of other areas
5 that companies in Canada must meet. Our requirements from
6 the CNSC meet or exceed any of those in the world. That's
7 one of the things that the Commission does insist on.

8 I think that companies can decide to exceed
9 those for a number of reasons and they do -- sometimes, as
10 Mr. Rabski says, they have exceeded in many cases.

11 But the Commission knows what its job is,
12 and its job is to set standards for Canadians across the
13 land. Be that in a health clinic or in a power plant,
14 there are standards for every facility that we regulate,
15 and those are to ensure that they meet those standards.

16 I must say to you the amount of resources
17 that would be necessary for us to monitor where they are
18 between "Bs" and "As" would be, I think, what one would
19 consider in the wrong place. A number of companies even
20 said to us, "How do we get from here to there", and I say,
21 "That's not the job of the Commission. That's the job of
22 you to talk about how you get from "A" to "B"."

23 So it's not an unreasonable question for a
24 citizen to ask a company, "What from your company's
25 philosophy is where you would like to go?" but the

1 Commission has a clear idea of what is its job.

2 So I think Dr. McDill's question and your
3 question has been asked before, and I think it's a valid
4 question to ask.

5 Other questions? Dr. Dosman.

6 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Mrs. Levtov, your question
7 on neutron radiation, there was -- I realize the hearings
8 are spread over two days, but there was discussion
9 yesterday and this issue was explored and I would advise
10 you to read the transcripts because it isn't reasonable to
11 have the same explanation again today.

12 **MS. LEVTOV:** Thank you. I do remember
13 yesterday.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Well, thank you very
15 much, ma'am, for joining us today.

16 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
17 submission which is an oral presentation from Ms. Patricia
18 Lawson, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.30.

19 Ms. Lawson, the floor is yours, ma'am.

20

21 **06-H18.30**

22 Oral presentation by

23 Patricia Lawson

24

25 **MS. LAWSON:** My name is Patricia Lawson. I

1 have lived in this town my whole life. I went to school
2 here. I taught school here. I love the town. I feel I
3 am very lucky that I have not had to move away.

4 In the early eighties the Town of Port Hope
5 appointed me as the first Chair of the town's
6 Environmental Advisory Committee.

7 I think perhaps the most useful thing I
8 could do right now for the Commissioners is to pick up on
9 questioning yesterday and the recent questioning on the
10 HF, though I would much rather talk about the issues that
11 Randy Smoke put before you and I hope to do that within
12 the context of the recent Massey lectures.

13 First of all, the HF problem, I have
14 written about that in my written submission to you and I
15 won't read it. Simply, I would like to add that the
16 majority of the energy we receive today comes from oil
17 refineries. We know that's coming to an end.

18 You should know that all Canada's oil
19 refineries have taken away the HF component that they had
20 to use in the process there. They have done that because
21 they consider it too hazardous for the surrounding
22 communities.

23 There is no place perhaps on this continent
24 that receives the volume of HF that comes into the plant
25 in our midst here. I've told you the approximate numbers.

1 You should also know that before the UF₆ plant was
2 licensed and built here, that a railcar fell off the
3 railway lines right on the edge of the Cameco property.

4 Now, I think the best way for you to
5 understand the criticality of the HF situation is within
6 the context of a letter from the Medical Officer of Health
7 to the Environmental Advisory Committee.

8 After the fire at Cameco, the Committee was
9 concerned about a lot of issues and we wrote to Dr.
10 Michael who was the Medical Officer of Health for
11 Kawartha, Haliburton and Pineridge District, and he says:

12 "Responding to Mrs. Lawson's request
13 for answers, an explosion in the plant
14 as a result of the fire could have
15 meant the instant release of either or
16 both ammonia and hydrogen fluoride.
17 The site and power of the explosion
18 would determine the extent of damage
19 and risk to health."

20 And this is a question of wind.

21 "If the wind at the time of the fire
22 had come from any other direction than
23 north, the plumes could have extended
24 over an area for ammonia of six and a
25 half square miles and for hydrogen

1 fluoride of nine square miles.
2 Thus, depending upon the direction of
3 the wind, a semi-circle from the
4 outskirts of Cobourg to south of
5 Rossmount, somewhat east of
6 Westleyville, could be involved."

7 We were given a description of how this
8 chemical would, on contact with the air, be sucked into a
9 cloud and pulled up our river valley.

10 So I also would like to comment on the
11 issues raised about the flooding issue, which I wrote
12 about in my supplementary.

13 The Municipality of Port Hope in its long-
14 term development plan, now approved by the Province,
15 states:

16 "There will be no toxins allowed in
17 the floodplain."

18 The issue of where floodwaters come was
19 discussed yesterday and the Ministry of Natural Resources
20 states that:

21 "Any new buildings in the floodplain
22 should adhere to the PMF
23 requirements."

24 Now, what is worrying the Ganaraska Region
25 Conservation Authority and Mark Peacock is that in one of

1 these unexpected storms, the floodwaters could -- will
2 move in the direction of the Port Hope Water Intake Plant.

3 Can you -- I just want you to -- can you
4 understand what I'm saying? Cameco has a lot of
5 monitoring stations right on the west of the UF₆ plant. A
6 tornado, something unexpected that causes a huge amount of
7 water will push the water right over to the water
8 pollution plant. I hope Mark Peacock is here. You can
9 question him about that.

10 So my whole thrust here, like Randy
11 Smoke's, is I will never allow the continuation of the
12 pollution of Lake Ontario as long as I live and it's not
13 only the fact that the majority of the emissions coming
14 out of this plant, out the stacks and out the pipes go
15 into the lake. That's what you have to realize.

16 Two-thirds of the emissions are coming
17 right down onto Lake Ontario. For instance, recently, the
18 company had trouble in the last two or three years with a
19 pump that wouldn't work on their western side near the
20 lake there and all this stuff goes into the lake and it
21 never goes away.

22 I could read you another -- history is
23 important, as Randy Smoke said. We can learn from
24 history.

25 In 1983, there was a huge radioactive spill

1 out the cooling water outlet that comes into the harbour
2 slip and Mr. Joe Didyck, a member of your staff at the
3 time, said about 700 kilograms of UF₄ were discharged into
4 the harbour. That never goes away. It's there, and I was
5 present when Dr. Durham of the Inland Waterways told how
6 he had analyzed a salmon coming up the Ganaraska River and
7 found uranium in the bones of the salmon.

8 We are facing a critical juncture and I
9 urge you, Madam Chair, to follow the lead of your
10 predecessor, M. Levesque, when he delayed giving the
11 licence to the company as a result of the evidence that I
12 brought before him on behalf of the Environmental Advisory
13 Committee.

14 Your staff at that time wished to raise the
15 DRL and the Committee talked about this issue. They were
16 against it, of course, because all of this triggers more
17 pollution over our town. This was in the '80s, and they
18 sent me to Ottawa and Dr. Levesque said, "We're not going
19 to give this licence until we've thought about it, what
20 you've said".

21 And so I went home and Mr. Andy Oliver was
22 there and at the next meeting of the Environmental
23 Advisory Committee, Mr. Andy Oliver said I was just an
24 anti-nuke and I didn't represent the people of Port Hope.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Ma'am, you just have one

1 minute left, please.

2 **MS. LAWSON:** All right.

3 I want to concentrate. I can't begin to
4 tell you all I want to tell you. But I do want to ask
5 you, Commissioners, two vital questions that I've put in
6 my supplementary submission.

7 The first is, and I hope you can answer
8 this for me, what standard do you require for uranium
9 toxins in the floodplain?

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Please complete your
11 intervention, Mrs. Lawson.

12 **MS. LAWSON:** And what standard -- how do
13 you relate the standard on which you base risk to the
14 other jurisdictions on this planet that have lowered their
15 standard by a factor of at least a hundredfold -- I don't
16 know how much but a lot lower than Canada.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much,
18 ma'am.

19 I just wish to note you mentioned Mr.
20 Peacock from the Regional Conservation Authority and he
21 will be doing an intervention later today. He'll be here
22 approximately three o'clock, I believe. So we will have
23 an opportunity to talk to Mr. Peacock directly about the
24 issues from the Regional Conservation Authorities.

25 So thank you for that.

1 **MS. LAWSON:** Mr. Trumper should come to
2 speak to you about the water pollution issue. He runs
3 Port Hope's intake water plant and he needs to tell you
4 how he analyzes for radioactive substances.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Well, as you know, Ms.
6 Lawson, we had an opportunity for people and groups to
7 intervene and so the list is now available and set.

8 Are there any questions for Mrs. Lawson?

9 Yes, Dr. Dosman first, and then Mr. Graham.

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

11 I would like to ask Cameco if they could
12 briefly summarize the manner in which fluorides are
13 handled in the plant.

14 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

15 First, I would like -- for the record, the
16 scenarios and situations that Ms. Lawson presented in her
17 intervention were related to another plant, another
18 situation. It was the Port Hope plant that was the old
19 UF₆ plant. At that time the nature of the plant was
20 completely different than today.

21 Today, hydrogen fluoride is contained. All
22 railcars when they arrive, all handling of the railcars,
23 happens indoors. The railcar is moved indoors. It is
24 sealed in an indoor location. All of the transfer and
25 storage is indoors. So the whole manner of handling

1 hydrogen fluoride in the current UF₆ plant is completely
2 different than the manner it was done in the plant that
3 Ms. Lawson described, or that is done in most other
4 plants. This is a complete containment. It is a very
5 unique feature that was designed into the UF₆ plant.

6 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** I'm wondering, may I ask
7 staff if staff could comment on staff's view as to the
8 safety with which fluorides are handled in the plant.

9 **MR. RABSKI:** Henry Rabski for the record.

10 Staff would like to begin by saying that
11 under subsection 12.1(c) of the General Nuclear Safety and
12 Control Regulation, there is a requirement of every
13 licensee to take all reasonable precautions to protect the
14 environment and health and safety of persons to maintain
15 security.

16 We do this on a case-by-case basis, as
17 pointed out by the project officer. HF is a hazardous
18 chemical that has been addressed extensively in the safety
19 report for this particular facility because the chemical
20 is so important in the processing of uranium at the
21 facility.

22 Now, to speak to what is in place speaks to
23 the fact that the company is required to put extensive
24 defence in depth in place at this facility, relating to
25 the fact of the hazardous properties of the chemical that

1 they are using.

2 This has been a concentration of effort on
3 behalf of the company and oversight by the regulator to
4 ensure that defence in depth is properly placed in this
5 particular area. This takes into account also the fact of
6 the facility's proximity to populated areas, a concern
7 that has been raised time and time again about lack of
8 buffer zone.

9 The defence in depth method of providing
10 sufficient barriers -- and we're not relying on one
11 particular barrier but a number of barriers in place that
12 stem from analysis of the situation, the processes,
13 procedures, instrumentation, chemical handling and
14 scrubbing systems of gases -- have all been taken into
15 account and are continuously reviewed to ensure that
16 enough defence in depth is properly placed on this
17 particular safety area.

18 With respect to HF, it has been pointed out
19 as well, another defence in depth, and a measure that has
20 been put in place at this particular facility is that all
21 handling of HF is done within the confines of the facility
22 in the plant. As pointed out, railcars are off-loaded
23 inside the facility where the defence in depth mechanisms
24 can be properly used to ensure the safety of workers, the
25 public and the environment.

1 Our staff has benchmarked this type of
2 process of dealing with HF in the uranium conversion
3 process against other similar facilities and the measures
4 that are taken go a long way to ensure that the public,
5 workers and the environment are protected. They far
6 exceed other standards that are used at facilities
7 comparable and have to be put in context of their
8 particular location.

9 We are satisfied that the defence in depth
10 approach provides a protection that a buffer zone would in
11 the case of this particular chemical and process that is
12 used in the conversion facility.

13 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** If I might ask CNSC staff
14 if there have been any incidents at the plant involving
15 fluorides during the current licence period?

16 **MR. RABSKI:** Henry Rabski for the record.

17 There were several incidences that
18 occurred. One has to put them into context. The
19 incidents relate to releases within the containment system
20 within the plant facility. We have the details regarding
21 each individual incident that occurred.

22 What I want to speak to as well is that
23 each time there is an incident, and not only involving
24 this particular hazard but any other safety significant
25 hazard, they are analyzed first of all by the company to

1 look at what the root causes were and any corrective
2 actions and measures that need to be taken to avoid these
3 incidents from occurring again.

4 But they are also analyzed by staff. They
5 are reviewed as part of our continuous inspection program.
6 We also bring in specialists as required to review these
7 investigations and incidents. We take them very seriously
8 and we put the onus on the licensee to continuously look
9 at improving their defence in depth in the particular
10 safety areas that have significant consequence.

11 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I'm sorry to
12 prolong. I would just like to ask CNSC staff if there are
13 any injuries to workers as a result of any incidents?

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I will note for the
15 intervenors that the CNSC Commission Members receive
16 reports of all the significant development reports right
17 afterwards. So we do know these as they happen and this
18 is part of the role of the Commission in its oversight as
19 well.

20 **MR. RABSKI:** Henry Rabski for the record.

21 Our review of the incidents that occurred
22 during the licensing period indicate that there was first-
23 aid administered to individuals as a result of the
24 incidents and Cameco can comment further on the details.

25 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

1 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, Bob Steane.

2 We have some incidents, there have been
3 some as Mr. Rabski described, some minor injuries to
4 people. We also have a protocol in which any potential
5 exposure to hydrogen fluoride is treated very, very
6 seriously and we have a protocol that we enact which
7 provides medical treatment at a level to be assured that
8 there is not a lasting effect.

9 With that, I will ask our Manager of
10 Production, Tim Kennedy, to further talk to that.

11 **MR. KENNEDY:** For the record, it's Tim
12 Kennedy.

13 Yes, HF events have occurred over the
14 licensing period due to loss of a containment inside the
15 building of the plant and if the personnel had smelled HF
16 or reported any breathing difficulties, that would then be
17 treated under their medical protocol, which currently our
18 plant doctor requires transport to the emergency room for
19 evaluation.

20 So during the licensing period, off the top
21 of the my head, we did have loss of containment due to the
22 reactive processes that are inside the plant and the
23 employee response, as Mr. Rabski mentioned, would be
24 investigated under our Occupational Health and Safety and
25 corrective actions be taken to improve the performance in

1 that area.

2 There was no loss of containment from that
3 primary area due to the barriers of depths that were
4 described. The emergency ventilation system along with
5 automatic detection devices are in place. We also have
6 digital recording cameras and plum detection systems in
7 those areas of the plant where these activities take
8 place.

9 So largely, first aid type incidents on
10 inhalation, there would also be some minor HF burns during
11 the licensing period from contact with the chemicals in
12 the plant, doing routine maintenance, largely, or
13 activities in the plant.

14 So those are the ones that come to mind
15 this morning.

16 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Graham.

18 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes, I just have one
19 question to Cameco and that is with regard to research,
20 getting away from the use of HF.

21 As we've heard and as we know there are
22 some processes, new processes that have come into effect
23 in other industries and I'm wondering, is there any way or
24 is there any research being done by your company to do
25 your processing or do another method of processing that

1 would not involve hydrogen fluoride?

2 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

3 The chemistry is such that to make uranium
4 hexafluoride you must have a source of fluorine and
5 fluoride atoms. So you have to use fluoride and the
6 source of fluoride which is commonly used, is a very
7 commonly used industrial chemical; whether it's in plastic
8 pipe, polyvinyl chloride or the fluorides and it's very
9 commonly used as an industrial chemical. But there is no
10 way to make uranium hexafluoride without using a source of
11 fluoride.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I'd just like to comment
13 that I think it would be important for the company to be
14 able to comment for the Commission and for citizens here.
15 It's one thing to talk about the incidences and it's
16 another thing to talk about how you investigate it, it's
17 another thing to talk about how you report it, but I think
18 it's reasonable to ask a company to reassure the
19 Commission and the citizens that they're doing everything
20 they can to come down to zero. Zero of these areas,
21 whether you ever achieve it or not is something.

22 But I think -- we've heard this debate
23 about, you know, everything that's in place but what I'm
24 expecting is a company to say, you know, that your goal is
25 that these won't happen and I haven't heard that yet.

1 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

2 Absolutely our goal is to have no contact
3 with hydrogen fluoride. We do maintain rigorous systems
4 for control detection procedures, how to work with the
5 material and everything is around the putting in place
6 systems and methods and work practices that achieve a
7 workplace with -- that is our goal, is absolutely no
8 contact with hydrogen fluoride.

9 Further, we do, within the industry, share
10 best practices. We meet once a year. The uranium
11 conversion operators meet to share aspects of safety,
12 health and safety and particularly most of the discussion
13 does focus around hydrogen fluoride and what practices
14 others are using for the safe handling and safe working
15 with HF.

16 We also participate and send workers to --
17 our suppliers, Honeywell have annually an HF users
18 conference where we send our engineers, send our safety
19 people to learn about the latest techniques and processes
20 and working safety with hydrogen fluoride.

21 Thank you, Madam Chair, for asking that
22 question. You're right; we should be putting that out.

23 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, Mr. Rogers.

24 **MR. ROGERS:** For the record Terry Rogers.

25 We're talking a lot about hydrogen fluoride

1 here today and it's -- the efforts we go through to
2 eliminate or to greatly reduce the risk of exposures to
3 it.

4 But generally in our industry and certainly
5 within Cameco our goal is to establish a strong safety
6 culture that would include elimination of all risks and
7 risks of chemical exposure, risks of conventional safety
8 issues, risks of radiation exposure as well.

9 So it's an ongoing theme and an ongoing
10 effort at all of our sites, not just the facilities here
11 in Port Hope but certainly within the company that is --
12 our focus is zero incidents.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mrs. Lawson, one of the
14 comments you alluded to and a number of other intervenors
15 is what you've called the PR campaign by Cameco.

16 Certainly I won't speak to the details of
17 the campaign on the ground but six years ago when I came
18 in, one of the things that we didn't have in CNSC was
19 guidelines for four companies in terms of their public
20 information.

21 Some people were quite good; some companies
22 were terrible at it. Some people were in the middle. The
23 reason it's a guideline is because there's no one way to
24 communicate with people that are important to a company's
25 day-to-day operations; be that the unions or staff or

1 whatever.

2 But the CNSC, based on the mid-term review
3 -- I'm sure you've looked at the reasons for decision out
4 of that -- said very clearly to Cameco that their
5 expectation was that there would be more community
6 involvement.

7 What the Commission's expectations are for
8 information to go out to the community and for engagement
9 with the community and that this be sustainable but it
10 isn't around licensing time particularly that there's a
11 sustainable effort and that these would happen.

12 So, I won't comment on whether it's
13 considered a PR campaign or whether it's considered great
14 information or information sessions or whatever. But the
15 Commission does require that there is engagement with the
16 community and they do require that this is reported in the
17 licence, which was done in this case, and they do require
18 that it's sustainable.

19 In this case the Commission asked the staff
20 to also -- the CNSC staff to be more engaged in terms of
21 both the Tribunal Secretariat and whatever.

22 So, it's unfortunate if areas are perceived
23 as PR and that will be the challenge before the company to
24 put forward a sustainable information -- two-way
25 information exchange that will hopefully provide the

1 information people need and that there's a back and forth.

2 So I just wanted to comment on this. PR
3 has become a word that seems to be a bad word. I don't
4 know, if I was a public relations professional I might be
5 not very happy about that but since I'm scientist there's
6 no danger of that.

7 So I just wanted to comment on that.

8 So thank you very much, Mrs. Lawson.

9 **MS. LAWSON:** But I need to respond to you.
10 Until the informed citizens of the
11 community are given a meaningful role in what's going on
12 here in the decision making that's happening in our
13 community all the rest of it is simply cosmetic.

14 We are not allowed to have any reasonable
15 role in the cleanup that you're putting millions of
16 dollars into, as a responsible agency.

17 The citizens who will live with the result
18 of this, who lived throughout the cleanup have had no
19 meaningful way of registering their concerns.

20 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** And I appreciate that
21 that's another licence and another hearing that we will
22 have.

23 Just to clarify, the Commission -- with
24 regards to the work that's being done in terms of the low-
25 level waste site -- will play the role that it plays now,

1 which is, it will be the regulator. It clearly would be
2 perhaps a cause of confusion because it's Natural
3 Resources Canada who is heading that effort.

4 They are, as you say, involving federal
5 funds but the Commission on that case, just like this, has
6 only one job and that's the oversight role and we won't be
7 spending a dollar on that. We will be doing the oversight
8 and it'll have to meet our -- so thank you, Mrs. Lawson.
9 We are going to move on now.

10 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
11 submission which is an oral presentation by Mr. Andrew
12 Johncox, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.31.

13 Mr. Johncox, the floor is yours, sir.

14 **06-H18.31**

15 Oral presentation by
16 Andrew Johncox

17
18 **MR. JOHNCOX:** Thank you.

19 Madam Chair, and Commission Members, my
20 name is Andrew Johncox. I'm a retired engineer.

21 During my career I spent 16 years working
22 for Eldorado in Port Hope and Blind River in production
23 and in applied research. I have presented to this
24 Commission twice before on the issue of decommissioning
25 and the bulk of my submission today will be on

1 decommissioning.

2 In my written report I have expressed my
3 displeasure with Cameco and with the CNSC's ability to
4 regulate and I don't think I will elaborate on that
5 anymore as it has been brought up many times.

6 So I will go on to decommissioning part.

7 A few days ago, I got the SNC-Lavalin
8 decommissioning report. It wasn't sent to me. I got it
9 from a friend. And I have been able to get through this
10 and make some comments. So those comments are not in my
11 written report.

12 Anyway, there is a considerable cost
13 increase for the Phase I decommissioning. Cameco has also
14 said that the reason for the cost increase has been to --
15 the extra labour costs -- increased labour costs and
16 transportation costs to Blind River. Well, when I read
17 this report it says it's a tomorrow's event. So in that,
18 if it was a tomorrow's event, it was not going to Blind
19 River. Tomorrow's event means the whole establishment
20 would be taken down and sent to the low-level waste in
21 Port Hope. And so that cost increase is not due to
22 transportation. I looked through that report. I couldn't
23 find any costs associated to transportation.

24 I think that the report is very well done
25 by SNC-Lavalin and it's a far cry better than what we had

1 received before. And I think the cost estimates by SNC-
2 Lavalin will be fairly correct.

3 Anyway, that's what I wanted to say about
4 that.

5 Also in there it said that there is process
6 waste, non-recycled process waste from Cameco from 1988 to
7 the present that's stored in drums in the various
8 warehouses they have in town on Dorset Street, in the
9 Centre Pier and I don't know where else, and that that
10 material is also going to the low-level waste. Well,
11 excuse me, but that is not historic waste. And when I
12 read the agreement, and I read it over in the office the
13 other day with Glen Case, and it doesn't say anywhere in
14 there that Cameco's process waste will be going to the
15 low-level waste site in Port Hope.

16 Personally, I agree it should go there.
17 Let's get rid of it. But it's not a freebie. I'm sure
18 Glen Case or AECL can come up with a fee for disposal that
19 Cameco is well capable of paying, and I'd like to ask
20 staff how many drums of non-recyclable waste is being
21 stored; that's Cameco's waste is being stored in the town
22 so we can differentiate between the Eldorado waste and
23 Cameco waste.

24 I think that those figures are important.

25 Okay. The Phase II decommissioning, we got

1 that straightened out last time. It's not -- the low-
2 level waste site in Port Hope is not going to be re-opened
3 at the time of Phase II decommissioning so now Cameco has
4 decided they were going to send it to Blind River. Well,
5 that's interesting. I was wondering how they engaged the
6 community of Blind River in that respect.

7 So I phoned the Mayor of Blind River, who I
8 used to know, Bob Gallagher. We used to curl together.
9 So I phoned Bob up and asked him if he had heard about
10 Port Hope radioactive waste going to Blind River. He said
11 he had never heard of such a thing. It was news to him.

12 And the nearest neighbour actually to the
13 proposed cell that's going to be on the Blind River site
14 is the Mississagi First Nations. Well, we heard Randy
15 Smoke this morning talk about engaging these people in
16 decisions. But Cameco has already made this decision that
17 it is going to send this stuff to Blind River as it has
18 engaged nobody. So there is communications for you.

19 I think that is an insult to anybody up
20 there on the north shore. Toronto garbage -- Toronto
21 decided they were going to send their garbage to Kirkland
22 Lake some years ago. It didn't happen. Even though
23 Kirkland Lake wanted to receive it, it didn't happen
24 because northern Ontario doesn't want Port Hope's garbage
25 or Cameco's garbage or anybody else's garbage.

1 Elliot Lake decided many years ago that
2 they didn't want Port Hope's garbage. They have the
3 biggest deposit of low-level waste in the world sitting up
4 there and when they were decommissioning RIO I naively
5 went to them and suggested that they take Port Hope's
6 waste up there and put it into the tailings, that it would
7 be an insignificant amount compared to what's there
8 already. They laughed at me. "Get out of town", they
9 said. "Don't want to hear about it." They don't want to
10 hear about it. They want the nuclear industry shutdown in
11 Elliot Lake and forgotten about. There is a whole lot of
12 widows up there that want to forget about it for sure.

13 Anyway, that's an example of Cameco's
14 communications.

15 I'd like to also point out that it doesn't
16 make any sense to me to have a private company, a public
17 company or whoever to build a radioactive waste site.
18 These sites have to be intact just like we read all about
19 this from Glen Case's Port Hope initiative, that this
20 mound that they're going to build in Port Hope has to be
21 maintained -- monitored, maintained and at least they
22 treat it for somewhere between 400 and 500 years. Well, I
23 tell you, Cameco is not going to be around for 500 years.
24 They'd be lucky to be around for maybe 20 years because
25 most of these companies get bought out by somebody else

1 and we don't want some other country -- company -- running
2 our low-level waste sites in Canada.

3 The only -- if we are going to build low-
4 level radioactive waste sites, the only people that can do
5 that for the long term is the Government of Canada. Who
6 can even be sure the Government of Canada is going to
7 exist 500 years from now?

8 But anyway, it doesn't make any sense to
9 have a private company or a public company have a
10 radioactive waste site and I can't understand how this
11 Commission or the CNSC can even contemplate that.

12 So that's what I'd like to say about
13 commissioning, about the waste that's already there. What
14 I'd like to say, that before we produce more material that
15 has to be decommissioned in the future; in other words,
16 before we build one more -- when we take 2210 -- 2010
17 Cameco is going to decommission their site of the Eldorado
18 buildings, unused buildings, and they're going to rebuild
19 new structures. Well, if they were to open up a new plant
20 somewhere else they would have to have a decommissioning
21 plan in place before those structures or that plant could
22 be built.

23 They haven't got a decommissioning plan.
24 Some idea that they're going to ship stuff to Blind River
25 is not a plan. They don't even know if it can even be

1 located on that site. There's been no EA done. There's
2 been no consultation done. It's right on the riverbank of
3 the Mississagi River which is one kilometre from Lake
4 Huron and that's a threat to the lake. It's a threat to
5 the river. It's amazing how that's only a little ways
6 from the Serpent River where the big wheel tailings dam is
7 overlooking that particular river, and if that ever lets
8 go it's going to wash out right out into Lake Huron and
9 take half the Serpent River First Nation's land and our
10 community with it.

11 So I don't know if we want that. We
12 shouldn't have to be building all these radioactive plant
13 sites on our rivers.

14 Okay, I have another issue; security.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I'm sorry, sir, you have
16 one minute. Please summarize.

17 **MR. JOHNCOX:** Okay. Security, I'm
18 concerned about the security of the Cameco site here and I
19 think everybody should be. Depleted uranium, Canadian
20 depleted uranium is being used for weapons over in Iraq
21 and in Afghanistan.

22 These weapons are massive. Each bullet
23 weighs over a kilogram and they can pump out 1,500 rounds
24 a minute, bunker-busting bombs. I don't know how much
25 they weight; they weight a lot.

1 We are spreading our depleted uranium all
2 over a country that we're supposed to be helping. If it's
3 going to cost that much to clean up Port Hope how the hell
4 are we ever going to clean up Iraq or Afghanistan?

5 I believe that we are committing a crime
6 here. We are contaminating civilians, children all over
7 Iraq, all over Afghanistan and it's Canadian people that
8 are doing that and our own soldiers are going in there,
9 our own people are going in there to clean up and do
10 reconstruction and we're contaminating them.

11 Those dosimeters that the soldiers are
12 wearing, that's no help at all because when they go in
13 there, those UO₂ bullets have burnt into a very fine
14 powder and they inhale that --

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, sir.

16 **MR. JOHNCOX:** -- and that's a crime against
17 humanity which is a war crime and you people are involved
18 in that.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, sir.

20 The floor is now open for questions.

21 Mr. Harvey.

22 **MEMBER HARVEY:** In the text of Mr.
23 Johncox's submission you can read the CNSC appears to
24 accept Cameco's word at par and later in lieu of
25 investigation they're out to uncover very obvious

1 shortcomings.

2 I would like the staff to explain the
3 nature of their work; the type of inspection or
4 investigation they do and the nature of their relation
5 with Cameco.

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

7 Monsieur Harvey, is this just on the
8 decommissioning issue or in broad -- our compliance
9 program in general?

10 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Compliance program.

11 **MR. HOWDEN:** Okay, thank you.

12 Yes, what we have is, part of the
13 regulatory program following any licensing activity, the
14 licence is issued with restrictions on the operations of
15 the facility.

16 Our compliance program, what we have for
17 this particular facility is we do quarterly Type-two
18 compliance inspections which are basically the routine
19 inspections, done by Mr. O'Brien.

20 Also, we have a series of what we call
21 Type-one inspections and these are commonly called audits
22 on specific programs or combination of programs, and if
23 you'll note in our supplementary CMD we did a combined
24 training, quality management and another program audit
25 that we've reported to you. That's a typical Type-one

1 inspection.

2 As well, the staff -- and those are done,
3 not -- with specialists who have specialty in the areas
4 and they involve the project officers. Normally we'd send
5 a team of maybe three or four people for an audit which is
6 usually about a week long, at the facility.

7 As well, we review, what we call desktop
8 reviews; are quarterly and yearly compliance reports that
9 are sent in by the licensee. We review event reports; we
10 also look at any other information.

11 So when we actually to go the site with the
12 Type-two and Type-one inspections, part of the job is to
13 do verification that the licensee is indeed implementing
14 the programs that they have been approved by the CNSC.
15 And that involves interviewing people, reviewing
16 documentation, doing the physical tours of the facility
17 with Cameco personnel. Walking down the systems as
18 required.

19 We focus on what we see as high-risk areas
20 or areas where there have been events or we see trends and
21 then we focus on those areas. So not every inspection is
22 the same; there's certain components are the same each
23 time. For example, because the security folks don't go
24 there all the time, Mr. O'Brien would look at certain
25 things on their behalf and report back. But then, we

1 would look at other specific things and follow-up on any
2 action items or deficiencies that we've noted before.

3 So it's quite a comprehensive program and
4 it's done with our qualified staff.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. McDILL.

6 **MEMBER MCDILL:** Thank you.

7 This intervenor and others in their
8 submission have -- the written submissions have raised
9 questions about the monitors in town and around town. And
10 I wonder if I could ask Cameco to comment and then staff
11 to comment on.

12 We have, for example, .E is raised and
13 similar questions are raised by other intervenors
14 throughout, so perhaps you could just discuss that and
15 then we could ask staff to comment as well.

16 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vektor for the record.

17 Cameco uses lime candles as a measurement
18 of ambient fluorides in the air.

19 As we showed in our presentation those
20 stations are located primarily in the areas of maximum
21 deposition which occur closest to our facility.

22 Lime candles, during the non-growing season
23 are placed out and we recover those samples on a weekly
24 and a monthly basis. During the growing season which is a
25 greater concern, fluorides is a concern with vegetation,

1 we're collecting those samples on a daily basis.

2 **MEMBER MCDILL:** Thank you.

3 Perhaps I could -- what is the state-of-
4 the-art of those monitors?

5 **MR. VETOR:** Cameco has found these to be
6 very reliable. We have a very large database and history
7 using these things and they have been -- they do have the
8 ability to inform us when we have elevated emissions from
9 the facility and that is the main purpose for having those
10 out there. The levels are very low, as we've shown, we've
11 reduced our fluoride emissions by more than 60 per cent
12 over the licence period so we're measuring very low
13 levels; they're typically coming back at ground levels.
14 But if there is an increase in the emissions from the
15 facility they are detected by these lime candle samplers.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Staff, our staff to
17 comment.

18 **MEMBER MCDILL:** I think you were going to
19 say one more thing. I was just waiting.

20 **MR. VETOR:** With respect to state-of-the-
21 art, there are newer technologies available that could be
22 employed but we have had very good success with these lime
23 candles and for that reason we haven't seen any reason to
24 replace them.

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

1 I'll ask Dr. Thompson to comment.

2 **DR. THOMPSON:** Patsy Thompson for the
3 record.

4 We do confirm what Cameco has just said.
5 There are other, I guess, more modern ways of monitoring
6 fluorides but the program that Cameco has in place is
7 suitable for the purposes of regulating and controlling
8 emissions and verifying that the impacts on vegetation and
9 human health are as they should be, very low.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

11 We are going to take a 10-minute break.

12 I'm sorry, sir, we'll be right back in 10
13 minutes.

14 --- Hearing recessed at 10:33 a.m.

15 --- Hearing resumed at 10:47 a.m.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Take your seats please,
17 we are ready to start.

18 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you.

19 The following two submissions which are 06-
20 H18.32 and .33 by Ms. and Mr. McDonald will be presented
21 this evening as per their request some time ago.

22 The next submission is a submission from
23 Mr. Farley Mowat, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.34. As Mr.
24 Mowat is not here today, the submission will be considered
25 as a written submission.

1

2

06-H18.34

3

Written submission from

4

Farley Mowat

5

6

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is a

7

submission from Mr. Stephen Smith, as outlined in CMD 06-

8

H18.35. Mr. Smith is not able to be here today so his

9

submission will be considered as a written submission

10

later today.

11

12

06-H18.35

13

Written submission from

14

Stephen Smith

15

MR. LEBLANC: So we will move to the next

16

submission, which is an oral presentation from Mr. Albert

17

Barracough, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.36.

18

Mr. Barracough, the floor is yours, sir.

19

20

06-H18.36

21

Oral presentation by

22

Albert Barracough

23

24

MR. BARRACLOUGH: Thank you.

25

Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I

1 am Bert Barraclough, resident, home owner and concerned
2 citizen of Port Hope. I have a few thoughts to add to my
3 written submission, which you have already read.

4 I stated that F.A.R.E. is not anti-nuclear.
5 I would like to repeat that. F.A.R.E. is not anti-
6 nuclear. It is a volunteer group endeavouring to bring
7 healthier and safer environment to this town.

8 Perhaps we are ahead of our time in
9 thinking this way. If Cameco was such a clean and healthy
10 place of employment, why is it necessary to constantly
11 monitor the health of its employees? We feel that Port
12 Hope is not an entirely clean and healthy place to live.
13 Why cannot we residents get health testing done? Is
14 someone afraid of what the results might be?

15 Emissions are going up, not down, and with
16 Cameco's expectation of increased demand for its product,
17 emissions will only continue to rise. Cameco will not
18 decrease pollution with Vision 2010. Knocking down old
19 unused buildings, landscaping does nothing to correct
20 emission problems. You cannot make a silk purse out of a
21 sow's ear.

22 Fire safety; when was or has there been a
23 time when Cameco met on time your request for an upgrade
24 in fire protection programs? Is it in compliance now with
25 the standard prescribed by CNSC Commission Member

1 documents?

2 Port Hope should be entitled to nothing
3 less than A+ ratings in regards to health and safety,
4 particularly when we consider Cameco's geographical
5 location in the town; the only facility of this type in
6 North America with no buffer zone around it.

7 I ask you, as members of this Commission,
8 if Cameco had come to your town and wants to build a
9 similar refining and manufacturing facility, what would
10 your response be? No buffer zone, highly toxic materials
11 being hauled through the middle of town. I think I know
12 what the answer would be.

13 Relocation under these circumstances
14 should, I believe, be considered. With increased
15 potential for terrorist attack, it should be seriously
16 considered.

17 I am quoting directly from Toronto Sun
18 article, Kathleen Harris, Ottawa Bureau dated September
19 the 9th, 2006. This I find rather amusing in the sense
20 that maybe due to our own biased printed media here that
21 this, I consider, a major news item, was never reported,
22 to my knowledge. I quote:

23 "Ottawa. The Federal Government is
24 imposing tough regulations for
25 Canada's nuclear facilities to fend

1 off future terrorist attacks. The
2 sweeping safety regimes set out by
3 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
4 published this week in a government
5 newsletter included an onsite armed
6 response force, intensified screening
7 for employees and contractors and
8 stronger physical protection against
9 forced vehicle penetration. Added
10 measures will cost the industry \$300
11 million in capital costs and another
12 \$60 million annually to comply. The
13 possibility of nuclear facility
14 receiving a threat has increased
15 significantly since the terrorist
16 events of September '01, as well as
17 other global terrorist events that
18 have occurred since that time said
19 CNSC spokesman, Aurele Gervais."

20 Many emergency security measures are
21 ordered for high risk nuclear facilities in the wake of
22 9/11, but the new regulations make the requirements
23 permanent and add new steps to bring Canada in line with
24 international safety practices. The penalty set out under
25 the *Nuclear Safety Control Act* could result in fines up to

1 \$1 million a day for violations or could require an
2 offending plant to cease operation.

3 I am pleased to see that you have already
4 set in motion steps to do what I have thought should be
5 done. Of course, you cannot tell me, the public, what
6 they are. Perhaps you can answer one question I have for
7 you. When can we anticipate these requirements being put
8 into effect at Port Hope's nuclear facility?

9 Given the planned decommissioning of the
10 waterfront plant during the terms of this licence now
11 would seem to be the time for Cameco and Zircotec to
12 consolidate their operations in Westleyville, retaining
13 jobs and economic spin off from its operations within our
14 community and creating a nuclear facility which could be
15 the pride of Canada. I suspect such a cost would be a tad
16 more than the \$300 million suggested in this article, but
17 for Cameco, the annual compliance figure could be likely
18 recouped through planning of a brand new facility, and as
19 I suggested our federal government should be willing to
20 anti up most of the costs. After all, it got us into this
21 mess through the Crown Corporation, Eldorado. It should
22 get us out.

23 In closing, I believe a five-year licence
24 term should be out of the question. A two-year term
25 should initially be put in place, and after Cameco has

1 demonstrated that it is in compliance with fire, health,
2 safety and security, then consider extensions year by
3 year. I for one, place a much greater value on this town
4 and its residents than on any industry.

5 I wish to thank you, Members of the
6 Commission, for your time and patience and listening to my
7 intervention.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much, sir,
9 for your intervention today and for your written
10 submission.

11 Perhaps I just might want to start on the
12 security area, since it was ordered by the Commission here
13 today. So I think it's the Commission who should answer,
14 rather than the staff on that perspective.

15 Immediately after -- we certainly did have
16 security regulations in place before September 11th, but I
17 think everyone had a wake-up call, and I think that's a
18 reality, and the Commission met literally two weeks
19 afterwards and put in an order, so what you read in that
20 article was actually started five years before that. But I
21 think one of the problems with short media articles, is
22 they don't give the full story of the risk of various
23 facilities.

24 So those orders that were in place are not
25 applicable to either Cameco here or Cameco mines. They

1 are requirements that are in place for the nuclear power
2 stations, of which we have 22 in Canada, and the ACL
3 facility, because they have been judged by a group of
4 experts in their assessment, as to the types of materials
5 that are there and the facilities that are there. The
6 Commission is fortunate to have a group of experts and
7 they have consulted other experts, and one of them is here
8 today of course, Mr. O'Dacre, to look at the various
9 facilities.

10 So the requirements for armed forces and a
11 number of the other issues were requirements made for
12 nuclear power stations and for AECL. However, every
13 facility, every facility that was regulated in Canada was
14 also required to go through an assessment. And I will
15 turn it over to the staff in terms of the specifics of
16 this facility, but every facility in Canada that is
17 regulated by us, every use of material, every
18 radiographer, every person that was involved in every
19 health clinic that uses nuclear materials in Canada has
20 gone through a review that was actually led by the CNSC
21 staff to do that.

22 So what you saw was the upper echelon in
23 terms of the announcements, but there could have been
24 announcements much like that for every facility across
25 Canada.

1 So I'll ask Mr. Howden to comment with
2 regards to what material he can talk about with regards to
3 this facility in that way.

4 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you. Barclay Howden
5 speaking.

6 I'll just give some initial information and
7 ask Mr. O'Dacre to comment, but yes, following the 9/11
8 incident, CNSC staff did a three-phase assessment of
9 security, the first phase being done very quickly with the
10 order issued by the Commission.

11 During the second phase, which looked at
12 the second tier of facilities, which included the Cameco
13 Port Hope facility, there was actually a designated
14 officer order issued at that time. That's issued by
15 staff.

16 The third phase was the lower tier
17 facilities and that did not capture this particular
18 facility but it looked broadly at all of them. So that
19 was the three phases. The designated officer order was
20 issued about a month following the Commission's order to
21 the nuclear power plants.

22 The amended Nuclear Security Regulations
23 that are going into effect -- actually, I think they just
24 went into effect on November 27. Some of the secondary
25 phase requirements from the designated officer order did

1 find their way into those Nuclear Security Regulations but
2 certainly not the ones that were written about in the
3 article.

4 So I'll ask Mr. O'Dacre if he could just
5 generally speak about this facility and some of our
6 requirements.

7 **MR. O'DACRE:** For the record, my name is
8 John O'Dacre, Acting Director, Nuclear Security Division
9 of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

10 Mr. Howden alluded to the fact that the
11 amended Nuclear Security Regulations now include and are
12 applicable to the Cameco Port Hope facility. Those
13 amended Nuclear Security Regulations are a matter of
14 public record, but just for the audience's benefit, they
15 talk about things where -- about intrusion detection,
16 enhanced vehicle searches, enhanced background checks of
17 employees that work at facilities such as the Port Hope
18 Cameco facility.

19 And as I stated yesterday, these
20 regulations came into effect Monday of this same week on
21 the 27th of November and Cameco meets both the former
22 regulations, as well as these new amended Nuclear Security
23 Regulations.

24 And they were based on a risk-based
25 approach and we were requested by the Commission to look

1 at facilities and, as a result, Cameco is now included in
2 the amended Nuclear Security Regulations.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So I know that the
4 intervenor -- I don't want to put words in your mouth but
5 I think that your expectations would be that there would
6 be armed security guards in Port Hope. Perhaps I'm wrong,
7 sir, but that will not be a requirement of the CNSC for
8 this facility at this time.

9 We would expect there would be continual
10 evaluation of the security, but at this time, based on the
11 expert advice of people who are experts in the security
12 field, that will not be a requirement here in this
13 facility. But I don't want to assume that that's what you
14 were suggesting.

15 **MR. BARRACLOUGH:** Madam Chair, I am
16 disappointed in your reaction to Port Hope. We are being
17 placed, I think, again in a second-class position in
18 regards to generating stations being the all prime
19 concern.

20 We are nothing -- by the sound of it, we're
21 nothing more than a little old mill town here that has to
22 put up with higher degrees of pollution than the
23 generating stations have to come under. Their pollution
24 standards are much lower than we have -- than we're
25 allowed here.

1 I would think that due to geographic
2 location and everything else involved with this operation
3 in our town should be a major consideration at this time
4 and by the sound of it, I would say upgraded to at least a
5 standard that is going to protect us from possible
6 terrorist attack.

7 The Cameco plant, as I put in my written
8 presentation, is vulnerable to air, sea and land. There's
9 over-flights, vehicle traffic into that plant, Lord only
10 knows what is going in and out and who knows what comes
11 in, in these boats that come in the channel.

12 Thank you very much.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, sir.

14 May I ask staff if the assessments of risks
15 that were done for the facility included the possible
16 risks and the robustness study that we heard about
17 yesterday looked into the possible implications for this
18 facility? Were those considered in your risk assessment
19 of this facility for security matters?

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

21 Yes, they were.

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Can staff assure the
23 Commission and the citizens of Port Hope that if at any
24 time that risk assessment changed that there would be a
25 re-evaluation?

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

2 Yes, we can provide that assurance. Mr.
3 O'Dacre, with his work with the various police agencies
4 and CSIS, looks at the threats and vulnerabilities and we
5 continue to assess the threats against all of the nuclear
6 facilities with the Port Hope conversion facility being
7 one of those.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I'd just like to mention
9 to the intervenor because I, like my colleagues are, work
10 in Ottawa and spend time looking at a broad level with
11 other agency heads, and continually the work that is done
12 by the CNSC is looked at as very forward in terms of the
13 security area. There's been probably more security work
14 put in place on nuclear facilities than comparable energy
15 facilities and other facilities around.

16 I wish to assure you that we don't consider
17 Port Hope as -- it is not Port Hope that is assessed for
18 the security rating. It's the facility, its threats at
19 the facilities, and then the CNSC is looking to protect
20 both the workers and the citizens against security
21 attacks.

22 So it's not an assessment of Port Hope
23 versus Clarington versus Pickering versus whatever. It is
24 an assessment of that facility and clearly the CNSC takes
25 very seriously that these assessments are done and the

1 work is done. And what we've heard is that this facility
2 has met the requirements for security of that facility.

3 Unfortunately, as I mentioned at the
4 beginning, in order to protect the facilities, we do not
5 go into great detail as we do with other items in this,
6 because we don't want to give those people who might want
7 to hamper that facility any information about how it is
8 protected. So it is unusual for the Commission not to be
9 as transparent on security matters.

10 Are there any other questions or comments
11 for this intervenor? Yes, Mr. Graham?

12 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes. Just for the record,
13 in the intervenor's intervention, written intervention, he
14 mentions the -- he asks the question -- I know it's in our
15 documentation but for the record though, it said that the
16 comments were made that fluoride had been reduced in half.

17 What half is an un-stated quantity and I
18 wonder if you could refer -- that's on the first page down
19 almost at the very last or the second-last paragraph. I
20 wonder if Cameco could comment on what the emissions have
21 been of fluoride and what they are today, give us maybe a
22 scenario of that?

23 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vetor, for the record.

24 I refer to Table 4 in the original CMD
25 18.1. In the third row, the gram per hour emission rate

1 for hydrogen fluoride is shown in 2002 as 138 grams per
2 hour as the average for the year. You'll see in 2003 and
3 in following years 70 grams per hours, 43 grams per hour,
4 59 and 52.

5 So those are the actual numbers for the
6 reduction.

7 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes, I knew that they were
8 in the report, but that's why I was just -- for the
9 record, for the benefit of the intervenor.

10 Thank you.

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

12 **MR. LEBLANC:** Before you leave, Mr.
13 Barraclough, you are also scheduled to present the same
14 submission tomorrow with respect to the Zircatec matter.

15 Do you wish us to use your presentation
16 today for tomorrow or do you wish to present tomorrow?

17 **MR. BARRACLOUGH:** No, I have a separate
18 presentation for Zircatec.

19 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you, sir. We'll see
20 you tomorrow then.

21 We will move to the next submission, which
22 is an oral presentation from Ms. Louise Barraclough, as
23 outlined in CMD 06-H18.37.

24 The floor is yours, Ma'am.

25

1 **06-H18-37**

2 Oral presentation by

3 Louise Barraclough

4

5 **MS. BARRACLOUGH:** Thank you, Mr. Leblanc.

6 Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I
7 am Louise Barraclough, also a resident and homeowner in
8 Port Hope.

9 I appreciate that you are holding these
10 relicensing hearings here rather than Ottawa. Thank you
11 very much.

12 I hope before you leave that you will be
13 able to take the time to walk about our town to see for
14 yourselves what a lovely well preserved bit of Upper
15 Canada it is.

16 My husband and I, both retired, have
17 enjoyed leaving here for these past three years, except
18 for the presence of Cameco brooding on the waterfront.

19 We have nothing more than a gut feeling but
20 it is that a nuclear facility should not be located on the
21 shore of a lake, on floodplain, at the mouth of a spawning
22 river, adjacent to two major rail lines in the middle of a
23 town. You've heard this again and again but being
24 Cameco's buffer zone does bother us, and it's about the
25 only thing about Port Hope that does, to be perfectly

1 honest with you.

2 That said, we are here to listen to the
3 arguments, pro and con, the relicensing of Cameco, now
4 Cameco/Zircatec, for another five-year term, and this is
5 just a year after we almost heard the arguments, pro and
6 con, the production of SEU.

7 At that time there were a mere 105
8 intervenors filed and five were written presentations. Of
9 the 100 oral submissions, 96 intervenors expressed
10 concerns about the project or asked that specific and
11 detailed questions be answered before the CNSC granted the
12 licence, or asked for a full panel review or even of a
13 judicial hearing of the application. So we aren't alone
14 here in our concerns.

15 A year later there are still more than 70
16 people still asking many of the same questions who have
17 taken the time, done the research and gone through the
18 agonizing and rather intimidating process of preparing
19 oral interventions for your Commission, whose mandate is
20 to make very important decisions for the nuclear industry,
21 but also to safe guide the persons in this community.

22 Public safety, particularly safety from the
23 threat of fire, has been very much on Port Hoper's minds
24 recently, and I had planned to discuss the 205 Jacques
25 Whitford Consultant Report on Safety, Health,

1 Transportation and the Environment commissioned by the
2 community, but that point has been -- that pointed up the
3 lack of adequate fire protection at Cameco, but I
4 mentioned in my intervention the very poor ratings your
5 staff gave Cameco and Zircatec on safety, et cetera. But
6 all of these things were covered yesterday and in
7 lightening question-and-answer session among the
8 Commission and its staff and the licensees.

9 And I also mentioned I wanted to talk about
10 Cameco, how Cameco and our excellent fire department
11 collaborated to train firefighters to Hazmat standards and
12 the reluctance of the municipality to match Cameco's
13 funding with the necessary equipment or the legal
14 framework within which they do our job, and I don't have
15 to elaborate on this either because this too has been
16 covered by Fire Chief Frank Haylow's remarks and Mr.
17 Morand's intervention.

18 Emissions: I referred to a talk in my
19 written presentation that some time ago was given by Dr.
20 Gordon Edwards, who is the President of the Canadian
21 Coalition for Nuclear Responsibilities. He gave us a
22 lengthy dissertation on the dangers of inhaling fine
23 uranium particulate. I frankly don't know anything, much
24 about it, but the man convinced me. He made me a real
25 believer of me. And I think that zero uranium emissions

1 should be Cameco's goal. I'm not a scientist but if it
2 can be done, let's get it done.

3 The hazardous material that can be deadly
4 toxic most quickly, I think, is hydrofluoric acid and it's
5 the one that kind of scares me because it comes in by tank
6 cars into Cameco and I heard a great discussion this
7 morning from Pat Lawson about HF and I hadn't even thought
8 about that, but I have heard more I guess about straight
9 hydrofluoric acid. And we have heard a little bit about
10 how it's stored, and I presume your staff has scrutinized
11 Cameco's storage facilities thoroughly.

12 But can you guarantee in any way that in
13 the event of a catastrophic fire, earthquake, hurricane,
14 or terrorist attack that it won't get loose on the wind?
15 Can you direct your staff to do a study of how such a
16 catastrophe could be compared to the situation in Bhopal?
17 I think it's the one thing that could totally destroy this
18 town, is if such a catastrophe occurred.

19 Cameco is planning decommissioning of its
20 Eldorado legacy in the course of this five-year licensing
21 application. It's all -- who are preparing for an
22 anticipated large increase in production of its products
23 and those of Zircatec, and of course during the same
24 period the LLRW program may finally get off the ground.

25 All of these projects have huge unknown

1 consequences for the safety and health of the citizens of
2 Port Hope. In all probability we will relicence these
3 facilities because we're going to have a nuclear industry
4 for a good long time and it's really too late to get away
5 from that.

6 But given the unknowns I've mentioned and
7 the rather poorish records of compliance by Cameco in the
8 past, I would ask that you not give it carte blanche
9 renewal for five years. So I would ask you to please
10 consider a term of no more than two years with very rigid
11 terms of reference.

12 Thank you for your time and patience in
13 hearing me out.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you for coming and
15 giving us a submission.

16 Are there any questions or comments?

17 Yes, Dr. Barnes.

18 **MEMBER BARNES:** I think I'd like to address
19 the issue of the fugitive emissions, and I'd ask Cameco if
20 they would put an image on the screen that you used
21 yesterday. It was in between the two on page 7. It's
22 this one which indicated the recalculated fugitive
23 emissions. Yes, that's the one there.

24 So I wonder if you could explain for us why
25 that issue of the -- let me just back up. We notice on

1 this graph that from 202 to 206 that there is significant
2 proportion of the UF₆ plant uranium emissions to air are
3 made up of fugitive emissions that are essentially
4 dependent on this new calculation and, as you indicate, in
5 the text just below the box at the top right, fugitive
6 emission calculations for 2006 are based on the 203 ESDM
7 report.

8 Why was this not appreciated earlier in
9 terms of this amount which is very significant? It's in
10 the order of a third to a half of the emissions in 2002
11 and 2006 from that particular facility.

12 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vetor for the record.

13 I'd like to start by emphasizing that this
14 is not a change to the amount of uranium that was emitted
15 from the facility. This is a change in the amount that we
16 have reported, that Cameco has reported.

17 Cameco, as part of the process to obtain
18 our site-wide comprehensive approval in 2003, we developed
19 an entirely new emission summary and dispersion modelling
20 report. We previously had an emission summary but that
21 emission summary did not meet the newer, more stringent
22 requirements of the Ministry of the Environment at that
23 time. Cameco elected to develop a new inventory from the
24 ground up rather than revising the existing emission
25 inventory.

1 At that time, we realized that the
2 emissions from the heating and ventilation unit, primarily
3 from the UF₆ plant, formed a significant portion of the
4 fugitive emissions from the facility and, indeed, a
5 significant portion of the total uranium emissions from
6 the facility.

7 We also recognize that those sources had
8 never been sourced tested, compliance source tested as we
9 conduct on our main stacks on a periodic basis. Since
10 they formed a significant portion or at least in this new
11 emission summary dispersion modelling report, that's what
12 it was telling us, we thought it was prudent to bring the
13 compliance stack testers in and we did that in 2004. It
14 was the largest source testing campaign that we have
15 undertaken and the result of that source testing, we bring
16 in an independent third party and the results confirm that
17 the emission estimates in the ESDM report, Emission
18 Summary Dispersion Modelling Report, were indeed very
19 accurate.

20 So that gave us the confidence to move
21 forward in 2005 and make the appropriate changes to the
22 calculations of air emissions from our facility.

23 Another little nuance that needs to be
24 understood is that the emission summary dispersion
25 modelling report was prepared for preventional purposes

1 and the province regulates on point of impingement
2 concentration and in order to ensure the regulators that
3 the facility is in compliance, that ESDM report is based
4 on the worst case climatic conditions. It's a five-year
5 meteorological dataset and it's also based on the
6 assumption that all of the emission points are operating
7 simultaneously. So it's a very conservative approach.

8 In order to take those calculations in the
9 ESDM report and apply them to our stack, it's not a direct
10 one-to-one relationship because when you're measuring the
11 stack you're interested in what's actually being emitted
12 as opposed to that conservative worst case scenario.

13 So that took some modifications to those
14 calculations.

15 The increase you see in 2005 and '06 is an
16 extrapolated -- those red bars are extrapolated. In fact,
17 we had started measuring those values in 2005 and '06 and
18 we felt it was important to go back and recalculate the
19 values for 2002, '03 and '04 so that all the data for this
20 licensing period was shown on the same basis.

21 I'd like to point out that the stack
22 emissions which are shown by the solid blue bar on this
23 graph, that is the emission point at which the action
24 levels apply to. So when we look at 50 grams per hour,
25 which is the full scale on this particular graph, you can

1 see that from 2000 to 2006 our emissions have been less
2 than 5 per cent -- or sorry -- less than 10 per cent, less
3 than 5 grams per hour from that source, and that's the
4 action level. That's not the limit. The action level is
5 a fraction of the limit. So the emissions from the UF₆
6 facility are very small.

7 As we move forward with our strategy to
8 reduce our emissions, this is valuable information. You
9 cannot reduce what you are not measuring. We have new,
10 more accurate information and this is pointing us in a new
11 direction. This is telling us that we've done a good job
12 at reducing our stack emissions. They've come down from
13 about 22 grams per hour in 1995 and we're now averaging
14 less than 5 grams per hour.

15 The fugitive emissions are now the most
16 significant portion of our emissions from the UF₆ plant
17 and that's where our attention will be focused. The
18 difference is not with values in the ESDM report. The
19 ESDM report was confirmed to be accurate. It's the
20 difference between the previous emission summary and the
21 new ESDM report that we have now and there's primarily two
22 differences.

23 The first one was these HVAC emissions and
24 the second one was the method that Cameco was using to
25 calculate the emissions from the incinerator prior to the

1 ESDM report and, at that time, there was a relationship
2 between -- prior to the ESDM report there was a
3 relationship between the quantity of uranium in the ash
4 from the incinerator and the amount of uranium in the
5 stack as based on compliance source testing.

6 Subsequent source testing: We have been
7 doing this on an ongoing basis since the early nineties,
8 and as more and more data became available it was clear
9 that that relationship we had originally developed was not
10 as accurate as we had hoped it would be originally. And
11 so Cameco felt it was more appropriate to adopt -- to use
12 the maximum value that the source testing has given us on
13 an ongoing basis when the incinerator is operating.

14 And I should also point out -- no, it's not
15 on this graph, but fugitive emissions on all of that,
16 that's the main difference.

17 **MEMBER BARNES:** So if I can pursue this a
18 little further, if we applied that kind of analysis to the
19 1995 to 2001 figures, which I recognize are not part of
20 the immediate past licence, how would those new additions
21 appear on that histogram?

22 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vektor for the record.

23 Thank you. That's a good question and, as
24 I mentioned, the 2005 and 2006 data was extrapolated. I
25 looked at the 2002, '03 and '04 data and the red bar is

1 roughly two-thirds of the fugitive emissions. So you
2 could take all of those blue hatch bars in the previous
3 years and multiply those by two, roughly, and it would
4 give you a similar emission and would be reasonably
5 accurate to do that.

6 **MEMBER BARNES:** A question to staff, a
7 question.

8 A previous intervenor -- I didn't pick it
9 up at that time but, certainly -- I think it was Miss
10 Barraclough indicated a concern about the lack of third
11 party involvement in the analyses that are being made by
12 the licensee, and this is a case where in order to meet
13 requirements of the provincial ministry a third party was
14 involved and the measurements, et cetera, were witnessed
15 by the MOE.

16 Does this give staff any concern of the
17 size of this factor that appeared to have been overlooked
18 in the past, a concern of that as an issue but also a
19 concern whether staff are exercising sufficient
20 investigation to make sure that the values of total
21 emissions to air really are complete?

22 **MR. O'BRIEN:** Marty O'Brien for the record.

23 In regards to what CNSC staff does to
24 verify the monitoring information, there is basically two
25 things done. We require the licensee, in this case

1 Cameco, to do third party verification of stack emissions
2 which they have an independent third party come in on a
3 regular basis annually, typically, to verify the numbers
4 they are getting from their own stack emission monitoring.

5 In some cases they have an MOE doing a
6 third party independent verification. For example, they
7 do annual vegetation surveys of the leaf sampling around
8 the facility and MOE does sort of split sample and also
9 verifies the numbers.

10 And during our routine inspection
11 activities we also do independent monitoring. We take
12 gamma radiation measurements. We bring instruments to the
13 site. We take water samples, split water samples with
14 Cameco and analyse them and we have a lab at the CNSC. We
15 do similar things for, say, high volume uranium and air
16 samplers. We will take a split sample and do independent
17 verification on that line.

18 Thank you.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

20 Any further questions?

21 Thank you very much.

22 **MR. LEBLANC:** I would like to ask if the
23 Commodore, Mr. Robert McCaw, of the Port Hope Yacht Club,
24 is in the room? We have not been able to locate you and
25 your are the next submission. So unless -- so Mr. McCaw

1 had been scheduled to present CMD 06-H18.38. As he is
2 absent, we will consider his submission as a written
3 submission later in this hearing.

4 So we will move to the next submission,
5 which is an oral presentation from Mr. Phill Boyko, as
6 outlined in CMD 06-H18.39.

7 Mr. Boyko, the floor is yours, sir.

8

9 **06-H18.39**

10 Oral presentation by

11 Phill Boyko

12

13 **MR. BOYKO:** Merci.

14 Madam Chairman, Members of the Commission,
15 I'd like to thank you for having us here and hearing this
16 presentation.

17 Je m'appelle Jean Phillip Alain Boyko.

18 My name is Phillip Alain Boyko and when I
19 first heard about this, I phoned the Commission offices in
20 Ottawa and they asked at what level do I submit my
21 intervention? Grade 3, grade 6? Oh, no, at a
22 professional level.

23 So my presentation is at a professional
24 level, I hope, and that the judgement is up to you. I'm
25 not making really any recommendations as to Cameco as

1 whether it should be shut down, closed down or what, but
2 these have been my findings.

3 My background is -- well, I grew up in this
4 area at a place called Lusaka Station and I did go to Port
5 Hope District High School. I left and went to Niagara
6 back in the late '50s and then to Cornell, and as you see
7 before you my research areas at Cornell, I worked along
8 with Dr. Richard Flint, who became a very good friend and
9 who got me into Brookhaven where I did research with Dr.
10 Vanwynkoop.

11 Now, for those who are not familiar with
12 Brookhaven, it's in Long Island, New York, and they did
13 research, nuclear research, and I went in with plans to
14 look into inducing sport's mutations and effects.
15 However, I didn't finish that because my body rejected the
16 environment. However, I was told that my experiments did
17 result in the white tagetes and the black rose.

18 After that, my academic led me to the
19 University of Water -- of Western -- not that other place
20 -- where I studied pliceticine and planetary geology
21 underneath Dr. Dermanis who later wished that I would take
22 his place, but I turned them down because my lifestyle is
23 a little bit different.

24 Then I also took bio-sciences and had a
25 very good friend, Dr. Battle, and then I took geography

1 because if you recall 40 years ago, there wasn't
2 environmental sciences and you had to come up with a
3 course that the regents of the university approved.

4 Now, continuing on, during the past three
5 seasons, my interest has been in discovering plant sports
6 and mutations of horticulture significance. As a plant
7 taxonomist and pathologist, I have observed a high
8 concentration of abnormalities in herbaceous plant
9 material to the west and north and much more to the east
10 of Port Hope waterfront.

11 Now, with plants I may add you can't really
12 detect it -- detect radiation or so forth. It's a
13 different process and this is what we found in Brookhaven.
14 Maybe 40 years ago or more, we didn't have the technology,
15 we didn't have the equipment, but we took symptoms.

16 Now my hope is that someday I will find
17 something that -- a mutation that I'll be able to put my
18 name to, other than a dinky little lobelia from the
19 pinery.

20 When I brought this information up to Dave
21 McLaughlin last spring or early summer, he stated that he
22 realized that these were problems, but because of
23 budgetary finances and staff limitations and
24 qualifications, he wasn't able to do these studies. So
25 they had to keep on with the studies that they started

1 out.

2 It makes me wonder if this is happening to
3 producers. For example, the Acer Negundo or the Manitoba
4 Maple or Ash Leaf Maple, the same tree, when it has an
5 infection, it just drops its leaflets. Continuously it's
6 dropping its leaflets, but it is also putting on new
7 leaflets.

8 In the construction of Expo when we moved
9 those large trees to La Ronde, we stripped the trees and
10 this was in July and almost immediately within weeks they
11 were putting out new leaves. So you just can't go out
12 once or twice a year and look at plants and say, "Oh,
13 well, this is the situation." It has to be a continuous
14 process.

15 Now, and part of this going into this
16 before, to understand what goes on, you have to study the
17 nuclide gases formation and so forth and I had the
18 opportunity to look into the original records of Watson
19 and Creek and it wasn't the abridged information that you
20 now get in text, because in their sketches they showed
21 where the plasma was formed. It was in the lower areas,
22 not in the bombardment whether it was horizontal or
23 vertical bombardment.

24 Reading the reports that I've had, I've
25 seen and read and got from the Commission and so forth

1 over the time, I'm disappointed in the quantitative and
2 qualitative reports. It's what we used to call back in
3 the old days, it was a drive-by inspection, where you sort
4 of drove by and you looked at it and you made a report.
5 You didn't get out and take actual plant samples, plant
6 analysis, plant counts, and considered the health of
7 everything.

8 Continuing on with the fluid effluent
9 discharge, well, some of you may -- I don't know whether
10 all of you, but perhaps one or two may have remembered at
11 Bronte, Ontario, there used to be tank that had fish and
12 this was because at that time city service later changed
13 to BP and eventually Shell, sent all their effluent
14 through water, filtered it, and then through this tank to
15 prove to the public that it was safe.

16 Perhaps this could be done here in Port
17 Hope, not only with just the liquids, but also through the
18 gases. If they're so safe, why not pump them through and
19 see how safe they are because this is going on in the
20 States now, as I mentioned here in the sheets, in the
21 Bluegill tanks.

22 Now, independent monitoring, I can believe,
23 but self-monitoring, I have learned over the years not to
24 trust because like peer review, it's like putting the fox
25 in with the chickens to guard the chickens. I'd rather

1 have the Rottweilers on the outside. I'd rather have had
2 the full panel review. I don't know why it was not done
3 in the first place. Perhaps it was political.

4 I guess it has been clarified why the 60
5 million milligrams of uranium part dust has changed to 120
6 million milligrams. I use the milligram unit because
7 that's more of a health concern than kilograms because
8 kilograms look so small. Perhaps we should even consider
9 how many drums does that fill.

10 Now, in site and location, we used to have
11 a beautiful sandy beach on the west side, but now if you
12 go down there, I don't think you'd want to go swimming.
13 We have postcards showing hundreds of people. I actually
14 counted -- Mr. Parrott and we counted the postcard, 121
15 people on the beach.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Sir, you have one -- sir,
17 you have one minute left please to sum up.

18 **MR. BOYKO:** Well, the whole point is there
19 is the matter of the truth and openness. They're trying
20 to be truthful. They're trying to be open, but do I trust
21 them? Maybe my experience in life has led me to not take
22 everything at face value.

23 I'd like to see where there would be more
24 help for people to lobby. Rather, they just have
25 corporations having finances to lobby your Commission.

1 Thank you.

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Sir, I just want to make
3 it clear that the Commission is independent. People don't
4 lobby us. You know, they don't lobby us. They don't give
5 us donations. We don't go for lunch. We don't -- any of
6 those lobbying things we don't do. The whole purpose of
7 the Commission is to be independent. So I just want to
8 assure you of that.

9 I was concerned about your first remark
10 where you said that you were asked what kind of an
11 intervenor you are so to be classified as professional or
12 not. I have just checked with the Secretary. That
13 certainly isn't the direction of the Commission. There is
14 no class of intervenor.

15 There is a licence applicant. There is
16 CNSC staff and then there is intervenors. And as we
17 pointed out yesterday, it's done based on who comes in
18 first and we do the oral -- we do separate oral and
19 written but there is no professional class of intervenor
20 that has different status. We think that everybody's
21 views are important.

22 So if that was the least bit given to you
23 as an implication, it is not correct.

24 **MR. BOYKO:** By grade 3, I mean the
25 understanding level because in education, you have grade 3

1 level, then grade 6 level, and then you have a higher
2 level. It's not anything to -- other than ---

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** But I want to assure you
4 and every member of the population here, there is no one,
5 six, or anything in between. Every person who puts an
6 intervention in is treated equally before the Commission.
7 There is no -- not that people haven't -- organizations
8 haven't said that they feel that they have different views
9 to put forward, but the Commission doesn't accept that.
10 The Commission accepts everybody as an equal intervenor.

11 Are they any -- Dr. Barnes?

12 **MEMBER BARNES:** Well, I take the
13 intervenor's comment to seek advice at what level to pitch
14 the intervention as opposed to the type of intervenor.

15 **MR. BOYKO:** Thank you, Dr. Barnes.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thanks. Sorry then, I
17 just -- I couldn't figure this out at all. So thanks for
18 the clarification.

19 Are there ---

20 **MR. BOYKO:** It's the -- I'm sorry -- it's
21 the terminology that I used, but if I was dealing to, for
22 example, council, I would deal at it with what we would
23 call a grade 3 level so that everybody would understand.

24 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

25 Are there any further questions?

1 Well, thank you very much, sir, for your
2 time here.

3 **MR. BOYKO:** It's been a pleasure.

4 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
5 submission which is an oral presentation from Ms. Janet
6 Fishlock, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.40.

7 Ms. Fishlock, the floor is yours.

8

9 **06-H18.40**

10 Oral presentation by

11 Janet Fishlock

12

13 **MS. FISHLOCK:** Good morning.

14 As is indicated, my name is Janet Fishlock
15 and I live here in the Municipality of Port Hope, a proud
16 member of this community and certainly prouder after
17 listening both for most of yesterday and this morning to
18 the kind of incredible interventions and issues and
19 questions that people are putting. We appreciate being
20 able to put them here in this arena and I think Dr. McDill
21 yesterday you asked questions of the very first intervenor
22 suggesting that he -- asking whether he had posed those
23 questions previously.

24 And I think part of the problem and I think
25 maybe you're getting a bit of a snapshot of that here is

1 that it's not often that there is all of these people, all
2 of this experience and expertise and insight all together
3 in the same room hearing each other in a very kind of
4 serious and sincere way. We don't have this opportunity.
5 There is a process that's lacking in this community to
6 help us resolve what I think you can see as very serious
7 issues of distrust.

8 I stood in front of you at the mid-term
9 licence hearing -- actually, sat in front of you like I am
10 now, a couple of years ago and I asked you for something
11 which I realize is very difficult to give, but I'm going
12 to put it again today to say that, you know, I needed some
13 reassurance that by raising my son in this community and
14 by letting him play on the Port Hope beach and in the
15 ravines and the public parks and breathing the air in and
16 around Cameco that I was not putting his health at risk.

17 I don't feel anymore reassured and when I
18 look at the documents that I received a number of weeks
19 ago related to this hearing, I see a chart that shows a
20 company operating at a "B" level and I'm surprised to hear
21 today -- I'm an academia and an "A" does mean something
22 and I do, on occasion, give someone an "A".

23 I'm surprised to hear that the rating
24 system that "As" are not given to the operations that you
25 license. So what does that mean for a "B" rating?

1 In the case of fire protection, I
2 understand that Cameco has been rated a "C". I looked at
3 the recommendations from your staff and I found it very
4 difficult to make an informed decision based on what I was
5 reading. I see that the recommendation is that the risk
6 posed to the environment, to the health and safety of
7 persons, to national security are not unreasonable.

8 I really struggle to understand the basis
9 of what unreasonable is and I understand there are
10 standards that are being met, but I am not convinced that
11 these standards, which can change -- and what does that
12 mean for giving a five-year licence if something can
13 change a year down the road?

14 Your staff report assures me that uranium
15 releases from the environment are being controlled but I
16 don't have a clear image of how.

17 This community is unique, as every
18 community is, but I think you must admit that there is a
19 certain uniqueness to this community and that, you know,
20 we are home to one of the only facilities of this kind in
21 Canada and one of two in North America and one of four
22 worldwide. We have an incredible history and radioactive
23 waste that is going to be cleaned up around our community.
24 We have lots of things happening in the future in terms of
25 Vision 2010.

1 It's a very complicated situation and to
2 take one piece and look at it out of context of others is
3 very challenging. I was very comforted to know that the
4 Jacques Whitford Report, which our municipality
5 commandeered, suggested that in fact there isn't
6 sufficient information and accessible information and
7 understandable information for us as citizens to be really
8 informed. And I take my citizenry very seriously, as I'm
9 sure many of you do.

10 I wanted to go sideways a little bit from
11 the submission that you have before you to talk about kind
12 of three key issues and that's the community consultation
13 process. I know a little bit about community consultation
14 and I was appreciative to hear Madam Chair talk about
15 engagement because I don't think that's been happening in
16 this community.

17 Cameco has improved and changed its
18 relationship to the community. The panels and the
19 meetings are there. I participated in the Stakeholder
20 Community Liaison Committee and in good faith and very
21 sincerely and found it to be a good process in the
22 beginning, but it did not extend into an engagement
23 process. I was not being asked to participate as a true
24 partner in this community for which I care very much about
25 and for which I feel all of us living in this community

1 need to have a role in the decisions which affect us.

2 This is, you said, Madam Chair, a two-sided
3 process. This is not -- I have not experienced it as a
4 two-sided process. We have forums where issues are put
5 out but they are not wrestled with and struggled with to
6 any kind of result in which we can all live with.

7 So I'm very concerned about future
8 processes and I think very clear recommendation has come
9 forward that a meaningful model -- and there are many
10 models out there. I'm quite familiar with participatory
11 research models. I'm very familiar with corporate
12 stakeholder engagement models. I'm also very familiar
13 with a rights-based approach to corporate and community
14 engagement and that's a part of what I'm looking at in my
15 own research in terms of mining companies overseas.

16 A rights-based approach is not just about
17 protecting the rights of communities but actually
18 extending them and I think we need to think about that
19 here. And I really appreciate it, Dr. Barnes, who
20 yesterday affirming that there is very significant public
21 concern and it's very hard to resolve.

22 We talk about zero emissions but I would
23 like -- I would appreciate hearing from you as the
24 Commission or through your staff, is zero emissions
25 technically possible? And I'm sure there are very

1 significant financial challenges to it, but is it
2 technically possible?

3 I would be interested, Dr. Dosman, I
4 understand from looking at your biography that you have
5 experience in environmental medicine and I'd really be
6 interested in knowing, have you looked at the studies that
7 are listed, the incidents, the cancer incidents reports
8 and the studies?

9 We've not -- as far as I can see, we have
10 not tested living people, live people living in Port Hope
11 and why is that? And can we make a true judgement on
12 health issues without that?

13 I just want to share with you how confusing
14 reading a lot of these reports can be because I think they
15 give a lot of mixed messages and we all know that
16 statistics and numbers can be interpreted, depending on
17 the place from which you sit.

18 This is from the cancer incidents in Port
19 Hope from 1971 to 1996 report and it says: (As Read)

20 "While there were some increases and
21 some decreases in cancer occurrence,
22 when data were subdivided into finer
23 units by gender and calendar time, the
24 observed patterns were similar to
25 those of other communities."

1 These findings are, on the whole,
2 reassuring that patterns of cancer incidents are
3 comparable to the Province of Ontario. However, the
4 limitations of ecological surveys must be kept in mind as
5 they can only paint with a broad brush the possibility
6 that environmental exposures have affected disease
7 occurrence in a community. Exposure to individuals is not
8 known.

9 Assigning cumulative radon or radiation
10 exposures, even to groups, is based on few measurements
11 and many assumptions about residential occupancy and
12 constancy of exposure over decades, population mobility
13 impacts on assignment of environmental exposures and
14 errors are not known.

15 And it goes on to say that, however,
16 conducting more --

17 "However, periodically evaluating the
18 cancer statistics that are routinely
19 collected similar to what was done
20 would be prudent."

21 I'm not sure that's being carried on and I
22 put that to you.

23 I guess as a final point I want to ask you
24 the question of, I understand that recently the CNSC
25 organized a meeting of NGO's from communities across

1 Canada affected by the operations that you licence and
2 that suggests to me a certain recognition that you need to
3 rethink your role or you need to improve on how you relate
4 to us as communities and our concerns.

5 So what can we hope for the future in terms
6 of a different role and can you see that there's an
7 important leadership role that you need to take with a
8 community such as ours and I'm sure other communities
9 across Canada, around the concerns and issues and
10 contested issues?

11 I mean we haven't talked about things like
12 Dr. Mintz' review of these reports and the ---

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I hope you are summing
14 up, ma'am?

15 **MS. FISHLOCK:** I am.

16 And the fact that he does raise questions
17 about certain rates, particularly as they relate to
18 children cancer rates which has a particular interest of
19 me.

20 So I hope that you can see that you can and
21 should play an important role in helping us rebuild trust
22 in this community and get at some of these questions that
23 are still questions.

24 Thanks.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

1 I note that you address specific questions
2 to specific members of the Commission. The Commission
3 will not render any decision or make any judgments here.
4 We will make those via our reasons for decision and we
5 will make it as a group.

6 Just to say that you won't get an answer
7 from any one of us, that would be inappropriate; we're a
8 Panel, we're a Tribunal and we have specific processes to
9 make decisions, so just to mention your specific comments
10 to members of the Commission.

11 Are there any questions?

12 Dr. Barnes?

13 **MEMBER BARNES:** Yes, I'd like to come back
14 to the -- which I think is the underlying main point of
15 this intervenor which is the issue of dialogue between the
16 community and Cameco and I would, perhaps if it's not
17 inappropriate, bring in Zircatec which is owned by ---

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** No, we can't bring in
19 Zircatec.

20 **MEMBER BARNES:** Many of the previous
21 intervenors have stated that the community is divided and
22 I think there's been evidence that that's been the
23 situation for quite some time. The concern is, obviously,
24 on the matter of safety, which is the focus of this
25 Commission.

1 So the substance of the concern is of
2 concern to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and a
3 lot of the technical information that we've been presented
4 and we've discussed has been on showing how things like
5 emissions have been reduced. And I guess the Commission
6 would hope that parallel to that there would be a
7 progressive reduction in the level of concern relating to
8 safety and perhaps an increase in the level of trust.

9 When I look at the documents, particularly,
10 that were given on Day One, and supplementary information
11 given by Cameco, specifically in their Supplementary
12 Document No. 2, 11.3, "Public Information Community
13 Outreach Initiatives by Cameco", what I think I see is
14 Cameco trying to get a better handle on public opinion
15 through your survey of June 2006 by Fast Consulting which
16 is in Day One documentation. Some of this information has
17 been cited.

18 On the other hand, we see many, many
19 intervenors and many to come, which are expressing some of
20 the concerns noted by this intervenor. What I don't see
21 in the documentation, I see a lot of evidence of public
22 information, of information being posted, but it's as
23 though there are two solitudes here which aren't, as the
24 first intervenor today mentioned, are people listening and
25 listening so that they can understand and build better

1 trust.

2 I also see from Cameco that in this next
3 period of the licence, at the tail-end of that, but we're
4 leading up to it, you are developing parallel to the
5 actual specifics of the licence, the Vision 2010, which is
6 a major change, I think, in your operations here that
7 we're looking at today.

8 I wonder -- so a question to Cameco. In
9 all the information that you're hearing about, the concern
10 that is still are clearly evident, do you think it's
11 possible and would you see Cameco being part of a
12 different structure of dialogue between interested parties
13 in the community which would more fruitfully address
14 issues of safety and trust in the community, a better
15 forum for analyzing some of all this information that's
16 been shared?

17 Every five years, there's a substantial
18 amount of information. This is sort of a benchmark of
19 information. We're spending two days here of public
20 hearings.

21 It seems to me it would be a shame to lose
22 this opportunity, to build on that when you, as a company,
23 are going to look and bring new information to bear on
24 Vision 2010.

25 So I don't see in the information, for

1 example, that you've given to us is on public information.
2 I'll just read what you've brought as supplementary
3 information.

4 In your specifics of 11.3 Public
5 Information Community Outreach Initiatives, it's Port Hope
6 fall fair; it's community walk; it's Northumberland Youth
7 Opportunities Expo; it's meeting with the President of
8 F.A.R.E.; it's Cameco Women Build Habitat for Humanity
9 Project; it's dragon boat races and if needed analysis and
10 other indicators.

11 So I see most of the effort of Cameco is
12 sort of reaching out to specific projects in the community
13 where you think you can help but it seems to me there is
14 still an opportunity here through a different
15 organizational structure to build a better communication
16 throughout the community to deal with a lot of the issues
17 that underline so many of the intervenors' concerns today.

18 So the question is, has Cameco -- looking
19 ahead over the time of this proposed five-year licence,
20 are you considering working with the community and working
21 with the City in any different relationship than we've
22 seen to this point over the past five-year licence?

23 **MR. STEANE:** For the record Bob Steane.

24 First, I'm going to respectfully disagree,
25 Dr. Barnes, that you're saying that we have a community

1 divided. I live in this community. I don't share that
2 this is a community divided. Perhaps the intervenors who
3 are appearing and come express that view but, over all, I
4 don't share that view in the context in which they are
5 portraying it.

6 Stepping back, over a year ago, about a
7 year ago, Cameco embarked upon a process with the Vision
8 2010 project where we had brought outreach to over 500
9 individuals in the community who participated not just in
10 sharing information within the -- and gathering
11 information, having input into what Vision 2010 might be,
12 what it could be, and that started the dialogue process.

13 Out of that process -- and we recognized a
14 year ago that this was -- we did need to revisit and look
15 at how we were interacting with the community. This was
16 the first step of a process. That then led into the
17 formation of -- and we've had six of these community
18 liaison forums. You reference some things in the document
19 there. You didn't mention the community health forum that
20 we have had in meantime. That was bringing in six experts
21 to sit and talk about health; be there, available to
22 answer questions, engage in a dialogue with the people of
23 Port Hope and anyone who wanted to attend were welcome to
24 attend.

25 We have started that community liaison

1 process. In the initial part of it, we recognized there
2 was a real need to have a number of forums to bring up the
3 -- I suppose fill in some of the information void. The
4 very first forum was, we asked the public what is it
5 that's important to you and what do you want to address?
6 And we have been working through the agenda items that
7 came out from that first forum. Health was a big issue
8 and that led to a second health forum to get some more
9 background information, which led to that one which we
10 have reported in a supplemental CMD of the -- all day. We
11 were in this room for a whole day talking about health.

12 We have also indicated to you we have
13 planned to continue this process. We have committed to
14 the community to continue this process of engaging with
15 and talking with the community, the whole community.

16 We have a forum. The exact date is not
17 defined yet, but it is scheduled in February. That's our
18 plan, is to have it in February. The topic is the
19 environment. We put together and spent a lot of work
20 putting together the environmental report card which we
21 have mentioned in our supplemental CMD, and it was in our
22 presentation of all of our emissions and getting all the
23 information. So now we have that basis of information to
24 go forward.

25 We have in our Environmental Monitoring

1 Management System where we sit and have identified all of
2 our environmental aspects. We do set the targets each
3 year. We review where we're going.

4 You asked me yesterday what's my target for
5 five years. I didn't have a target for five years, but
6 every year we do, on a risk-based basis, do set targets of
7 where we are going to focus. We are now taking that
8 process one step further, and we're taking that to the
9 community and told the community that at the health forum
10 that this was the intent. The next forum would be to talk
11 to them about environmental aspects, how we set
12 environmental targets, where we focus. So we're bringing
13 the community and those who are there into the process of
14 helping us define, and so we're all on the same path
15 forward, what are the targets.

16 The community walk: The community walk was
17 not just a -- it was not a fundraising item. It was
18 something where employees went around door-to-door and
19 knocked on people's doors and engaged in a dialogue to the
20 extent that the residents wanted to engage in a dialogue.
21 We took questions if they had questions. If the employee
22 couldn't answer it, those questions were brought back and
23 answers were provided to those people.

24 We have had open houses. We have had a
25 number of people coming to open houses. As well, the fall

1 fair which it sounds like a small item but the whole focus
2 of the fall fair was to actively engage with people. We
3 have Cameco people there to answer questions. We have had
4 displays. We had information and we contacted 4,500
5 people through that process.

6 Are we committed to being a little
7 different than we have in the past? Absolutely. We have
8 been working extremely hard at it for a year and we have
9 committed to the community and everyone that we're going
10 to continue with that, and that's as the -- the Chair
11 pointed out as well, the Commission has a requirement and
12 a guide for public information programs. We have
13 developed along those lines with that public information
14 program, submitted it and it's all there in that program
15 and that's what we're -- that's what we're doing.

16 So the short answer -- that was a long
17 answer to the question -- is yes, we are trying very hard
18 and are working to engage a lot more of the people in the
19 community.

20 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I would just like to
21 comment to the intervenor -- that I meant what I said
22 about looking at how the community works. My experience
23 in looking at other communities around nuclear
24 establishments, because we were just in Kincardine, a
25 number of us recently and we were just at Becancourt a few

1 weeks ago as well, just like this, to hear people and hear
2 what's going on.

3 Clearly, the expectation is that the
4 establishment develops. They are in the community. They
5 are expected by us and by you to be good corporate
6 citizens but it does take time. I think that it will --
7 which is why my comment was to the licensee, "Is it
8 sustainable?" You know, is it sustainable, because my
9 first licence hearing six years ago when I was appointed
10 was in Pickering, which is a community that more recently
11 had a -- just before that had a new community outreach
12 program and involved people differently than they had
13 before, and I think there was a lot of skepticism about
14 whether it was a PR program and whether it would go away.

15 So I think the evidence is that it takes
16 sustained effort and it takes ability of a company to
17 reinvent -- you know, not reinvent in a negative sense,
18 but listen to people and say, you know, what are they
19 interested in. And frankly, all citizens, not people with
20 one point of view, but listen respectfully to people
21 because there is some people that will not be happy unless
22 there is no establishment. There are other people that
23 have different views.

24 So I think, listening to citizens that
25 don't intervene as well and listening to all of them and

1 people that are concerned about economics and jobs, which
2 is not our concern, but the company has to be concerned.
3 So I think, will the Commission expect that Cameco
4 sustains and grows and evergreens their program? The
5 answer is "yes".

6 To speak to your comment about the NGO
7 forum, this was an initiative of the CNSC staff to seek,
8 particularly in areas where intervenors were unhappy about
9 the process that the CNSC does, how does the CNSC
10 distribute information and that type of thing, to do that,
11 and looking at that. It's a very new idea. The history
12 of these has not necessarily been positive in other areas
13 but we and, I think, the CNSC staff are very hopeful that
14 this will give some ideas.

15 One of the areas will be about
16 organizations but I think the Commission's expectations
17 are that the staff doesn't just pay attention to people
18 who are very involved around but that are members of the
19 communities. And in that case, we do believe that mayors
20 do have a role. Mayors are elected by their towns and we
21 do pay attention to mayors. We do encourage them to come.
22 We do encourage unions to come and tell us. They are the
23 workers that are on the site.

24 They are the ones that are right there.
25 And I think people -- I think it would be unfair for

1 people to say that they're not interested in their health
2 and safety, they are, and they're engaged and they
3 wouldn't work for a company.

4 So I think what the Commission finds
5 probably too often there's a black and whiteness of
6 peoples views towards each other. So I think part of the
7 engagement is not just between the community and the
8 citizens and groups in this community but amongst people
9 too, which I think I took very much to your heart your
10 comment about people dialoguing and finding ways to do
11 that, and I think communities have to take
12 responsibilities themselves as well for dialogue as well
13 as companies in there.

14 But I think that it is the -- Dr. Barnes'
15 question to the company was what are you planning to do
16 for the next five years in this particular area is a very
17 reasonable question to be asked. Not only by the
18 Commission because the Commission will be following this,
19 but for the community to ask for, you know, what are those
20 -- show us the sustainability of the engagement, I
21 suppose, if I would put it that way, in the true sense of
22 that.

23 **MS. FISHLOCK:** If I can just add one small
24 comment about that. I appreciate your recognition, but I
25 do think that the point needs to be emphasized that it's

1 not -- it's the context in which the dialogue happens.
2 It's how -- what's the mandate or the terms of reference
3 and who gets to dictate that.

4 I mean, my experience in working with
5 corporations is that understandably they like to maintain
6 control of the process because they have shareholders and
7 profits and tasks that they have to deal with. That's the
8 culture of business, as I understand it.

9 The culture of communities and the values
10 of communities is very different. It's about people.
11 It's about people and processes that don't always adhere
12 to timelines, are often chaotic and messy, and I just
13 think we need to think more carefully about how the terms
14 of how we have this dialogue and the culture in which we
15 have the dialogue, that people need to be involved in
16 deciding that first before we can sit down at the table,
17 otherwise, there is no trust.

18 If my concerns and my dialogue is going to
19 be taken away, and some of it may be heard and some of it
20 not, and not result in an action plan that I can live
21 with, that's not sustainable.

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Well, thank you, and I'm
23 glad that this forum has allowed you to make that point
24 for us today.

25 Thank you very much.

1 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
2 submission, which is a submission from Ms. Mary Birkett,
3 as outlined in CMD 06-H18.163.

4 As Ms. Birkett is not in attendance today
5 her submission will be considered as a written submission
6 later in the process.

7 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will then move to the next
8 submission, which is an oral presentation by Limelight
9 Advertising & Design, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.41.

10 Mr. Peter Gabany, President, is here to
11 present the submission. The floor is yours, sir.

12

13 **06-H18.41**

14 Oral presentation by
15 Limelight Advertising & Design

16

17 **MR. GABANY:** Thank you.

18 I would like to start off by saying I think
19 that Dr. Barnes helped steal a bit of my wind out of my
20 sail. However, I will go on.

21 I wish to address the Commission on the
22 basis mostly of health, and that would be social and
23 economic health. Port Hope's industrial sector has been
24 under duress for the past two decades. It lost two major
25 businesses a few decades ago and we've never replaced

1 those jobs. Any replacement that has happened has been
2 mostly minimum wage jobs.

3 We're now in the throws of yet another
4 industrial having -- industry having hard times, and again
5 under duress of losing another vast amount of jobs. This
6 makes Cameco and Zircatec one of the underpinnings or
7 underpinned corporations in our town.

8 To move on, we have several people in this
9 community that have positioned against Cameco and Zircatec
10 and there are really too few of these to call them a
11 faction, and I'd like to refer to them as fractions. I
12 wish to point out that possibly only one of these people
13 that are against Cameco in Port Hope have actually removed
14 themselves off the electrical grid. I don't see any of the
15 others doing that. Yet they take comfort in going home,
16 making toast and tea and they would scream a first time
17 that they would be out of heat or hot water.

18 These same fractions have asked Cameco and
19 Zircatec to be forthcoming and give them answers and facts
20 based on science, and as soon as Cameco or Zircatec stand
21 up and do that they're accused of running an expensive PR
22 campaign.

23 These factions helped to cause divisiveness
24 in our community; much like one of our former councillors
25 did yesterday waiving a green garbage bag and calling it

1 his buffer zone kit. This, I believe, is fear mongering.

2 Being behind much of these communications
3 that Cameco has initiated this year, I must say that in my
4 20-plus year career I've never seen a more determined
5 group than the Cameco people, the knowledgeable people
6 that have put together such a huge effort to get the right
7 answers out, the correct answers, answers that are based
8 on science.

9 These are not always the answers that these
10 fractions wish to admit to being correct. They don't want
11 to hear them. And for evidence of that, at an info day
12 hosted by Zircatec this year one of the members of these
13 fractions actually was speaking with Andy Oliver. And
14 commented to Andy after his questions saying that thanks
15 for being so forthcoming and straightforward with your
16 questions but we're still coming after you.

17 Yesterday the same person said that his
18 organization F.A.R.E should not be blamed for the
19 community being torn apart, which moves me to health.

20 There are two fundamental issues pertaining
21 to health that these fractions against Cameco are most
22 willing to ignore. I'm not a psychologist or a doctor but
23 you don't need to be one to see that the community has
24 been stressed. But thanks to Cameco and its information
25 strategy the wounds are healing and the fractions are

1 dissolving.

2 At an info day at Zircatec our numbers were
3 quite low, but the unique thing happened at this info day
4 was that families started to come out and ask questions of
5 Zircatec and the answers were there.

6 At a launch of a Cameco sponsored rotary
7 hosted economic impact study we are oversubscribed by
8 business leaders in our community. Unfortunately we
9 booked too small a room and we only got 80-plus people and
10 we probably could have well, easily supported 120-plus.

11 At the 175th running of the Port Hope fall
12 fair we were challenged to increase the number of visitors
13 to the Cameco exhibit from around 200 or 300 -- and this
14 goes to Dr. Barnes' question. Two or three hundred people
15 were visiting the Cameco booth at the fall fair and Bob
16 Steane asked "Do you think we can improve those numbers?"
17 and I said "Well, I would hope that we would be able to
18 get maybe 1,000 out."

19 Late Sunday morning we ran out of things
20 that we were giving out to the people. We had ordered
21 4,500 pieces. That was late Sunday morning. Later that
22 day, I mean, still hundreds of people came through.

23 And the way that we can tabulate that is
24 that we gave everyone a passport, the passport was filled
25 with questions, and these questions, I couldn't believe it

1 myself that these people actively stood there, read the
2 information and answered the questions.

3 And further to my amazement were that the
4 Cameco employees who were a bit reluctant to face their
5 public came out and asked to come out time in and time
6 again to tend those booths, that tent that we created, and
7 they helped with the questions, they helped with the
8 understanding.

9 And the best part is that Lloyd Jones of
10 Zircatec and Bob Steane could be seen at the end of the
11 line of people coming through, and there really was a line
12 up of people waiting to get their passports checked, to
13 make sure that they had got the questions right, and
14 funnily enough, Bob Steane was there actually, helping
15 them out and correcting their answers.

16 This did a number of things. It
17 demonstrated that Cameco employees were engaged, as they
18 tended the exhibits. They took questions and they visited
19 with their friends and their neighbours. The community,
20 4,500 of them at least, filled out those questionnaire
21 passports, learning more about energy, the nuclear
22 industry, Cameco and Zircatec, and most importantly, their
23 friends and neighbours that work there.

24 At a recent community walk, I must admit it
25 was touch and go at the beginning because it was difficult

1 to recruit people to actually go out on the walk, because
2 there is trepidation of going out and meeting people,
3 because they've sort of been punished, they've been
4 ostracized somewhat. But I was very delighted we got 80
5 employees to volunteer. Now, this community walk lasted
6 for five days and those volunteers that came out to walk
7 that community walk didn't come for one day. They asked
8 if they could come out two, three, four and we even had
9 people coming out five days and participated in that
10 community walk.

11 And I walked around with them to take some
12 photographs to see what the reactions were, and we had
13 people closing the door on the walkers, saying "You know
14 what? Cameco is great. My husband worked there. You
15 know what? Cameco is fine; I have no issues." I said,
16 "Can we give you some material?" No, they didn't want to
17 take the material because they felt comfortable with
18 Cameco and Zircatec.

19 Most recently, I sat in an audience and
20 listened to a panel of health experts, scientists and an
21 engineer, including Dr. Bliss Tracy, and I wrote out a
22 question card and I handed it in to have my question asked
23 and then moments later, oddly enough, the new mayor, Linda
24 Thompson, posed the same question that I just penned, and
25 the question was: "Knowing what you know about Cameco and

1 Port Hope and Zircatec, would you and your family live
2 here?" and the answer was a resounding, "Yes" by all the
3 panel, participants, including the two that already live
4 here.

5 FARE, like its acronym suggests, costs this
6 company. It costs each time a tourist chooses to stay
7 away. It costs each time a condo or home buyer chooses
8 another community. It costs when some zealot stands up on
9 national television and flags Port Hope as a terrorist
10 target. It costs when other companies don't wish to be
11 interrogated by the factions that seemingly are anti
12 anything in Port Hope.

13 Bob Steane stood up months ago to a packed
14 room of citizens, the first community forum, and said, "I
15 stand before my friends and neighbours, and I am
16 accountable to you." This is a rare person, one of
17 integrity and a man that continues to inspire and work
18 with an excellent staff and workforce to ensure our
19 safety, bring jobs to a struggling community, and is part
20 of a solution for clean and safe energy.

21 Yesterday, Sarah Clayton, another, spoke of
22 how destructive the debate had become and that we need to
23 bring the two sides together.

24 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** If you could just wrap up
25 please, sir.

1 **MR. GABANY:** And I believe that if the
2 fractions could rid themselves of their bitterness and
3 their divisiveness, I'm certain Bob Steane and his people
4 could work with them.

5 And finally, my wife, daughter, son and
6 myself who have lived either all of our lives or most of
7 our lives in Port Hope, we have met now and worked with
8 some of the great scientists, engineers, electricians,
9 communications people, managers and even security guards.
10 These, along with the balance of the community, are our
11 friends and neighbours, and together with Cameco and
12 Zircatec and Port Hope, we help turn on half the lights in
13 the Province of Ontario. Thank you.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

15 Are there questions for this intervenor
16 from the Commission Members?

17 Thank you very much, sir. We are going to
18 take a one hour lunch break and we will be back in one
19 hour. Thank you.

20 --- Upon recessing at 12:29 p.m.

21 --- Upon resuming at 13:31 p.m.

22 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will be resuming.

23 We will move to the next submission, which
24 is an oral presentation by the Port Hope and District
25 Chamber of Commerce, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.43. Ms.

1 Holly Hills, President, is here to present this
2 submission. Ms. Hills, the floor is yours.

3
4 **06-H18.43**

5 Oral presentation by
6 Port Hope & District
7 Chamber of Commerce

8
9 **MS. HILLS:** Thank you, Madam Chairman,
10 Members of the Commission.

11 The Port Hope and District Chamber of
12 Commerce is in support of the licence renewal application
13 of Cameco Corporation, Port Hope Conversion Facility based
14 upon their compliance to CNSC renewal criteria. Our
15 support of the renewal falls in line with our mandate to
16 promote and improve trade and commerce and the economic,
17 civic and social welfare of our district.

18 Cameco Corporation contributes
19 significantly to each of these areas. The firm supports
20 numerous local businesses through local purchasing and
21 many are dependent on that support. We concur with the
22 recent economic impact study completed by Harry Kitchen,
23 Trent University, Department of Economics in that Cameco
24 is a vital component contributing to the economic
25 stability of Port Hope. The study estimates that Cameco

1 and Zircatec generate an estimated 164-person years
2 through secondary job creation.

3 The impact on local economic activity and
4 contributions to local charities in Port Hope account for
5 a significant total of economic activity estimated at \$63
6 million, including direct and secondary spending.

7 Looking at the broader region, the impact
8 is estimated at \$117.3 million for Northumberland County.
9 The positive economic impact of the Cameco operation is
10 supported in the 2006 Economic Development Strategy Plan,
11 adopted by Port Hope council. The strategy recognizes the
12 importance of Cameco and Zircatec by identifying the
13 nuclear sector as a key economic strength. It recommends
14 the municipality build on the strength of our local
15 nuclear industries by attracting complimentary businesses
16 and services to Port Hope.

17 Cameco Corporation continues to be a vital
18 component of the Port Hope community. The firm
19 consistently demonstrates an excellence in corporate
20 responsibility by donating to social, cultural and civic
21 activities. This is accomplished not only by investing
22 dollars, but by investing in their employees, allowing
23 them to volunteer time to numerous committees and
24 community projects.

25 The company earns the support of the

1 communities with which it interacts. Cameco Corporation
2 has been nominated numerous times and has received rewards
3 for excellence in large business and community service in
4 the annual Port Hope Business Excellence Awards. Through
5 their community liaison and educational activities, Cameco
6 has worked to give our members and the community an
7 opportunity to be up to date on what's happening at their
8 facility and has provided venues to answer public
9 questions and concerns.

10 In particular, we appreciate their public
11 forums, the community forum publication, and their
12 www.camecoporthope.ca website. Cameco is important to our
13 community. We appreciate and value this company. They
14 continue to take a leadership role in developing
15 partnerships and strategic alliances. Their efforts have
16 brought life to numerous community projects, including
17 CAER, Habitat for Humanity Women Build, the Capital Arts
18 Centre, Northumberland Manufacturers' Association,
19 Northumberland United Way, and the list goes on.

20 It is evident through their actions that
21 Cameco cares for and supports the communities in which
22 they operate. The firm supports community organizations
23 and activities with donations of time and funds.

24 In closing, Cameco Corporation is a member
25 in good standing and a strong supporter of the Port Hope

1 and District Chamber of Commerce and our mandate. As a
2 member, they continue to be a consistent contributor to
3 the economic, civic and social wellbeing of our district,
4 our community and, therefore, we are in support of their
5 licence renewal.

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

7 Are there questions for this intervenor?

8 No, thank you very much.

9 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is an oral
10 presentation from Ms. Glynnis Tomkinson, as outlined in
11 CMC 06H-18.44.

12 Is Ms. Tomkinson here in the room? As Ms.
13 Tomkinson is not in the room we will consider her
14 submission as a written submission to be considered later
15 in the process.

16 We will then move to the next submission
17 which is an oral presentation from Mr. James D. Hunt, as
18 outlined in CMD 06-H18.45. Not back from lunch, okay.

19 We will therefore consider Mr. Hunt's
20 submission as a written submission to be considered at the
21 end of the hearing.

22 We will then move to the next submission
23 which is an oral presentation from Ms. Miriam Mutton, as
24 outlined in CMD 06-H18.46.

25 Miss Mutton, the floor is yours.

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

06-H18.46

Oral presentation by
Miriam Mutton

MS. MUTTON: Thank you very much.

I have submitted a written presentation. I will go through the main points of my written presentation, but what I'm presenting to you is in a slightly different order, just to let you know in case you are following or trying to follow.

My name is Miriam Mutton. I live in Cobourg. I am a landscape architect by profession.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, ma'am. Please commence.

MS. MUTTON: I am a landscape architect by profession. My profession has taught me to read and to understand how people are part of their environment.

The matter at hand involves our friends and neighbours as well as one of the area's largest employers. It is understandable that some may find it difficult to speak their mind. We must not discount the reality that some people who would otherwise become involved in a public hearing feel intimidated into staying away in fear of social and economic reprisal.

1 I wish to acknowledge those who care about
2 their families and their environment but feel they must
3 remain silent.

4 I have been involved in community matters
5 for many years and I would like to bring to the attention
6 to the Commission that I was recently elected a member of
7 the new municipal council and I take office as of Friday.
8 I also wanted to confirm that I am here today to follow up
9 my written presentation as a member of the public. I am
10 not here to officially represent the Town of Cobourg as a
11 member of council.

12 Now, I did have an opportunity to meet with
13 our mayor. I did that on Monday, November 27th and also a
14 senior member of staff of the town and asked them if the
15 Town of Cobourg has made an official submission on these
16 matters, and the answer was "no" and the new council has
17 not -- has yet to meet.

18 Having said this, I'd like you to know that
19 the public in Cobourg has a fairly good idea of what I'm
20 about. I also want to quash any rumours that the mayor or
21 someone else at Cobourg asked me not to present today, and
22 that is not the case.

23 I have been active in my community on
24 matters of public interest for more than 20 years and have
25 made a number of presentations to council on various

1 matters. I am concerned about the environment, our
2 heritage and planning and development issues. My letters
3 on various topics including nuclear issues have been
4 published in the local papers. Topics include concern for
5 an adequate liability insurance coverage for the local
6 nuclear facilities that are licensed here in Port Hope;
7 internalized radiation as a carcinogen and an apparent
8 lack of action by our Federal Member of Parliament on
9 local nuclear issues.

10 I am concerned about a balanced community
11 and that includes good jobs and opportunities in industry
12 that are diverse but not exclusionary to other sectors of
13 employment. For example, in Cobourg we have hundreds of
14 jobs in the food service sector.

15 I am concerned about the wellbeing of
16 others and I care about our community, but I also believe
17 that as a citizen of Cobourg our elected representatives
18 should be informed about matters that may impact our
19 community and the local nuclear industries have a wide
20 area of influence that includes us.

21 I need to describe to you that there is a
22 bit of a communication gap with citizens in Cobourg, and I
23 speak to you quite frankly about this. The nuclear issue
24 is not something that is really a topic of discussion
25 there and there has traditionally been a communication gap

1 between Cobourg and Port Hope and I feel that the CNSC has
2 not only perpetuated this communication gap but has also
3 taken advantage of it, whether it was intentional or not.

4 For example, my submission regarding the
5 proposed hearings on Cameco's SEU proposal sometime ago
6 pointed out that Cobourg, a community of about 18,000
7 persons, was not included in the regional study area on
8 the EASR, sections on air quality and atmospheric
9 environment whereas the more distant communities of
10 Peterborough, Ottawa -- or Oshawa rather -- and
11 Bowmanville were. And I understand there is a sort of
12 weather measuring station in Cobourg.

13 I have also participated in the hearing
14 carried out by the CNSC regarding the mid-term licensing
15 about two years ago. I have also sent a letter with
16 comments about the Cameco Vision 2010 to their consultants
17 but that letter was never acknowledged. In it, I point
18 out that my concerns about Cameco's environmentally-
19 sensitive location -- and also, there was missing
20 information such as information that would identify
21 possible alternative sites for the facility and, more
22 importantly, information showing the contextual relevance
23 of the current site as it would relate to downtown Port
24 Hope and other urban areas.

25 And specifically, for someone like myself

1 in Cobourg, I am very concerned about the transportation
2 routes and other storage facilities that may -- include
3 product and waste storage.

4 I recognize that the impact of local
5 nuclear industries, past, present and future is not
6 restricted to Port Hope and I am concerned that the
7 continuing operation of these companies in the urban area
8 of Port Hope has not fully considered all the affected
9 persons and all the existing and potential impacts.

10 Now, of significant concern -- you may
11 remember me from the mid-term licensing hearing. I showed
12 a map of Cobourg or Cobourg's location with respect to
13 Port Hope. Now, I realize you don't have this in front of
14 you. This is a map of Northumberland County. The extreme
15 side here, that's Port Hope which Ward 1 is here and
16 Cobourg is here. I measured the distance between town
17 halls, Cobourg Town Hall to Port Hope Town Hall is 11.3
18 kilometres, much closer than the far northern end of Port
19 Hope, and the distance between boundaries is in fact much
20 shorter, 4.4 kilometres. So I would say that we are
21 within the area of influence.

22 And there is also other communities. For
23 example, there is Colborne, Grafton and Brighton which
24 also are in the County of Northumberland.

25 I have seven main points and this is the

1 reason why I am straying a little bit from my written
2 submission because I wanted to make sure I covered all
3 seven.

4 Firstly, I'm in essence concerned about
5 process and I heard earlier -- there was a discussion
6 about dialogue and I certainly feel that's a positive
7 measure. I have come to understand that the governing
8 principle in the assessment of a licence application or
9 renewal is the risk benefit analysis of operations of a
10 company assumed to be or seen to be carrying out an
11 essential public service.

12 However, how can you regulate the values of
13 others, either individuals or collective others? What is
14 the scientific evidence or measure that is used to
15 determine and evaluate the importance of the values of
16 others?

17 And I think that we, the public, at best
18 can expect that the scientific information is accurate
19 and, yet, we see constantly conflicting opinions. This
20 may not be a venue for debate, but I feel that the CNSC is
21 sending me a mixed message.

22 Secondly, based upon observation over the
23 last several years, including information brought forward
24 at related hearings and the fact that our local emergency
25 response services can not yet address a major event at

1 either Cameco or Zircatec, I ask why have you not
2 suspended or revoked an operating licence or at least
3 caused a stop work order to be place on the facility that
4 has failed to meet deadlines that, in my view, were
5 apparently mutually arrived at in the first place? How
6 many extensions are reasonable in light of public safety
7 and security?

8 It is my understanding that the Cobourg
9 emergency response currently can provide a first level of
10 response which is essentially securing an area and
11 requesting assistance. I am not an expert in this but you
12 may wish to seek confirmation of this information from the
13 appropriate authorities.

14 On my third point on the matter of health,
15 simply I don't agree that everything is okay. I believe
16 that we do need additional health testing and that needs
17 attention.

18 So given that, I wonder how the Members of
19 the Commission can fairly assess the merits of a licence
20 or re-licensing application when not all pertinent
21 information has been made available for scrutiny.

22 Other information is relevant not only to
23 Port Hope but other communities as well. As you may know,
24 Zircatec has a facility located in Cobourg on publicly-
25 owned land and that manufacturing process uses Beryllium,

1 which I understand to be classified as having acute
2 toxicity.

3 On my fourth matter, fourth item, I wonder
4 that studies and reports acceptable to the CNSC often use
5 municipal or political boundaries for study areas and, of
6 course, this doesn't correspond to actual emission
7 patterns that would impact others and therefore undermines
8 the credibility of the findings.

9 I have described Cobourg as a community of
10 about 18,000 persons and I'm uncomfortable with the fact
11 that it is often overlooked, despite the fact that it is
12 downwind and downstream.

13 I wonder how the CNSC has decided who are
14 the affected parties or stakeholders in the consideration
15 of the licensing of Cameco and Zircotec in Port Hope. And
16 I have this question; by what scientific information or
17 evidence have you determined that political boundaries
18 should be used to determine areas affected by the local
19 nuclear industries?

20 My fifth point; materials used at Cameco in
21 particular are regularly stored at the Cobourg train
22 station and rail yard without security until they are
23 delivered. For example, a very toxic gas used at
24 production in Cameco was transported in tankers which are
25 stored near yards from the VIA rail station and platform

1 and residences. Across the street is a major commercial
2 supplier of farm products including fertilizer.

3 Now, I apologize that I didn't send these
4 photos at the time of my original submission but I do have
5 them and I can provide as many copies as you wish. What
6 these photos show is the hydrogen fluoride ---

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Ma'am, you have one
8 minute left, if you could sum up.

9 **MS. MUTTON:** Okay. Thank you.

10 The tanker also, its position with respect
11 to storage, lack of security, public access, et cetera, et
12 cetera, that tanker is located there regularly. The last
13 time I brought this to CN Rail's attention about two and a
14 half years ago, it disappeared for a while. It came back.
15 I expect -- this morning when I jogged through the station
16 it was not there. These are various tankers of course.
17 But they do come on a regular basis. There is no full-
18 time security at that site.

19 Six; communities other than Port Hope are
20 impacted by issues such as water and airborne
21 contaminants. Because of my time constraints I won't go
22 into details with that, but suffice it to say that myself,
23 as a resident in Cobourg, do not know what to do if
24 there's an emergency, an accident at Cameco or Zircotec
25 here in Port Hope. I have no idea. And there's no way

1 that you can contact me -- or the emergency response can
2 contact me. I have no idea what that is.

3 So those cover essentially my six or seven
4 ---

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are you finished?

6 **MS. MUTTON:** Actually, I'm almost done and
7 I think I just want ---

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Ma'am, I've really tried
9 to hold everybody to 10 minutes. So thank you very much.
10 I've given you over 10 minutes already. Thanks.

11 **MS. MUTTON:** So I guess I'll have to leave
12 it just like that?

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes. I've tried to hold
14 everybody, for fairness to the community.

15 Are there questions?

16 Dr. Barnes.

17 **MEMBER BARNES:** Could we just deflect at
18 least the question of political boundaries versus impacted
19 areas to staff for their comment.

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

21 I'll ask Chris Taylor to respond to that
22 because that's in the context of environmental assessment.

23 **MR. TAYLOR:** Thank you. It's Chris Taylor
24 speaking, the Acting Director of the Environmental
25 Assessment Division.

1 While we do, in setting guidelines for
2 environmental assessments, do set out some initial or
3 preliminary -- really suggestions for local and regional
4 boundaries for the assessments, it's very clear in these
5 guidelines that the boundaries are left to be flexible and
6 as the assessment progresses and we are looking at a
7 particular type of effect in the environment that the full
8 spatial extent of those environmental effects are taken
9 into account in conducting the assessments and the
10 studies.

11 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. McDill.

12 **MEMBER MCDILL:** I think it's worth asking
13 the question about the tanker at the Cobourg train station
14 to both Cameco and staff in terms of security and
15 transport licences.

16 **MR. KENNEDY:** For the record, Tim Kennedy.

17 The HF railcar falls under the jurisdiction
18 of Transport Canada, as do other transportation of
19 hazardous goods, and there are requirements for CN to
20 inspect the car at a set frequency and there are anti-
21 tamper devices on the cars, which I won't go into detail
22 at this point.

23 The HF supply for the facility is
24 transferred from the west of Toronto, through to
25 Belleville and then back to Port Hope, and CN again can

1 store full and empty cars as it meets their shunting
2 requirements along that way.

3 So I have seen the cars at the Cobourg VIA
4 station and also to a shunting yard to the west of
5 Cobourg. There also will be at times empty cars on the
6 spur in Port Hope and those are all decisions by the
7 current rail provider, which is CN, under our current
8 contracts with the HF car.

9 **MEMBER McDILL:** Does staff wish to comment?

10 **MR. RABSKI:** Henry Rabski for the record.

11 With respect to the materials, we regulate
12 within the licensed area, the licensed area in which
13 Cameco is operating on. So once the chemicals are on-site
14 we expect the licensee to take appropriate measures to
15 protect those chemicals alongside of the nuclear materials
16 that they use at the facility.

17 In this particular case a defence and depth
18 analysis has included the recommendation to bring these
19 type of railcars immediately into the facility where they
20 become part of the enclosed facility and available for all
21 systems there to manage HF in the process. So that's the
22 measure that we have seen implemented at the site by the
23 licensee.

24 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** The intervenor raised a
25 number of issues in her written submission that I feel

1 it's important to deal with.

2 With regards to the Zircatec, the other
3 Zircatec facility in Cobourg, if you have some questions
4 with regards to that I would ask you to write to Zircatec
5 and the staff and ask. We can't handle licensing matters
6 here, are questions about that that don't pertain to the
7 facility before us. So if you've got questions with
8 regards to that facility, I would suggest you do that and
9 since I think officials of Zircatec and also the staff are
10 here, I'm sure they'll answer your questions with regard
11 to beryllium.

12 You make some comments -- I don't believe
13 you made them in your oral, but in your written you make
14 some comments about the mandate of the CNSC, the
15 Commission as an arbitrator who seeks compromise and
16 settlement, and the Commission appears to be biased. So I
17 think that those are important not to let those sit on the
18 public record without comment.

19 First of all, there is no definition in the
20 *Canadian Nuclear Safety and Control Act* as to what is the
21 most affected party. So to say that the affected party is
22 the applicant and that therefore we are the prime -- have
23 anything to do with who is the most affected party, the
24 answer is no. The *Nuclear Safety and Control Act* makes it
25 clear that we work for the Canadian public and so it is

1 the Canadian citizen who is the one and the only client of
2 the CNSC. Every CNSC staff member knows this. They're
3 told this probably about five times a year that the
4 citizen is the client. So I don't think there is any
5 evidence to do that.

6 So we're not in a conflict of interest
7 position. There is no conflict of interest for the CNSC,
8 the Commission or the CNSC staff as to their role. They
9 are not to protect the licensee at all.

10 We are not set up as an arbitrator. That
11 is not the role of the Commission. We are a quasi
12 judicial administrative tribunal. So thank you for the
13 opportunity to reinforce that.

14 I mentioned that yesterday at the
15 beginning. Our job is not to find compromise or
16 settlement. We are not conciliatory people. That is not
17 our job. Our job is to clearly ensure that there is
18 oversight and these applicants are qualified and there is
19 oversight of these facilities for health, safety,
20 protection of the environment, and meeting of
21 international commitments. That is exactly what the job
22 of the Commission is.

23 We have no economic interests and we are
24 not interested in the economy of these projects in our
25 decision making. So I wanted to make that clear.

1 The Commission, in terms of the role of
2 emergency response, we did discuss this at some length
3 yesterday in terms of the relationship between the city,
4 the licensee and the oversight of the CNSC.

5 I think that the Commission -- I do not
6 feel that the Commission is biased against the public, in
7 fact, that's our only job.

8 So I just felt that you hadn't mentioned
9 those in your talk but since this is a document provided
10 as a submission to the Commission, I think it's important
11 to handle those details.

12 Is there a comment by the licensee?

13 **MR. ROGERS:** For the record, Madam Chair,
14 Terry Rogers.

15 I just want to clarify your instruction to
16 the intervenor about the Cobourg facility. It is not a
17 licensed facility so the question would be appropriately
18 addressed to Zircatec ---

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much. I
20 apologize; that's absolutely clear. So this is not a
21 facility licensed by the Canadian Nuclear Safety
22 Commission which has been clarified and so therefore the
23 question would be directly to Zircatec, who is the owner
24 of that facility.

25 Any other questions?

1 Thank you very much for participating in
2 the process.

3 **MR. LEBLANC:** Ms. Mutton, are you going to
4 participate in tomorrow's Zircatec matter as well or can
5 we take your testimony today as being applicable to
6 tomorrow's proceeding?

7 **MS. MUTTON:** I understood that I was placed
8 today because my application, although I did indicate that
9 it applied to both, that I had not intended to come back
10 and make ---

11 **MR. LEBLANC:** Okay, so your presentation
12 today will also be considered as part of the Zircatec
13 matter?

14 **MS. MUTTON:** Yes, yes please, unless you
15 feel that there are some issues that I should cover.

16 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you very much.

17 We'll move to the next submission which is
18 an oral presentation from Mr. Bill Crowley, as outlined in
19 CMD 06-H18.47.

20 Mr. Crowley, the floor is yours.

21

22 **06-H18.47**

23 Oral presentation by

24 Mr. Crowley

25

1 **MR. CROWLEY:** I'd just say a word or two
2 about my background. I'm a retired meteorologist from
3 Environment Canada. I have a degree in Science from the
4 University of Manitoba in Math, Chemistry and Physics and
5 a major in Economics, and I have the equivalent of an
6 Honours Degree in Meteorology through departmental
7 training provided by the department.

8 I will be very brief. As the Commissioners
9 know or ought to know, it is normal to have a buffer zone
10 around any nuclear facility to protect the people in case
11 of an accident.

12 In Port Hope, the Canadian Nuclear Safety
13 Commission graciously uses the people of Port Hope as its
14 buffer zone. Therefore, when an accident occurs and I
15 don't say "if", it will occur, and when it is major enough
16 that it can't be smoothed over by public relations or when
17 there's a terrorist attack and our property values are
18 reduced to nothing, or people are injured or killed, if
19 you approve this licence without the buffer zone I would
20 suggest that you shall be charged with criminal
21 negligence.

22 In my opinion, and it is only my opinion, a
23 jury would find you guilty.

24 However, having said that, the insurance on
25 our homes, businesses in this town or any town,

1 specifically excludes damage caused by a nuclear incident.
2 So any accident at Cameco or Zircatec, we have zero
3 homeowners insurance, our company insurance, to protect
4 us.

5 The Canadian government, in my opinion, to
6 protect the industry has forced Cameco to carry \$4 million
7 worth of public liability insurance in case there is an
8 accident and Zircatec is required to carry \$2 million.

9 I understand the Canadian government has
10 said that they will step in if damages exceed that.
11 However, in the cleanup of Port Hope, the citing taskforce
12 spent 13 years studying and several million dollars into
13 nuclear consultants' pockets before they stopped, without
14 removing one ounce of radioactive waste from this town.
15 And at present we've had another six years of study and
16 yet to have removed any more waste from this town.

17 So I would suggest that they -- where do
18 the Canadian government is worthless and has no
19 credibility with regards to protecting us in case of a
20 nuclear accident.

21 Therefore, I would suggest that if you are
22 going to approve this licence, without a buffer zone, I
23 would suggest that the Members of the Commission provide a
24 two-to-four billion dollar trust fund so that we are
25 covered.

1 This may seem unreasonable but I don't
2 think so in view of the fact that the properties in town
3 are worth approximately two billion, give or take a bit
4 and if you look, injuries or health effects or death, two
5 to four billion dollars is nothing.

6 As regards to fighting a fire, the smoke,
7 the carrying of nuclear waste particles into the air, the
8 stigma on the town will mean its death.

9 In closing, I would like to quote a sign
10 you see frequently on the roadsides; "Accident is only a
11 word until it happens."

12 Thank you.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, sir.

14 Are there questions for this intervenor?

15 I believe, sir, that you were referring to
16 the *Nuclear Liability Act* in terms of the insurance
17 program?

18 **MR. CROWLEY:** Yes.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, I just wanted
20 to clarify that.

21 Thank you very much for your submission and
22 coming here today.

23 **MR. LEBLANC:** Mr. Crowley, before you
24 leave, you are also scheduled to present tomorrow a
25 similar submission, can we use this submission or do you

1 plan to present tomorrow as well? You'll be here
2 tomorrow?

3 **MR. CROWLEY:** No.

4 **MR. LEBLANC:** No, okay. Thank you very
5 much.

6 We will move to the next submission which
7 is an oral presentation by the Municipality of Port Hope,
8 as outlined in CMD 06-H18.48.

9 Mr. Carl Cannon, Chief Administrative
10 Officer, and Dr. Malcolm Stephenson are here to present
11 this submission.

12 Mr. Cannon, the floor is yours.

13

14 **06-H18.48**

15 Oral Submission by the
16 Municipality of Port Hope

17

18 **MR. CANNON:** Thank you, thank you very much
19 and again, welcome to the Municipality of Port Hope.

20 For the record my name is Carl Cannon. I
21 am the CAO for the Municipality of Port Hope.

22 Accompanying me today is Dr. Malcolm
23 Stephenson from the firm of Jacques Whitford and Frank
24 Haylow, Director of Fire and Emergency Services.

25 My role is to put into some context the

1 importance of Cameco to our community while also noting
2 through the assistance of Dr. Stephenson that there are
3 certain issues and matters that arose during our due
4 diligence review with respect to this application.

5 I certainly want to note that Cameco is an
6 active member of our community. It is a generous
7 contributor to the Library Board, to Capital Theatre
8 cultural events, arts events, local sports, mentoring,
9 local fundraising, such as the United Way.

10 I lost count around 57 associated events
11 and organizations they havr participated in. It is fairly
12 substantial.

13 Cameco certainly has a significant regional
14 and local positive economic impact. Three-hundred-and-
15 seventy (370) employees or 20 percent of the manufacturing
16 positions in Port Hope are with Cameco.

17 The company contributes \$26 million
18 annually to the regional and local economy through
19 purchases and salaries and various other means.

20 The corporation itself represents
21 approximately 3 percent of the total property tax revenue
22 generated through their assessment annually.

23 So again, they are certainly a very
24 significant community member.

25 The firm Jacques Whitford Limited,

1 represented by Dr. Stephenson, was engaged by the
2 municipality as part of its due diligence obligations.
3 And while there are matters regarding the application that
4 do need clarification and do need to be addressed, nothing
5 represented today diminishes the positive respect that the
6 Municipality has towards Cameco. However, as noted, there
7 is an exceptional nature of Cameco as far as industry
8 goes. It does create challenges beyond those that we
9 would normally have for industries and industries that
10 generate assessment for the community, and those
11 challenges do need to be met. They certainly do, Cameco
12 and Zircatec both contribute much to our local agenda and
13 time that is associated to them. We wouldn't put in
14 dissimilar industries that provide this kind of assessment
15 to our corporation. Again, they important parts of our
16 community.

17 Not only do they occupy a large part of the
18 municipal agenda, it does create exceptional circumstances
19 that we do need to address and one that has been spoken to
20 many times here today is that certainly it is not the
21 traditional relationship with industry that we would have
22 to venture into a circumstance where we had shared
23 responsibilities with respect to fire and emergency
24 services, but that's a reality with respect to this kind
25 of industry which we wouldn't have with other types of

1 industries in your typical or traditional relationship
2 with the community.

3 So that's something that we are working
4 towards working with, and it's a matter that has been
5 discussed here.

6 If I may, I will turn it over to Dr.
7 Stephenson who will deal with a number of points that
8 arose through his report.

9 Thank you.

10 **DR. STEPHENSON:** Thank you.

11 For the record, Malcolm Stephenson.

12 Jacques Whitford was retained by the
13 Municipality of Port Hope to review the licence
14 application prepared by Cameco and the CNSC staff
15 information and recommendations to the CNSC commission in
16 regards to that application. Those were the two documents
17 that we were asked to look at.

18 Our review was received by the Municipality
19 of Port Hope on October the 24th and it led to the
20 adoption of a resolution that the municipality would see
21 intervenor status at this Day Two hearing.

22 I want to speak just for a moment about the
23 review philosophy. First in our review we identified
24 observations which are simply comments arising from the
25 review. Secondly, those observations that we felt were

1 more noteworthy were identified as findings for serious
2 discussion and there were seven findings as I will detail.

3 This first finding: The licence
4 application was vague in many respects and this finding
5 actually is reflected in several of the subsequent points
6 that I'll raise, but we felt that Cameco did not provide,
7 in the public document, information or context for that
8 information in many areas that would be required to reach
9 an informed opinion regarding the facility performance
10 during the past licensing period. We trust that this will
11 be seen as constructive criticism and that future
12 documents prepared by Cameco of this nature would be
13 improved in this regard.

14 The methodology for measuring or estimating
15 employee dose rates has been changed to include lung
16 counting. Additional information should be provided to
17 the public to explain whether Cameco has accurately
18 estimated or underestimated internal and total dose
19 received by employees and whether there is any safety
20 significance to the revised estimates of total dose.

21 In the environment section of their
22 application, Cameco refers to Program C, which is a
23 program to measure arsenic in soil and vegetation. It's
24 unclear whether that information has, in fact, been
25 provided. It is implied that Program C is not, or was

1 not, going to be completed. Regardless, the public should
2 be provided with information on arsenic and other
3 contaminant concentrations in soil and vegetation, both in
4 the context of the ERA study and changes observed since
5 1986, which was the date of the information used to base
6 the Ecological Risk Assessment Study.

7 There has been wide comment on this point.
8 Some fire and building code inspection report
9 recommendations have been outstanding since 2000. Our
10 perspective on this was that the rationale for the
11 deferral of some of these inspection actions, including
12 those dealing with sprinkler systems, hydrogen systems and
13 laboratory safety, should be explained. Alternatively,
14 these actions should be completed, but again this was an
15 area where we felt that the application document was
16 deficient in providing sufficient context for the
17 information that was provided.

18 Some fire and emergency response issues
19 remain outstanding and I would rank this probably as the
20 most important of the observations or the findings, pardon
21 me, that we are commenting on today.

22 The requirements of the Port Hope Fire
23 Department for additional and ongoing training and
24 equipment specifically to meet Cameco's needs, should not
25 be underestimated. A recent development is that there are

1 negotiations presently underway between Cameco and the
2 municipality moving towards a formal agreement in this
3 area. This is extremely positive, but until there is a
4 formal, signed agreement that addresses funding and
5 equipment to support that training and to support that
6 delivery of fire fighting services, we really don't have
7 anything. One of the Commission Members yesterday
8 identified this as, "What is the vehicle to make sure that
9 this happens?" and I think that is a key and very
10 perceptive observation.

11 Point Six: Appendix 'E' of the draft
12 licence outlines waste water and cooling water quality
13 requirements and these are not strictly radiological.
14 They include, for example, limits on nitrate and ammonia
15 in the cooling water. Our perspective here is that to be
16 consistent with other federal legislation, Appendix 'E'
17 should also provide:

18 "The process wastewater and cooling
19 water discharge to the harbour shall
20 not be acutely lethal to aquatic life
21 when measured using standard aquatic
22 toxicity tests." (As read)

23 Again, in these hearings, we've heard
24 reference to overlapping and divisions between
25 jurisdictions and this is an area where we feel that if

1 the CNSC is not exercising jurisdiction, it's unclear that
2 other federal authorities are.

3 And, lastly, a revision to NFPA 801 is
4 expected to be issued in 2008 and will be available in
5 draft form considerably earlier than that. Since the
6 licensing period that the applicant is requesting would
7 extend to 2011, we feel that the Commission should require
8 Cameco to evaluate its facility against NFPA 801, 2008
9 standard, within six months of that standard being
10 released, rather than freezing the facility on the 2003.

11 It's unlikely that there will be dramatic
12 differences between the two standards and I think it would
13 be reasonable within the licensing period to make sure
14 that the standard for this, again, fire issue remains
15 current.

16 This leads to our recommendation and as
17 recommended by Jacques Whitford and is resolved after
18 discussion by the Municipality of Port Hope on October
19 24th, 2006, the municipality supports a five-year licence
20 renewal period with a mid-term review, and the key
21 perspective there is that we feel that it is important
22 that issues such as the agreement that the municipality
23 would like to have in place with Cameco regarding
24 provision of fire and emergency services, is concluded
25 within a reasonable period of time.

1 Thank you.

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

3 Does that conclude the presentation?

4 I just want to note for the record that we
5 were pleased to have the Chief with us earlier yesterday
6 and there was a number of questions discussed as well. I
7 would surmise that the two can be discussed together if
8 appropriate in terms of that.

9 I wonder if we could put back on your
10 presentation in terms of your specific recommendations
11 because I think we need to go through those one by one, in
12 order to have this well handled. So if you could have the
13 presentation put back on by someone.

14 I think it would be easier than us
15 pretending that we're going ---

16 **DR. STEPHENSON:** I'm on that page. We're
17 just waiting for the ---

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Okay, good, because I
19 think Cameco has to see these.

20 I think, if my colleagues agree, what we
21 may want to do is go through these and get some sense of
22 precision on them because these will be, of course,
23 important for us in terms of going forward.

24 So I just wonder. The first one is vague
25 in what it says about being vague to be honest, so I

1 wonder if you could start out by giving us some precision
2 on that and then we'll ask Cameco to react to that,
3 please.

4 **DR. STEPHENSON:** Well, first you do have
5 our written submission which is more explicit. I'll give
6 just two examples for now.

7 One is, of course, this is an application
8 for a licensed facility. The document that was released
9 to the public doesn't actually identify the precise
10 location or boundaries of that licensed facility. There's
11 no map provided. There isn't a legal address provided in
12 the publicly available -- what we have is that it is
13 located on the north shore of Lake Ontario near the mouth
14 of the Ganaraska River. That's an example of a lack of
15 precision that we think could easily be resolved.

16 Another good example is tables that are
17 presented in the document are often presented without
18 reference to specific locations where data are collected
19 or even more specifically, within the same table, examples
20 -- the regulatory standards or expectations would be for
21 that parameter. This, in our opinion, makes it difficult
22 for members of the public to evaluate whether the
23 proponents or the applicant's performance has been good,
24 fair or poor in that context.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. It's very

1 applicable maybe to more -- more than just this particular
2 area where we're a scientist not talking in a language
3 that is easily understood.

4 Would Cameco like to comment on this? And
5 more than this, the written CMD which is more fulsome.

6 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

7 Just to clarify, Madam Chair, the
8 expectation, just at the moment, do we just deal with
9 these one by one or would you like Cameco to proceed
10 through 1, 2, 3, 4?

11 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** No, we're going to deal
12 with the one by one.

13 **MR. STEANE:** Okay, so right now, I guess
14 number one. Thank you.

15 Again, Bob Steane for the record.

16 I think as an overview first, the documents
17 that Jacques Whitford reviewed, in their report they
18 identified those documents. They were a very limited
19 suite of documents to which they reviewed, which is true.
20 Our presentation to the Commission was, by nature, for a
21 20-minute presentation and was quite abbreviated. So our
22 introductory slide started off with we are on the shore of
23 Lake Ontario in Port Hope and didn't go into greater
24 detail at that point and in that document.

25 Having said that, that was an aspect that

1 was raised by members of the Commission about maps and the
2 application would be assisted by additional maps and
3 location of sampling points and monitoring stations which
4 we did provide in supplemental CMD's and we have provided
5 in our supplemental and our presentation to the Commission
6 the Day Two.

7 So I understand where Jacques Whitford --
8 the context of which the comment was made but I think that
9 we have provided that information and a clarity of
10 sampling points and geography.

11 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I think the point is that
12 since this is -- I think, to me the point is it doesn't
13 provide members of the public with information. So I
14 think the sense is not whether the information is given to
15 the -- is the legal requirements for the Commission staff
16 or for the Commission. It's a sense that looking at it
17 from the eyes of the Municipality of Port Hope that the
18 information itself is not fulsome and isn't at an
19 appropriate level that it could be read.

20 So I think you were acting as the citizen
21 of the Municipality of Port Hope in reading this. So I
22 think that's what I heard and I guess what my expectations
23 are is that Cameco will take this and other advice that
24 you receive from the Municipality and look at this as part
25 of your public information plan and campaign over the next

1 period of time.

2 I think that's what I would assume would be
3 the answer.

4 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, Bob Steane.

5 Yes, and even going further with that and
6 taking that comment to -- to address that comment, we also
7 started posting all of those reports, all those CMD's,
8 maps and so on, on the community website and advertising
9 that information in the local media so that that
10 information was available to the public. They could
11 access all those reports, access all that information and
12 maps and so on.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Barnes.

14 **MEMBER BARNES:** I think Cameco is still
15 missing the point. The point was that on Day One you
16 provided information and that was distributed to the
17 public, to the Commission and to the Municipality to
18 Jacques Whitford to make an analysis.

19 We observed, as Commissioners, that it
20 lacked substantial information which you did provide in
21 Day Two, through the supplementary reports.

22 But in truth, there's a huge amount of
23 material that has been provided which doesn't really give
24 the public, community members, in this case Jacques
25 Whitford, a lot of time to analyse that and as I think one

1 of the first intervenors yesterday mentioned, only that
2 morning had they received the last submission of 521
3 pages.

4 So I think what it speaks to and this is
5 water under the bridge really but for future applications
6 by Cameco on something as substantial as this, certainly
7 next time, if there's Visions 2010, Cameco needs to think
8 a little bit more about what it presents right up front
9 for Day One consideration so that it really is, as the
10 President would say, fulsome and complete as possible and
11 that the material to be provided as supplementary material
12 on Day Two is minimized.

13 This then gives the public the maximum
14 opportunity to evaluate and give them appropriate time so
15 that when we come to Day Two like this, which is
16 intervenors' day, they've had sufficient time to digest
17 these. In many cases because they represent groups as
18 opposed to individuals, give them time so that the whole
19 process is as fair, open, and effective as possible.

20 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Stephenson, you have
21 a point?

22 **DR. STEPHENSON:** Malcolm Stephenson for the
23 record.

24 Yes, I'd like to again, just perhaps
25 provide clarification and a request to Cameco and that

1 would be, don't provide less information in the future.
2 The information that you provided was all important and
3 relevant but please provide more context for that
4 information because I believe if you do you will have
5 fewer questions and you will build more trust and I think
6 that's the payoff for Cameco.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I just point that one of
8 the things that the staff have informed the Commission
9 that they intend to do is have an evergreen CDM so that
10 they aren't starting from square one all the time.

11 This may be something in terms of providing
12 information to the city and to citizens continually.

13 But you have experts who know to do that
14 and as I said earlier, I'm a scientist, so I'll let your
15 experts decide that.

16 But I think this is not separate from what
17 we heard before lunch which was this need for information
18 involvement and consultation thereof.

19 If we could move to the second one then
20 please.

21 I would ask for Cameco's reaction to this.

22 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane, for the record.

23 Yes, there has been a change in the method
24 of estimating employee dose but I would call on John
25 Takala, our Director of Safety and Radiation as this is

1 integral to his work, if he can talk about the lung
2 counting and the application and how long we've been using
3 it.

4 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I think as much as the
5 information, I think what this again looks like, it talks
6 to additional information you provided to the public and I
7 would submit to the employees as well. But I think it's
8 not so much the raison d'être behind the changes as it is
9 the information and the safety significance. This
10 statement is quite clear I think.

11 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane, for the record.

12 I was reading and it's saying, the question
13 was whether Cameco has accurately estimated or
14 underestimated the internal or total dose received by
15 employees and I think that's ---

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Sorry, sir, you're right.

17 **MR. STEANE:** And it's also applying, well
18 not traditionally giving employee dose information to the
19 public; we do it with employees. That's why I thought ---

20 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I'm sorry, please go
21 ahead.

22 **MR. TAKALA:** John Takala, for the record.

23 I'd say our efforts in this area are best
24 viewed in part of our efforts of continual improvement.
25 We have been monitoring intakes of inhaled uranium among

1 our workers for over 25 years, with lung counting.

2 Under the old AECB regulations we did not
3 calculate or assign doses with the -- we use that for
4 screening purposes to follow-up on significant intakes and
5 the majority, the vast majority of the measurements were
6 less than detection limits anyways.

7 However, with the new CNSC regulations
8 there was a requirement to assign doses from inhaled
9 uranium. We undertook significant efforts to upgrade our
10 lung counting technology to achieve this and the results
11 that we've been getting back for the last several years
12 show that the majority of doses are between one and three
13 millisieverts for our workforce at the Port Hope facility.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would the staff like to
15 confirm that statement about the accuracy?

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

17 I'll ask Cherry Gunning, our Radiation
18 Protection Specialist.

19 **MS. GUNNING:** That would be correct now
20 that they are doing total effective dose which includes
21 internal dose. Annual average doses for Cameco workers
22 for the three years that we have data for both would have
23 increased from around .6 millisieverts to 2.6
24 millisieverts. So the internal dose is adding to 2
25 millisieverts to the dose.

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** And the safety
2 significance?

3 **MS. GUNNING:** I think the safety
4 significance is that with -- in the future, we are going
5 to have a more accurate idea of the workers' dose. I
6 think that with the old method of measurement, they were
7 detecting intakes, large intakes, so that I don't think
8 that there is any safety significance there.

9 I think that with the data in the future,
10 we know that there is this thing for the epidemiological
11 studies that you know in the past there's been a possible
12 underestimate of dose but we have an idea of what it is
13 and it can be taken into consideration in the future.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Steane, I think you
15 were talking about your views about supplying information
16 about employees to employees versus what we supply to the
17 public about employees and I think that was an important
18 point that you may wish to make about Cameco's policy
19 about information.

20 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane, for the record.

21 The dose information for employees is
22 considered confidential and we do provide that to
23 employees, but even there we can't post it on boards and
24 so on. It is covered under privacy.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Further questions on

1 number 2?

2 Then moving to number 3.

3 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, Bob Steane.

4 Number 3 was if Cameco should commit to the
5 completion of Program C. In the CMD that was filed on Day
6 One right up there, Program C was completed and was
7 reported in the original CMD.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Further questions on this
9 matter?

10 Any comments from the staff on this?

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

12 I'll ask Malcolm McKee to comment.

13 **MR. MCKEE:** Malcolm McKee, for the record.

14 Just to clarify, the next stage in Program
15 C with respect to the -- with respect to the arsenic
16 pathway for rabbits in that case, the next step into that
17 was to look at -- review the emissions records and review
18 of the phytology studies that had been completed over time
19 at Cameco to determine if there was any more -- any
20 ongoing emissions of arsenic from the facility.

21 The conclusions were that the arsenic
22 pathway was a historical pathway. The objective of the
23 ERA that we're using for all our facilities now is using
24 the ERAs for developing present continuous monitoring
25 programs for the facilities.

1 Now, this gives us an opportunity to
2 identify the ongoing importance of the ERAs as well, is
3 that the ERA will be updated on a regular basis. So when
4 the ERA is updated, we would be putting in -- we would
5 expect that the most recent soil data would go back in and
6 we'd remodel and reassess.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So if I read this, Mr.
8 Stephenson, I'm also seeing that there was an analysis by
9 the municipality for the municipality that said again the
10 public should be provided with this information. Is that
11 correct?

12 **DR. STEPHENSON:** That's correct. My
13 understanding at the time that we conducted our review of
14 the licence application was that that information was
15 still forthcoming from Cameco, but the information
16 provided in the licence in section -- I believe it was
17 4.1.3 -- was ambiguous in the sense that it appeared to
18 suggest that since Program D had shown that airborne
19 concentrations were very low, Program C -- of arsenic were
20 very low -- that Program C was no longer required.

21 And in that context and in the context of
22 change since 1986, it was unclear whether the public would
23 be provided with information on any change in arsenic
24 concentrations since 1986 and the current status.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Does Cameco have any

1 comments with regards to the provision of information to
2 the public on -- not confined to Program C but to the
3 results of studies on this matter?

4 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vektor, for the record.

5 We will make the results of all the follow-
6 up programs from the ecological risk assessment available
7 to the public. And in fact, some of these have already
8 been placed on our website, community website.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Number 4, please?

10 Cameco, would you care to comment?

11 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane, for the record.

12 I think we had some discussions on this
13 yesterday with going through the progress but I think it
14 would probably make sense that we do it again today in
15 this context. And with that again, I'll get Ivan
16 Bolliger, our Fire Engineer and Specialist, to go through
17 how it is that the recommendations since 2000 and the
18 audits that have been done ---

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Well, I think what it
20 specifically says is, what is the rationale for deferral
21 of the actions. That's what we really would like, is
22 rationale for the deferral, not an explanation of the
23 total program.

24 **MR. STEANE:** Again, Bob Steane, for the
25 record.

1 I think we said yesterday all of the
2 mandatory items from the 2000 audit were completed. Some
3 of the other good engineering practice and recommendations
4 were deferred until such time as we did all of the
5 mandatory first. That's what we tackled first and then
6 some of these others, even though yesterday our big
7 systems and the installation of sprinklers, they were not
8 specifically mandatory but were good engineering practice
9 and those were put on Phase 2 of the program and so on.

10 So we've been addressing them in the order
11 of mandatory to good engineering practice and in that
12 order.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would the staff wish to
14 comment on the deferral of these specific items --
15 specific ones to this ---

16 **MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.
17 I'm going to ask Marty O'Brien to speak to
18 that.

19 **MR. O'BRIEN:** Marty O'Brien, for the
20 record.

21 I guess back in 2000, Cameco submitted to
22 CNSC an assessment of the items as mandatory and non-
23 mandatory, and the outstanding items remaining today are
24 of the non-mandatory type.

25 Thank you.

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Any comments from Dr.
2 Stephenson on that?

3 **DR. STEPHENSON:** Yes. We were fairly
4 pleased with the explanation that was provided yesterday.
5 That in large part provided the rationale that we have
6 been seeking and this bullet actually in part reflects the
7 context that we were referring to in our first bullet as
8 well that you go on record as saying that we did an
9 inspection in 2000 and we still have a number of actions
10 outstanding from that.

11 To leave it at that point begs a lot of
12 questions and that's where we thought -- we thought there
13 were probably good reasons and we were looking for
14 rationale. And again, we think that the public when they
15 are provided with the rationale generally will be
16 understanding of that rationale.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Number 5? I think we
18 discussed this quite a bit with the chief yesterday in
19 terms of these issues. I suppose the concept of
20 negotiations between Cameco and the municipality, the
21 Commission doesn't want to get in the middle of this in
22 terms of negotiations.

23 But can we have a sense from Cameco and
24 then the municipality as to whether these are moving ahead
25 and what would be an estimated time of arrival for this

1 agreement, starting with Cameco?

2 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane, for the record.

3 Yes, these discussions are progressing, I
4 think, in a very expeditious manner and I anticipate
5 coming to resolution -- well, it always takes two to come
6 to an agreement but the discussions are very productive.
7 I think we effectively agree on most things and I
8 anticipate it's a matter of weeks or months, I think, that
9 we would have a written agreement in place.
10 Having said that, I think we do have a good working
11 relationship with the Port Hope Fire Department and
12 support of and working with our Emergency Response Team
13 and they're capable to assist with our very competent and
14 capable people in dealing with a credible event at Port
15 Hope.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Cannon, do you have a
17 comment on this?

18 **MR. CANNON:** Carl Cannon, for the record.

19 Certainly, yes, there have been ongoing
20 discussions with Cameco with respect to a memorandum of
21 understanding for fire training, compensation associated
22 with fire training, and as well as equipment.

23 However, for the municipality to fully be
24 able to assist Cameco at their site and to achieve a level
25 that is towards or at operational level we, in essence,

1 look to have the finalization in the memorandum of
2 understanding to allow us to achieve that and that's an
3 integral -- certainly a very significant point for us.
4 And I guess that's an element of our issues or concerns to
5 looking towards having a mid-term review is that we can
6 have a check at that time to see if we are meeting those
7 measures, they are meeting those measures, and CNSC is
8 satisfied.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would it be possible to
10 give some sense of timing on that?

11 **MR. CANNON:** Any discussion we're having, I
12 think we're fairly far down along through the process.
13 But in turn, ultimately I have to take that to council,
14 council has to have discussion. I don't think the comment
15 or reference to timing is unrealistic. However, I take
16 direction from my council.

17 So I think it could be done fairly soon but
18 obviously the urgency may coincide with the licensing
19 process. Maybe that's a little not fair but our concern
20 is that following this what assurances that this measure
21 will be met and we have some understanding.

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Dosman.

23 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I'd like to
24 inquire of the municipality if the municipality might be
25 able to enlighten me as to what the average number of

1 fulltime fire fighting personnel would be for southern
2 Ontario for a city of 15,000?

3 **MR. CANNON:** For the record Carl Cannon.
4 If I may defer that to the Fire Chief,
5 Frank Haylow.

6 **CHIEF HAYLOW:** For the record, Frank
7 Haylow.

8 I can't give you a number at this time for
9 a municipality of 15,000, how many full time they have.
10 In our case we have myself and the Assistant Chief.

11 Cobourg, next door, which is a little
12 higher population have 15 fulltime firefighters, backed up
13 by volunteers.

14 I'd have to really rack my brain. I don't
15 have that answer off the top of my head, sir.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Graham.

17 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** I have a question and I
18 don't know whether it's in order or not and if it isn't,
19 Madam Chair, I'll depend on you to direct me.

20 The Port Hope fire team are with exception
21 of the Chief and Assistant Deputy are all volunteers.
22 When they go onsite, on Cameco site, are they covered,
23 fully covered liability-wise and so on and protected under
24 -- whether they're volunteers -- so they're not protected
25 under Worker's Compensation or whatever it's called here

1 in Ontario? I'm just wondering how they're protected for
2 their health and safety when they're on that site.

3 **CHIEF HAYLOW:** All the volunteer
4 firefighters once they respond to an alarm are covered
5 under Worker's Compensation Board Insurance.

6 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** And that's the City's, not
7 the licensee?

8 **CHIEF HAYLOW:** That would be under the
9 municipalities as long as they're working for us.

10 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** But when they go onsite
11 they are working for you then, okay.

12 Just one other question I have, Madam
13 Chair. We heard yesterday from one of the intervenors and
14 I made a note of it at the time, with regard to -- and
15 this really doesn't deal with fire but it deals with
16 security in one way that there'd been a unanimous motion
17 of council regarding the construction of a guardhouse.
18 I'm not even sure what street it was and so on, this was
19 some time ago. Could you enlighten us on that?

20 **MR. CANNON:** For the record Carl Cannon.

21 If I may, as part of our review as a
22 municipality we looked at the site issues regarding
23 elements of buffer, access or ease of access for the
24 public to the sites and looked at -- through our
25 suggestions that the internal road -- and it's escaping my

1 mind at this time -- would be closed and there would be a
2 guard or some constraint at the entrance to the site as
3 well as some additional fencing or other parameter
4 controls on the site.

5 And our thought was, and ultimately
6 approved through council, was that those elements would be
7 somewhat addressed through the Vision 2010 exercise and
8 that we look forward to working with Cameco through their
9 exercise to look towards the closing of that street; the
10 control and some element of land assembly to assist in
11 their security and basically look towards a better and
12 more improved site at that location.

13 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** So what you're saying is
14 that it wasn't something that was to be done last year or
15 the year before, it's to go forward in the 2010 Vision?

16 **MR. CANNON:** That was the representation I
17 put forward to council and that's the process we have been
18 working on subsequently.

19 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Just one further question
20 to Cameco. Do you have anything further to add? Is this
21 being part of your -- will this be incorporated in your
22 2010 Vision?

23 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, Bob Steane.

24 Yes, that is part of the Vision 2010 plans
25 and to the extent that we can do that earlier, we would

1 like to. We have had some discussions with the
2 municipality as to how that could be effected.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** There are six comments
4 from Cameco on this wastewater and cooling water quality
5 requirements, and then from staff.

6 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vektor for the record.

7 I believe this point is referring to
8 Appendix E of our licence. I'm not sure it's appropriate
9 for Cameco to comment on that.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Any comments from staff?

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

12 Yes. Mr. Rabski is going to speak to this
13 point, and then if you wanted any technical details Mr.
14 McKee could.

15 One of the things that we heard in the oral
16 presentation was there was a concern that there might be a
17 regulator gap between us and -- he didn't say, but it
18 would be between us and the Ministry of Environment in
19 Ontario, and that's not the case.

20 But Mr. Rabski will describe our approach
21 to this.

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I think Mr. Stephenson
23 wanted to clarify perhaps, before you start.

24 **DR. STEPHENSON:** Specifically, it's a
25 Fisheries Act concern. It would be federal jurisdiction,

1 as I indicated in the oral presentation.

2 The other federal regulator would be
3 Environment Canada but Environment Canada would not
4 normally be involved in immediate oversight on a facility
5 of this nature.

6 It's very common in licenses that are
7 written under the Fisheries Act and other federal
8 legislation to ensure, for example, that an effluent
9 discharge to fish bearing water shall not be acutely
10 lethal to fish when measured using, for example, a 96-hour
11 rainbow trout test.

12 That's missing from this appendix which is
13 not solely restricted to radiological parameters and
14 therefore it seemed to us to be an oversight.

15 **MR. RABSKI:** Henry Rabski for the record.

16 Appendix E, which I believe the intervenor
17 is referring to, is in the proposed licence for the
18 facility and refers to maximum concentrations, pH limits;
19 action levels for process wastewater effluent.

20 With respect to the issue of toxicity
21 testing, I would refer to Appendix A of the proposed
22 licence. The document that we would be referring to would
23 be the Environmental Monitoring Program or "Environmental
24 Monitoring Plan, November 2005".

25 What staff has done is to build on the

1 regulatory framework that exists in the province of
2 Ontario. We're trying to not to duplicate regulatory
3 requirements and where they are in place we use that to
4 build on and to include as part of the regulatory
5 envelope.

6 In this particular case, toxicity testing
7 has been conducted on effluents at a variety of
8 facilities, both municipal and industrial, under the
9 municipal industrial strategy abatement under the Province
10 of Ontario initiative.

11 This facility has participated in this
12 regulatory requirement since its inception in the early
13 eighties, and the commitment to conduct toxicity testing
14 and to be in compliance with that provincial requirement
15 is stated in their environmental monitoring plan, and we
16 have incorporated that as part of our licence and continue
17 to do that.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So it's as much
19 provincial -- federal coordination -- I think it's federal
20 coordination in that case.

21 I believe that's the six recommendations.
22 Oh, there is a seventh as well. Sorry.

23 Comments from the staff?

24 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you. Barclay Howden
25 speaking.

1 As you are aware, we are recommending to
2 the Commission, if you should renew this licence, the
3 inclusion of NFPA 801 2003 version with a one year roll-in
4 time.

5 With regard to a future revision of this
6 document, the 2008 version, our expectation is actually
7 that CNSC staff will review this document to determine the
8 need for application to this particular licensee prior to
9 a future licensing term. That's our expectation at the
10 moment.

11 Mr. Cherkas could speak to any details that
12 you'd want. But definitely as this revision comes through
13 we will be looking at it for applicability to not only
14 this facility but many other facilities because we've
15 applied NFPA 801 to virtually all the Class 1 facilities
16 now.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Because of the interest
18 in the municipality in this particular issue, and I can
19 understand that, why there is, would it be reasonable for
20 the staff and Cameco to be in contact with the
21 municipality after this standard is released and to have a
22 conversation with the municipality and with the expertise
23 of the fire chief with regard to the standard so that
24 you're not making this judgement without the municipality
25 involved since they're intimately involved in fire

1 protection?

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

3 From our perspective, absolutely, this
4 needs to be done in conjunction with the municipality.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Is there a comment from
6 Cameco on that suggestion?

7 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, Bob Steane.
8 That's fine with us. It's CNSC and they
9 are telling us which codes to apply and we'll have some
10 discussions when that comes out we'll be happy to review
11 it with the municipality.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would it be a helpful
13 suggestion for the municipality?

14 **DR. STEPHENSON:** I spoke with the Chief.
15 It seems very reasonable.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.
17 Are there further -- oh, I'm sorry.
18 Dr. McDill.

19 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair.
20 My question is concerning all seven at
21 once, if I may, now that we're done. So if there are
22 other questions from my colleagues I'll wait a minute.

23 If I may, to Mr. Cannon and to Cameco, this
24 was -- this document was sent to the Commission October
25 27th. It's now, for the sake of argument, a month later.

1 Mr. Cannon, have you received any item-by-
2 item response from Cameco to the questions raised in the
3 Jacques Whitford paper?

4 Cameco, have you responded on an item-by-
5 item basis?

6 And staff, have you seen anything to that
7 effect?

8 Sorry, I'll start with the municipality, as
9 I directed my question first to them.

10 **MR. CANNON:** Thank you. Carl Cannon for
11 the record.

12 Just conferring with Dr. Stephenson, he did
13 not receive anything, nor did I, responding to those
14 particular issues.

15 **MEMBER McDILL:** Cameco.

16 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

17 No, we did not respond item-by-item with
18 this intervenor nor with any other intervenors through
19 this process.

20 **MEMBER McDILL:** I would assume then that
21 staff hasn't seen anything.

22 May I ask, Cameco, with the amount of
23 community concern that we have heard, why there was no
24 response offline in the intervening months so that some of
25 these questions could have been answered and given to the

1 community?

2 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, Bob Steane.

3 Again, in the context of all the
4 interventions, we have been just evaluating all the
5 interventions and looking and seeing how, where, and when
6 we respond we have been posting information on websites,
7 getting information out as we can but we have not turned
8 our attention to focusing specifically on this with the
9 municipality.

10 We have been discussing other things with
11 the municipality in terms of fire response, negotiations
12 that Mr. Cannon and I have referenced in terms of the MOU,
13 and just we have not done that.

14 **MEMBER McDILL:** I wonder if I might ask
15 staff, in other -- at other facilities is it frequently
16 the response of the proponent to try and address
17 intervenors responses between submission dates and hearing
18 dates?

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

20 In the general sense some do and some
21 don't, and that very general. Often -- occasionally
22 licensees will speak to the intervenors before the arrival
23 at the hearing, but it's very much case-by-case. It
24 depends on what the issues are. And there's no -- I can't
25 tell you any particular set pattern.

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Further questions?

2 I think the time spent on this is
3 indicative of the fact that the Commission knows that the
4 municipality of Port Hope is sometimes put in the middle
5 of communications issues in this regard. We believe that
6 both the licensee and the CNSC have responsibilities to
7 ensure that the municipality has its valid concerns
8 answered in a timely manner.

9 So I think it's important that we use the
10 opportunity at the licensing hearing to support the
11 municipality in its efforts to provide overview and to
12 know that you are part of several important issues, such
13 as fire protection and emergency preparedness. So you are
14 very much involved in this as well.

15 So I'd like to thank you for all the work
16 you did putting this together and being here today.

17 Thank you.

18 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission, which is
19 a submission from Mr. Steve Kahn that is in CMD 06-H18.49
20 will be heard this evening as requested by Mr. Kahn
21 sometime ago.

22 So we'll move to the next submission, which
23 is an oral presentation from Ms. Holly Blefgen, as
24 outlined in CMD 06-H18.50.

25 The floor is yours, Madam.

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

06-H18.50

Oral presentation by
Holly Blefgen

MS. BLEFGEN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair,
Members of the Commission, CNSC staff, ladies and
gentlemen. For the record my name is Holly Blefgen.

I would like to ask the Secretary for
permission to present on Zircatec today as well, as I will
be absent tomorrow.

Thank you.

As a private citizen of the Municipality of
Port Hope I feel socially and morally bound and
responsible to address this hearing of Cameco's
application for renewal of Class 1B nuclear fuel facility
operating licence and that of Zircatec Precision
Industries for renewal of Class 1B nuclear fuel facility
operating licence, both facilities in Port Hope.

I serve voluntarily and I am not
financially remunerated or compensated for the time and
effort to present this intervention, but I do hope that I
contribute in a small way a human viewpoint on behalf of
the health, welfare and natural environment in which these
two industries impact upon us, the Municipality of Port

1 Hope, Province of Ontario and Canada.

2 Society is faced with a very complex and
3 difficult equation to balance. As presented here, our
4 collective individual human values versus a set of
5 corporate values of a monolithic profit driven industrial
6 giant, and how that interfaces with our federal government
7 and the regulator, the CNSC, Commissioners and staff.

8 First, I would like to address a
9 housekeeping issue; the difficulty in ascertaining the
10 documentation required for this hearing. For future
11 consideration I urge this type of documentation to be
12 handled in the best interest of the public and be
13 conducted professionally, with due diligence.

14 Secondly, as I've noted in this written
15 submission, several documents were not ready until the
16 hearing, and how can we make comment when these documents
17 are unavailable. I just received the supplemental
18 information on Friday November the 24th, just four days
19 prior. This is unsatisfactory and reemphasizes the need
20 for improved management of communication by the CNSC.

21 It's been just one year since Cameco's
22 decision to not proceed with slightly enriched uranium
23 blending at Port Hope; press release issued September
24 23rd, 2005.

25 The news was gratifying and provided some

1 relief of build-up tension and divisiveness that has
2 occurred amongst this community and the general public of
3 Port Hope.

4 However, this release also stated that
5 Cameco had recently identified several non-Canadian
6 suppliers capable of providing SEU funding services at
7 competitive pricing.

8 This news shed light that Cameco would at
9 some point continue its efforts to bring slightly enriched
10 uranium into town. Sure enough, within the very same
11 year, Zircatec was acquired by Cameco as stated in press
12 release of December the 2nd, 2005, with an anticipatory
13 agreement to close February 2007. In a statement by Jerry
14 Grandey, Cameco's President and CEO:

15 "This agreement will provide us the
16 opportunity to participate in one more
17 step in the nuclear fuel cycle,
18 consistent with our plans to grow in
19 the nuclear energy business."

20 Then, on September 15th, 2006

21 Northumberland News headlines read:

22 "Regulatory staff recommend five-year
23 nuclear licence renewals for Cameco
24 and Zircatec and assessment could
25 delay fuel production at Cameco."

1 Whereas a "C" is defined as "below
2 requirements" and is merited when:

3 "Either assessment topics or programs
4 deviate from the intent or objectives
5 of CNSC requirements or performance
6 deteriorates and falls below
7 expectations to the extent that there
8 is a moderated risk that the programs
9 will ultimately fail to achieve
10 expectations for the maintenance of
11 health, safety, security,
12 environmental protection or
13 conformance with international
14 obligations to which Canada has
15 agreed."

16 In addition, as stated in the assessment
17 documentation, a subjective trending that is indicated
18 with an arrow:

19 "Little change or improving of the
20 licensee's performance during the
21 current licence period".

22 This scale of reporting a measurement of
23 operational safety performance begs questions concerning
24 its reliability, validity, and the wording of the
25 terminology used in the definition seems quite ambiguous,

1 questionable to supporting subjective bias and, to my
2 mind, instils little or no confidence for adequately
3 assessing the industrial facility's safety performance and
4 record, let alone addressing what needs to be improved.

5 How critical to the operational activities
6 of Cameco they actually represent and if deadlines are met
7 and enforced?

8 Since Cameco deals with multiple processes
9 and the preparation, use and manufacturing of toxic and
10 hazardous materials in excess of 35,000 tonnes per year,
11 could not a better, more accurate performance of safety
12 measures in all areas be considered?

13 Further, I ask, why then is Cameco not
14 capable of producing an "A" and exceed requirements in all
15 of these safety areas when defined as "when assessment
16 topics or programs meet and consistently exceed applicable
17 CNSC requirements and performance expectations"?

18 Performance is stable and improving. Any
19 problems or issues that arise are promptly addressed, such
20 that they do not pose an unreasonable risk to the
21 maintenance of health, safety, security, environmental
22 protection or performance; again, within international
23 obligations.

24 As a safeguard, thereby would not an "A"
25 provide the benefit of the doubt that Cameco is fully

1 pro-active. We need to address public
2 concerns about technical issues and
3 that process ultimately took longer
4 than the time we allotted."

5 Based on this statement, I applaud Cameco
6 for finally undertaking the Public Information Program,
7 although as previously stated it took just two years
8 before Cameco submitted its plan to CNSC staff and
9 received acceptance with the condition that the program
10 could be enhanced to provide more information on how the
11 licensee's activities will affect the environment and the
12 health and safety of workers in the community.

13 Thus, I read with interest the oral
14 presentation submitted by Cameco. We learn under 12.0
15 "Other Initiatives" and at 13.0 "Community Outreach", the
16 program currently being implemented.

17 Fall of 2005 commenced Cameco's Vision 2010
18 process and the start of community outreach of community
19 dialogue in which I have participated in. However, with
20 all that said, I find that what is raised as critical
21 issues by the participating public at the roundtables that
22 request urgent action and follow up are inadvertently not
23 addressed or information not fully disclosed or facility
24 upgrade or changes in operation not met as requested; for
25 example, zero emissions, a physical buffer zone, emergency

1 response system, to list just a few.

2 If Cameco wants our social licence to
3 operate as stated in Appendix B of Cameco's oral
4 presentation by Fast Consulting then a real-time, action
5 plan operational ---

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** One minute remains,
7 ma'am.

8 **MS. BLEFGEN:** --- are a must by Cameco.

9 As for another example in attendance at the
10 recent health forum held on October 21st, I wanted to
11 learn about the health implications of Cameco staff and
12 what presumably they may do in evaluating the health of
13 the surrounding community and environment. Instead, I
14 listened to their delivery and their roles in public
15 health, cancer registry, et cetera, but no mention of
16 actual ongoing data that was and is being collected by
17 Cameco of its employees and their health-related issues or
18 the start of a review and long term, multigenerational
19 epidemiological study, health monitoring study of the
20 community with a control group or upgrading of
21 environmental testing to be undertaken on an ongoing
22 basis.

23 Why must we continue to wait?

24 I'd like to address Fast Consulting's
25 reporting ---

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Your 10 minutes is past,
2 ma'am. Could you line up in just a few sentences, please?

3 **MS. BLEFGEN:** I'm just going to say the
4 last.

5 I'd like to state that Cameco's financial
6 success has delivered to shareholders since 1991 an
7 increase of 68 per cent, stated in its 2005 annual report.
8 Last year's gross profit for Cameco's uranium business was
9 \$159 million Canadian. Conversion facilities was \$28
10 million. The financial strength, I understand, is
11 supposed to address that ever so important equation of our
12 mutual gains and successes. I keep waiting or should I
13 buy stock in Cameco instead?

14 I'd like some answers. I request a follow
15 up, action, accountability, enforcement by the CNSC; full
16 compliance by Cameco and the best of science on a
17 continuous basis for this equation to be met.

18 I thank you for your time and your
19 consideration.

20 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

21 And your complete presentation has been
22 read and will be used as well for deliberations.

23 Are there any questions to this intervenor?

24 Thank you very much, ma'am.

25 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is an

1 oral presentation by Ms. Celeste Stewart McNamara, as
2 outlined in CMD 06-H18.51. Is Ms. Stewart McNamara in the
3 room? Pardon me?

4 Okay, thank you.

5 As Ms. Stewart McNamara is not in the room
6 we will consider her written submission at the end of this
7 hearing with the other written submissions.

8 We will move to the next submission which
9 is an oral presentation by the Lake Ontario Waterkeeper,
10 as outlined in CMD 06-H18.52.

11 Ms. Laura Bowman, who is an articling
12 student, is here to present this submission on behalf of
13 Lake Ontario Waterkeeper.

14 Ms. Bowman.

15
16 **06-H18.52**

17 Oral presentation by
18 Lake Ontario Waterkeeper

19
20 **MS. BOWMAN:** Members of the Commission,
21 Madam Chair, Monsieur Leblanc, I thank you for the
22 opportunity to give this presentation today.

23 For the record, I am Laura Bowman from Lake
24 Ontario Waterkeeper. We're an environmental justice
25 organization that works to ensure that we all have the

1 ability to swim, drink and fish in Lake Ontario.

2 We are here before you today to ask that
3 the CNSC regulate uranium in a manner which is consistent
4 with other provincial and federal standards, and that the
5 CNSC demonstrate its willingness to take regulatory action
6 when its licence conditions are not met.

7 As a prudent regulator, the CNSC should be
8 willing to be consistent and not undermine the objectives
9 of other schemes and standards set for related objectives
10 to those set out in the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*.
11 Other agencies have developed water standards for uranium.
12 For example, the *Safe Drinking Water Act* and Health Canada
13 use 20 micrograms per litre as a standard for drinking
14 water and provincial water quality objectives use 5
15 micrograms per litre to protect aquatic life.

16 Cameco's current licence permits it to
17 discharge approximate -- a little over seven times Health
18 Canada and *Safe Drinking Water Act* guidelines and 30 times
19 provincial water quality objectives. I note that Port
20 Hope's harbour water quality is double provincial water
21 quality objectives for uranium, and the discharge into the
22 sanitary sewer, which is part of the drinking water system
23 here, is more than twice drinking water quality standards
24 set by Health Canada and by the province.

25 The CNSC does not enforce the standards set

1 by other agencies. However, it confirmed in Cameco's mid-
2 term licensing review that it does undertake to assure
3 compliance with the law more generally by the facilities
4 that it regulates.

5 The *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*, as well
6 as the Constitution, do give the CNSC the ability to
7 regulate uranium in the air as well as in the water as a
8 metal, in addition to its properties as a radionuclide.
9 This is not reflected in Cameco's current licence which
10 uses a standard of half-a-gram per cubic metre of air for
11 ambient air concentration. This standard, according to
12 CNSC staff documents, is developed exclusively based on
13 radiological dose.

14 Cameco itself has strived to adopt a
15 standard that more closely reflects the toxicity of
16 uranium. They use a standard of five one-hundredths of a
17 microgram. This standard is 10 million times stronger
18 than the CNSC licence standard. The CNSC licence gives
19 wide latitude for Cameco's emissions, given this context,
20 and as waterkeepers we wonder whether or not this standard
21 is really meaningful or enforceable because it is so
22 distant from both the actual emissions of uranium from the
23 stack and from what the toxicity of uranium might suggest
24 would be an appropriate standard.

25 We do feel that the data submitted by

1 Cameco in its quarterly compliance reports is consistent
2 with a view that the uranium emissions are rising.
3 Explanations were given yesterday and in the Day One
4 Hearing about why the data gives this appearance, as well
5 as from the quarterly compliance reports. Given this
6 context, we feel that this is the time for the CNSC to
7 ensure that Cameco's uranium emissions remain as low as
8 reasonably achievable and that they reflect its mandate,
9 which is to protect health, safety and the environment.

10 This Commission has the discretion to make
11 that decision. I would like to emphasize that it's the
12 Commission that has this discretion rather than CNSC staff
13 per say, and that this Commission must make that decision
14 on proper grounds, and that you do have the jurisdiction
15 to make this decision.

16 To re-licence Cameco for a five-year term
17 without improved uranium emission standards would simply
18 not be reasonable. The CNSC must strive to give meaning
19 to the standards that it imposes. We feel that the
20 failure to meet provincial water quality objectives, for
21 example, should weigh against re-licensing Cameco for such
22 a lengthy term.

23 Cameco can be a good neighbour in Port Hope
24 but it needs effective regulatory oversight to be that
25 good neighbour.

1 We urge you not to re-licence Cameco on the
2 terms proposed, but to ensure that the licence conditions
3 are consistent with other standards and do not undermine
4 their objectives.

5 Thank you.

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much for
7 your presentation and for your written submission as well.

8 Are there questions? Oh yes, lots of
9 questions.

10 Dr. Dosman.

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

12 I would just like to refer Cameco to Figure
13 7 on page 5 of the presentation, and I would like to ask
14 Cameco if Cameco confirms that these emissions are
15 accurate as demonstrated and if these emissions include
16 just the stack or are they stack plus fugitive emissions.

17 Also, what happened in May of '05 to double
18 the emissions?

19 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vetor for the record.

20 This Figure 7 is taken directly out of one
21 of our quarterly reports and, as you can see see, this is
22 a new reporting format. This is part of our continuing
23 improvement process. We haven't previously reported on
24 emissions directly from the facilities and we hadn't
25 provided the data in a graphic format, so we are improving

1 our reporting to the public.

2 This is the sum of the stack and the
3 fugitives combined. We're also -- but it's not provided
4 in here, but we're also graphing the gram per hour so you
5 can see the gram per hour emission rates separate from the
6 kilogram. We're trying to keep track of the monthly --
7 the bars are the monthly kilogram emissions and then the
8 year-to-date and it's on a different scale. The year-to-
9 date is shown on the line.

10 May was a month in which the in-plant air
11 concentrations were elevated; therefore, for the fugitives
12 were elevated. That's how we're calculating those. The
13 reason for that was some work we had done -- again, on the
14 continuing improvement things don't always work as you
15 plan -- to improve the seals on the equipment. These are
16 the seals that would keep the powder, uranium powder,
17 within the equipment. They didn't work as well as the
18 manufacturer had claimed and we had to take some
19 corrective action and resolve that situation. You can see
20 that in June the emissions returned to normal.

21 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

22 I wonder if I might ask staff to comment on
23 May of 2005?

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

25 I'll ask Marty O'Brien, our Project

1 Officer, to reply.

2 **MR. O'BRIEN:** Marty O'Brien for the record.

3 Yes, just to verify that what Cameco said,
4 yes, that was an in-plant elevated air concentration and
5 it was due to some difficulties that we had with seals and
6 CNSC staff is satisfied that it has been brought down in a
7 timely manner.

8 Thank you.

9 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

10 **MS. BOWMAN:** Would I be permitted a brief
11 reply just to clarify?

12 In May there was obviously an elevated
13 rate, but the doubling of emissions that I refer to in my
14 submission is the ambient air concentration.

15 If you look at the rates in the quarterly
16 compliance report, there is a lot of variability not only
17 in May but in other months such as January and March.
18 There was a shutdown in April of this year as well that
19 should have offset some of the increase due to the seals
20 in May, but in spite of this, this year's ambient air
21 concentrations are still twice what they were last year.

22 Would you like that developed further, Dr.
23 Dosman, or are you satisfied with what Cameco has said
24 already?

25 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Yes, I would like Cameco to

1 comment on ---

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** But I just don't want
3 this to be thought of as a precedent for a scientific
4 debate at this table.

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

6 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vetor, for the record.

7 I believe the reference is to the high
8 volume air sampling results, the ambient air
9 concentration, uranium, and because those levels are at
10 such a very, very low level and if we could bring our
11 presentation up here, please, if that's possible.

12 This information is also provided --- You
13 can see from this graph over time that the ambient air
14 uranium concentration has been significantly reduced to
15 the point where it's now approaching zero. So the levels
16 are so very low. We're averaging now about .005
17 micrograms per cubic metre, micrograms uranium per cubic
18 metre.

19 To put that into perspective, that's five
20 billionths of a gram, that billionth with a 'b' per
21 thousand litres of air. This is a very, very small
22 number, so we're getting to a point where small
23 fluctuations in weather, re-suspension of contaminated
24 soils or indeed, emissions from the facility have a very
25 pronounced effect on these low levels. If you back up to

1 the early 80's, you could add .005 or .05 even to that and
2 you wouldn't notice it. So we're getting into very low
3 levels and that's just -- we're just seeing fluctuations.
4 We're seeing noise.

5 If you look at the trend line on this
6 graph, you will notice that it continues to decrease and
7 hasn't turned, it hasn't started to increase, and indeed,
8 over time, you will see individual years where that
9 average crosses the trend line is a little higher, other
10 years it is a little lower, but that's just normal
11 variation in the data.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Graham? Dr. Barnes?

13 **MEMBER BARNES:** I was just going to say my
14 question has been answered.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Dr. Barnes.

16 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** I'd like to respond to the
17 intervenor's points raised on the bottom of page 6, which
18 is addressing the;

19 "...uranium effluent figures in the
20 range of 2 to 5 times the level
21 required by the Provincial Water
22 Quality Objectives. At the Port Hope
23 sanitary sewer, the discharges were on
24 average ten times the PWQO in 2005,
25 slightly less than the first half of

1 2006. Although Cameco has not
2 violated its licence limits, LOW
3 submits that violation of the
4 standards used in the *Fisheries Act*
5 should be a factor weighed against the
6 renewal of the licence.”

7 Since we just talked in the, I think, the
8 issue of Appendix E, in the discussion with the
9 municipality, where it was pointed out that that should
10 embrace other federal legislation, could CNSC staff give
11 us some comments on the substance of that section, that
12 paragraph and the following two. It goes on to deal with
13 the toxicity of fish, *Ontario Safe Drinking Water Act* and
14 so forth.

15 **MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.
16 I will ask Malcolm McKee to respond.

17 **MR. MCKEE:** Malcolm McKee, for the record.
18 First we'll start with the question about
19 standards in the *Fisheries Act*. The *Fisheries Act* itself
20 does not have any specific effluent limit, numerical
21 limits or standards. Underneath the *Fisheries Act* is
22 other legislation, such as the Pulp and Paper legislation
23 and the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations; those have
24 approved standard limits. Outside of that, there are no
25 specific numerical numbers related to the *Fisheries Act*.

1 The provincial, there's the CCME, Canadian
2 Water Quality Guidelines or objectives for the protection
3 of aquatic life, and then there are various provincial
4 guidelines for the protection of aquatic life. Those are
5 guidelines that are used for assessment purposes. They
6 are not meant to apply to effluent strengths in
7 themselves. They are meant for surface waters, natural
8 surface waters.

9 With the licensing approach here is -- the
10 CNSC had brought in the idea of using the ecological risk
11 assessments, looking at the releases from the facility,
12 and determining, ensuring that we would not expect any
13 risk to human health or biota with the emissions. That's
14 one of the reasons the emissions, especially with respect
15 to these liquid emissions, are extremely low.

16 We do recognize that we do not have --
17 there are no uranium surface water quality objectives,
18 CCME ones. There is the provincial, however, that was
19 brought in, if you read the footnotes on the guidelines,
20 it's stated as an emergency basis and should be used with
21 extreme caution because it's extremely low.

22 The CNSC has been involved and has
23 completed, recently, a number of uranium toxicity
24 contracts with a final objective of coming up with a
25 surface water guideline for uranium. We have been

1 involved with the Province of Saskatchewan in helping them
2 develop a guideline because of their extensive activity in
3 uranium mining and that guideline has just been released,
4 an interim guideline of 15 micrograms per litre.

5 But we recognize that we are looking at
6 developing a uranium guideline that relates to protection
7 of surface water quality environment for and best
8 available technology for use in the licence as a hard
9 number.

10 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Just clarify one point for
11 me. I recognize the nature of the contamination might be
12 different but nevertheless, when we've been looking, for
13 example, at the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station and their
14 effluent not going into streams, but going into Lake
15 Huron, a lake system, and having an effect on the toxicity
16 of fish, which is being eaten by First Nations, primarily
17 the white fish. I'm not quite sure what the difference is
18 here. It says, uranium going in, it's failing a fish
19 toxicity test; is it not, according to this paragraph?
20 Does that not come under the same Fisheries Regulations?

21 **MR. MCKEE:** The actual release into the
22 harbour, I believe, has not failed a toxicity test. The
23 failure on the toxicity test was the further upstream node
24 within the system, and with respect to, at least, the
25 metal mining regulations and others under the *Fisheries*

1 Act, the rainbow trout test is used as the licence
2 requirement, and then the licence requires the daphnia as
3 an extra screening tool for responding, due to its greater
4 sensitivity.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are there any further
6 questions on this particular ---

7 I'd like to thank you for coming and for
8 submitting your written submission as well. Thank you.

9 **MR. LEBLANC:** We'll introduce at this time
10 Mr. Peacock of Ganaraska -- what's the name of the
11 organization, sorry I just don't want to mispronounce it.
12 The Ganaraska Region Conservation Authority, and not
13 committee. We have asked you to come here at the front
14 because the Members have a few questions pertaining to the
15 work of your organization. Thank you for coming.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Peacock can only be
17 with us for a very short time, so we have taken the
18 exceptional step of asking you to be here, and this isn't
19 with regards to any particular intervention per se, but
20 questions that we have in terms of the community. So who
21 would -- does anyone wish to start with regards to
22 questions from this authority? Dr. Barnes?

23 **MEMBER BARNES:** Just to follow up on
24 questions I asked yesterday which do look at the potential
25 threat of, I'll call it flooding in general, but not just

1 necessarily going back to Hurricane Hazel in which there
2 was a combination I guess of freeze and thaw and heavy
3 rain, but given that certainly some part of the scientific
4 community dealing with climate change that's taking place
5 today and likely over the next decade or two, and how it
6 might affect a facility like this over a series of at
7 least one five year licence, if not beyond.

8 The question was really raised because
9 there had been a section dealing with climate change in
10 the submission by the licensee, but there appear to be
11 almost no consideration of two things: one, tornadoes,
12 but the point I raised was the increased threat of larger
13 and more frequent hurricanes, right. So I wondered if
14 this factor was being considered in your study which a
15 final report has yet to be released?

16 **MR. PEACOCK:** The occurrence of flooding in
17 the Ganaraska River, 85 per cent of the major flows that
18 happen are spring and winter flows. So those are the
19 conditions that create major flows in the Ganaraska River.

20 And how climate change will affect those,
21 we're not sure. The major flows, such as the 1980 event,
22 which is the largest flow on record, and the record is
23 about 40 years in length, occurred because of ice
24 conditions and snow conditions in the watershed. We got a
25 100-year flow from a five-year rainfall.

1 So those are the conditions that are the
2 critical conditions in the Ganaraska watershed. And the
3 actual warming of the climate may actually lessen some of
4 the severity of those major events in the winter. We are
5 not sure. It really depends on the climate change models
6 and whether or not the conditions in the watershed that
7 create those 85 per cent of the huge events we get,
8 actually are replicated more often in the winter.

9 One of the concerns, however, is that when
10 we look at return period of rainfall, there are a number
11 of models that show that we're going to get higher spring
12 rains, and if we get those and we do get replicate
13 conditions of ground; frozen conditions and snow, we may
14 have more frequent rainfall, but we are unsure.

15 **MEMBER BARNES:** I guess what I was looking
16 also for, if you -- and I think that you have indicated
17 that -- but that you are in your study are taking into
18 account some of the latest projections, for example, from
19 Environment Canada and others in Canada. Canada's got a
20 good reputation for looking at long term climate change,
21 whether you're building some of that information, even
22 though it's to some degree uncertain, into your look ahead
23 for a flooding in the river system.

24 **MR. PEACOCK:** We are not. We are using the
25 standard that is given to us by the province. We

1 implement the provincial standards. We are in Zone 1 of
2 the province, which means that we test the worst case in
3 100 years historically against Hurricane Hazel to generate
4 that flood line.

5 **MEMBER BARNES:** So do you have any
6 information whether the folks that are looking at the
7 Ministry of Environment guidelines are actually looking
8 ahead as opposed to looking past, since we've been told by
9 many agencies that the future is changing as opposed to
10 being reflective of the past?

11 **MR. PEACOCK:** There has been a number of
12 studies and continues to be, but there is nothing that is
13 relating back into policy at this point.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Harvey.

15 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Yes. I asked the same
16 question yesterday but I will make it differently today.
17 What is the importance of the water level of Lake Ontario
18 on the -- what is its effects on the flood and the
19 mapping, the flood mapping?

20 **MR. PEACOCK:** It affects the flooding in
21 two different ways. We set the elevation, our backwater
22 curve, for the floodplain and the flood wave coming down
23 the river curates from a starting water surface elevation
24 in the lake, and that's the average annual high elevation.

25 So we do a river analysis using an average

1 annual high elevation off the lake. Then we overlay the
2 worst 100-year flood elevation from the lake itself, and
3 we use the worst condition of those two things.

4 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Graham.

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

6 Yesterday we heard or we received
7 information regarding the construction of the berm and I'm
8 not sure which way you're facing but it's on one side.
9 The berm will be constructed on one side, I believe. Has
10 there been mapping or modelling with regard to the effects
11 of flooding on the opposite side where there is no berm
12 construction; the opposite side of the harbour, or is not
13 exactly in the same place?

14 **MR. PEACOCK:** Just a point of
15 clarification. What berm are you referring to?

16 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Cameco talked yesterday
17 about a -- and I believe I made a note at the time of the
18 construction of the berm that you're proposing, and that
19 maybe -- it's down the road I realize but it's -- although
20 I thought it was on the left-side of the harbour. Is that
21 where the berm was going to be constructed or am I
22 incorrect on that?

23 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

24 What we've been looking at it for the flood
25 proofing of the conversion facility is a berm along the

1 left side or the right side, but along the east side of
2 the main site facility.

3 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** That's the berm I'm
4 referring to.

5 **MR. PEACOCK:** With the analysis of the
6 regulatory event, which is the Hurricane Hazel event,
7 there is very little intrusion of that event into the
8 property, and therefore the berm will have very little
9 effect on that flood line.

10 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** And it won't affect water
11 flows and so on in the area? That's what I was referring
12 to. Will it affect the historic water flow and so on in a
13 big storm? It's not going to hinder it. Is that what
14 you're saying?

15 **MR. PEACOCK:** Under the Hurricane Hazel
16 event it will not.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. McDill.

18 **MEMBER MCDILL:** Thank you.

19 With respect to the numerical modelling
20 that was done, are you satisfied that the numerical models
21 match the physical characteristics of the turning basin,
22 the pier, the piles on the pier, et cetera?

23 **MR. PEACOCK:** Yes. The conservation
24 authority is satisfied and so is the pier reviewer that
25 was hired to review the modelling as it went forward.

1 **MEMBER McDILL:** For the community -- I'm
2 just following up on a statement you just made that in the
3 event of a Hurricane Hazel-like situation there would be
4 little or no intrusion onto the property, and what about
5 the buildings?

6 **MR. PEACOCK:** There is a minor intrusion.
7 I think it's just above Building 24, and it's a very
8 limited area and it is mapped out in the floodplain
9 analysis, and I don't see that will have a significant
10 effect. If the berm was in place that intrusion would be
11 stopped.

12 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much. We
14 do appreciate you making a special effort to be with us on
15 these questions.

16 What I'm going to ask the Secretary to do
17 is there is a number of ones that are being put forward
18 into written so that we will have sense after a break --
19 we're going to have a break right now, but we will be
20 coming back with 1856 but there is a number that will be
21 put forward into written. We just want to give you a
22 sense of where we will be, after a 10-minute break.

23 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you.

24 One such submission is a submission from
25 the Port Hope Nuclear Environmental Watchdogs. Mr. Kelly

1 is not in attendance today and the submission will be
2 treated as a written submission, same with respect to the
3 following submission which is CMD 06-H18.54. Again, this
4 is from Mr. Kelly who is not in attendance and his
5 submission will be considered as a written.

6 **MR. LEBLANC:** I should note that the
7 Commission does not encourage double intervention, that is
8 one by an individual and then under the aegis of an
9 organization. Did accept it with respect to this hearing,
10 but it should not be considered as a precedent.

11 The next presentation or submission is the
12 submission from Mr. Pat McNamara, as outlined in CMD 06-
13 H18.55. Mr. McNamara is not with us today so his
14 submission will be treated as a written.

15 **MR. LEBLANC:** When we return from a 10-
16 minute break we will proceed with the oral presentation by
17 the Canadian Nuclear Workers Council.

18 Thank you.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So 10 minutes, please.

20 Thank you.

21 --- Upon recessing at 3:35 p.m.

22 --- Upon resuming at 3:53 p.m.

23 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Ladies and gentlemen,
24 please take your seats.

25 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you.

1 We will now proceed to the next submission,
2 which is an oral presentation by the Canadian Nuclear
3 Workers Council, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.56 and 18.56A.

4 Ms. Joanne Usher and Mr. Tom Fraser are
5 here to present this submission. The floor is yours.

6

7 **06-H18.56/06-H18.56A**

8 Oral presentation by the
9 Canadian Nuclear Workers
10 Council

11

12 **MS. USHER:** Good afternoon, Madam
13 President, Members of the Commission and citizens of Port
14 Hope.

15 My name is Joanne Usher. I'm an executive
16 member of the Canadian Nuclear Workers Council. I have
17 worked in the nuclear industry for the past 20 years. The
18 council represents thousands of men and women from 11
19 different unions.

20 Assisting me today is Tom Fraser.
21 Mr. Fraser is the Canadian Nuclear Workers Council site
22 representative at the Port Hope Cameco facility and is a
23 member of the local United Steelworkers Union.

24 Our presentation will be brief. I will
25 highlight some of the points that are in our written

1 submission and update the Commission on events since our
2 brief was submitted. I will comment on the following
3 issues: our views on health and safety; workforce;
4 community perspective; conclusions; and recommendations.

5 The United Steelworkers at the Cameco
6 nuclear facility ranked health and safety at the top of
7 its agenda. The union members of the joint health and
8 safety committee are appointed. The joint health and
9 safety committee is a watchdog for the worker at the shop
10 floor level. The union-appointed representative on the
11 joint health and safety committee ensures that health and
12 safety issues are brought to the attention of management
13 and unions.

14 Improving safety performance is mainly due
15 to the actions of the joint health and safety committee.
16 The legal rights and bargain rights for health and safety
17 of the workers ensures a good safety culture within the
18 facility. The majority of the workers at the plant are
19 members of the on-site unions that are locals of the
20 United Steelworkers. It is our view that unionized
21 workplaces are safe places to work. Workers have a means
22 to have their concerns addressed and this is especially
23 true in regards to health and safety or environmental
24 issues.

25 Workers at the plant recommend that their

1 friends and their family members seek employment at this
2 facility. This shows that they believe the Cameco
3 conversion facility is a safe place to work and a safe
4 place for the residents of Port Hope. Many workers live
5 with their families in close proximity to the conversion
6 facility in Port Hope. Also, many of the employees at the
7 plant are volunteers in the local communities. There are
8 also many workers from the Ontario Power Generation sites
9 that reside in Port Hope. The fact that many nuclear
10 workers live in the Port Hope area should indicate to the
11 public that these workers live and raise their families in
12 this community as they believe that it is a safe place to
13 live.

14 The Canadian Nuclear Workers Council
15 believes that the majority of the people in the community
16 are confident that the plant is being operated safely.
17 Quite frankly, the public can be assured that any and all
18 issues in regard to plant and public health and safety as
19 well as environmental will be addressed by the unions on
20 site.

21 The Canadian Nuclear Workers Council is
22 fully supportive of renewing the operating licence for
23 Cameco's Port Hope conversion facility for a five-year
24 period. Furthermore, we believe that the facility is
25 operating in a safe and efficient manner.

1 Thank you. We are prepared to answer any
2 questions you may have.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Any comments, Mr. Fraser?

4 **MR. FRASER:** Tom Fraser for the record.

5 I'm just here to answer questions
6 pertaining to the plant specific.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

8 Are there questions? Yes, Dr. Dosman.

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

10 I would like to ask are the workers, in
11 your view, being given adequate training in health and
12 safety by the company?

13 **MR. FRASER:** Tom Fraser for the record.

14 The answer is yes. We have five members on
15 the joint health and safety that are appointed by the
16 union. We meet once a month to discuss issues. Usually
17 we meet for two days. Day one involves certain items like
18 on the shop floor, for an example, electrical cords,
19 tools, grinders and so on. Day two we have the
20 environmental scientist radiation safety officer there.

21 The committee has actually been expanded
22 from two to five people over the last couple of years.
23 The union has actually fought to get more staff on board
24 as well.

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

1 Another question. Could you tell me, are
2 the workers being open to safety training provided by the
3 company?

4 **MR. FRASER:** For the record, Tom Fraser.

5 The answer is yes. The membership is open
6 to an all new safety culture in the plant. We have a near
7 miss program. If we find something that, you know, for
8 instance what we would call a near miss, not an accident
9 but a near miss, all the membership is on board with
10 filling these forms out. We sit down as a group with the
11 membership and try to come up with ways that a near miss
12 won't happen again.

13 Also, the company encourages the membership
14 to take the safety home to our children and our families.
15 They do this through the wellness committee. The children
16 actually do a safety calendar every year. Tyler Rouse
17 over here has done one of our safety meetings for fire
18 safety in the home. All of our membership is very open
19 and happy to have this training.

20 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I have one
21 brief question.

22 Do you work in a culture where it's okay to
23 admit a mistake?

24 **MR. FRASER:** Yes. Actually, the company
25 tries to find a solution to the problem. We don't finger

1 point at the worker. That encourages the workers to come
2 forward with safety concerns. This has been very, very
3 good for the membership because there is no blame put on
4 the worker to come forward with their concerns, and if
5 something has happened we try to rectify it as a group.

6 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

7 Madam Chair, I would like to, if I may, ask
8 CNSC staff, do you concur with the last statement?

9 **MR. O'BRIEN:** Marty O'Brien for the record.

10 Yes, I believe that's the case. Just to
11 add that we do, on a regular basis, meet with the union
12 representatives and they also speak their concerns to us
13 when they are on site as well.

14 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Further questions?

16 Thank you very much for coming today.

17

18 **06-H18.57**

19 Oral presentation by

20 Ian W.M. Angus

21

22 **THE SECRETARY:** The next submission is the
23 submission from Mr. Ian Angus. It is CMD 06-H18.57.
24 Mr. Angus, being unable to attend today, his submission
25 will be considered as a written submission.

1 We will then move to the next submission,
2 which is an oral presentation by CAIR as outlined in
3 CMD 06-H18.58. Mr. John Morand is here to present this
4 submission. I understand we are setting up the
5 presentation as we speak.

6 When you are ready, Mr. Morand, the floor
7 is yours.

8

9 **06-H18.58**

10 Oral presentation by

11 CAIR

12

13 **MR. MORAND:** Thank you, Madam Chair and
14 Commission Members.

15 The last Commission meeting I was at two
16 years ago was for me very disappointing. This one is
17 incredibly encouraging. I would like to comment and
18 congratulate the Chair and the Commission Members on the
19 care, concern, quality of questions and interest that you
20 have shown in terms of reading the material and asking
21 questions. The feedback that I have been getting from
22 everyone is that you are doing one hell of a job and I
23 would like to thank you.

24 You have been hearing an awful lot of
25 issues and not many suggested solutions, so I'm not going

1 to speak to the presentation you have in front of you
2 other than the single last page, which is a recommendation
3 page.

4 I had the honour of being asked to attend
5 the NGO RAC meeting and the further honour of being asked
6 to co-chair that with James Clarke. I look forward to
7 that, to working with the CNSC and the other NGOs to look
8 at the regulatory process over the years to come.

9 One of the issues that I think has become
10 very clear to us all in this room is that people feel
11 frustrated because issues are raised but they are not
12 dealt with, whether they are at a community forum, whether
13 they are at a hearing or tribunal.

14 I would like to suggest a process to the
15 Commission to deal with this and to bring down the level
16 of concern in this community and maybe in other
17 communities. What I am going to suggest is a very simple
18 business principle that I have used for some 35 years as a
19 senior officer either in municipalities or the private
20 sector. I would like to see you set up a flowchart, a
21 critical path, of every single issue that has been raised
22 here today and yesterday and tomorrow, every outstanding
23 item that sits in your variety of reports. I would like
24 that critical path to show the issue, when it was first
25 raised, who on the CNSC staff is actually responsible, not

1 just the director general but the individual, let's get
2 down to who does the work, the individual at the
3 corporation at a senior level because it is a little
4 different there, and down below if the corporation is
5 available and wanting to do that, and at the municipality,
6 who at the municipality has the responsibility.

7 That flowchart would show the date that the
8 issue came up, when all of the parties agreed that it
9 would be handled -- for instance, I was at a meeting where
10 someone said in three months we will solve the fire
11 problem, two and a half years later it is still not dealt
12 with -- and finally when the issue was actually dealt
13 with.

14 Let's have a critical path method of
15 analyzing what is happening within the CNSC.

16 Certainly, in terms of Commission members,
17 you come to a commission, you read all the material, you
18 go away, two and a half years later you come back and you
19 hear a bunch of us saying, oh my God, this wasn't done,
20 this wasn't done, this wasn't done. Let's give you a
21 quarterly report of all outstanding issues and where they
22 are, and an explanation if they are not on schedule.

23 Let's set up a committee, here in our
24 community at least as a first look at it, of individuals
25 from the corporations, from the unions, from the community

1 interested groups -- I spoke to the First Nations
2 representative, to the First Nations -- that would meet
3 quarterly and sit down among ourselves and sort out the
4 issues, what is moving forward properly, what isn't moving
5 forward; how do we deal with this; how do we advise the
6 CNSC, perhaps through the NGO RAC in certain areas and
7 other ways in other areas, so that the people in our
8 community know that there is progress being made item by
9 item.

10 I have come to the conclusion that the CNSC
11 is dramatically under funded. I have heard this from a
12 number of your senior officers on a confidential basis.
13 They don't have the staff. They don't have the dollars.

14 I think that you should be speaking as
15 commissioners, and some of you have very good contacts,
16 right into the PMO, you should be speaking as
17 commissioners to tell the government that they need to
18 spend more money.

19 I am going to make a comment that the
20 industry is not going to be very happy of, but a fee at
21 \$22 a pound of uranium and a fee at \$60 a pound of uranium
22 might be different. Perhaps it is time to look at your
23 actual fee structure in terms of how you regulate and the
24 fees that are charged to the corporations that you
25 regulate.

1 I frankly don't think that you are funded
2 effectively and efficiently enough to provide you with the
3 staff to go and do the job. That bothers me because I
4 have been impressed on many occasions and not as impressed
5 on other occasions with the information you get.

6 I had intended to sit down and go through
7 chapter and verse, but you are aware of it. You have seen
8 it in the last couple of days. I'm sure you have seen it
9 other places. Your staff doesn't have the time and
10 doesn't have the resources. They are trying hard to
11 provide the information to you. They are trying hard to
12 regulate the industry. The industry responds very well.
13 I have said that again and again here.

14 My attack has not been on the industry,
15 although you have heard personal attacks. I just wanted
16 to read something, Madam Chair, just to correct something.

17 I was accused of being a fear monger again
18 because I brought a sheet yesterday of plastic and a thing
19 of duct tape. This is going out from our fire department
20 to everyone in the community. If I might read from it:

21 "Also turn off all fans, vents and
22 heating and air conditioning systems
23 and close any fireplace dampers.

24 Additional protection can be provided
25 for window and door openings by

1 purchasing plastic sheeting and duct
2 tape from a local supplier and
3 covering those openings with the
4 plastic and sealing with the duct
5 tape."

6 It also suggests that you have duct tape in
7 your automobile so that if you are in the automobile and
8 caught in a cloud of whatever that you shut off your
9 engine and duct tape all of the vents in your car. I
10 guess it would be around the floor pedals and things too.

11 So I wasn't fear mongering. It has taken
12 three years of hard work since I raised at the mid-term
13 hearing the issue on fire and emergency services, but we
14 are getting there. It should not have taken three years
15 to get this piece of paper out to everyone in our
16 community.

17 The other issue I will raise before I come
18 back finally to what we can do is that we have no way to
19 notify our citizens. I provided for you part of a log of
20 20,000 phone calls that I caused to be made. About a
21 third of those calls actually go through to humans. The
22 rest are screened in one way or another. With voice-over-
23 Internet-provider it is going to get worse.

24 I act as a consultant. I'm under NDAs to
25 three of Canada's largest mobile communication companies

1 and one in the States. The market is changing. It's
2 changing quite dramatically.

3 In Italy, for instance, there is 125 per
4 cent coverage of cell phones. The current methods we have
5 of notifying people don't work and will work even less in
6 the future, so you need to think about another way of
7 notification here in the community.

8 The company and the municipality have tried
9 with the technology that they have as best they can, they
10 are working at it, but you need to think about different
11 ways. In Pickering I think it was you suggested a siren.
12 Perhaps we need to consider that here.

13 In closing, Madam Chair and Commission
14 Members, thank you. You have treated us all very well.
15 We didn't have to jointly, as I remember with the
16 Commissioner, try and knock at a door at 1:30 in the
17 morning to get a candy bar while people were walking down
18 the street trying to get a little sugar into their system.
19 We didn't make you testy and angry. You didn't make us
20 frustrated. It has been a wonderful experience certainly
21 for me and I congratulate you. But again, we need a
22 method of tracking. We need a method of fixing
23 responsibility.

24 Someone said earlier if you don't measure
25 it it doesn't get done. Well, Madam Chair and Commission

1 Members, we have seen a lot of that over the years. It
2 hasn't been measured and it hasn't gotten done. I'm sure
3 even a low-priced consultant can set up a system for you
4 that will absolutely allow you to track everything,
5 provide it to those of us in the community, recommend that
6 we set up a committee, move forward together, as has been
7 said again and again, whether it was Sarah yesterday or
8 the about to be Dr. Fishlock about two and a half hours
9 ago. Give us a way of monitoring, give us a way of
10 working together in a room. We will do it for you.

11 Thank you.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

13 Before I open the floor for questions I
14 will just mention that a number of the suggestions you
15 made, Mr. Morand, are actually part of the duties of a CEO
16 and I am certainly not the CEO today. I'm certainly the
17 President.

18 Certainly, some of the issues in terms of I
19 would call it the ongoing compliance and enforcement work
20 that happens, that is, whether we grant the licence or
21 not, one of the characteristics of nuclear facilities is
22 that they can't be unlicensed, as far as we are concerned,
23 when they have any type of substances -- you know, we have
24 to make sure whether they have an operating licence or
25 not, whether they are licensed, because that means we have

1 control over them, so the Commission understands that -- a
2 number of the suggestions you made really refer to the
3 operations of the Commission per se and I think that
4 receiving suggestions on that.

5 As you talked about the NGO group, that's
6 really what the NGO group is, to talk as much about
7 processes and how to make things work better for people
8 who are not licensees, I guess, if I was going to put it
9 that way, people that are interested in the work of the
10 Commission from that point of view.

11 I will take those suggestions and via
12 Barclay Howden, who is the director general responsible
13 for this facility, to have discussions on site on that.
14 But there are a number of other issues that you raise that
15 I will start with my colleagues and then come back if
16 those aren't resolved.

17 **MR. MORAND:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Harvey.

19 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Mr. Morand is talking about
20 critical path. I will ask the staff, do you have some
21 sort of critical path?

22 When you conduct those inspections and you
23 have many issues to be realized I suppose you have
24 something like a critical path, which is probably shared
25 with the licensees in order to have those points solved as

1 requested.

2 **MR. RABSKI:** Henry Rabski for the record.

3 Yes, staff has an inspection plan, a plan
4 we have for each processing facility, that we are
5 responsible for, licensing activities and follow-up
6 compliance. We develop these plans on an individual basis
7 based on the risks associated with the facilities,
8 specific risks, and the programs, the key safety programs
9 for each individual facility, so over a licensing term we
10 will be looking at the critical safety areas.

11 As part of your question, which relates to
12 critical path, what we do is as part of our inspection
13 program we look at the key safety areas and when we find
14 an item that requires action on behalf of the licensee,
15 whether it be a recommendation, an action or a directive,
16 we track those on each of our inspection reports. You
17 would find a tracking system of all of our findings,
18 dates, when we set target dates for which the licensee is
19 to respond initially in some cases, maybe some follow-up
20 action in terms of investigation and so on.

21 But when it comes to a particular action,
22 an activity, we set target dates and we track those as
23 part of our inspection program. The project officer, in
24 this case Mr. Marty O'Brien, would be setting up that
25 individual site-specific program and track those

1 throughout the course of his inspections. He will also
2 confer with other specialists if that's required. If any
3 item that has been brought up on his particular general
4 inspections of the facilities warrant any extra input from
5 specialists, he will also consult with them and they will
6 come in and assist him with any of the recommendations.

7 So from a tracking standpoint we have
8 implemented a means by which we list all of our actions
9 and items that we are working on in a particular facility.
10 We set target dates and we track those and we make sure
11 that the licensees are fully aware of that and our
12 expectations with respect to addressing these items.

13 Obviously, there is a level of risk
14 associated with each one and we also apportion the
15 sufficient time to address those in proportion to the
16 level of risk that those items raise.

17 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Do you have any comments
18 about that?

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** To Cameco.

20 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, no, I have no
21 comment to what Mr. Rabski has said.

22 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Just that you are aware of
23 those plans or those targets and you work with those
24 targets, I suppose.

25 **MR STEANE:** For the record Bob Steane.

1 We are quite aware of the tracking system
2 and the staff do -- we get dates and times and actions.
3 We know they are tracking and we are tracking, yes.

4 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** But I think what I have
5 been hearing over the last two days and I think what
6 Mr. Morand is talking about here are two things. I will
7 come back to him later about it.

8 The first is that I think that the
9 Commission understands that many of these things can be
10 quite complex. We talked about fire or something and
11 someone says it is going to take three months and it takes
12 years to do. I know that, for example, recently there was
13 a security matter, not in our jurisdiction but another.
14 Someone said, oh, we can fix it really fast. In fact, we
15 know it takes years to train people and get them on.

16 I think what I sense and what the
17 Commission has shown in the past is sometimes there is a
18 real sense that we expect progress by say mid-term reports
19 or five years and it doesn't happen in those time periods.
20 It is sometimes that frustration that is there with regard
21 to the progress. There may be good reasons for that, but
22 it doesn't always seem to be clear what that is.

23 I think the second comment is the
24 transparency of the process so there is not a sense that
25 say coming out of a licensing decision that there are a

1 set of matters involved, everything from information, some
2 more qualitative than quantitative, some things are
3 specificities that -- for example, the Commission spends a
4 lot of time on the reasons for decision so that it
5 indicates clearly what the reasons are for what we decide.
6 So I think there are more subtleties to the issue than
7 just the existence of a critical path per se, but perhaps
8 I'm wrong in the suggestions, Mr. Morand.

9 **MR. MORAND:** Madam Chair, I like to keep
10 things very simple. If I might I will tell you a very
11 short story.

12 A number of years ago I had the opportunity
13 to do some negotiations with Senator Guy Charbonneau and
14 the former premier of Newfoundland, Frank Morris. He made
15 the comment that when you are premier you ought to really
16 be able to make decisions, but that there was someone in a
17 parliament building in a room with no doors or no windows
18 that when he made a decision they said, yes, no, yes, no.

19 So in a bureaucratic process, and I have
20 run some pretty big ones, what happens is that decisions
21 are made by a tribunal, commission or council and they are
22 interpreted by staff, sometimes at quite a low level, and
23 staff firmly believes they are doing exactly what they
24 want.

25 What I'm suggesting is a very simple, one

1 line per issue, critical path that says, here is the
2 issue, here is when it was raised, here who is doing it,
3 here and here, here is when it gets done, and a regular
4 report to yourselves and an established committee here in
5 our community who would monitor that.

6 I fully understand, Madam Chair, because I
7 have been in your position, that it is your job, but I am
8 suggesting that this be part of the actual licensing
9 process, that this be a requirement to be set up as a
10 first time test to actually help our community cool down
11 the level of debate. I know an awful lot of people would
12 be very happy if they could look at a quarterly or monthly
13 report that says here are the items, here is where we are
14 going.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you for that
16 clarification.

17 Further questions? Dr. Barnes.

18 **MEMBER BARNES:** Just to add to the
19 discussion, what I took from Mr. Morand's comments was the
20 disconnect basically between what the community can see as
21 opposed to what you have just heard from staff, that
22 essentially say, yes, we have a tracking record and we do
23 all this and it is a great idea but we already do it. The
24 point is you didn't know they did it. Right?

25 Often I think when staff have to produce a

1 document for us, particularly on the mid term, and tie it
2 to the ratings, which you end up with perhaps a page
3 indicating that, to give it an A, B, C or whatever,
4 everything is generalized to such a degree that it is very
5 difficult to in a sense track back to a discussion like
6 this. I think this is reflected partly on this, the CMD
7 material that we just had from the municipality where
8 Jacques Whitford just took, as an example, the fire and
9 building code inspections that were so-called outstanding
10 since 2000. Now, it turns out from the discussion that a
11 lot of these have actually been solved.

12 The point is that the impression of the
13 community is that they haven't been solved. I think I'm
14 going to come back to the issue I was trying to address,
15 which is, you know, if this is a divided -- I will put the
16 word "if" -- if this is a divided community, there is
17 certainly an impression that it is to some degree, I'm not
18 saying it is a 50/50 division, but there are certainly
19 some folks that would think it's a divided community, I
20 think there has to be a fair bit of work to try to repair
21 that situation. Some of that can be a better means of
22 demonstration that certain things are being done on time
23 or if there are problems it is openly addressed, right, in
24 terms of we have slipped or we have to take a different
25 tack.

1 That comes back, as I was trying to
2 indicate, to what is the mechanism of getting this
3 information out, not in a sense directly through the
4 company in a formal sense, but you are suggesting some
5 kind of advisory body in which the city and the public,
6 interest groups and so on, and perhaps the CNSC could be
7 an observer on that process, so that there is a better
8 information flow out into the community on a number of
9 these issues. I don't think actually that would take an
10 awful lot but I think it would help enormously to diffuse
11 some of the impressions or concerns that we are hearing
12 repeatedly over these two days.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I think we will take into
14 account these discussions and we will work within our
15 jurisdiction, as you can appreciate. I will certainly do
16 that as well.

17 One of the issues you raised today and has
18 been raised continuously through here that we haven't
19 really discussed very much so I'm going to take the
20 opportunity to talk a little bit about it is emergency
21 preparedness. You raised the issue of what is suitable
22 for the community. Cameco talked a little bit about what
23 they are doing and their plans to look at this.

24 In terms of the system, we have had
25 testimony over a number of licensing hearings about the

1 work that is done together by industries here. I have
2 asked the representative here from Emergency Management
3 Ontario to be with us too, because I think that if there
4 is anything that the Commission has found on all licensing
5 issues emergency management, meaning preparedness, et
6 cetera, is one of the most difficult issues because it
7 isn't under our jurisdiction totally. It does require
8 cooperation from licensees, municipalities, the province
9 of Ontario in this case, and the CNSC to deal with this.
10 So it is I think apropos for us to spend a couple of
11 minutes talking again -- perhaps I could ask Cameco to
12 start this, to talk about what is the emergency
13 preparedness process in place here with those partners,
14 the relationship with those partners, including the
15 municipality, the CNSC, EMO and yourself, and perhaps
16 other companies. Where do you see the gaps and what would
17 be the expectations of progress over the five years that
18 we see? Then I will ask CNSC staff to comment and our
19 colleague from EMO as well.

20 Let's start with the company please.

21 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

22 Over the years Cameco has been very active
23 and working through the CAER committee, which is the
24 community awareness and emergency response, and through
25 that committee. It is a committee of initially

1 industries, other industries in the municipality, but also
2 the municipality of Port Hope is a member. The emergency
3 services in the municipality are members of that. They
4 attend the meetings. The police and the fire also.
5 Emergency Management Ontario are also involved in that
6 committee. Through that committee there has been a lot of
7 planning and working on how to deal with issues, not just
8 Cameco issues but municipal issues, emergency response
9 issues.

10 Then in Ontario more recently there has
11 been new legislation and requirements of taking some of
12 those -- they weren't the responsibility of the CAER group
13 but the CAER group had come together to work on those
14 items. Port Hope has advanced a long way over other
15 municipalities in Ontario, but now Ontario legislation has
16 mandated that specifically as a responsibility of the
17 municipality. The municipality has created a new
18 committee. It is chaired by the fire chief. Frank
19 Halo(ph) is the chair of that. There are members, other
20 organizations participating. We have been working with
21 them and certainly they need to -- you know, planning to
22 put together, emergency plans, evacuation plans and those
23 things. To the extent that we are able to assist and work
24 with them on that, we are happy, willing and supporting
25 that initiative.

1 We also have arrangements with the
2 municipality of Port Hope and we have had some practices
3 with their emergency response organization. We have had
4 some simulated drills and we have participated with them
5 in their emergency centre as an advisory role because they
6 are in charge of it, but we work with them on that front.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Do you see gaps in that
8 at this point and what would be the plan over the licence
9 that you have requested, five years, in terms of
10 addressing those gaps? Is everything fine and just
11 continue with self-improvement in those areas or do you
12 feel there are specific gaps that need to be filled, and
13 again what would be the plan over five years?

14 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

15 I think there are gaps. There are gaps in
16 further developing or bringing up to date the municipal
17 emergency plan. There is a process in place where the
18 municipality has gone out to engage consultant support to
19 develop those plans, put that into place, if there is a
20 need for further exercises doing that and develop all the
21 scenarios. These are scenarios both for other industries
22 in town, transport, highway and leading up to more joint
23 training and simulation exercises. Those are the gaps.
24 There is a process that is active now. The municipality
25 is about to award that contract going forward.

1 Although a lot of this is out of our or my
2 control, at the risk of saying it is going to be done in a
3 year or two and, as Mr. Morand says, you sit at a meeting
4 and someone says we will do it in three months and it
5 doesn't get there, I do anticipate that this has enough
6 momentum that in the next maybe 12, 18 months they will
7 have those plans and exercises will have been done.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

9 Our representative from the EMO, thank you
10 for coming, sir, again.

11 **MR. QURESHI:** Thank you, Madam Chair. It
12 is a privilege to be here in front of the Commission
13 today.

14 I shall expand on the points already given
15 by Mr. Bob Steane.

16 I think I will start from the *Emergency*
17 *Management and Civil Protection Act*, which was proclaimed
18 at the beginning of this year. It requires, like the
19 ministries and other levels of government, also the
20 municipality, to do what we call HIRA, hazard
21 identification and risk assessment, basically a criteria
22 that uses the probability of something happening and the
23 related consequences. There is a scale on which they will
24 prioritize the hazards to the community. With this HIRA,
25 they have to come up with the response plan and it has to

1 dovetail in the overall plans we have at the provincial
2 level.

3 I had a look at the response plan of the
4 community. They do identify radiological as one of the
5 HIRAs there, but it may not be at the top of the thing.
6 Accordingly, they have to have a built-in mechanism in
7 their response plan to deal with that hazard.

8 Before I go further I should also like to
9 put in front of the Commission that Emergency Management
10 Ontario started about two years back with an emergency
11 program which was in phases. We started with essential
12 level and then we were supposed to go to enhanced and
13 comprehensive levels. Port Hope was one of the first few
14 communities who was in compliance with the essential level
15 program, which required them to have a full-time community
16 emergency management coordinator, things like an emergency
17 management coordination committee, and the committee which
18 Mr. Bob Steane referred to, one of our reps, the AD
19 officer, she is on that committee too, and we get a
20 regular report on that.

21 I see a little difference as compared to
22 our other nuclear designated committees, like Pickering,
23 Darlington, where we have very site-specific plans because
24 of the reactors, but in the case of a Class B facility,
25 our plants do not require those kinds of plans.

1 There are some other mechanisms in the case
2 of those communities where we have what we call the
3 regional nuclear emergency management committees. They
4 report to the overall overarching committee which we have
5 at Emergency Management Ontario, which is known as the
6 nuclear emergency management coordinating committee. They
7 meet twice a year and discuss all the issues pertaining to
8 emergency preparedness. So that aspect is a little
9 different in the case of Class B facilities, but we see
10 that happening more at the municipal level and they are
11 taking care of that.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** The head of Emergency
13 Management Ontario has left, Mr. Fantino. Has a new head
14 of this been appointed yet?

15 **MR. QURESHI:** We have Mr. Jay Hope who has
16 been appointed the new head. He got a briefing and is
17 very interested in nuclear matters. Actually, that was
18 the first briefing we gave to him. One of my first tasks
19 will be going after -- from this report, to go back and
20 report to him what happened here today.

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would staff like to
22 comment and then I will ask my colleagues if they have any
23 questions about emergency management?

24 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you. Barclay Howden
25 speaking.

1 From a regulatory standpoint, within the
2 regulations under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*,
3 there is a requirement for licensees to have emergency
4 plans and to cooperate with off-site authorities.

5 We have also developed a Regulatory
6 Guide 225, which is emergency planning at Class One
7 nuclear facilities and uranium mines and mills. That is
8 what we use to guide licensees in their preparation and
9 also indicate the type of criteria we would be using to
10 assess them.

11 In this case, what we have looked at is
12 Cameco's abilities to respond to emergencies but also look
13 at their interfaces between them and off-site authorities,
14 which is generally the municipality, which is the first
15 responder. We have looked at the plans, the implemented
16 program. We also look at exercises as an opportunity to
17 actually see licensee performance under simulated
18 conditions as well as the interfaces that they have with
19 the off-site authorities. Generally, when those exercises
20 are done there is a multi-agency assessment done, although
21 we do something specifically under our regulatory regime.
22 We do participate with others off site, Emergency
23 Management Ontario, the municipality, sort of as a
24 combined group that provides their input on the
25 assessment. It is very much a multi-stakeholder approach

1 in that case. That is what we do. We can respond to
2 questions on performance, if you wish.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** But we had interveners
4 yesterday talking about, if I interpreted them correctly,
5 they don't know what the sound would be or what would
6 cause them to do something. I don't know if that is a
7 fair thing to ask of them, to feel that they wouldn't know
8 what would indicate a real emergency.

9 Again, I didn't ask this question yesterday
10 to Cameco but in the event of a real emergency that was
11 not -- I mean an emergency that was beyond the immediate
12 plant that could have impact for the citizens, can you
13 walk us through what would happen and how would they know
14 actually that something had happened, aside from
15 Mr. Morand's comments about phones, et cetera? What would
16 really happen? Can you walk us through that?

17 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

18 Stepping back to the previous question,
19 there is a gap, that is, certainly another gap identified
20 there is communication and communication in a couple of
21 areas. One is communication of what to do or what all the
22 events are and the sounds and sirens and what they are.
23 The other is in the event of an emergency happening.

24 We have put in place the CAN system. We
25 have put it in place, but it is available through the

1 municipality. Cameco also has what we call the keys to
2 the system so we can do it and run it. We would broadcast
3 the information via the telephone system, the CAN system.
4 We also have arrangements with the radio station that we
5 would be able to broadcast emergency instructions,
6 emergency information on the radio as to what to do. So
7 if it was something ongoing we would notify the radio
8 station. Part of the CAN message would be to tune into
9 the radio station to listen for further updates. That is
10 what is in place today.

11 I think there is a gap as to what we need
12 in place in the future.

13 Mr. Morand's comment about how effective is
14 the CAN system today. As time is going by cell phone
15 technology is challenging. We recognize that. When you
16 make the calls out are people home, do they get the
17 message, what happens then.

18 The other aspect is getting the phone
19 numbers in. Every time we have public information we
20 gather people's phone numbers, but we haven't been able to
21 tap into the 911 network systems so people who have
22 unlisted phone numbers, unless they put them in they
23 aren't there.

24 Back to your original question, that is
25 what would happen is the CAN system would be notified and

1 we would keep doing it as necessary and go to the radio.

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Were the concept of
3 sirens looked at? Is that appropriate or not? From
4 Cameco, EMO and then staff.

5 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

6 When we first went into the process, we,
7 the CAER committee, when we started looking at a community
8 notification system, we did explore sirens, we did look at
9 -- the model that we went to was Sarnia. Sarnia has a lot
10 of chemicals, lots of hazards. They had gone away from a
11 siren system and gone to the phone system because they
12 found the maintenance of sirens very difficult. They
13 didn't always work when you wanted them to work. They had
14 all sorts of items that came up in their siren system.
15 They migrated from that to the CAN telephone system, so we
16 went to the CAN telephone system. There are other
17 problems with it so a siren system, perhaps that is to be
18 revisited.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Any comment from EMO?

20 **MR. QURESHI:** Madam Chair, I'm sorry. I
21 should have introduced myself in the beginning. It's
22 Foto(ph) Qureshi. I am one of the nuclear plant officers
23 with EMO.

24 On the public alerting issue, I will again
25 go back to the structure of our nuclear plants at EMO

1 where the site-specific plans have very specific measures
2 for public alerting. There are standards there. Just for
3 example, in the case of Pickering or Darlington, within 15
4 minutes 100 per cent of the population within the primary
5 zone, indoors and outdoors, they should hear the sirens
6 and get in and tune in on the media and they will get more
7 instructions there. But Part VIII of our nuclear
8 emergency response plan, which deals with other
9 radiological and nuclear emergencies, starting from say a
10 hospital using isotopes to a facility like Cameco, a
11 re-entry of a satellite having radiological material on
12 board, it does not specify any standards about public
13 alerting.

14 Having said that, I'm taking this point
15 back with me. We are in process of revisiting this plan
16 right now. It is in draft form. Even issues like RDDs
17 and RDs, we want to encompass that in this plan too.

18 This point can be addressed subsequently,
19 like what kind of standards should be there for a facility
20 like that. So far in our plans we don't have those
21 standards.

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Staff.

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

24 I am going to ask our emergency management
25 specialist, Jim Sandles, to comment in a moment.

1 Just contextually, using a generic term for
2 sirens, like warning systems, there are different types of
3 warning systems, our focus would be on site. I would like
4 Mr. Sandles to speak to that.

5 However, I think one of the things that
6 came up yesterday is if an on-site warning is heard off
7 site, what expectations would we have of the licensee to
8 inform the public. I will ask Mr. Sandles to comment.

9 **MR. SANDLES:** Thank you. For the record my
10 name is Jim Sandles. I am with the Emergency Management
11 Programs division.

12 Mr. Howden said some of what I would have
13 started my remarks with. With respect of what Mr. Howden
14 asked, there are systems in place and we expect them in
15 place at all licensed facilities for the onsite alerting.
16 It's certainly true in Cameco's case that offsite people
17 will hear them, and that's always a concern when you're
18 dealing with the number of exercises and practices done.
19 What you're hearing is it real?

20 So I think this is -- and it's an ongoing
21 thing that has to -- it's a reality and there is no real
22 way to eliminate it. It's just a matter of working
23 through a communications system and working with the
24 people. I know that information goes out when tests are
25 to be done and practices to alert them and these are all

1 important things to minimize but it probably will not
2 eliminate some concerns or things that do happen.

3 With respect to sirens in general, how the
4 community or the area government chooses to deal with
5 emergencies is really their call. Some places allow the
6 company to initiate an emergency through a siren system.
7 As Mr. Howden said, some use sirens; some use warning
8 systems. In all cases, we find people one way or another
9 are never totally happy with it. We know down in New
10 Brunswick, for example, that people have disabled parts of
11 their phone system because they found it a nuisance. So
12 it's always trying to find the best balance to making sure
13 that the public is informed.

14 We just ask that the licensee cooperate
15 with the local authorities in the manners they can to come
16 up with a workable solution for their environment.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I believe, Dr. Dosman,
18 did you have a question -- oh, Mr. Graham.

19 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes. I know there's been a
20 lot of debate and hopefully the sirens are never -- or
21 whatever type of early warning never becomes an actual
22 accident, but I think there has been a lot of discussion.

23 We heard 15 or 18 months, a year and a
24 half, I think, from Mr. Steane, that you're trying to put
25 together an appropriate -- or I gathered that a few

1 minutes ago; could be wrong. But in essence, is there
2 some way that -- or is CNSC staff prepared to put into a
3 licence condition the fact that an appropriate, well-
4 communicated emergency warning system be in place by a
5 certain length of time? And I don't want to be -- hold
6 someone to 18 months or one year or whatever it is, but
7 after discussions and so on.

8 Is that a possibility to make that part of
9 -- to give the community some comfort and also the fact
10 that the community -- be well communicated with the
11 community also. Having a plan is one thing, but having
12 everyone to know what's part of that plan is another.

13 So is that a reality or is that a
14 possibility?

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

16 I think from a jurisdictional point of
17 view, something to do with the emergency response of a
18 municipality is outside ours. Our requirement is that the
19 licensee has their own emergency plan and that it
20 interfaces with the municipality.

21 I see our role, perhaps to -- as Madam Keen
22 said, to be an observer and maybe to provide input. But
23 really, from a community perspective it's a community-
24 based requirement and I would expect that Emergency
25 Management Ontario would be one to look stronger at what

1 regulatory requirements they may have.

2 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** My only concern is when you
3 get a lot of levels of government and a lot of levels of -
4 - there has got to be some leadership. Maybe by doing
5 something like a condition might be a way of getting
6 Cameco, the licensee, to see the urgency of getting it put
7 in place by a certain time and expediting every avenue.
8 But we can look at that as we deliberate.

9 Did Cameco want to comment?

10 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

11 I completely agree with you, Mr. Graham,
12 that we need to have -- the plans need to be integrated
13 and working together on a good communication plan.

14 I also respect that there are -- Mr.
15 Howden's position -- there are differing jurisdictions
16 and, to the extent you, Cameco, is able to cause things to
17 happen in the municipality sometimes we're -- people think
18 we have more powers than we do in getting things to happen
19 in a municipality, and we'll certainly work in conjunction
20 with the municipality. The responsibility does rest with
21 the -- legal responsibility through Ontario legislation
22 with putting together these plans.

23 So I fully accept the responsibility that
24 we need to do more with keeping our neighbours and people
25 who can hear our sirens, get information to them as to

1 what those sirens and sounds from the plant mean and
2 notification and maybe a can system. But to the extent
3 that municipal emergency evacuations and plans and
4 notification systems, I think that's beyond Cameco's
5 direct responsibility to take.

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, Mr. Morand.

7 **MR. MORAND:** Madam Chair, I don't think
8 that that onus should be put on Cameco. I think that the
9 new council of this municipality needs to step up to the
10 mark in that area most certainly and that it would help if
11 the Commission wrote the municipality and said, "Do it".
12 I think that Cameco has exhibited again and again that
13 they do things and this is one instance, as Mr. Steane
14 correctly pointed out, where the municipality must step up
15 to the mark in the same way they must step up to the mark
16 on the legislation on the fire service.

17 So perhaps the Commission might direct a
18 letter to the municipality saying, "Do it".

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you for the
20 suggestion. The reason I raise it is, I must say that the
21 Commission has tried repeatedly to perform some -- how can
22 I put it -- some bringing together of the various parties
23 on this. It has to be sustained. It has to be something
24 that operates and I think what we have continually found -
25 - and this is not Ontario; it is everywhere -- is that

1 emergency preparedness falls to the bottom of the area.

2 But my sense is, listening to the people,
3 although some people didn't mention emergency
4 preparedness, what we're talking about, how do we ease the
5 concerns of people that are living in this community with
6 regards to this facility?

7 If you think about how would we all do
8 that; information, a number of areas come through,
9 emergency management system and communications. I think
10 if one took a holistic look at this, there is issues that
11 have to be looked at that don't fit into a neat area.
12 There is science which is what we are about, a lot about,
13 but then there's those other issues and how do you provide
14 that holistic sense of oversight?

15 That said, the Canadian *Nuclear Safety and*
16 *Control Act* and the regulatory policy of the Commission
17 clearly holds the licensee accountable, and that's because
18 they are onsite everyday running this facility and we hold
19 licensees accountable as do communities in various ways.
20 So I don't want to give a sense that we want to take that
21 -- put off that gas and I know that Cameco wouldn't --
22 would be very surprised if we changed that.

23 So thank you very much, sir, for your
24 interesting involvement in this, and thank you very much
25 for your submission as well.

1 **MR. MORAND:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

2 I'm accused of being not warm and fuzzy. I
3 have attempted to be warm and fuzzy this time.

4 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I have never been accused
5 of that either, sir.

6 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
7 submission which is an oral presentation from the Port
8 Hope Community Health Concerns Committee. It can be found
9 at CMD 06-H18.162. I just want to note that Miss Faye
10 More had asked yesterday that we switch her presentation
11 with that of the Port Hope Community Health Concerns
12 Committee so we can hear you today.

13 The floor is yours, Madam More.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I'm sorry, Miss More. I
15 just want to make sure all the Commission Members have 162
16 with them? Do they?

17 Thank you very much, and Miss More, the
18 floor is yours, ma'am.

19

20 **06-H18-162**

21 Oral presentation by the
22 Port Hope Community Health
23 Concerns Committee

24

25 **MS. MORE:** Thank you very much, and thank

1 doses for every man, woman, and child in Port Hope. That
2 is essentially the bottom line.

3 You may feel comfortable doing this because
4 Health Canada and your staff provide a cushion for you in
5 making you feel reassured that health study results show
6 no effect or that there's unlikely to be an effect or it
7 wouldn't be significant or these are not unreasonable
8 effects. We disagree. We believe in reality that cushion
9 is an illusion and does not exist for you.

10 In 1979 the federal and provincial
11 governments committed up to \$5 million for comprehensive
12 health investigations in Port Hope. What I'm holding up
13 here is just a newspaper clipping of the time that that
14 announcement was made. They committed between 4 million
15 and 5 million in 1979 dollars to properly investigate the
16 health of the people of Port Hope when this story broke
17 about the radiation contamination all over our community.

18 Those studies were never done. A very
19 small fraction of work has been done that needs to be
20 done.

21 I know it's late in the day, and I do have
22 a number of slides and I'm actually going to try and go
23 through them all. So some will be quite quick.

24 Essentially, we are saying that Cameco does
25 not meet the requirements for a five-year licence. We

1 support the position of Families Against Radiation
2 Exposure in this regard. Cameco's data shows volume and
3 concentrations of uranium emissions have increased over
4 this licensing period just ended, over 2000-2001.

5 We find that the ongoing risks daily to
6 people and the environment are not properly characterized
7 for us by health authorities and that this has been
8 happening for decades.

9 We do not understand why Canada does not
10 recognize, as the United States government does, through
11 the U.S. Department of Justice, through its compensation
12 legislation and executive order of President Clinton, harm
13 that has been caused to military personnel, to atomic
14 workers and community down-winders.

15 We have found, on the issue of health, in
16 particular, that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
17 has been an ineffective regulator to protect the people
18 and the Atomic Energy Control Board before it.

19 Essentially, federal departments have a
20 conflict of interest in Port Hope which presents us with a
21 dilemma. Health Canada, as well as the Atomic Energy
22 Control Board, now the CNSC, when Eldorado was a Crown
23 Corporation and now they have been regulating and they
24 have been responsible for health, have regulated the
25 pollution with which we live. So when it comes to doing

1 health investigations they must be done independently.

2 We do not agree with the foundation for the
3 standards. The European Committee on Radiation Risk,
4 among others, has demonstrated that the ICRP dose models
5 are incorrect. They're based on flawed outdated
6 principles and unsupportable analytical models of the
7 biological effects of radiation.

8 They were adopted many, many years ago,
9 before DNA and stem cells were discovered and understood.
10 The devastation of one neutron or one alpha particle has
11 been demonstrated clearly and actually photographed.

12 Standards do not factor in cumulative or
13 synergistic effective exposures and that question has come
14 up.

15 We've been exposed. There has been 93 per
16 cent enriched uranium according to previous transcripts at
17 Zircatec and, I believe, Cameco as well. So we are
18 looking for the precautionary principle for Port Hope.

19 We have exposures of alpha gamma and
20 neutron radiation; we inhale airborne uranium, enriched
21 uranium and uranium compound particulates. We need
22 investigations.

23 Our health has been treated as a liability
24 issue, a business issue, political issue, international
25 relations issue, someone else's issue but our exposures

1 are not treated as the real public health issue that they
2 are for us.

3 There's no historical or ongoing
4 investigation of public uptake, lung retention and
5 biological accumulations to even attempt to validate the
6 official "no harm" predictions or "not an unreasonable
7 risk" guesses.

8 The widely accepted impacts of inhaled
9 particulate on cardiovascular and respiratory systems are
10 not discussed in relation to this industry and they must
11 be.

12 The response that we received when the
13 community through independent testing disclosed the
14 presence of neutron radiation here was this public
15 sidewalk; that the levels were known about, but they were
16 too low to be concerned and why should they be an issue in
17 Port Hope when they aren't in the rest of the world?

18 Cameco had to borrow neutron detection
19 equipment. Dosimeters in use don't record neutron
20 radiation. So our understanding as of June that no
21 protections have been put in place for drivers or
22 employees or the public, wasn't considered necessary
23 because the dose is low.

24 You heard Dr. Blecher yesterday stress the
25 importance of avoiding unnecessary ionizing radiation and

1 he, as a very experienced geneticist, brought this
2 message.

3 Trucks with uranium hexafluoride still park
4 at coffee shops and travel public areas through our town.
5 When they stop at a red light the neutron radiation does
6 not stop. We still are not being given data on the
7 monitoring of neutron radiation.

8
9 This is from the U.S. Department of Energy
10 website that even the heels that are left in UF₆ cylinders
11 can contain enormous amounts of uranium and are still
12 emitting, especially if they're transuranics still
13 emitting significant neutron radiation.

14 This is a calculation done using a Lawrence
15 Livermore Laboratory calculator where you simply input the
16 volume and it gives you a calculation of how many neutrons
17 per second, per canister are being emitted.

18 They talk about the need to monitor the
19 canisters one at a time because they can be quite
20 different.

21 In terms of the emissions the
22 concentrations have increased according to our
23 calculations, which is simply using the Cameco quarterly
24 reports and doing mathematics and you can see the figures
25 there, 6.16 grams per hour -- grams of uranium per hour to

1 14 and 54 kilograms of uranium per year, average versus
2 122.72.

3 In terms of uranium and healthm the health
4 panel that Cameco has talked about, I too attended and
5 received a slide deck and my colleagues. We have just
6 excerpted one from a slide deck put out by Health Canada
7 where it said:

8 "Uranium, by route of exposure,
9 inhalation, cancer, they had equivocal
10 causality?? Ingestion, no evidence,
11 but potential hazard."

12 The cancer incident study in Port Hope, the
13 identified radiosensitive cancers is thyroid, lung,
14 breast, and leukemia.

15 Consistently in Health Canada material and
16 CNSC, the major contributor to radiation exposure for the
17 Port Hope population has been said to be up until 2002,
18 indoor radon.

19 Now, we are not aware of any announcement
20 that every home in Port Hope had elevated indoor radon.
21 Certainly, some did and some of us grew up in those homes.
22 But everybody has inhaled the air. Everybody, man, woman,
23 and child inhales the uranium particulate in the air. So
24 we find that some of the critical assumptions in these
25 reports are not well founded.

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I've let you go ---

2 **MS. MORE:** Oh, sorry.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Exactly the 10 minutes,
4 my fault, so I'll give you a minute extra.

5 **MS. MORE:** I'm at 10?

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** You're actually 11:30.
7 I'm sorry, it's my fault.

8 **MS. MORE:** We do have a chore though in
9 terms of responding to what has been put out.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, and a minute more.

11 **MS. MORE:** There is consistent increased
12 circulatory disease; mortality rates, but they're said to
13 not be related to the pollution. No health effects would
14 be expected and you heard that again yesterday from Dr.
15 Tracy.

16 The Mintz analysis is of the federal data
17 itself and it finds reason to be concerned. These disease
18 trends have been ignored. What you heard yesterday was an
19 overall average given to you and in fact the overall
20 death, there was a 13 per cent elevation in the death rate
21 in the last 10-year period studied.

22 A Commissioner asked about leukemia;
23 childhood, 41 per cent more than expected.

24 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Ms. More, could I suggest
25 you move to your recommendations and questions because

1 otherwise I'd hate to have to cut you off.

2 **MS. MORE:** All right. Thank you.

3 And just to draw attention to the diseases
4 that the U.S. Department of Justice stipulates in law as
5 conducted to radiation, induced by radiation.

6 Recommendations: Maximum two-year licence,
7 impose and enforce strict conditions for full compliance
8 with laws and requests within three months, ensure funding
9 for independent health investigations led by the community
10 are provided along with ongoing independent health
11 monitoring and refer to the Minister of the Environment
12 for independent panel review EAs for all nuclear projects
13 in Port Hope.

14 Then, there are a list of questions for the
15 Commissioners at the end asking you to use your power as a
16 Commissioner to make changes for our wellbeing.

17 Thank you.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

19 Are there questions from the Commission
20 Members?

21 Dr. Dosman.

22 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, earlier
23 yesterday and today there were a number of presentations
24 on health issues and a number of replies from CNSC staff
25 and I just wonder, Madam, if I might request that perhaps

1 CNSC staff might forward to Ms. More a summary, perhaps,
2 of some of those studies.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Actually, the transcripts
4 would be the first step I think for Ms. More.

5 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you for that
6 suggestion.

7 Of course, Ms. More, the comments that were
8 made will be on the transcripts and I don't think it would
9 be fair to the group to repeat again some of the comments
10 that were made earlier during what is albeit a very long
11 hearing.

12 **MS. MORE:** May I just make a comment?

13 I was here, and I'm aware of what was said
14 and some of the summaries of those studies we disagree
15 with.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

17 Are there any other questions or comments?

18 Yes, Dr. Barnes.

19 **MEMBER BARNES:** Ms. More raised the issue
20 of neutron radiation and staff did respond to that. But
21 if I could just pick up on one aspect and that is the
22 potential health of the truck drivers involved? Is there
23 any hazard to truck drivers?

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

25 From our perspective, no, but Cameco may be

1 able to provide you with more details on doses. But from
2 our view, when the trucks are loaded up there's a
3 transportation index prepared which is based on potential
4 exposures. And from our perspective, the risk to the
5 truck drivers are not elevated.

6 **DR. BARNES:** Even though the truck driver
7 may be involved in this over an extended period,
8 repeatedly doing this, is that taken into account?

9 **MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.
10 This is taken into account with the
11 transportation regulations, so I'm going to ask Mr. Rajesh
12 Garg to speak to that point.

13 **MR. GARG:** For the record, my name is
14 Rajesh Garg and I'm the Transport Advisor in the Packaging
15 and Transport Licensing Division at CNSC.

16 The CNSC regulations are based on the IE
17 regulations and the IE regulations take into consideration
18 what should the dose rate on the conveyance and also they
19 take into consideration the dose that the truck driver
20 could be exposed to.

21 The licensees are supposed to monitor the
22 dose where the driver is sitting and any passenger along
23 with the driver. They are -- the doses are monitored in
24 that area.

25 So that has been taken into consideration

1 that they're not overexposed.

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

4 Yes, Mr. Graham.

5 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Yes, I have two questions,
6 and I'm trying to be brief.

7 The first one is, and for the record is, in
8 one of the slides that Ms. More put forward said that
9 Cameco had to borrow neutron detection equipment from OPG.
10 Do you now have neutron detection equipment onsite?

11 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vetor for the record.

12 The equipment we borrowed from OPG was for
13 the 2000 study. We've purchased our own equipment for the
14 2004-2005 study or, rather, 2005 and 2006 studies.

15 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** In one of the questions to
16 Commissioners it was why is there still no disclosure on
17 neutron radiation monitoring or protection in place for
18 workers for the public? Would you like to comment on
19 that? I think maybe we dealt with that or some of that,
20 but just for the record this afternoon.

21 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vetor for the record.

22 That information was included as an
23 attachment to one of the supplemental CMDs. I can't
24 remember which one, but both of those have been placed on
25 the community -- our community website. So that

1 information is available to the public now.

2 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Just one other question,
3 regarding UF₆ cylinders at Cameco, and I don't know
4 whether it's relevant to our licensing but I'll ask it and
5 if I'm out of order, okay.

6 Are all cylinders being monitored for alpha
7 beta and gamma neutron radiation and who has that data?
8 Is that information put on the website also or do you
9 monitor those UF₆ cylinders?

10 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vektor for the record.

11 The neutron measurements were only done
12 along our fence line; we haven't been doing those on a
13 cylinder by cylinder basis. But all cylinders are
14 monitored for alpha and gamma before they leave the site
15 and there are release criteria that we have to meet before
16 they're released from the site.

17 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** My question was, though, do
18 you put the information out to the public?

19 **MR. VETOR:** Kirk Vektor for the record.

20 That information ---

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Did you mean, Mr. Graham,
22 that they would (audio difficulties) cylinder by cylinder,
23 put that out to the public?

24 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** No, that's not what I
25 meant. I just meant is there a monthly reporting of x

1 number of cylinders and so on? Is there any reporting on
2 this at all or is it realistic type -- not cylinder by
3 cylinder because there's literally thousands of them but -
4 --

5 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

6 I'm sorry, Mr. Graham, we were having a
7 little trouble here. We missed the second part of your
8 question.

9 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** I guess my question is this
10 transparency and you can't get everything out, but is
11 there any type of information with regard to cylinders
12 given on a quarterly basis or anything to the public? Not
13 on an individual one but how many were tested and how many
14 -- or any type of information.

15 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

16 Each and every cylinder is checked for the
17 alpha and gamma radiation. That information is posted on
18 the side of every cylinder as it's in transit. What you
19 have -- it's called a transportation index. The
20 information is there but we haven't been summarizing that
21 on a cylinder-by-cylinder basis or monthly averages or so
22 on in other reports.

23 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Further questions?

24 Thank you very much, Ms. More.

25 **MS. MORE:** You're welcome, and may I just

1 add that we just send a bibliography that is a work in
2 progress to help you understand where our thinking is
3 coming from on this. It didn't make distribution but you
4 may be receiving it as commissioners. I don't know. But
5 we'd be happy to provide that.

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Ms. More, one of the
7 things that's never been clear to me is health is a
8 provincial responsibility and when we go to other
9 facilities there has been a dialogue between people
10 interested in health studies and the province, and it's
11 not clear to me that there has been any dialogue with the
12 province at all in terms of, I guess, regular studies on
13 any community, not just this community and I just wonder
14 if you could enlighten us that way?

15 **MS. MORE:** Yes, I'd be happy to.

16 At the time; for example, in 1979 when this
17 announcement was made, it was made jointly. There was the
18 federal Minister of Health and the provincial Minister of
19 Health and there was the Ministry of Labour involved as
20 well.

21 When we started out we had roundtable
22 discussions and we had representatives from the AECEB,
23 Health Canada, MOE, Province of Ontario Health. All kinds
24 of people came to our table and gradually they started to
25 go away because they said the overriding responsibility is

1 with you, and it seemed to become gradually a ministry's
2 stance as the people perhaps -- and ministries gave in
3 kind through staff time. Often staff were paid to come to
4 evening meetings with us as we developed our study plan,
5 which we have, and we have an advisory team of people
6 ready to go. We just need funding. Right now, we're
7 fundraising for radiobiological testing in Port Hope.

8 So we're pursuing everything but the
9 problem was -- and we all noticed this, that really people
10 felt the buck stopped with the Atomic Energy Control Board
11 and now the CNSC and because radiation was involved and we
12 have these sort of two solitudes that worked, the metals
13 and the radiological, that you trumped the other one, and
14 so you got the price tag. And because, I guess, it had
15 been a major federal announcement before, people persisted
16 in thinking, well, you know, that'll happen again and we
17 had hope as well and we still do live in hope.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.
19 That was new information for me. So thank you very much.

20 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is an
21 oral presentation from Ms. Ashlea Tombs, as outlined in
22 CMD 06-H18.61.

23 Is Miss Tombs in the room?

24 As Miss Tombs is not in the room we will
25 consider her submission as a written submission.

1 We will then move to the next submission,
2 which is the submission -- an oral presentation from Ms.
3 Diane Taylor, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.62. Miss Taylor
4 has asked to present this evening. She has asked this
5 morning, so we'll try to accommodate but if this is not
6 possible this evening her submission will be considered as
7 a written submission.

8 We will move to the next submission which
9 is a presentation from Mr. John Floyd, as outlined in CMD
10 06-H18.63. Is Mr. Floyd in the room?

11 As Mr. Floyd is not in the room, we will
12 consider his submission as a written submission.

13 The next two submissions are submissions
14 CMD 06-H18.64 and 18.65. These intervenors had asked
15 previously to present this evening. Time allowing once
16 again.

17 We will then move to the next submission
18 which is an oral presentation from Ms. Karen Colvin, as
19 outlined in CMD 06-H18.66.

20 Miss Colvin, the floor is yours.

21 Choir

22

23 **06-H18.66**

24 Oral presentation by

25 Karen Colvin

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

MS. COLVIN: Thank you.

Madam Chair and Commissioners, I thank you for coming to Port Hope to hear our interventions and I think that the number of interventions that you are hearing here is a reflection of how much we love this town and wish to keep it as safe as possible.

My name is Karen Colvin and I have lived in Port Hope, Ward 2, for 21 years. We live in a glorious pristine rural part of this community and the headwaters of the Ganaraska River spring from the ground and flow in tributaries around our property and the water out there is pure enough to drink. This eventually flows through the town, the beautiful river that you see that flows into Lake Ontario.

Because I live in such a beautiful, natural area, I am keenly aware of what has been lost here along the waterfront in Port Hope. You cannot put a dollar value on it for it is something so valuable that surely it is priceless.

And even though I live 25 kilometres away or so, the Town of Port Hope is where we shop and bank and visit with friends and, most importantly to me, is where my children have attended school. And I am very concerned as a mother that the safety of my children has been

1 compromised by the presence of the nuclear industries in
2 town and that lax regulatory guidelines are partly to
3 blame.

4 When I first began making friends in Port
5 Hope, I was really surprised at the number of mothers I
6 met who had children with brain tumours or leukemia. This
7 is anecdotal evidence, I realize, but it is very alarming
8 and totally unbelievable to me that there are no
9 comprehensive health studies to understand this anomaly.
10 As the regulator, I think you should insist that proper
11 studies in this area be completed.

12 Emissions at Cameco have increased or maybe
13 they were always this high. I heard yesterday that
14 fugitive emissions previously may have been overlooked.
15 This is a tragedy for anyone who inhales these
16 contaminants. In fact, I am so concerned about this that
17 I have withdrawn my daughter from her school in Port Hope
18 and have enrolled her in a school in Cobourg where I feel
19 it is safer for her. I know that I am not the only parent
20 who has made this decision for this reason.

21 In fact, breathing in emissions directly
22 from the stack is only one of the many ways that we are
23 put at risk here in Port Hope. My son worked after school
24 at a fast food restaurant in town and one evening as I was
25 waiting for him to get off work -- it's also a big truck

1 stop -- in pulled a nuclear payload. The driver parked
2 his rig directly in the public lot right in front of the
3 entrance to the restaurant, and I don't know why he didn't
4 park where all the other rigs park. Maybe he wasn't
5 welcome there.

6 I understand that neutron radiation has
7 been detected and recorded on these rigs and how many
8 unsuspecting people walked by this vehicle that evening?
9 How often does this happen in this town that we drive
10 alongside or walk by one of these rigs or pull up behind
11 one when it's at a traffic light.

12 What I would like to know is what you have
13 done to investigate and rectify this problem. I don't
14 think that monitoring it is sufficient. This also raises
15 the issue of once the rigs are on the road is it really
16 possible -- you sort of lose whatever control you may have
17 had.

18 Now, I know the subject of neutron
19 radiation has come up a lot and I did hear someone say
20 yesterday that the levels are quite low. But that's
21 really -- doesn't satisfy my worries as a mother and I
22 don't want my children to be exposed to even a quite low
23 dose of neutron radiation, and this is a quote:

24 "Neutron radiation is known to produce
25 tumours in animals and cause cell

1 transformation."

2 That is from Sloane, Newcombe and Palliser
3 from the Department of Pathology in the New York School of
4 Medicine.

5 The other issue I'd like to raise about
6 these rigs is that I think the signage is inadequate. I
7 think the sign is too small and I think it should be
8 visible from all sides. I don't think that it's visible
9 from the side. At least, I didn't notice it, but I did
10 notice a small sign. I thought it was way too small at
11 the back of the transport truck.

12 So here in Port Hope how many of us have
13 been contaminated simply by walking on the beach; digging
14 in our gardens; or simply taking a breath of air? As an
15 environmentalist and citizen of this earth, I appeal to
16 your sense of ethics and morality to reconsider what your
17 role entails. Not only are you directly responsible for
18 the welfare of the employees of Cameco and citizens of
19 this town, but you should consider the global impact that
20 your decisions may have.

21 In an era of dangerous nuclear
22 proliferation, your role takes on a dramatic importance.
23 Can you be certain that the end product of the industries
24 you regulate if not used in the making of weapons that may
25 one day be aimed at us? Did the tritium sale to Iran

1 really go into compasses? Did our depleted uranium poison
2 the U.S. Troops in the first Gulf War?

3 These are questions that would certainly
4 keep me awake at night. They do keep me awake at night.
5 It would be a good idea to look at the ethics, as well as
6 the science of these industries. The end product must
7 always be tracked to ensure that it doesn't fall into the
8 wrong hands.

9 I do not blame Cameco for doing what it is
10 in business to do. It is a world-class corporation. I
11 realize that it must make itself profitable in order to
12 continue, and I think that we are fortunate to have such
13 highly skilled workforce of people who are dedicated to
14 their jobs, many at the top of their fields, working here
15 in Port Hope.

16 But I do expect a high standard from you,
17 our regulators. It is your mandate to protect our health,
18 safety and our environment. Are you certain that
19 everything is being done to protect Port Hope from
20 unnecessary radiation exposure?

21 I don't believe that a licence exceeding
22 two years in duration should be granted to Cameco until
23 all outstanding safety issues, including fire protection
24 and this issue about neutron radiation, is rectified. And
25 I thank you.

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.
2 Are there questions for this intervenor?
3 Yes, Dr. Dosman.

4 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I seek your
5 guidance. My question would relate to trucks.

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** We had quite a bit of
7 discussion earlier on the rigs and the neutron radiation,
8 just a moment ago. But if it is in addition to what the
9 staff has talked to us about with regard to
10 transportation; is it in addition to that?

11 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Well, I'm not sure.
12 Perhaps I could pose the question and if it's already been
13 adequately covered, I certainly would accept that.

14 I'd just like to ask Cameco, what about the
15 trucks? If you're standing next to one of the trucks
16 transporting the product, what's the radiation exposure?
17 Is that a duplication?

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** By the time we talk about
19 whether it's a duplication, we can have the question
20 answered, I think. So let's just answer it and go for it.
21 I think it is, but ---

22 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

23 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane, for the record.
24 The transport of radioactive material has
25 everything to do with our industry, and very well

1 regulated, and the allowable radiation from a package and
2 the design of the package is such that it can be out in
3 the public and meet all public exposure requirements. So
4 it's absolutely safe in transit for any member of the
5 public anywhere.

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

7 I just wanted to comment on the issues that
8 you discussed about the use of uranium products coming
9 from Canada. The Government of Canada was one of the
10 first countries, first of all, to abandon military uses
11 after the war. That was a research project during that
12 time, and Canada abandoned non-peaceful uses of the
13 nuclear industry period and that has been reinforced
14 continually by the Government of Canada in international
15 forums, such as the UN, and certainly in the work that we
16 do here in the CNSC.

17 So there is a vigorous system of export
18 controls and import controls in Canada, and in fact
19 exceeds the international benchmarking for controls of
20 materials going in and out.

21 So one of the roles of the CNSC and other
22 countries as separate agencies, but it is part of the
23 responsibilities of the CNSC to monitor this, to work with
24 other regulators of other countries, require permits and
25 to monitor this and so certainly it is an increasingly

1 dangerous world. I think that that's fair to say. But
2 Canada is not contributing to the increase and Canadian
3 uranium is not used for other purposes, and that's
4 absolutely Canadian policy.

5 Thank you very much for intervention.

6 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to a final
7 submission before we break for an hour for dinner. The
8 way that we're going to proceed is that we did advertise
9 an evening session, starting at 7:00 and made some
10 arrangements with some of the intervenors, but we may
11 start a bit before 7:00 to continue with the current list
12 of intervenors, after which we will start as planned with
13 the evening session.

14 So the next submission is an oral
15 presentation from Mr. Curtis Brisbois, as outlined in CMD
16 06-H18.67. The floor is yours, sir.

17 **MR. BRISBOIS:** Thank you.

18 My name is Michel Curtis Brisbois. I am a
19 resident of Port Hope, and I'd like to speak to you
20 tonight on the application for a five year extension.

21 In reading the LLRW draft screening
22 report which was released a couple of months ago. I came
23 across something that triggered me being here today. And
24 it states;

25 "Health and safety consideration.

1 Cumulative effects were considered
2 with respect to health and safety
3 considerations in combination
4 with Port Granby project, Zircatec
5 plant upgrades, Cameco plant physical
6 modifications, Vision 2010, and DNGS
7 re-tubing and DNGS shutdown and
8 decommissioning".

9 The proponent identified increased stress
10 and adverse effects to health and general wellbeing
11 resulting from the negative changes to people's feelings
12 of health and sense of wellbeing, feelings of personal
13 security and feelings of satisfaction with living in a
14 community as a residual cumulative effect.

15 My occupation, I am a member of Local 873
16 of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage
17 Employees. It's one of the largest trade unions in North
18 America. I also sit on the Health and Safety Committee of
19 that in Ontario. My direct position is transportation and
20 with the subtitle of picture cars. And what picture cars
21 are is we develop smoke and screens on television.

22 The reason I brought that up is basically
23 with smoke and screens. My job as a supervisor in picture
24 cars is to get the job done, but my duty is to secure the
25 health and wellbeing of the people on set. And why I

1 bring that up is I drove home from Toronto this morning,
2 and remember smoke and screens. I drove home this morning
3 at 5 o'clock and at 6:15 I went to the mailbox and picked
4 this up. It's a community form put out by a Cameco
5 publication dated 2006.

6 In all its pomp, Mr. Steane identifies that
7 one of the turning points of a health related symposium
8 that we had here, was that every member in that committee
9 said that they would live in Port Hope. What he failed to
10 mention was that a Health Canada doctor, a Dr. Tracy, also
11 said there should be ongoing health studies in this town;
12 not here; smoke and mirror, and that's what he's putting
13 out to the community and that's why my high blood pressure
14 is boiling over.

15 Also, in every article in here, every
16 little graph, emissions up, up. In 2003 they were
17 approximately 60 kilograms or kg's of uranium dust, and in
18 2006 they're fabricating or they're looking at 130
19 kilograms. So what if we licence them for another five
20 years? We give another five years. They tell us that
21 their business is going to increase 10-fold. So in my
22 little mind I'm saying "Oh, Christ, if it's going up
23 already, what's going to happen?" They've never indicated
24 that they were going to do anything about bringing it
25 down. A lot of smoke and mirror; yes, we'll bring it

1 down, but there's the proof in the pudding. They put it
2 out.

3 Also, environmental performance; and it
4 stipulates here: (As Read)

5 "Cameco has illustrated substantial
6 decreases in annual average uranium in
7 air concentrations near the facility."

8 Near the facility, well, that's great. The stack is up
9 here.

10 Sampling locations, Waterworks, Canadian
11 Tire, Shooter Street, conveniently left out March Street,
12 which I have understood has the highest level of emissions
13 or capturing. I'd like them to answer that.

14 When you talk about transportation and
15 the hydrofluoric -- what is it, the hydrofluoric which
16 comes in? When CN delivers that it comes off the mainline
17 and then it crosses a major thoroughfare, and why I say a
18 major thoroughfare is that there are numerous construction
19 companies that utilize that road.

20 When it enters the facility into
21 Cameco it's a padlock. I had Global come down here and do
22 a story on that and they put it on. One of their first
23 headlines in the news was this little padlock for
24 security. I stage catastrophic accidents. My
25 responsibility is to maintain the health and welfare of

1 the people doing it. I can tell you that when that -- not
2 only do we know who owns that -- if they were bringing the
3 railcar in past that gate and the engine was left on the
4 major thoroughfare, who's taking care of it?

5 I'm going to blow the lid off this
6 right now. I had a conversation with Frank Carlo out
7 there not more than three hours ago and I asked him this
8 direct question.

9 "If that railcar is on the road and a
10 transport truck hit it whose
11 responsibility is it?"

12 "I don't know. I'd run."

13 Also, I can go down on any given night
14 and after that container is emptied and brought out
15 through that gate it's put on a rail side not 50 feet from
16 the major thoroughfare. And somebody earlier today said
17 well, we have this locking system that's on it that no one
18 gets in it. Gentlemen, we were all boys at one time.
19 Tell me one instance where we wouldn't try to get into
20 something. No security. No cameras. No anything. It's
21 unbelievable.

22 My point in being here today is not
23 only is my blood pressure going up, we have one of the
24 largest -- well, I think it is in North America at least -
25 - evacuations of low-level radio waste ever. It's a test

1 case. Port Hope is a test case. And they say that
2 they're starting in 2008. If we allow the five-year
3 licensing we're going to be smack dead in the middle of
4 it.

5 In this report from the low-level
6 waste here it's all hypothetical. It's never been done
7 before. They acknowledge the amount of contaminated waste
8 that's going to be floating in the air. Has anybody
9 brought up the case that we have two plants emitting
10 emissions that are increasing today? They want to expand.
11 So I think they're going to go up. We haven't --
12 nobody's talked about how much the low-level waste is
13 going to produce. How much can Port Hope take? How much
14 can we take?

15 My question to the council -- bear
16 with me one second here. I've got it. I have a simple
17 question that has not yet been answered. Does either
18 Cameco or the CNSC staff know the kilogram how much --
19 know to the kilogram how much uranium goes into the
20 conversion facility, how much leaves the facility invoiced
21 by price and weight and what is the difference? In other
22 words, how much "u" goes in and how much goes out and what
23 goes missing.

24 Thank you.

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

1 While your question at the end is a
2 question -- the first question that will be asked and this
3 plant is under safeguards. It is required to pay
4 attention to what it's got on its site, et cetera. So I'm
5 sure that there is some commercial issues here that I want
6 to be sensitive to.

7 But I guess my question to Cameco and then
8 to staff is -- I won't repeat your question, sir. Could
9 you please answer his question?

10 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

11 Yes, we know exactly how much uranium comes
12 in and how much goes out, and it's not just Cameco's
13 accounting, it's also verified and is oversighted by CNSC
14 and oversighted -- which ultimately is oversighted by the
15 IAEA. As you correctly pointed out, it comes under
16 safeguards and we have to track everything.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Could that be confirmed
18 by staff?

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

20 Karen Owen, our Safeguards Officer to
21 reply.

22 **MS. OWEN:** For the record, my name is Karen
23 Owen from the International Safeguards Division.

24 Yes, I can confirm that the International
25 Atomic Energy Agency, one of its roles is to perform

1 routine book audits of inventory going into the site and
2 out of the site, so inputs and outputs. And then those
3 are also backed up by routine annual physical inventory
4 inspections where they use a statistical inspection plan
5 to verify that all the material that was declared to be
6 onsite is in fact onsite.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** And actually I can say
8 that I participated in one of those audits about a year
9 and a half ago at the Cameco facility and also at
10 Zircatec, so I am well aware of this. And Canada takes
11 these responsibilities very seriously.

12 I mentioned earlier that we're a country
13 committed to peaceful uses, and one of the interesting
14 points about this is that we have probably the most
15 vigorous inspection regimes in the world because of this.
16 Countries who have -- that don't subscribe to peaceful
17 uses, in fact, ironically enough, haven't got the same
18 level of scrutiny that we have.

19 So we are subject -- we have agreed to the
20 additional protocol as well, which requires that Canada
21 and its facilities are submitted to extra scrutiny, which
22 includes snap audits, snap visits as well. So there is --
23 I think it's fair to say, Ms. Owen, if I'm not mistaken,
24 that we have the -- that there's -- we are at the highest
25 level of inspection that the IAEA does.

1 Is that correct?

2 **MS. OWEN:** For the record, Karen Owen.

3 Yes, I can confirm that Canada is the
4 signatory to the additional protocol, which is basically
5 an agreement between the Government of Canada and the
6 IAEA. That involves, as you said, a strengthened version
7 of safeguards.

8 And to add to that, Canada is one of the
9 first countries with a major nuclear fuel cycle in place
10 that has been granted a conclusion by the IAEA that all of
11 our declared nuclear material is accounted for and that we
12 have no undeclared or secret facilities in the state as
13 well.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Barnes has a
15 question.

16 **MEMBER BARNES:** Okay. Again, without
17 getting into the specifics, Cameco takes in quite a large
18 volume or weight of uranium and has a very large output.
19 So could you say plus or minus a per cent or plus or minus
20 so many kilograms? You're not able to provide that
21 accounting on an extremely precise level, are you?

22 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

23 You're correct, Dr. Barnes. Yes, there is
24 a large volume of material flowing in and out. We track
25 to less than a point of a per cent.

1 **MEMBER BARNES:** But one of the things that
2 you have shown us in your initial presentation is that
3 despite this tracking, you had not accounted for 60
4 kilograms per year of fugitive emissions. Is that
5 correct?

6 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.
7 That's correct. It was 60 kilograms out of
8 --

9 **MEMBER BARNES:** A lot.

10 **MR. STEANE:** -- out of 14 million
11 kilograms.

12 **MEMBER BARNES:** That was a partial lead
13 into another question the intervenor really asked and some
14 of my questioning was to probe the same sort of thing. So
15 I think I would like to sort of close the circle on it to
16 at least provide an answer to the intervenor.

17 I pointed out, holding up the magazine
18 there, that Cameco's emissions had doubled over the last
19 licence period. Part of that, I think, was recognition of
20 these fugitive emissions. I had asked you earlier if you
21 anticipated requesting any increase in the amount of
22 uranium to be used through this next licence period. The
23 answer was "no".

24 And you've indicated that, I think, you
25 believe you've captured most of the fugitive emissions, at

1 least at the principle sites. So at the level of
2 approximately a total of 120 kilograms of emissions of
3 uranium per year; is that correct, for the plant or for
4 the facility?

5 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.
6 Yes, that is.

7 **MEMBER BARNES:** Right. Could you tell us
8 what you would expect the level to be at the end of a next
9 requested five-year licence period?

10 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

11 I guess this is a -- I had a similar
12 discussion yesterday. I do know it will be down about 10
13 per cent by actions that we are taking at the end of this
14 year, by the end of next year. We did talk about going
15 forward with the -- with our Environmental Management
16 System, resetting priorities and goals and going forward.

17 So today I would anticipate it's going to
18 be significantly less than 120, say 10 per cent notably
19 lower, about 10 per cent next year. But five years from
20 now, I can't commit today that it will be 50 per cent.

21 **MEMBER BARNES:** No, I am not asking for a
22 commitment. I'm asking for -- I had pointed out before
23 that I didn't see any targets in the documentation which
24 really worries me because of working under the ALARA
25 principle and under (a) the recognition which was brought

1 about in part by increased monitoring, and recognition of
2 the fugitive emissions.

3 One, I think the Commission expects Cameco
4 to continue to improve its systems, its monitoring, its
5 effectiveness in the spirit of ALARA and I think that's
6 for any organization. I would say that's hard to do
7 unless you have some kind of target, knowing the kind of
8 facility that you have and knowing the fixed amount which
9 I think you've told us over this next period of time and
10 any modifications that you expect to put in over this
11 period.

12 So I'm trying to respond to an intervenor
13 that is concerned that it's been doubled over the last
14 five years and was implying that it could well double over
15 the next five years. I'm not wanting to put actual words
16 in your mouth, but I think it would be helpful to the
17 community if you could give some kind of general estimate,
18 not a precise figure, general estimate of what you think
19 the figure might be going from 120 now to what it would be
20 in 2011 at the end of a proposed five-year licence period.

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** May I add that if this is
22 not possible, since we have talked about transparency as
23 well -- I mean, it would be ideal if you could answer Dr.
24 Barnes right now, but if you can't, I think it's going to
25 be important as well as reporting the emissions as you go

1 forward to the CNSC and to the community that forecasts of
2 what you believe will be the emissions will also be put on
3 -- I talked about the public.

4 So if you have got -- if year by year you
5 set a target for those years as well as going forward,
6 that that be discussed in public as well as given to the
7 staff. But I do reinforce for Dr. Barnes' point about it
8 would be better to have it now.

9 **MEMBER BARNES:** Just an approximate figure.
10 That's all I'm looking for. I'm not ---

11 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

12 What we have committed to and will be doing
13 is -- because uranium is not the only aspect of our
14 emissions. We look at reducing and our Environmental
15 Management Program is looking at reducing emissions,
16 reducing risk, reducing all aspects of what we do and
17 setting priorities and targets. I have committed to the
18 community, I'll commit to the Commission that we, and
19 going forward we have set our baseline information there,
20 we will work with the community in setting targets.

21 Perhaps the community in looking on all the
22 numbers says -- I don't expect this -- but perhaps they
23 say, "Well, your level of uranium in air is so low why
24 don't you -- let's all focus on fluorides and really go on
25 fluorides" and we say all right, there's the priority. As

1 I say, I'm not expecting that nor am I saying we're going
2 to abandon uranium emission.

3 But I am committing to setting targets in
4 conjunction with the municipality and reporting back very
5 publicly on those targets and how they go. I have stated
6 that with our community forum process it's -- I'm
7 accountable to the friends and neighbours in the community
8 and so we will set -- we have set -- really got the
9 information gathered now so it's understandable by the
10 public and now the next step is to set targets and report
11 against them.

12 We are and we do know from some actions we
13 are taking with our incinerator at the end of this year
14 that those uranium emissions will drop by about 10 per
15 cent.

16 And another thing I will absolutely -- can
17 commit to in five years from now, it won't be higher than
18 -- they won't have the same -- they won't be higher and
19 they will be lower, but I have a hesitation to giving you
20 -- even you say today an approximate number because it's
21 on the record and it'll come back and that will be a
22 number that, "Mr. Steane, you said five years ago it was
23 going to be 50 and it's 55" so I am committing to the
24 process.

25 **MEMBER BARNES:** But Mr. Steane, what I have

1 just heard you say is that you do not expect it to exceed
2 120 kilograms a year. Correct?

3 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

4 That is correct.

5 **MEMBER BARNES:** Thank you.

6 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I just want to mention to
7 the intervenor that your concern about the low-level waste
8 site work going on at the same time as ongoing facilities
9 is absolutely reasonable and that's why our environmental
10 assessments talk about cumulative effects in terms of
11 processes. I think that is very reasonable and I think
12 there is communities around the country that we regulate
13 that are seeing, you know, a number of projects going at
14 once and I think that's very reasonable.

15 The Commission has not seen the licensing
16 documents for that. They may say that they're going to
17 start in 2008 and we'll see. The Commission will do a
18 complete licensing process, if I am correct -- I am just
19 looking at the staff -- on the low-level waste site and
20 your comments are very -- are a red light for us in terms
21 of looking at how they intend to do that production; the
22 pace of it, the pace of how they do the work, et cetera,
23 and we will certainly be paying attention.

24 So we thank you for bringing that to our
25 attention.

1 **MR. BRISBOIS:** Thank you, Madam
2 Commissioner. And you are correct. I think I was trying
3 -- what I was trying to do in my high blood pressure
4 moment was, to put it all in perspective, proceed with a
5 two-year licence so that at the end of two years we can
6 see if Mr. Steane's emissions haven't risen and we can
7 look at the low-level and I think that's very reasonable.

8 But thank you, anyway. I enjoyed this.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much, sir.
10 We are going to take an hour break. So
11 it's 10 to 6:00 and we'll be back at 10 to 7:00. Thank
12 you.

13 --- Upon recessing at 5:50 p.m.

14 --- Upon resuming at 6:56 p.m.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.
16 Mr. Secretary.

17 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you, Madame la
18 présidente.

19 As per the Agenda, the next two submissions
20 H18.68 and H18.69 are scheduled for the evening session.
21 Even though we are after dinner, we're still not in the
22 evening session. We will now complete the day session
23 prior to proceeding with the evening session. This means
24 we have four or five interventions to consider and then
25 we'll proceed with the evening session in the order of

1 priority that has been set up.

2 Thank you very much, so, with this said we
3 will now proceed with the submission, which is an oral
4 presentation from Mr. & Mrs. Haskill as outlined in CMD
5 06-H18.70.

6 Mr. Haskill, the floor is yours, sir.

7 **06-H18.70**

8 Oral submission by

9 Mr. Sanford and Mrs. Helen Anne Haskill
10

11 **MR. HASKILL:** Thank you very much.

12 My name is Sanford Haskill and that's S-A-
13 N-F-O-R-D; it's a Jewish name, not English.

14 I have a little bit of comment about this
15 and then I have a number of questions I would like
16 answered and, Madam Chair, I would like the opportunity to
17 maybe respond to some of the answers that are given to me
18 if it's permittable with you.

19 Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I
20 would like to thank you very much for allowing me to speak
21 tonight and I'd like to congratulate you on the way you
22 acted on the October 4th Hearing in Ottawa. I went to
23 that Hearing and I was very pleased with the way all the
24 Commissioners acted. You requested information, which we
25 did not get in time, and I don't believe that's your fault

1 and I don't know whose fault it is, but it must be
2 addressed, in the near future.

3 Madam Chair, we're here today, we shouldn't
4 be here today; let me put it that way. Back in the
5 eighties, I attended a sod-turning just outside my farm in
6 the west end of Hope Township for a new facility for
7 Cameco. Had that facility went ahead, we would not be
8 here today and this town would not be divided, and the
9 real reason we're here is because of one fellow by the
10 name Marc Lalonde. He caused us to be here, because he
11 stopped this facility from starting in Wesleyville. And
12 that's the only reason we're here and he is the person
13 that is responsible for dividing this town.

14 I would like to go into a few things that I
15 have concerns about; first of all, about notifying the
16 public if there's a disaster at Cameco or Zircatec. The
17 people that live just up here in this subdivision or we
18 live 1 ½ clicks west of the municipality, we could not
19 hear a siren at our place. As far as the telephone
20 system, this is awfully hard for me to say, but I have to
21 agree with Mr. Morand. I think it is the municipality's
22 responsibility to look after phoning us and telling us and
23 I would respectfully request, that you ask the
24 Municipality of Port Hope to do that, because Mr. Cannon
25 was here today and he fully supports Cameco and you have

1 five councillors that fully support Cameco. So it will be
2 a slam-dunk, when it was put before those commissioners.

3 There was some talk by Mr. Steane about
4 closing the road and, him and I have discussed this
5 before, where I used to take my favourite girlfriend on a
6 Saturday night, down to the beach in Port Hope. He's
7 talking about closing that road. That road leads to water
8 and in Ontario we have a law that states it must be passed
9 in Parliament for a road to be closed to water. I
10 certainly hope that you don't have the power to do
11 something about that and close that road for us.

12 I would also like to talk about Hurricane
13 Hazel. I don't think there are too many other people in
14 this room that was here, when Hurricane Hazel passed
15 through our municipality. I had an uncle who was working
16 at the, what was then, the Matthew Conveyor, which is now
17 part of Cameco's property; the most southern building
18 which is a brick building. The water was going up --
19 where Cameco's parking lot is, was a baseball park and a
20 pavilion and the water was going right up to the bottom of
21 the -- or the north end of the baseball park. I would
22 think the waves were as high as my head over the -- when
23 they were coming off Lake Ontario.

24 So, Mr. Peacock, I think was out-to-lunch
25 when he told you what he told you about that. I hope to

1 God we never see another Hurricane Hazel, here.

2 Now, Madam Chair, I would like to ask a few
3 questions and I need answers to them and I certainly hope,
4 and I'm sure, that the high-priced help that you have here
5 can help me out.

6 Number One is a licence. Is there another
7 licence other than the one that I was presented with that
8 is in operation now for Cameco? Is there a new written
9 licence available? And if so, in the old licence it does
10 not define the area that the licence covers; and does this
11 licence cover rented property that Cameco has?

12 I have a copy of a by-law where the
13 municipality rented them the centre pier for \$9,000 a
14 month and that licence is transferable to low-level if
15 they take it over. So, I want to know if Cameco's licence
16 covers that area, and also I understand the DFO owns some
17 of that land which is leased to Cameco and is there a
18 rider from DFO okay-ing the licence to be issued?

19 I would like to talk about the railroad
20 going through there. If we had a major catastrophe on the
21 railroad, every one of those people working at Cameco
22 could not get out to get home or to get to safety. I
23 think you have to take a long, hard look. This is a one
24 inlet place to Cameco and I don't think that should be. I
25 think there must be another road built somewhere, whether

1 it's to the west, down over the railroad or something, but
2 a one-entrance is not acceptable and certainly there is
3 railcars going by there and the railroad is not in good
4 condition. My father-in-law was an engineer for 40 years
5 and he told me some horrendous stories about it.

6 Now, in two weeks from today I believe it
7 is, you're doing Blind River, and in their submission,
8 they're talking about an incinerator that is going to burn
9 barrels of something from Cameco in Port Hope. I would
10 like to know how many of those barrels will be transported
11 to Blind River and what is in them. They are talking
12 about some kind of oil and some kind of uranium. Now Mr.
13 Parr, who is an expert on uranium, tells me that uranium
14 won't burn, so why is this stuff being taken to Blind
15 River if you can't burn it?

16 Transportation is a major problem for me.
17 We race horses in the Province of Ontario; we're licensed
18 in Canada to race horses. We have to go through the weigh
19 scales with our equipment. I was sitting at the weigh
20 scales one night with my horse and my trailer, a Cameco-
21 loaded truck come up and went through the left lane which
22 is the lane you don't have to use, and when I questioned
23 the lad who was giving me hell at my truck, he said, "Oh,
24 that's nuclear stuff and we don't have moon suits. We
25 can't look at it. We wave them through." I would like to

1 know if this is true and why is it being allowed here in
2 Ontario.

3 I also notice that my trucks all have to
4 have a yellow Ontario sticker stating that they are
5 certified for the Province of Ontario. These trucks are
6 tagged somewhere else; there's no sticker on them. I
7 don't know where they're tagged. Are they tagged in
8 Saskatchewan or Panama or Montreal, I don't know, and I
9 would like to know why they are allowed to run these roads
10 without one of our Ontario stickers on them.

11 Another thing that I'm very concerned about
12 and I certainly would expect that the CNSC would have
13 heard about it, but there was a dredging in the harbour
14 this summer and Terraprobe did a study for them to find
15 out if everything was okay, and there was a high level of
16 benzene in there. Now, I'm not a chemist and I don't know
17 much about benzene, we don't use it on horses so I can't
18 answer, but if it is a serious thing, benzene, it was
19 removed from the harbour and taken up to the Works
20 Department and they told me that there were going to
21 wriggle it around every couple of weeks, dry it out, and
22 put it back into use somewhere. I would like confirmation
23 that -- give me the true story on that, please.

24 I have a map here of where it was found and
25 it was found I would think, according to map, maybe within

1 30 feet or 40 feet of the Cameco discharge into the
2 Ganaraska River. So I would like an answer on that and I
3 would like to ask maybe a couple of questions back, if
4 you'd permit Madam Chair, on that?

5 Also, last week it was reported to me by
6 one of the fishermen that somebody left Cameco in a
7 stretcher and I would like to know if that was a serious
8 incident or was it just a normal -- somebody passed out or
9 stubbed their toe and they had to take them by ambulance.

10 Madam Chair, I think that covers everything
11 that I would like to know and I would like my questions
12 answered so I can pursue it.

13 Thank you.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

15 So we'll start from the top of your
16 questions. The first is with regards to the scope of the
17 licence on Cameco. Could I please have the CNSC staff
18 answer number one question?

19 **MR. O'BRIEN:** I understand the question is
20 where the description of the facility is in the licence?

21 **MR. HASKILL:** Yes, sir.

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** And he specifically asked
23 for some issues with regards to DFO riders and turning
24 over of portions of that licence to the lower waste
25 office, et cetera.

1 **MR. O'BRIEN:** To cover where the licence is
2 described, it's described in an appendix in the Facility
3 Licensing Manual, which is one of the documents listed in
4 Appendix "A" of the proposed licence and the current
5 licence as well.

6 **MR. HASKILL:** I don't have that. Where
7 would I get that?

8 **MR. O'BRIEN:** Yes, that could be made
9 available -- can be made available.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** The second question is
11 with regards to the issue of a railway accident and
12 access, a secondary exit road for Cameco staff in the end
13 of the blockage of the exit road from Cameco. That's what
14 I understand.

15 I hope everybody is listening as hard as I
16 am. Okay.

17 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

18 I'll get Tim Kennedy, who looks after all
19 of our emergency response to answer that question.

20 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** He can probably answer
21 the next one, which is the Blind River -- the materials
22 that are going up to Blind River, and the other question
23 was with regards to the weigh scales. If there's anything
24 you know about that, that's probably provincial
25 responsibility and harbour and the stretcher. So there

1 are four areas. It might be easier if Cameco just takes
2 them all on. I'll remind you if there are some issues.

3 **MR. KENNEDY:** For the record, Tim Kennedy.

4 The major railway is a feature north of the
5 facility. Two railways, about 80 trains a day, and we are
6 well aware of the 1978 incident of a car coming off the
7 railway and we have done tabletop drills working through a
8 scenario where an incident might be occurring to the
9 northeast of the plant and that we would be trapped on the
10 plant site and have to react to it.

11 We have a shelter in place, training for
12 all our employees, plus areas of the facility that are
13 designed for that. We also have an environmental sampling
14 boat and in the one scenario, we use that to start
15 transporting, in this case, an injured employee that was
16 part of the scenario. So we have worked through that and
17 prominent wind directions would leave anything to the east
18 of us, would most likely miss the plant site, but we could
19 be isolated by the emergency response and we also know
20 that the railways can be shut down to allow other exits
21 across the rail lines. It is common during an emergency
22 response by local authorities, and we have the same access
23 numbers to shut down both railways if need be.

24 And there was an incident in the community
25 where the Mayor took that action to safeguard an event and

1 shut down the railway. So we are well aware of that
2 feature of our facility and have taken adequate
3 precautions to respect that and also drill and practice
4 that.

5 **MR. STEANE:** I come back to the question
6 Mr. Haskill had regarding the road access to the water.
7 And yes, we have had conversations on that and do know
8 that there are people who would like to maintain the
9 access to the south end of the property and with the road
10 restructuring that we had talked about with the
11 municipality, the intent is to continue with the public
12 access to the south end, just by a different road that
13 would not go along March Road and down, but would go up
14 and around.

15 So the access committed before, the access
16 to Mr. Haskill's favourite spot would be maintained.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So could we go swiftly
18 then through the Blind River barrels, the weigh scale and
19 the harbour benzene and the stretcher? Just take it away.

20 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, Bob Steane.

21 For Blind River, yes, there is -- well,
22 it's subject to an environmental assessment. There is a
23 proposal in for modification to the incinerator at Blind
24 River, an addition of additional pollution abatement
25 equipment at Blind River and part of that proposal has

1 been going on for a number of years is that contaminated
2 combustible materials from Port Hope would also go to
3 Blind River.

4 I don't have the numbers and volumes in my
5 head today, but they are in the project EA documents that
6 are available on the websites.

7 I was just reminded by Mr. Rogers, the
8 question was that uranium doesn't burn and that is
9 correct, but may contaminate materials though that we use
10 the incinerator as a means of recovering the uranium. The
11 uranium doesn't burn. It reports to the ash and the ash
12 is recycled back to a mining facility for the recovery of
13 the uranium.

14 The transportation of the weigh scales, I'm
15 sorry, I don't know what's happening at an Ontario weigh
16 scale. I would think that they need to go through it as
17 well.

18 The registration of the vehicles, I know
19 they meet all of the transport requirements on the
20 Transport Canada and Canadian Transport Regulations, but
21 specifically with an Ontario sticker, I'm not familiar
22 with that one. We would be happy to meet with Mr. Haskill
23 and review that circumstance with him.

24 The dredging in the harbour, I can't speak
25 to the benzene. We did hear about some benzene. We have

1 checked our site and we have absolutely no benzene on site
2 and any benzene that was in some materials in the harbour
3 that were dredged, we cannot give any further information
4 on.

5 And lastly, the one about a stretcher,
6 there was an individual who suffered from a medical
7 condition and they were removed by ambulance to the
8 hospital.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.
10 Any follow-up you need on those specific
11 areas?

12 **MR. HASKILL:** Haskill is the name.
13 Maybe CNSC staff could tell me; who
14 regulates these trucks on the road? Is it the Ontario MTO
15 or who am I going to go and talk to?

16 **MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.
17 I'm going to ask ---

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** If we know, we'll let you
19 know.

20 **MR. HOWDEN:** He will respond to that
21 question.

22 **MR. GARG:** Rajesh Garg here.

23 The carriers and the convenience trucks are
24 regulated by Transport Canada, so any marking, labeling,
25 placarding, those kinds of stuff are regulated by

1 Transport Canada and their regulations. Thanks.

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Any further questions
3 from my colleagues?

4 Thank you very much, sir. Thank you for
5 your patience as well. The day is getting on.

6 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
7 submission, which is an oral presentation by the Sierra
8 Legal Defence Fund as outlined in CMD 06-H18.71. Mr. Hugh
9 Wilkins, Staff Lawyer for Sierra Legal Defence Fund is
10 here to present this submission.

11 Mr. Wilkins, the floor is yours.

12

13 **06-H18.71**

14 Oral presentation by
15 Sierra Legal Defence Fund

16

17 **MR. WILKINS:** Thank you very much and good
18 evening. My name is Hugh Wilkins from Sierra Legal
19 Defence Fund. I am providing submissions this evening on
20 behalf of Families Against Radiation Exposure (FARE).
21 I'll be making brief submissions on three issues.

22 The first is the need to ensure that before
23 a licence renewal is granted, that the applicant has
24 completed all the outstanding action items that the
25 Commission staff have requested to complete in the past.

1 The second issue which I'd like to address
2 is the need to ensure that a full and independent
3 assessment is conducted regarding the vulnerability of the
4 applicant's Port Hope facilities from the risks of
5 flooding and also from possible structural failures in the
6 Port Hope harbour wall.

7 And the third issue which I'd like to
8 briefly address is the need to ensure that the public has
9 an adequate opportunity to review, assess and comment on
10 all the materials and submissions made by the applicant in
11 these proceedings.

12 We submit that the Commission should rule
13 that the applicant's licence should not be renewed until
14 such time that: (1) the actions that the Commission has
15 required the applicant to undertake in the past in regard
16 to fire safety and emergency response preparedness are
17 fulfilled; (2) that flood and harbour wall security
18 concerns are fully addressed and; finally (3) that the
19 public has been given a meaningful opportunity to review
20 and comment on the proposals and all the supporting
21 materials before the Commission.

22 We submit that if the applicant complies
23 with the Commission's requirements, that it should renew
24 the applicant's licence for a term of no more than two
25 years with a licence condition requiring it to have strict

1 compliance with all provincial and federal environmental
2 legislation.

3 So I'd like to turn to the first issue, the
4 need to ensure that the licensee has completed all of the
5 action items that the Commission staff has set for it
6 before renewing its licence.

7 Achieving high levels of licensee
8 compliance with legislation and regulations is fundamental
9 to the work of the CNSC and critical in ensuring Canadians
10 of the safety and security of nuclear installations and
11 processes. Section 12(1)(c) of the Acts, *General Nuclear
12 Safety and Control Regulations* states that:

13 "Every licensee shall take all
14 reasonable precautions to protect the
15 environment and the health and safety
16 of persons and to maintain security."

17 For years, CNSC staff have tried to have
18 the applicant meet this regulatory requirement with
19 respect to fire safety and emergency response, but they
20 have not had full success.

21 Since 2000, deficiencies at Cameco with
22 respect to complying with the National Fire and Building
23 Codes have been identified. Instead of working to ensure
24 that requirements under the codes are met by Cameco, the
25 company states in its application for renewal that it has

1 made efforts to ensure current code compliance where
2 feasible. This is hardly a committed effort at
3 compliance.

4 According to the CNSC, Cameco has yet to
5 complete all the fire safety actions that were identified
6 by a CNSC inspection in a third party review conducted in
7 2000. During that review, a staggering 210 deficiencies
8 were found including problems in sprinkler coverage,
9 hydrogen systems, laboratory, safety and building exits.
10 A subsequent inspection by CNSC staff in 2004 found 33
11 deficiencies in Cameco's fire safety practices. And after
12 inspection in 2005, another 67 deficiencies were
13 identified.

14 In its application, Cameco states that many
15 of the necessary actions that were highlighted in 2000
16 still remain outstanding. In fact, 49 necessary action
17 items that were identified during these inspections have
18 not yet been fully addressed by Cameco.

19 If one were told before boarding an
20 airplane that 49 necessary action items regarding the
21 plane's safety had not been addressed by the airline, I
22 would have some reluctance getting onboard the plane.
23 However, here the situation is completely different. It
24 is far more serious. If a significant fire were to occur
25 at the Applicant's facilities, the harm caused could have

1 disastrous long-term health, environmental, and economic
2 consequences for the entire community.

3 The safety deficiencies also extend to
4 Cameco's emergency response capabilities. In February
5 2005, the Commission required Cameco to ensure that it had
6 the capacity to respond to a hazardous materials emergency
7 within ten minutes 90 per cent of the time by no later
8 than July 2005. To date, it has not met this standard.
9 During testimony in Day One, Cameco staff reportedly
10 stated that response times vary presently from three
11 minutes or 30 minutes to an hour. CNSC staff have
12 concluded that fire emergency response provisions for the
13 facility require further improvement.

14 I submit that any fire or emergency
15 response issue that requires further improvement does meet
16 the test in section 12(1)(c) of the regulations. No
17 applicant should be rewarded a licence renewal in such
18 circumstances.

19 The second issue which I would like to
20 address is a need to ensure that a full and independent
21 assessment is conducted regarding the vulnerability of the
22 applicant's Port Hope facilities to a significant flooding
23 of the Ganaraska River and to possible structural failures
24 in the harbour wall.

25 Two assessments that were referred to

1 during discussions on Day One of the hearing were
2 subsequently circulated in a limited fashion to the
3 public. These assessments were a hydraulic assessment
4 done by AMEC Earth and Environmental on behalf of Cameco,
5 and a harbour wall stability study prepared by SNC-Lavalin
6 Engineers and Construction on behalf of Cameco. These
7 assessments raise serious questions regarding risks from
8 continuing operations at the Applicant's facilities, which
9 must be fully addressed prior to a renewal of the
10 Applicant's operating licence.

11 First I would like to briefly address the
12 floodplain assessment. The flood modelling results in the
13 assessment indicate that a regional flood would exceed the
14 top of the harbour turning basin wall and shows that flood
15 water would enter the Applicant's property. The
16 assessment's conclusions do not cite how the law defines
17 whether a building is in fact on a floodplain, but one
18 could assume that if the flood waters reached the wall of
19 a building, the that building is at least partly within a
20 floodplain. The fact that the floodplain line is drawn
21 along the exterior walls of both building 24 and the
22 building directly north of it is simply because the
23 building's exterior walls act as a barrier to the water
24 migrating further horizontally along the Cameco property.

25 In addition, the flood modelling also shows

1 that the centre pier would be flooded. This is a location
2 of radioactive contaminated soil and sediment, which was
3 removed during the construction of the new Port Hope water
4 filtration plant. A flood could cause radioactive
5 contaminated materials to wash into Lake Ontario and
6 perhaps even contaminate other flooded areas near the
7 mouth of the Ganaraska River.

8 Regarding the harbour wall stability study,
9 this assessment aims to examine the possible impacts of
10 harbour wall failure in the Cameco processing facility.
11 However, the study limits its examination of effects on
12 the Applicant's processing facility to an outright failure
13 reaching the perimeter of the building. The report fails
14 to examine how a failure that approaches the Cameco
15 buildings might affect the buildings' stability.

16 Furthermore, the study does not consider
17 how a failure might impact the structural integrity of the
18 Applicant's buildings on the site. No information is
19 provided on the foundation of the Applicant's buildings
20 and depending on how each building is founded, a failure
21 that does not reach the buildings' edge but gets within
22 close proximity could impact the stability of the
23 buildings' foundation and cause settling and other
24 structural failures.

25 In addition, the report does not examine

1 the possibility of ice build-up in the harbour and how it
2 might contribute to a failure and several other
3 assumptions regarding the construction of the harbour wall
4 are also not verified in the assessment.

5 Given the nature of the processing
6 conducted at the Cameco facility involving highly toxic
7 and radioactive materials, even a remote chance of a
8 failure is cause for great concern, given that such a
9 failure could be catastrophic.

10 Given the significant risks that are
11 identified through a review of these two assessments, it
12 is submitted that Cameco's licence should not be renewed
13 until such time that the deficiencies noted above
14 regarding the risks from flooding at Cameco's facilities
15 and the structural integrity of the harbour wall are fully
16 addressed by Cameco and verified by an independent
17 auditor.

18 We believe that this review should include
19 an assessment of the impacts of a regional flood on the
20 existing Cameco operations and any risk that it poses to
21 the public; an assessment of the dangers to the public,
22 employees, and the environment of such play in the Cameco
23 facilities and the centre pier; a full assessment of
24 structural integrity of the harbour wall and finally an
25 assessment of the dangers to the public, employees and the

1 environment of a structural failure of the harbour wall.

2 Finally, the last issue, which I would like
3 to briefly discuss is the need to ensure that the public
4 has an adequate opportunity to review, assess, and comment
5 on the materials and submissions made by the Applicant in
6 these proceedings.

7 In 2005, the CNSC received 192
8 interventions over the course of 29 hearings. At today's
9 hearings, there are over 165 interventions listed on the
10 agenda. The extraordinary number of written and oral
11 submissions at these hearings provide a strong message in
12 itself. There is overwhelming public interest in the
13 application that the Commission has before it and an
14 overriding need to ensure accountability, transparency,
15 and meaningful public engagement and inputs in the
16 process. As stated by the Chair in the Commission's
17 annual report:

18 "An expectation of Canadians is that
19 the regulatory process will be
20 accessible and transparent. Whether a
21 mayor from a community next to a power
22 plant, a patient being treated with
23 nuclear medicine in a hospital or a
24 driver of a transport truck carrying
25 uranium ore, individual Canadians

1 expect to be able to find out about
2 the regulatory process, which protects
3 their health, safety and security and
4 that of their community."

5 As noted above, the materials on flooding
6 and harbour wall security were not disclosed to the public
7 until after Day One of the hearings was completed.

8 Other key materials that were referred to
9 during Day One were only circulated yesterday ---

10 **THE COMMISSIONER:** One minute, if you could
11 conclude please.

12 **MR. WILKINS:** To conclude, yesterday
13 morning, F.A.R.E. received some 520 pages of new documents
14 that were -- which we have yet to fully review and we are
15 not -- we haven't been able to assess whether they are
16 complete.

17 The public should have a further
18 opportunity to review and comment and provide submissions
19 on these recently circulated materials. We therefore
20 request that an opportunity at a later date to provide
21 further interventions on these documents be made
22 available.

23 To conclude, we submit that the Commission
24 rule that Cameco's licence not be renewed until such time
25 that the actions of the Commission has required Cameco to

1 undertake in the past in regard to fire safety and
2 emergency response are fully met. That flood and water
3 security concerns are fully addressed and that the public
4 is given a full and transparent opportunity to review and
5 comment on all the supporting materials before the
6 Commission.

7 Thank you very much, Chair.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

9 You mentioned, Mr. Wilkins, a large number
10 of interventions that we've had and since your number is
11 71, you can gather how many we've had.

12 And a number of the issues that you've
13 raised have been discussed at some lengths over the last
14 two days; fire safety, et cetera, a number of issues to do
15 with flooding and structure, integrity. Certainly, the
16 issue of public access to documents and public access
17 generally to discussions and information about the
18 facility, I think, has been discussed at some length.

19 I will just check with my colleagues to see
20 if there's any questions that they have further to this.

21 Dr. Barnes?

22 **MEMBER BARNES:** Just a comment based on the
23 two recommendations on the first page because a number of
24 intervenors have also stressed that it is desirable to
25 have a much shorter licence in order to achieve certain

1 things.

2 I just wanted to point out that that's
3 sometimes more appropriate to have a specific licence
4 conditions within the body of a licence in order to
5 achieve certain things by a particular time, which is
6 independent of the actual timeframe of the licence itself,
7 especially when you have a number that should be brought
8 into effect at different times.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Dr. Barnes.
10 Are there any further questions?

11 Thank you very much for your submission
12 today.

13 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
14 submission which is an oral presentation - well the next
15 submission, sorry, it was filed as an oral presentation
16 but is now considered a written submission. This is CMD
17 06-H18.72 that had been filed by Mr. Gordon Edwards for
18 the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility. This
19 will be considered as a written.

20 We will move to the next oral submission,
21 which is a presentation by the Northumberland
22 Manufacturers' Association as outlined in CMD 06-H18.161.
23 Mr. Stephen Rosa, President, is here to present the
24 submission.

25 Mr. Rosa, the floor is yours.

1 **06-H18.161**

2 Oral presentation by the
3 Northumberland Manugacturers

4
5 **MR. ROSA:** Thank you very much.

6 Madam Chair and Members of the Commission,
7 thank you very much for hearing me tonight.

8 My name is Steve Rosa. My background is in
9 manufacturing. The last nine years of my career I have
10 been the plant manager and site leader for General
11 Electric Corporation here in Northumberland County. The
12 previous four years I was the plant manager and national
13 operations leader for CAE, a division of CAE, and also for
14 a company called ZCL; and prior to that, seven years with
15 Proctor & Gamble, all in operations and manufacturing.

16 I'm currently the President of the
17 Northumberland Manufacturers' Association. We are a
18 not-for-profit organization. We are about 30 months old.

19 We are committed to really two specific
20 things. The first is to help our local manufacturing core
21 in Northumberland County drive growth and excel at the
22 manufacturing fundamentals, which include things like high
23 performance manufacturing, training, supervisory skills
24 development and predominantly health and safety in our
25 plants and factories. We are a consortium organization.

1 We roll up our sleeves, we meet regularly and help each
2 other learn and translate best practices. That's what we
3 do.

4 The second thing that we are committed to
5 is to drive community economic growth. We understand and
6 take responsibility for the fact that manufacturing is a
7 key contributor to bringing net dollars into the economy,
8 perhaps the key contributor to bringing net dollars into
9 the local economy.

10 Both Cameco Corporation and Zircatec have
11 been instrumental in the Northumberland Manufacturers'
12 Association right from its inception. They were there at
13 the table when we were defining our mission and our
14 vision. They continue to be active members in our current
15 operations. Both of these companies are corporate
16 sponsors. Both placed directors on our not-for-profit
17 board of directors. They truly are showing strong
18 leadership to make sure our citizens thrive and that our
19 economy is healthy.

20 The Northumberland Manufacturers'
21 Association has strategic focus groups and one of these is
22 focused specifically on health and safety. We have
23 monthly consortium sessions. This is an opportunity for
24 large companies to get together with small companies and
25 help each other on a health and safety front. Both Cameco

1 and Zircatec have been active members ever since that
2 focus group began and they continue to be active members.
3 They are showing leadership in our community helping
4 Northumberland County manufacturers strengthen their
5 health and safety programs outside of their own walls.

6 In the role as president of NMA, I have had
7 an opportunity to tour extensively through both of these
8 operations. I bring a lot of experience to this role, as
9 you can tell from my background. I have toured many
10 plants over my career. At both of these facilities I
11 observed a number of things that I want to cover with the
12 Commission today.

13 First of all, security protocol. When I
14 arrived at Cameco and Zircatec Corporations I witnessed
15 very rigorous and very professional security protocol. I
16 was on a tour. I was escorted at all times. There was no
17 discretion whatsoever on this escort. This was at all
18 times. I was in possession of a dosimeter at all times.
19 I was professionally signed in and signed out. I felt
20 this was extremely well done, some of the best that I have
21 seen.

22 Secondly, relative to the working
23 conditions that I observed, again I have seen a lot of
24 plants. What I observed here were: very organized work
25 areas, good lighting, very clear pathways, good signage.

1 It was very clear that the operator and visitor safety in
2 these facilities is a priority. I was very impressed with
3 what I saw.

4 From a health and safety perspective, again
5 clearly a priority. As I was touring I was given an
6 orientation before the tour on what to expect, what the
7 protocol was, what the emergency response protocol was. I
8 had full use of personal protective equipment. Everything
9 that I required was supplied to me, readily available, for
10 both employees and visitors. I was assisted to ensure
11 that I was properly using this PPE and it was very
12 rigorously enforced as I travelled through. I felt very
13 comfortable through the entire tour.

14 The radiation protocol, this was my first
15 experience in a nuclear facility. From the time I went
16 through the gate, and all the way through, I felt totally
17 comfortable with the experience. Again, their protocol
18 was extremely rigorous, very strict. I felt very well
19 enforced and observed and monitored as we toured through
20 the facility. In other words, there were people making
21 sure that proper protocol was being followed.

22 Again, when I went to exit the protocol was
23 impressive. The dosimeter was monitored. We were fully
24 screened. As I left that facility, I felt as comfortable
25 as I did upon entry.

1 My professional opinion of both Cameco and
2 Zircotec Corporations were that health and safety is
3 clearly a priority both for employees and for visitors.

4 That is my submission today. Thank you.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much, sir.
6 Are there any questions or comments for
7 this member?

8 Thank you very much for coming.

9 **MR. ROSA:** Thank you.

10 **THE SECRETARY:** We will move to the next
11 submission, which is an oral presentation by Madam Faye
12 More as outlined in CMD 06-H18.60.

13 The floor is yours, Madam More.

14
15 **06-H18.60**

16 Oral presentation by
17 Faye More

18
19 **MS. MORE:** Thank you very much.

20 I'm Faye More and I'm presenting as an
21 individual.

22 Madam Chair and Members of the Commission,
23 I have gone through, having sat through and heard the
24 presentations, and just tried to whittle down what I would
25 say to make it less repetitive now because you have

1 certainly noticed that many of us have the same concerns.

2 In my written submission the first heading
3 in the letter was "Ineffective regulator". I would like
4 to just highlight a couple of points under that heading,
5 first of all emphasizing that the residents of Port Hope
6 have, for decades, done their best to raise alarm bells
7 with you specifically at the few occasions we have, fewer
8 all the time if five-year licences become the norm. Five
9 years should not be the norm when significant changes are
10 planned by the industries and so many questions and
11 concerns exist.

12 Mid-term reviews are not a proper
13 substitute for an industry supposedly having its licence
14 on the line at a licensing hearing and having to produce
15 information and argue its case for approval.

16 I then listed a substantial list -- this is
17 from mine and the people that I have worked with for
18 years, and these are reflected in the minutes of previous
19 AECB and CNSC meetings -- of issues that have been brought
20 forward that, to my knowledge, have not yet been resolved
21 going back 10 years and the frustration that ensues with
22 having to raise these issues repeatedly, but I'm just
23 going to zero in on the bottom two bullet points on the
24 second page.

25 Concern for CNSC's environmental assessment

1 policies.

2 For environmental assessments, which result
3 in screening level EAs rather than full panel reviews,
4 unless you are in a pristine area, to protect a pristine
5 environment, including the geese and the ducks, while we
6 love the geese and the ducks I think the question is if
7 you live in a community that has contamination and it has
8 an industry that wants to change its operation, rather
9 than viewing that as an incremental change that is
10 appropriate and okay under the existing licence or is fine
11 to use a screening level, that really coming back,
12 especially in the Port Hope situation, seeing that as a
13 significant enough change to warrant a comprehensive study
14 or a panel review is very much in order.

15 The second bullet was the allowable levels
16 of exposure. I covered that earlier in my presentation
17 for the committee based on inaccurate outmoded assumptions
18 that do not account for the internal threat of inhaled
19 soluble and insoluble uranium to which both are exposed.
20 I wanted to draw a parallel with the tobacco industry.
21 The zealousness with which the federal government,
22 specifically Health Canada and the provincial governments
23 and municipalities, have gone after smoking, and the
24 bylaws that have ensued and the smoke-free environment and
25 the acknowledgement of the harm from second-hand smoke

1 even when there is contradictory science and there is not
2 consensus in the scientific community has led to very
3 severe restrictions on this product in public areas.

4 I and many other people in Port Hope are
5 wondering why tobacco then is politically correct to deal
6 with and yet uranium remains apparently politically
7 incorrect and the fact that we have uranium in our air in
8 Port Hope has really not been the focus of public health
9 discussion as it should be. We want to bring that to your
10 attention. We think that focus needs to change.

11 On the next page, I will just zero in on
12 the need for a complete hazards analysis.

13 I found a U.S. Department of Energy
14 document last February. I sent it to the CNSC, copied
15 Cameco on it as well, sent it to them, suggesting after a
16 meeting at town hall that left me very disconcerted about
17 the lack of knowledge of the hazards at the Cameco site
18 and Zircatec, that this is an excellent document, quite
19 substantial. It is my understanding they are required at
20 all nuclear facilities in the United States, regardless of
21 the type. I didn't receive a reply about that.

22 I know, from meetings held in the
23 community, that there is not this level -- and certainly
24 the public hasn't seen one -- this level of analysis done
25 of sites.

1 What it would hopefully do, if it is a
2 complete risk and hazards analysis, is that all these
3 questions would be headed off that take an ordinate amount
4 of time and energy and really erode goodwill in the
5 community amongst people quite unnecessarily as to whether
6 uranium burns and do things explode and are they
7 pyroforic. That shouldn't even be in 2006 a question that
8 we can't answer by flipping open a document.

9 I draw attention to the fact that we have a
10 lot on the go in Port Hope, including the low level
11 clean-up. We have meetings, we have documents and we need
12 help. The best help that I can suggest administratively
13 for something like this is to have a higher level
14 environmental assessment that provides to the community
15 intervener funding, intervener opportunities to be able to
16 bring in scientific expertise that can represent their
17 viewpoint, because right now this is done by people of
18 science who volunteer their time for us or we are doing
19 the best we can to run and catch up with everything.

20 If I can just add now a couple of points
21 that were not here, but just to mention that the fugitive
22 emissions issue is a real concern. It raises a question
23 about control. One sort of assumes that if you are
24 dealing with fugitive emissions you are dealing with
25 emissions that are not under control by the company.

1 thank you for your time.

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

3 I am going to check with the staff because
4 I think this issue of the average public dose is not what
5 I understand at all. I don't think it varies among the
6 number of houses you have, but I just wanted to ask the
7 staff to provide a definition of that. That would be very
8 serious.

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

10 I will ask Chris Clement to speak to that.

11 **MR. CLEMENT:** Thank you. Chris Clement for
12 the record.

13 What we regulate or what we monitor or have
14 the licensee monitor is dose to a critical receptor, so it
15 has nothing to do with the number of houses or number of
16 people in Port Hope.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are there further
18 questions? I'm asking you if you have questions. Any
19 questions?

20 Okay. His answer is that the level is
21 based on a critical receptor, which means -- perhaps
22 Mr. Clement could define it in plain language.

23

24 **MR. CLEMENT:** Thank you. Chris Clement for
25 the record.

1 What we ask the licensee to calculate and
2 the calculations we verify are based on a hypothetical
3 single person or a small group of individuals but with
4 similar habits. It has nothing to do with the number of
5 people in Port Hope. We look at a hypothetical person who
6 may receive the highest potential exposure.

7 I hope that is sufficient. Thank you.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So it is really a model
9 person that would receive a high dose based on selection
10 of habits and age. Is that right? Perhaps you could
11 actually give us a ---

12 **MR. CLEMENT:** Chris Clement.

13 That's correct. In fact, we require that
14 they use very conservative assumptions, so we are looking
15 at the highest possible dose through various pathways to a
16 single person, a single hypothetical person.

17 Thank you.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So it wouldn't be the
19 division of everybody by the releases. It would be what
20 person would receive and making sure that what that person
21 could receive would be lower, much lower, than the limit,
22 a conservative limit.

23 I think there should be an opportunity, if
24 you need to check with Mr. Clement and get some more
25 information, the staff should make themselves available to

1 you, Ms. More.

2 Thank you.

3 **THE SECRETARY:** We will move to the next
4 submission, which is a submission from Mr. Roger Carr as
5 outlined in CMD 06-H18.164.

6 Is Mr. Carr in the room? Are you Mr. Carr?
7 No. Okay. Thank you very much.

8 **THE SECRETARY:** This brings to the end the
9 day session with a bit of delay. We are now going to
10 start the evening session that had been planned to start
11 at seven o'clock. We are a bit late.

12 We will now start with the next submission
13 which is an oral presentation from Ms Juliet Fullerton as
14 outlined in CMD 06-H18.18. I will repeat, CMD 06-H18.18.

15 Mrs. Fullerton, the floor is yours.

16

17 **06-H18.18**

18 Oral presentation by

19 Juliet Fullerton

20

21 **MS. FULLERTON:** Thank you.

22 Madam Chair, Members of the Commission,
23 thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. For the
24 record, my name is Juliet Fullerton. I am a graduate of
25 King's College and Dalhousie University and currently

1 pursuing a master's in education, but first and foremost I
2 am a mother and resident of Port Hope.

3 I reside within the thousand metre buffer
4 normally set aside for nuclear facilities where fissile
5 material is handled, manufactured or utilized.

6 I grew up in Cobourg on the waterfront and
7 note that my parents still live there downwind of the
8 facility and down lake of the facility. Should there be
9 an accidental release of hazardous chemicals from the
10 facility it would not take long for the material to travel
11 by wind to my parents' home with little or no warning.

12 It would not be much longer for prevailing
13 currents to pollute their water and that of thousands of
14 Cobourg residents. I have an article that supports that
15 information.

16 My worry is not fear mongering but based on
17 a reading of relevant data that indicates releases of
18 hydrofluoric acid or UF6 in gaseous form as it travels and
19 can cause deaths up to 32 kilometres from the source.

20 My parents' home is close to the truck
21 detour route as well. Should the 401 be blocked and a
22 shipment of UF6 is heading off to the port of Montreal and
23 France for enrichment, it would pass along highways too
24 close to their residents. Can Cobourg's emergency
25 services support any incident that might occur?

1 In fact, Port Hope Council after Cameco,
2 much to their credit, funded training of Port Hope
3 volunteer firefighters at the operations level refused to
4 pass a bylaw allowing the fire service to respond to that
5 level or indeed even fund the required equipment and
6 ongoing training. I congratulate Cameco for stepping up
7 to the mark but note they still only have a C rating on
8 fire and emergency based on your staff reports.

9 As a mother, should my children come home
10 with a C rating on their report card, I would expect
11 indeed great room for improvement.

12 I am here today as a mother of those two
13 young girls, an individual who works in the Early Years
14 Centre, which is several hundred metres from the main gate
15 of the facility on a site which is up the valley from that
16 facility. Both my home and place of work are therefore
17 within the buffer zone and that is a great concern to me.

18 When I read a transcript of your March 23'
19 2005 hearing and understand that the CNSC does not
20 regulate in the public good like the National Energy
21 Board, you regulate to make things happen with the lowest
22 reasonable risk, my risk, my children's risk, our
23 children's risk, I am not a gambler. I do not take risks
24 with my children, my partner or my parents.

25 Furthermore, because of historic soil

1 deposition many other buffer zoners and I are not able to
2 grow vegetables for human much less animal consumption.

3 Last year I was speaking to someone from
4 the low level office who was doing some work preliminary
5 to moving soil from our property. They suggested that at
6 any time you are in the garden to not inhale dust, to wash
7 our hands thoroughly and clothes very carefully and to not
8 get our hands near our mouth or eyes during work in the
9 garden. They also advised me that our dogs should not be
10 rolling in loose dirt.

11 Has any work been done by the CNSC process
12 to investigate the rate of radiation-related cancers in
13 our pets here in Port Hope? If not, why not? The files
14 are all readily available. Unlike workers at the
15 facilities or residents, pets don't move to another
16 community and they are no longer part of the Port Hope
17 statistics on cancer and cardiovascular diseases.

18 I and my children like to use the East
19 Beach for swimming and sunbathing, but we always look at
20 the wind direction before using the beach simply because
21 we do not want to breathe uranium particles, which
22 according to company information have been increasing over
23 the past five years.

24 Let me put it another way. Maybe they
25 aren't increasing, it's just that the company under

1 pressure from the Ontario Ministry of the Environment had
2 to install a new modelling system that indicated 100 per
3 cent increase in emissions of uranium over those publicly
4 reported in the ICU proposal to council.

5 I was shocked to find out that Cameco does
6 not really know how much of their radioactive product goes
7 into the atmosphere because everything is modelled.

8 If I were running their business and my
9 product was worth \$50 a kilogram, I would weigh everything in
10 and out, and that difference is what is in the environment of
11 everyone downwind and the drinking water exposed, that is
12 ceramic uranium not natural uranium.

13 It has earlier been suggested this
14 difference is 120 kilograms. Does this match to the gram
15 Cameco's records?

16 We walk and cycle around the town and
17 occasionally around the facility. One morning a group of three
18 of us were walking around the facility May 31, 2005. I noticed
19 a plume of steam coming from a leak in one of the large lines
20 that run along the east side of the plant. We subsequently
21 reported the leak and were told in a follow-up by
22 Mr. Prendergast, and I quote from his email:

23 "The leak will be repaired on Friday
24 during a scheduled steam outage.

25 Thank you for your continued interest

1 in Cameco and for bringing this matter
2 to our attention.

3 Doug Prendergast,
4 Communications Specialist."

5 Quite frankly, why did it take an outsider
6 walking the perimeter to discover the leak and why was it
7 going to take furthermore three days to repair it? There
8 are other lines that parallel that line and a major steam
9 rupture of that and an adjoining line concerned and
10 worried me for the next few days.

11 In your 2002 licence renewal hearing
12 Mr. Steane spoke to the age of the plant. We see triple
13 redundancy system failures and releases of fluorides, and
14 a CNSC employee going to the hospital during that event
15 and wonder how safe are we.

16 Furthermore, based on all environmental
17 impacts, I worry about the interaction of UO2 from an
18 accumulation of water, Mr. Prendergast's definition of a
19 flood. My question is could such an accumulation and a
20 resulting explosion in the UO2 facility impact the UF6
21 facility and the integrity of the on-site buffers? Your
22 staff raised that issue with Cameco during the SEU EA, but
23 it's apparent that the information was never made
24 available to Commission members.

25 It would also seem to me that the process

1 is not open and clear but conducted behind closed doors to
2 satisfy your staff's directive to make it happen with the
3 lowest risk.

4 As a former county warden, Mr. Ian Angus
5 said to your Chair at the mid-term licence review, you are
6 gamblers. As a mother of two children living within the
7 buffer zone I cannot afford to gamble.

8 As mentioned, we walk or cycle around the
9 plant. At the mid-term review comments were made about
10 the amount of gamma and indeed neutron radiation that is
11 emitted from the plant. There was a comment about a wall
12 being built to ensure children and anglers would not get
13 unexpected doses of gamma and neutron radiation.

14 Well, there is still no warning sign and
15 the gamma dosage still exceeds the action level in two
16 locations even though it appears that the action level has
17 moved from 14 to 40.

18 I see from the Cameco material that a
19 ridiculous dry stone wall has been built inside the plant
20 to reduce exposure on the east side of the plant to
21 anglers and walkers. That would not have happened had the
22 issue not been raised at the mid-term review.

23 It would appear that the people you
24 regulate know that you don't have sufficient staff or
25 resources to do the job properly and they just ignore your

1 mandates, like fire code, building code, or in the case of
2 AECL waste disposal direct orders. In fact, from
3 documents you released, your staff backed down when faced
4 by a challenge of legal action.

5 I think perhaps the CNSC definition of
6 "enforce" is extension.

7 I was present recently at the Lion's Centre
8 when one of your staff, Mr. Rabski, in response to a
9 direct question about why a fire mandated direction from
10 the Commission was not implemented, stated that staff gets
11 to interpret what you mean. This is not reassuring.

12 You need to be very specific on the
13 implementation side and protect us, not the industry.
14 That is your mandate.

15 If you want to hear a licensing hearing
16 where we will all support you go through the process of
17 raising your rates 200 per cent to hire sufficient staff
18 to do the job properly, then we will all be here saying
19 you got it right.

20 In the meantime, we do not think that you
21 have the resources and most certainly your mandate is not
22 the public good in the minds of many of us. Your mandate,
23 as so clearly stated, I paraphrase Mr. James Clark at the
24 March 23, 2005 hearing, is to approve with the lowest risk
25 acceptable to whom?

1 It is interesting to note from that
2 transcript how the comparison was made to the National
3 Energy Board whose mandate is to look after the public
4 good.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** One minute.

6 **MS. FULLERTON:** I now clearly understand
7 that your mandate is to protect us or listen to our
8 concerns, but to approve this re-licensing proposal with
9 the lowest possible risk you and your staff are not at
10 risk. Quite frankly, fewer than a handful of the
11 employees at Cameco live within the buffer zone.
12 Mr. Prendergast, head spin doctor for the company, just
13 moved to safety buying a house outside the zone despite
14 the fact the house he was living in was for sale. That is
15 quite a commentary on saying one thing and doing the
16 opposite.

17 Recently, the senior staff at Cameco
18 relocated to offices across from Zircatec, out of one
19 non-existent buffer to another.

20 But we are used to this treatment.

21 Quite simply, on behalf of my girls, my
22 friends and our community I ask you to deny this
23 application as stated today. Only extend the licence for
24 two years with strict conditions until all the outstanding
25 directives from the Commission are dealt with. The

1 application, as you will hear, clearly does not meet your
2 criteria for a five-year extension.

3 I have full confidence that the company
4 will do what you tell it to do at some point. You need to
5 be more action-oriented. Get it done. Dr. Barnes must be
6 tired of hearing these same issues raised year after year.
7 Do something about them please.

8 Thank you for listening.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. That was
10 perfectly timed, I must say. Thank you very much.

11 Are there questions?

12 I just wanted to remark, I made this
13 comment several times but perhaps you weren't here, the
14 mandate of the CNSC is for the client, the Canadian
15 public. It's unfortunate that you don't look at it that
16 way, but there is no document from the CNSC that states
17 otherwise. The mandate is to ensure the protection of
18 Canadians from the products. There is no economic
19 interest. That is the mandate that is clearly stated and
20 which the Commission members all subscribe to.

21 Thank you very much.

22 **MS. FULLERTON:** You're welcome.

23 The information that I had was that licence
24 fees received from the licensing did go to the CNSC.
25 Whether it is listed in their mandate ---

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** That is actually
2 incorrect.

3 There are a number of agencies, including
4 the National Energy Board and the CNSC. The government
5 charges fees to the company and it goes to the government
6 and then there is a separate budget request that goes from
7 us to the and then there's a separate budget request that
8 goes from us to the government and the government pays us,
9 and the reason that is done is to protect us in -- for
10 example, one could visualize a case where a company, say,
11 went -- had problems and it can't be -- regulatory
12 activity can't depend on the financial status of the
13 company. That isn't the way it goes. So we get our
14 budget every year and they pay their fees. They pay their
15 fees based on work that is done, but there's two separate
16 amounts. That's how it's done, which I think is
17 surprising to Cameco too, but that's the way it works. So
18 maybe we should publicize that a little bit more.

19 Thank you very much.

20 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will now move to the next
21 submission which is an oral presentation from Ms. Nola
22 McDonald, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.32.

23 Ms. McDonald, the floor is yours.

24

25 **06-H18.32**

1 Oral presentation by
2 Nola McDonald

3
4 **MS. McDONALD:** Madam Chair, Members of the
5 Commission, my name is Nola McDonald. I have lived at 89
6 Dorset Street West for close to 26 years. Dorset Street
7 is one of many in town that are celebrated for their
8 century homes. It is also in close proximity to Cameco
9 and is identified as an area of higher fallout in the
10 company maps of emission dispersal.

11 I have always been uneasy about the
12 location of the plant since we first moved here.
13 Initially, I understood that there was a lot of regulation
14 and I felt safe enough trusting the government. I no
15 longer do. I hope that my comments will help you to
16 understand why. I also hope that you care about personal
17 fears and broken trust and can find a place for these
18 issues in your deliberations.

19 I would also like to note at the outset
20 that I am a social worker, and if you think I am ill
21 prepared to criticize the technical engineering language
22 of the licensing application and the CNSC response, you
23 would be entirely correct.

24 In fact, I find the documents difficult to
25 relate to and I know I am not alone in this regard. Is

1 there not something very wrong with a process that invites
2 citizens' comments but provides information in a form that
3 is beyond the grasp of the average citizen.

4 Nevertheless, I would like to express
5 appreciation for the decision of the CNSC to hold this
6 hearing in Port Hope, and I thank each of you for coming
7 here.

8 The benefit, as I see it, is less than I am
9 able to appear here than that you may have the opportunity
10 to experience firsthand the nature of the town and the
11 presence of the nuclear industry in it. In that, I think
12 I am appealing to you to step outside a purely scientific
13 frame of reference into a more experiential one, a more
14 humanistic or purely human experience.

15 So what I am suggesting is to please find
16 time in your busy schedule to walk about the town and gain
17 an appreciation of its historical architecture and
18 cultural value.

19 Note also firsthand the unfortunate
20 intrusion of the nuclear industry into the heart of the
21 lakefront and the residential life of the town.

22 Consider also the pollution this industry
23 has scattered around the town. Many of the sites are
24 clearly marked and you will see them fenced off as you
25 walk around some of our lovelier neighbourhoods, in fact.

1 With this in mind, are you comfortable
2 licensing the continuing dispersal by Cameco of toxic
3 substances on the townspeople?

4 If at all possible, please take a tour of
5 Cameco, as I did two years ago, and try to put yourself in
6 the place of a local resident who lives close by, so not
7 in fact as the scientists that you are but simply with the
8 hat on of someone who might be living in one of those
9 houses that you can see so clearly from the site itself.
10 You might then ask questions such as this: "Are these
11 buildings in good condition? Is the site as a whole in
12 good condition? Does this place look safe? Does it feel
13 safe? What are the staffing levels on nights and weekends
14 of this huge enterprise? What would they do in the case
15 of a large fire? What if there was an escape of
16 hydrofluoric acid? Is it really safe parking railcars of
17 hydrofluoric acid and ammonia on siding so close to those
18 houses and people who live right there? What would be the
19 impact of an accident and fire on those homes and people
20 right over there? What is the effect on humid, summer
21 days of the new 12-month production cycle of the plant
22 with no summer shutdown?" And I'm thinking about the
23 inversion factors and smog, hanging those emissions right
24 on top of those houses and people that are so close to the
25 plant. And finally, of course, what everyone, I think,

1 wearing that hat would ask, "Should a facility like this
2 have a buffer zone?"

3 Many of these questions may sound naïve and
4 not be a direct part of your mandate with regard to
5 Cameco's re-licensing application, but they provide a
6 community-based context for your decision making.

7 Context is missing from the re-licensing
8 documents I have attempted to read. I think questions
9 such as these provide human, domestic context for the
10 detail in the application and the CNSC response with
11 regard to so many areas of critical importance to the
12 townspeople who live right next door.

13 In my view, both the company and the
14 regulators have failed the local community in the past
15 five years. The public has identified emissions as a high
16 concern and indeed many of us are calling for zero
17 emissions. I realize others have spoken to the emissions
18 issue, but I do feel very strongly about it.

19 In response, the company has advised that
20 emissions are actually two, and at one point it looked as
21 though they might be three times -- I think they are, in
22 fact, a little more than two times higher than they had
23 previous published, and this has been material that has
24 been out there for several years. It's not as though it
25 was just a brief error of some kind.

1 It seems there are some fugitive emissions
2 which have only recently been located. However, the
3 company was quick to reassure us that this was not a cause
4 for alarm because the rate was the same. So the emissions
5 were not really higher at all. This again was a statement
6 by Mr. Prendergast.

7 Can the public be expected to trust self-
8 reporting in these circumstances? Should the regulator
9 not be asking for independent audits of emissions? In
10 other words, I don't really trust the company's figures,
11 and I think the community has a right to have an
12 independent audit of those figures.

13 The regulator has failed to exercise due
14 diligence with regard to fire and safety issues with
15 routine extension of deadlines and a frankly frightening
16 willingness to accept "progress" as a substitute for
17 compliance in areas that are quite literally life-
18 threatening. This has been going on for decades.

19 Who is truly looking out for the interests
20 of the local community?

21 In conclusion, I would ask the
22 Commissioners to reject this re-licensing application for
23 the following reasons. A nuclear industry located in the
24 heart of a town must be held to the most stringent
25 standards with regard to emissions, health concerns, fire

1 and safety. This has not been done.

2 The company's "progress" is unacceptably
3 slow and consists of perpetual intentions that are rarely
4 fulfilled.

5 CNSC staff have demonstrated a lack of
6 willingness to enforce their own regulations and
7 deadlines. Their record is one of indulging the company's
8 unacceptably low standards with regard to full compliance.

9 The company has invested heavily in public
10 relations -- you have lots of evidence of that -- but has
11 not invested at all in real change.

12 You, the Commissioners, have the
13 opportunity to effect real change. It is long overdue.
14 Real change would be a denial of this application or, at
15 the most, the issuance of a provisional licence for a two-
16 year period. Real change would also be an acknowledgement
17 by the Commission -- and you might come to this conclusion
18 after your town tour -- that the Town of Port Hope has
19 been in harm's way for too long.

20 The time for grandfathering this location
21 is up. This is an opportunity for the Commission to
22 signal to the company the desirability to begin to make
23 plans for a relocation to a site with a buffer zone, as is
24 true of all other nuclear facilities.

25 Nuclear power and Cameco are on the cusp of

1 a huge expansion in this country. It is the best of times
2 for a large corporate capital investment in a new facility
3 located at a safe distance from this community. Please
4 consider encouraging that option.

5 Thank you for this opportunity to address
6 the Commission.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

8 Are there any questions for this
9 intervenor?

10 I just wanted to say that one of the issues
11 that is -- we're not all scientists. I'm a scientist.
12 We're not all scientists here. However, there is this
13 nature of a very scientific oversight of a facility and it
14 is just in the nature of these very technical terms and
15 the Commission understands this.

16 On the other hand, there is this danger of
17 taking technical terms and turning them into something
18 that people talk about in different language that is also
19 very difficult, and so language becomes a use that can
20 therefore sometimes oversimplify what is a very complex
21 interrelationship between technology and science.

22 The second comment I wanted to make is that
23 one of the natures of science, as I say as a scientist, is
24 things do improve and do change, and I think that's it's
25 very -- it's difficult sometimes to see this middle ground

1 between people who criticize when improvements are made in
2 science that detect things differently, and at the same
3 time wanting to know what those results are.

4 So sometimes you will see science change in
5 a number of areas; clearly in the health field, which we
6 also regulate. We see large increases in science all the
7 time, and things that we didn't know before we know now.
8 So the Commission understands, I think, some of the two
9 underlying principles of what you're saying.

10 I don't know if you were here earlier
11 today, probably not. We had a very long conversation
12 about communications, consultation, supplying information,
13 and the Commission has received a great deal of input over
14 the last day and a half as to ways that public information
15 could possibly be improved. And Cameco has also been here
16 hearing those comments as well as the staff.

17 So thank you very much for your submission.

18 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
19 submission, which is an oral presentation from Mr. Ian
20 McDonald, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.33.

21 Mr. McDonald, the floor is yours.

22

23 **06-H18.33**

24 Oral presentation by

25 Ian R. McDonald

1 **MR. McDONALD:** Thank you.

2 My name is Ian McDonald, and like my wife
3 and with my wife, I have lived at the corner of Dorset and
4 Catherine Streets for something over 26 years and we are,
5 as my wife has indicated, within 500 metres of the plant,
6 and many of the issues that are on the table today are
7 ones that are of very specific and real concern to us.

8 I would, not surprisingly, share many of
9 the remarks that my wife has already made, but I would
10 like to say three things; two of them having to do really
11 with process and one with substance.

12 Let me start by saying that I think it is
13 incumbent on the part of a public body, like yourselves,
14 to seek public input into decisions of the kind that are
15 about to be made, and in order for this to happen we have,
16 I think, to have detailed and closely documented reports,
17 comprehensible reports that will make it possible for
18 those of us who are not expert in the area to make
19 informed and intelligent decisions about what is going on.

20 I am not a scientist, although I am an
21 academic by profession. I read a great many reports of
22 this kind and I must say that I find an awful lot of this
23 vague and opaque and excessively technical, and I would
24 point out that the environmental firm retained by the town
25 to assess the report says this:

1 “The application is vague in many
2 respects and does not provide members
3 of the public with information or
4 context for information in many areas
5 that would be required in order to
6 form an informed opinion regarding the
7 facility performance during the last
8 licensing period.”

9 If those technical experts in an
10 environmental firm have that trouble you can imagine that
11 those of us who are not expert in that area find it doubly
12 difficult.

13 Frequently, as Ms. Fullerton points out,
14 the report uses terms like not unreasonable, reasonable
15 agreement, appropriate, acceptable and so on. Rarely is
16 it clear exactly what these terms mean, for whom something
17 is acceptable, what is an unreasonable risk, for whom and
18 for long a time. I think that we need much clearer and
19 more specific documentation, both on the part of the
20 applicant and on the part of the Commission and staff.

21 That is my first point having to do,
22 really, with process.

23 My second point is one that you have heard
24 probably until you’re deafly tired of hearing it, and that
25 is emergency management and fire response. I won’t repeat

1 all the details that you have no doubt heard from any
2 number of people, but I would remind you that at the time
3 of the mid-term review, at which I also addressed you, the
4 Commission is on record as having found a situation in
5 this regard as unacceptable.

6 You have at the back of your submission a
7 list of definitions and if the term unacceptable is to be
8 held up to the standard of the definition of unacceptable
9 in Attachment A, what that meant was that there was
10 evidence of an absence or total inadequacy breakdown or
11 loss of control of the program, if that's how you define
12 things. That is obviously a bad thing.

13 And in consequence, you as a Commission,
14 warned and instructed the applicant to do something and
15 even gave the applicant a deadline to do so. As I read
16 it, it was the 30th of July 2005. Fifteen (15) months
17 later the issue is still before us and although there is
18 some encouraging language in the application about how the
19 trend in this area is improving, the fact remains that
20 neither Cameco nor the local fire department has the
21 equipment, the personnel or the authorization to fight a
22 major fire.

23 I read in this evening's newspaper that the
24 fire chief yesterday told you that it would not be
25 possible for this municipality's fire department to deal

1 with a major fire at Cameco and that they would go to
2 other locations, especially Cobourg and Bewdley.

3 When I toured the plant a couple of years
4 ago I asked the tour guide what would in fact happen if
5 there were a major fire and she told me, "Well, we'd call
6 in the Bewdley Fire Department." I honestly thought she
7 was joking and now I find that apparently this really is
8 the case.

9 The Port Hope Fire Department is working
10 very hard to upgrade its standards and training and I
11 applaud that absolutely, but I wonder whether the same
12 level and standards are to be applied to Bewdley and to
13 Cobourg.

14 More than a year after you, the Commission,
15 gave Cameco a deadline to be fully compliant with the fire
16 protection level expected, there still, as I understand
17 it, is no acceptable pre-fire and emergency plan. And as
18 I read the applicant's documentation the corporation is
19 not committing to complete that plan until August of 2007,
20 which is a full two years, as I would understand it, after
21 the deadline that you already gave them.

22 The company's supplementary information
23 that was given to you on the 4th of October says that
24 although you, the Commission, propose to require the
25 corporation to meet NFPA standard 801 at the time the new

1 licence takes effect, some of the standards' general
2 requirements, as the document from Cameco says, remain a
3 concern for Cameco and Cameco is, I understand, requesting
4 a phase-in period in meeting that standard.

5 You heard earlier from the intervenor on
6 behalf of the Sierra Legal Defence Fund that Cameco still
7 has not completed 23 actions mandated in your 2000
8 inspection report or seven in the 2004 report. 19 items
9 still are outstanding from the 2005 report.

10 Overall, you and your staff have given the
11 area of fire protection a grade of "C" meaning, I gather,
12 improvements required, but you also say this; that is,
13 CNSC staff says this on page 21 of the report:

14 "Considering Cameco's timely
15 completion of actions respecting
16 upgrading their onsite fire response
17 capabilities and onsite verification
18 of the combined emergency response
19 capabilities, CNSC staff is satisfied
20 that the fire emergency response issue
21 has now been adequately resolved."

22 I submit to you, Commissioners, it has not
23 been adequately resolved in my eyes or those of my
24 neighbours, and I would like to know exactly what
25 combination of resources and where they would come from

1 would be used to fight a major fire in that facility?

2 The third thing I want to say, Madam Chair,
3 has to do with expectations from this community, or at
4 least many members of it, both of the company and of you
5 as commissioners you rate the company in eight different
6 safety areas, ranging from radiation protection to
7 security. In not one of those eight does Cameco earn an
8 'A'; and in one of its most important areas, fire
9 protection and emergency response, it rates a 'C'. This
10 is, I think, embarrassing, I would say to Cameco.

11 As an international firm that has invested
12 heavily in public relations, that it should not even have
13 a single 'A' in this area is a matter, I think, that would
14 be depressing to corporate self-esteem if I worked for
15 that company. But for those of us who live here, this is
16 less than disappointing. It's not a matter of self-
17 esteem; it's simply not good enough.

18 The trade-off, I think, is to have that
19 facility historically located where it is, that it has to
20 be held absolutely to the highest standards. And where I
21 come from at the university at which I work, that means
22 'A' across the board, not a bunch of 'B' minuses and 'C's'.
23 We will not be comfortable in this community as long as
24 the commission provides little incentive for Cameco to
25 pull up its socks in these areas.

1 It is simply not acceptable to me that the
2 Corporation should be given extension after extension in
3 meeting mandated deadlines. Promises about what is going
4 to happen in the future really are not good enough.

5 It is with all those points in mind, Mr.
6 Chair, that I urge you, as many others I think have done
7 over these past two days, either to limit the renewal of
8 this firm's licence to a period of two years at most, or
9 if that is a less practical way of assuring the same
10 thing, that within a five year licence certain specific
11 deadlines be made for the meeting of the expectations of
12 many of us in this community.

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

15 He's a very good secretary, but actually
16 I'm the Chair.

17 Are there any questions from the Commission
18 Members?

19 Mr. McDonald, one of the disadvantages of
20 being where you are on the schedule is that there has been
21 a great deal of discussion about these matters over the
22 last two days.

23 So I wish to assure you that the
24 Commission, if you look at the transcripts, and you will
25 have the Reasons for Decision of this Commission, have

1 covered in great depth some of the issues that you've
2 talked about; communications, issues about fire safety,
3 emergency preparedness. We spent quite a bit of time
4 earlier today on emergency preparedness with the officials
5 from Emergency Measures Organization, as well as the
6 municipality, et cetera.

7 So I think a number of your issues have
8 been discussed quite vigorously in that area, but thank
9 you very much for coming this evening.

10 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will now take just a five
11 minute stretch break, and we will resume with the next
12 submission.

13 --- Upon recessing at 8:19 p.m.

14 --- Upon resuming at 8:25 p.m.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** May I ask you to take
16 your seats, please.

17 **MR. LEBLANC:** Thank you.

18 We will now move to the next submission,
19 which is an oral presentation from Dr. Robert J. Neville,
20 as outlined in CMD 06-H18.42 and H18.42A. I repeat,
21 H18.42 and 18.42A.

22 Dr. Neville, the floor is yours.

23
24 **06-H18.42/H18.42A**

25 Oral presentation by

1 Robert J. Neville

2

3 **DR. NEVILLE:** Thank you very much. Madam
4 Chair, Members of the Commission, Ladies and Gentlemen.

5 My name is Dr. Bob Neville. I am a
6 licensed physician practising here in Ontario. I divide
7 about 50 per cent of my practicing time to occupational
8 environmental medicine, and about 50 per cent to family
9 practice. I practice in Peterborough.

10 My background and education is that I
11 graduated from Queens University with a Bachelor of
12 Science in Life Sciences, Bachelor of Pharmacy from the
13 University of Toronto, Doctor of Medicine at Queens,
14 Residency and Chief Resident in Family Practice and as a
15 slow learner, I went back to school in the nineties and
16 did my Master's program at McGill University in
17 Occupational Medicine.

18 I also in practice look after approximately
19 17 companies here in central Ontario, three of which are
20 nuclear fuel suppliers. They include General Electric
21 Peterborough, both of the large motors in the nuclear
22 division, as well as Cameco, Port Hope; as well as
23 Zircatec.

24 I am here to speak in support of the
25 application, and I do it in an unsolicited manner.

1 I have had the opportunity to work for both
2 Cameco and Zircatec for the past six years. This amount
3 of time has given me the opportunity to appreciate that
4 these companies, I believe, are truly leaders in the areas
5 of health and safety.

6 I have formed this opinion for many
7 reasons. These include one, the high quality of medical
8 surveillance programs which as exist; two, their
9 continuing focus on education; three, the commitment that
10 is quite unique to medical research; four, their attention
11 and promotion of medical education for the employees;
12 five, the continuous support for their emergency medical
13 and emergency response teams; six, the community
14 involvement in the local hospital emergency department,
15 community and local physicians, emergency medical staff,
16 paramedics, and the general public.

17 Lastly, and certainly not the least,
18 throughout this time I have also come to understand the
19 qualities of honesty, integrity, sensitivity, and
20 professionalism that I have seen throughout both of these
21 organizations.

22 I would like to spend a few minutes
23 expanding on these particular areas.

24 First of all, medical surveillance: With a
25 number of organizations that I work with, I am pleased to

1 say that Cameco appears to me to be a leader in the area
2 of medical surveillance. The employees participate in
3 either an annual or a biannual medical examination.
4 Associated with this is extensive blood work. This
5 includes liver function tests, renal function tests,
6 thyroid function tests, electrolytes, calciums, a variety
7 of other tests to look at their state of health, including
8 PSAs for men at certain ages. Electrocardiographs,
9 pulmonary function tests, hearing tests, vision tests, and
10 ultrasound measurements are also being done. Chest x-rays
11 are done periodically as well.

12 Unlike sometimes the need for moving
13 through an office at a faster pace in family practice, I
14 am afforded the luxury of 45 minutes per individual as a
15 minimum when I see these employees. And during that time
16 not only is examination done, but a lot of medical
17 education is performed at that basic level.

18 I am onsite at Cameco three times per week
19 and I am onsite at Zircotec one time per week.

20 I am also very blessed to have the
21 privilege with working with three registered nurses who
22 have extensive backgrounds in occupational medicine. They
23 are also famous for their ongoing blood pressure clinics,
24 their diabetic clinics, their weight loss clinics, their
25 smoking cessation clinics and also a very well thought out

1 healthy choices program.

2 These programs have certainly provided a
3 very valuable role in detection treatment, and also
4 monitoring the medical health of the workforce.

5 When I first came to Cameco, the management
6 and the people here challenged me to make sure that I was
7 up to speed and continuing my education in terms of what I
8 was doing here, in terms of the different processes and
9 involvement. I felt very fortunate to be flown to
10 McArthur River and I was down in the minds, attacked by a
11 bear almost, Key Lake, Blind River and also, of course,
12 here onsite in Port Hope.

13 It was very clear that there was a lot of
14 talented health professionals in all of these areas,
15 including physicians, nurse practitioners, et cetera.
16 Having a chance to visit these sites and since repeated
17 sites to Blind River, has allowed me to help in the
18 program development in this organization.

19 Early on I was also made aware of the
20 importance of hydrofluoric acid. It wasn't long before I
21 was taken to the Honeywell sites, south of Windsor,
22 Ontario to learn more about the dangers and the treatment
23 of hydrofluoric acid burns. Dr. Michael McKinnon, I
24 believe, is probably the world leader in this area. Mike
25 is right around his retirement, if not fully retired now,

1 but certainly I was offered an opportunity to spend a
2 significant amount of time with Dr. McKinnon and
3 subsequently Cameco has sent me to the World Conferences
4 on hydrofluoric acid on several occasion to the United
5 States to maintain my understanding of what is going on at
6 this point in time.

7 In addition, I was also asked, and was
8 happy to go to Oakridge, Tennessee where I was able to
9 visit with a number of other doctors who work in nuclear
10 facilities to understand what the state of the art is and
11 the treatment of nuclear emergencies as well as treating
12 the contaminated worker.

13 This type of opportunity also afforded the
14 opportunity for us to develop a policy and procedure for
15 treating contaminated workers here onsite in Port Hope.

16 I must take this time to also congratulate
17 Zircatec. About four years ago, I was of the opinion from
18 my reading that a new test at the time called the
19 "Beryllium Lipocide Proliferation Test" was the test which
20 would allow us to understand the earliest chance that
21 someone had become sensitized to beryllium. About 50 per
22 cent of the people who are positive on this test will end
23 up developing the disease. Unfortunately, in clinical
24 practice it may be 20 years or more before this disease
25 rears its ugly head, just like asbestos, and now we have a

1 way of detecting this quite early.

2 It was just after a matter of a week or so
3 that I provided the medical information to Zircatec and
4 they asked me in turn to provide the information to the
5 union for their study that I was permitted to begin this
6 test. This test costs about \$600 to \$650 per test tube
7 per employee and we do about 60 employees at a batch. So
8 it's not a small amount of money but at no point in time
9 was there ever a denial or a concern that it was doing the
10 right thing. And I'm pleased to see this leadership was
11 taking place.

12 Another aspect that I find very valuable is
13 the aspect of teaching. We are basically pushed to teach
14 our employees on various issues in medicine and their
15 general health. For example, I think over 20 lectures
16 have been given in areas such as hypertension, diabetic
17 management, prostate cancer, breast cancer, osteoporosis,
18 menopause, andropause. You name it, we have done it. And
19 out nursing staff are very active on a monthly basis in
20 health and safety meetings not only with the everyday
21 person who is working out there, but also with their
22 medical response teams as well.

23 A very special group is the medical
24 response team. I have nothing but the highest praise for
25 them. They are trained in some ways almost to the level

1 of paramedics in very focused areas, not at all to the
2 level of paramedics in most ways. But they are very
3 skilled in the treatment of hydrofluoric acid injuries as
4 well as other types of accidents. They are also very
5 skilled in CPR. They are experts on defibrillators and
6 they participate with the ERTs in mock disasters as well
7 as problem solving that we throw at them in the classroom.
8 The level of knowledge, dedication and the pride they take
9 in their work is unmatched, in my opinion.

10 By the way, when you were asking to expand,
11 and we needed to expand our Emergency Response Team, I had
12 a concern that some of these people who were coming
13 onboard may be slightly older and would they be fit and
14 able to handle the workload? I consulted with
15 cardiologists and found that we probably should be doing
16 stress testing or stress echo testing on all of our
17 employees, as they do with the OPP SWAT teams throughout
18 the province of Ontario.

19 Cameco stood up and said, "Yes, if that's
20 what we must do" and, again, the price tag was heavy but
21 we did that. I think it was a good idea because
22 fortunately, we found a few things we weren't expecting
23 and it was a good idea. All of our regular emergency
24 responders had passed but some of the new people were
25 people that were surprised and, fortunately, I think we

1 have helped them out. But it's been a good, positive
2 experience.

3 Another area which I was very ---

4 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** There is just a little
5 less than a minute to go, sir, if you don't mind?

6 **MR. NEVILLE:** I do want to mention that
7 Cameco has taken a leadership in research in hydrofluoric
8 acid treatment and has come up with a chemical treatment
9 on its own which I think is taking a leadership
10 opportunity.

11 In addition, I would like to note that we
12 have worked extensively with the local population here in
13 Cobourg and Port Hope. There is now protocols in place
14 that are now done at the Cobourg hospital, at
15 Northumberland Hills Hospital. We have had a number of
16 sessions there. We have had eight sessions with the
17 paramedics at their site in dealing with contamination and
18 hydrofluoric acid burns and we certainly are seeing great
19 communication going on.

20 Finally, I think as in all aspects of our
21 lives, it's the people that make the difference. In all
22 the places I traveled to, I think that Cameco and Zircatec
23 employees seem to be as positive about what they do as any
24 group that I worked with. As you know, they are very
25 active in the community.

1 As a result of this, I would say that I
2 have not in the last six years encountered very many times
3 or on very many occasions where I saw dissatisfaction or
4 major concerns with the workers in terms of their
5 workplace site. I am proud to be part of the
6 organizations.

7 Thank you.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much for
9 your very comprehensive presentation.

10 Are there any questions or comments from
11 Members?

12 Since we have our own medical doctor with a
13 specialty in occupational health and safety as well --
14 thank you very much. That was very informative.

15 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
16 submission which is an oral presentation from Mr. Steve
17 Kahn, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.49.

18 The floor is yours, sir.

19

20 **06-H18.49**

21 Oral presentation by

22 Steve Kahn

23

24 **MR. KAHN:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair
25 and fellow Commissioners. Thank you for coming to Port

1 Hope again.

2 Mr. Secretary, I'll be speaking to both the
3 re-license and the Zircatec, so you can cross -- yes,
4 please.

5 My name is Steve Kahn. I'm a high school
6 teacher from Toronto. This doesn't make me a scientist by
7 any stretch of the imagination but I feel that I have to
8 attend because my son is attending Port Hope High School
9 and for the past few years we have been hit with Cameco's
10 SEU re-licence attempt, the LRW; this Zircatec thing is
11 coming up and we are here for the re-licensing. And we
12 are feeling a little inundated, I guess, is what you're
13 hearing from me.

14 I'm a little uneasy with the rate of
15 proposed change and I'm finding it a little difficult to
16 stay on top of things.

17 I feel that we have a unique chance here to
18 get a handle on the problems and let me just sort of
19 explain where I'm going with this. We need to, I think,
20 increase the monitoring of what's going on. From my
21 understanding of it, everything that we are seeing in
22 terms of emissions is coming out of a model and if we
23 don't have adequate monitoring we can't validate the model
24 and fine tune it to really understand what it is we're
25 getting. That strikes me as being a little shortsighted.

1 You folks are the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and
2 if there was no risk you wouldn't exist. So there is a
3 risk because you're here. I can't see any other reason
4 for it.

5 Where does that leave us? I have listened
6 to a lot of people over the last couple of days debate
7 numbers and the real numbers are never going to match the
8 model numbers. Okay. But we still have a risk and I
9 think we still need to minimize it. And that's why I'm
10 here. I have heard people talk about epidemiological
11 studies with no problem in the short term and having sat
12 through Cameco's health outline in this very room, we were
13 told that it was a long legacy. We are talking about a
14 generational problem. And I guess to sum that point up,
15 absence of short term evidence is not evidence of long
16 term problems in this. I've got to get that straight.

17 So within the next two years we've got this
18 unique chance to pin down the sources of problems by
19 increased monitoring. In two years the LLRW is going to
20 come on stream and our picture here gets quite muddy
21 because we have an additional source now of contamination.
22 While it's unlikely our numbers are ever going to match
23 their numbers, it's imperative to attempt to get a grip on
24 the extent of this situation if it's not going to become a
25 real problem.

1 I'm not anti-Cameco and I'm not anti-nuke
2 but I really do want to see a good, definitive, solid
3 study that as a layman we can understand it, that we're
4 not simply listening to the scientific terms get bounced
5 around over our heads.

6 I'm surprised a little because, given the
7 optics, I would think that it would be in Cameco's best
8 interest to allay these anxieties in the population, and
9 there certainly is anxieties, otherwise, we wouldn't be
10 here either, and to clearly demonstrate that they're
11 running a safe operation.

12 To conclude this, giving them a five-year
13 licence is simply business as usual. Putting them on a
14 two-year leash with some significant restrictions sends
15 them a message that the public that live here and play
16 here and go to school here really want to understand
17 what's going on.

18 With increased monitoring it will go a long
19 way to helping us get an integrated approach to this
20 entire nuclear problem that we're faced with, not just
21 their re-licence but Zircatec and the LLRW that's
22 happening. I do believe there is grounds for a happy
23 coexistence within the town but it's going to take some
24 work and I think that you people are the regulatory
25 commission that will help us make that coexistence happen.

1 Thank you.

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

3 I just wanted to comment on the reasons for
4 the existence of the Nuclear Safety Commission.

5 There is something like us every place in
6 the world, including countries that don't have the large
7 complex cycle -- nuclear cycle we have in Canada, going
8 from uranium mines, because even if you have a health
9 clinic, radiation used in cancer clinics or whatever you
10 have to have overall monitoring. I mean, it really is,
11 even countries like Austria that are quite small countries
12 have people like us to make sure things are done safely
13 and there is an international network to make sure we know
14 what else other people are doing, so the existence is
15 warranted, you're right, and that's why we're here.

16 Any questions from ---

17 I just wanted to point out that we had a
18 bit of a discussion earlier about the low-level waste
19 depository coming up. I think the Commission recognizes
20 that that is going to be another project going on in this
21 community. The Commission will be -- is not the lead on
22 the environmental assessment. We're not the lead there
23 but we will be licensing the facility, so you can expect
24 that when that comes up for licensing, assuming it gets
25 through a first step which it hasn't yet, it will receive

1 full new licensing which is quite extensive from the
2 Commission, and one of the issues that is always looked at
3 is the effects of different projects going on at once.

4 As I told another intervenor, having it
5 raised here -- you're the second person today, just this
6 afternoon, who has raised that. It's good for the
7 Commission because we have it on our radar now as one of
8 the concerns of putting it together.

9 There also was quite an extensive
10 discussion earlier about communications and language and
11 trying to find the right method and the right language to
12 communicate with that. The Commission notes that really
13 Cameco has been in this new communications mode for about
14 a year and is certainly looking at how it's working, and
15 what could we do in terms of our guidelines to provide --
16 even this provides input -- not even this, this provides a
17 lot of input to Cameco in terms of communications and two-
18 way communications with people around here.

19 So thank you very much, sir, for taking the
20 time tonight.

21 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
22 submission, which is an oral presentation from Mr. Robert
23 Lang as outlined in CMD 06-H18.59, so it's 06-H18.59.

24 Mr. Lang, the floor is yours.
25

1 **06-H18.59**

2 Oral submission by

3 Mr. Robert Lang

4

5 **MR. LANG:** Thank you, Madam Chair and
6 Commissioners of the CNSC for coming to our town and
7 actually being able to present to you in person, face-to-
8 face.

9 In the interests of time and sparing you
10 excessive repetition I haven't been here a lot but I was
11 here yesterday for a few hours and I've been here for this
12 evening session. I realize that much of what I have to
13 say has been said, so I'm going to -- I tried to do a very
14 quick edit of my notes here just so that we wouldn't all
15 get bored and raise the two issues that I really feel are
16 of most concern to me and the people around me.

17 I've lived in the Port Hope area with my
18 wife and our 3 children for the past 20 years. I'm a
19 writer and producer of television documentaries, many of
20 which focus on scientific subjects. That doesn't make me
21 a scientist or a science expert, but it certainly has
22 always given me an interest while I've lived here in some
23 of the ongoing debate about low-level waste issues and
24 Cameco and the historic connection with the nuclear
25 industry.

1 It should be acknowledged before I even
2 start with my concerns, that Cameco and Zircatec have been
3 here a long time and they do represent much-needed
4 economic benefits and jobs for the community. We all know
5 that; most people know that and most people recognize
6 that. However, it's also been -- actually and we've seen
7 that personally, they've been a generous supporter of a
8 lot of social and cultural initiatives.

9 The problem with that, from my point of
10 view, is that it begins to create an environment in which
11 many people don't want to bite the hand that feeds them,
12 and I've seen that with friends I know and people who have
13 been beneficiaries of that beneficence. They don't want
14 to go public and it's up to perhaps a smaller group of
15 people than otherwise would come forward to ask the tough
16 questions.

17 I was here for much of the day yesterday
18 and I know you've been exposed to quite a range of
19 arguments regarding the company's re-licensing
20 applications and, as I've said, I'll try to distil my
21 thoughts to the two issues that I consider the most
22 pressing and of broad community concern.

23 In a nutshell they're the same for both
24 companies, both Cameco and Zircatec. First, the
25 inadequate controls on the monitoring of toxic emissions

1 given off by Cameco and Zircatec and, secondly, the lack
2 of appropriate fire protection and emergency response
3 plans at both locations.

4 I know these things have been discussed,
5 but I have a few questions that I would like to pose that
6 relate to those two things. Clearly, as many people have
7 said, because there's no buffer zones between us and the
8 plants, these issues become particularly urgent.

9 The way monitoring and reporting -- I do
10 have some questions too, I don't want to just reiterate
11 what everybody has said already, but I do have some
12 questions in here and I'll try and make it quick.

13 The way of monitoring and reporting of
14 emissions have been carried out and the poor environmental
15 compliance record over recent years have left many of us
16 deeply concerned. I'm sure you've heard that. Even in
17 the few hours that I've been here, I've heard some of that
18 concern expressed.

19 It certainly didn't help, and you've heard
20 this as well, when Cameco recently admitted to the
21 substantially higher emissions of uranium and then
22 attributed it to a "better accounting methods". Somehow
23 that doesn't give many of us the comfort that we've really
24 reached the best level of monitoring and accounting.

25 What further questions and surprises will

1 we be confronted with? That's, I think, what many of us
2 are asking and, granted, in science there are always
3 improvements and we know that, but when you're dealing
4 with people's immediate health and their exposure,
5 potentially, to toxic chemicals, those questions become
6 serious and very immediate for them. So they are no
7 longer a theoretical question, they really have weight.

8 I'll just mention that over at Zircatec as
9 well, it took them until 2002 to start monitoring the
10 gamma radiation with up-to-date technology. The results
11 over the first two years between 2002-2004 revealed
12 unacceptable levels along the perimeter and a CNSC review
13 required them to build a shield. Well, again, clearly the
14 monitoring prior to 2002 was seriously inadequate.

15 My questions are, as many people I think
16 would ask, what was the damage done before 2002 when that
17 monitoring was inadequate? And what current monitoring
18 methods today will be shown to be deficient in the future?

19 Those are very tough questions but, again,
20 they need to be addressed and people are very concerned
21 about these things.

22 Here's my -- I think, I haven't heard this
23 stated before in any of the submissions that I've heard.
24 While self-monitoring and reporting at both companies
25 might be cost-effective and necessary, I believe it's not

1 really good enough and here's the reason. It's just too
2 important, I believe, to be left solely in the hands of
3 the very people who are concerned primarily with
4 production efficiencies and their own bottom line.

5 It seems to me that given the kind of
6 scepticism and concerns in this community, there needs to
7 be an independent oversight of those monitoring of uranium
8 emissions and toxic effluence; to independently verify if
9 it's being done in the most stringent and state-of-art
10 manner.

11 I know that that's the role of the CNSC but
12 given the amount of scepticism in here about the ability
13 to really enforce some of the findings of the companies
14 themselves, I think many people are feeling, is it not
15 possible to have an independent, verifiable body that can
16 basically oversee the monitoring of these companies and
17 they report in turn to the CNSC who then can take
18 appropriate action?

19 My second concern also has been addressed
20 here quite a bit already, but I still want to weigh in
21 because it seems -- I'm still not comfortable in the
22 submissions and the answers responses I've heard that it's
23 really been addressed adequately.

24 The plans for fire protection and emergency
25 response at both facilities appear to still be quite

1 inadequate. We've heard here yesterday from the Fire
2 Commissioner that the town of Port Hope doesn't have the
3 systems in place on its own, nor the skills to deal with a
4 major fire or hazardous materials event at Cameco, and the
5 assurance yesterday of Cameco that it's trained 48 of
6 their own as volunteer response team. That's great I
7 think everybody would applaud that.

8 The concern and the question I have is,
9 what if the incident, an incident happens on the
10 nightshift when there are only four people on at that
11 point? Is that adequate to deal with that incident,
12 whether it's a fire or whether it's an emergency response
13 situation? Would that be enough?

14 After its mid-term review in 2005 Cameco
15 was required to comply with a CNSC order to implement a
16 much more effective and quick response time in the event
17 of an incident; has this actually been completed? I've
18 heard assurances that it has but I've never heard from the
19 CNSC whether they have adequately met those requirements.

20 From other CNSC reports I've read recently
21 the Cameco building was also found to be noncompliant with
22 the National Fire Code. Again, that may have been
23 addressed somewhere at a time when I wasn't here but is
24 this still the case or have they -- are they now in
25 compliance with the National Fire Code?

1 I don't want to go into -- I know this is
2 about Cameco but I won't be able to be here tomorrow but
3 there have been some questions about Zircatec as well,
4 about the CNSC ordering the company to address a lack of
5 protection against fires involving hazardous or
6 radioactive materials before the middle of last year, July
7 in 2005, the company has still not come up with adequate
8 answers.

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Just one minute, sir.

10 **MR. LANG:** Okay, I'm going to wrap up.

11 All these are important issues and yet both
12 Cameco and Zircatec's non-compliance in the past never
13 really resulted in consequences or penalties as has been
14 mentioned many times. On this and a number of other
15 matters on the record I was surprised that they wouldn't
16 or weren't able or willing to enforce these crucial
17 directives.

18 To wrap up, I mean obviously if there had
19 been a fire we would have been in deep trouble, it would
20 have been a disaster. But it's unacceptable danger to
21 our community.

22 To wrap up though, I firmly believe that
23 when Cameco and Zircatec are re-licensed, because of their
24 history of non-compliance, it would be prudent to limit
25 their terms to two years. After that the regulator and

1 public can assess how much improvement has been made in
2 the fire protection emergency response and monitoring of
3 their toxic emissions and effluent before letting them
4 continue to operate for their next phase.

5 A phase, which it's been pointed out, would
6 carry them through the crucial period in which
7 decommissioning will take place and about which there will
8 be many further questions.

9 Thank you very much.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

11 I note your comments about Zircatec and
12 we've made notes on those matters to bring them up
13 tomorrow; we can't talk about Zircatec today.

14 Are there any questions or comments from
15 the Commission members?

16 As you noted, the number of the areas had
17 already been discussed at great length, fire protection,
18 emergency preparedness, and those kinds of issues as well,
19 so we appreciate your comments, sir.

20 **MR. LANG:** Can I have an answer just to the
21 very simple question that I do have?

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Were they questions you
23 asked?

24 **MR. LANG:** Yes, they were, I'm sorry, if
25 they're not clear.

1 The first question was, would there be
2 enough as the Cameco representative yesterday admitted,
3 there might only be four people at a given time that were
4 actually fully trained for fire or for emergency response.
5 Would that be enough, in fact, to deal with an incident
6 that might occur at the plant?

7 The 48 is an impressive figure but if it's
8 down to four as he said, is that ---

9 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Got that question,
10 question two?

11 **MR. LANG:** And the second question was,
12 would it be possible for the CNSC or is it not within its
13 mandate to have an independent oversight of the monitoring
14 that is done by the companies and report back to CNSC and
15 the public so that we can be assured that the monitoring
16 that is done by the company is done, fully and with the
17 most up-to-date equipment?

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I can answer the second
19 one because that would be the Commission or the Commission
20 staff, either or both could order independent monitoring
21 of any facet of the oversight of a facility, any part of
22 the licence if they felt that number one, the company
23 wasn't capable of doing that which is usually based on a
24 lack of skills in a particular area or a perceived,
25 probably by a, you know, human performance audit or

1 something that says that there wasn't sufficient capacity
2 or skills to do something.

3 So that clearly is within the prerogative
4 of the Commission and sometimes the staff have recommended
5 that as a licence condition to do that. So it certainly
6 is that.

7 Or, if there was specific areas that needed
8 to be looked at, in say a short-term level, that is, we
9 are capable of doing that. However, it would require that
10 the Commission was satisfied that that was necessary but
11 that is possible, yes, that's true.

12 May I ask Cameco to respond to the question
13 about nightshift and capacity.

14 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

15 Yes, we would have adequate capacity but
16 I'd also like to ask Tyler Rouse to talk to that issue.

17 **MR. ROUSE:** Tyler Rouse for the record.

18 As stated before if we did have the minimum
19 number of four onsite with an incident commander, these
20 ERT can respond to and effectively mitigate any credible
21 fire event onsite. And this is due to several factors,
22 the first of which is low combustibility. All of the
23 buildings onsite are built of non-combustible materials.
24 The internal fire load in these buildings is very low. We
25 have low transient combustibles. Cameco has an aggressive

1 program in place to reduce transient combustibles onsite.

2 We have over 2,500 fire detection devices
3 that provide for early warning to our emergency response
4 team.

5 As you know, we do have a large number of
6 fire suppressant systems onsite and more will be coming in
7 the future. And all of our employees onsite are trained
8 to use a fire extinguisher and they're trained using live
9 fire so they're not scared to use the fire extinguisher
10 and they know how to use it.

11 And in addition to that, all of our
12 employees onsite have an awareness of the fire alarm
13 systems and evacuation procedures.

14 But most importantly, we do have trained
15 ERT onsite 24/7, they're awake, alert, and ready to go in
16 case they have to make a rapid attack on a fire in order
17 to mitigate and control and contain an event.

18 So in closing, I want to put it in
19 perspective for you. In my 11 plus years as a fire-
20 fighter in the U.S. and abroad, in most fire scenarios,
21 I'd probably say at least 8 out of 10, I can't support
22 these statistics but from experience I'll tell you, 8 out
23 of 10 fires that fire departments are called to are put
24 out by the first arriving engine company. That's why you
25 see fire-fighters zooming down the street because most of

1 the time, yes they do want to get to the fire, but more
2 importantly, they want to beat their buddies in putting
3 the fire out.

4 So, most fires are put out by the first
5 arriving engine company and the first arriving engine
6 company generally consists of four fire-fighters.

7 So we do feel that four fire-fighters is
8 adequate to make a rapid attack at the Cameco facility.

9 Thank you.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Does the CNSC staff agree
11 with that assessment?

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

13 Yes, we agree with that assessment.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

15 Did we lose you on that question?

16 Thank you.

17 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
18 submission which is an oral presentation from Dr. Peter
19 Blecher, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.64.

20 The floor is yours, sir.

21

22 **06-H18-64**

23 Oral presentation by

24 Dr. Peter Blecher

25

1 **DR. BLECHER:** Thank you Madam Chair and
2 fellow committee members.

3 My name is Peter Blecher, I'll be speaking
4 tonight both on Cameco and Zircatec, the common supply.

5 Along with my wife, Louise and my two sons,
6 I live in town, less than a kilometre from Cameco which as
7 you know occupies the centre of our waterfront at the foot
8 of our town.

9 Other than as a resident of this community,
10 my interest in the issue surrounding Cameco's licence re-
11 application lean the expertise I may offer as a medical
12 doctor.

13 I graduated from McGill Medical School, did
14 post-graduate training in emergency medicine, surgery, and
15 critical care at the University of Toronto. I also hold
16 degrees in biomedical science and human genetics.

17 I'm here today to express my deep concerns
18 over the potential ongoing health risks and safety to the
19 citizens of this town as a result of Cameco and subsidiary
20 Zircatec's continued operation in our midst.

21 The CNSC has a consistent history of
22 repeatedly failing to impose firmly the very safety
23 related recommendation your own organization has set.
24 Glaring safety transgressions continue with seeming
25 impunity to Cameco where private citizens, to operate in

1 this fashion, ignoring repeated government-imposed
2 warnings, the result would be stiff fines, followed by
3 incarceration.

4 I wish to speak today under three headings:
5 community health, safety and emissions.

6 Under community health, Port Hope's history
7 with the nuclear industry spans almost three-quarters of a
8 century. This makes it the community on earth with the
9 longest history of manmade radiation exposure. Yet, formal
10 health studies have never been conducted, never on the
11 citizens of this community, nor have the workers of the
12 nuclear industry been tested; certainly none which have
13 been released for scrutiny and peer-reviewed scientific
14 literature.

15 As you well know, passing off census data
16 of mortality and morbidity records without regards for
17 controlling variables such as community immigration or
18 emigration is completely unscientific and utterly without
19 validity in making determinations of long-term potential
20 health effects of Cameco's radiation and toxic pollution
21 output to the local community.

22 As the CNSC is well aware, we have known
23 for almost a century that there is no such thing as a safe
24 amount of radiation. Radiation damages genes and even
25 minute amounts of radiation produces mutation change.

1 Small constant doses of radiation does proportionately
2 discriminate deleteriously towards young children with
3 increased metabolic Basal rates as well as women of child-
4 bearing age.

5 All of this is a well known fact, as you
6 heard yesterday. Moreover, and notwithstanding the above,
7 there is evidence, as others may have undoubtedly
8 highlighted, of significantly increased presence of
9 vascular disease in the community as compared to peer
10 communities in Ontario. Inhaled micro-particulate uranium
11 or sramecide uranium, the very kind Port Hope residents
12 are subjected to in ever increasing amounts, by Cameco's
13 own admission, from licence renewal applications submitted
14 to your body for this hearing is, in fact, now showing a
15 growing body of support in the scientific literature
16 suggesting that this very fine form of uranium dust
17 aggravates and precipitates in small vessels, causing
18 endothelial damage, leading to platelet aggregation and
19 plaque formation akin to that which happens in smokers and
20 heart disease and circulatory disease.

21 No long-term contemplation of a licence
22 renewal should be considered in light of rising emissions,
23 the absence of health studies and no clear commitment by
24 the CNSC to even enforce its existing transgressions.

25 Safety. Cameco has been in non-compliance

1 with the *National Fire and Safety Code* since 2000. On
2 page 30 of the CNSC report, suggesting that the granting
3 of this five-year licence application, it states that such
4 five-year term should be granted only "when effective
5 compliance programs are in place on both the part of the
6 applicant and the CNSC", and "when the licensee has shown
7 a consistent and good history of operating compliance".

8 As you well know, this flies in the face of
9 an earlier judgment by your very Board in February of last
10 year, when the CNSC concluded that fire safety at Cameco
11 was unacceptable. This is the wording that the CNSC uses
12 in mid-term licence review, as you've heard many times
13 over the past several days.

14 Cameco was told that failure to comply with
15 the CNSC imposed improvements in fire safety would result
16 in an appropriate regulatory response such as an order of
17 restrictive licensing action to be implemented to rectify
18 the action. The CNSC's deadline for chemical compliance,
19 as we all know, was July 30th, over a year and a half ago.
20 This date came and went without any of the CNSC's punitive
21 threats being set into action.

22 Again, if a private citizen ignored a
23 government-imposed demand to begin obeying the law or
24 punishment would ensue, they would certainly not be
25 allowed to continue breaking the law with impunity again

1 and again. Why is Cameco allowed to do this?

2 Your Commission states that the fire issue
3 has now been resolved, yet the CNSC still admits there are
4 glaring deficiencies in fire safety at Cameco. According
5 to page 5 of the CNSC reply to Cameco's five-year
6 application, Table A indicates "CNSC staff rating in
7 safety areas", in no parameter does Cameco achieve higher
8 than a B for any safety-related criteria. For fire, they
9 score a C and this only after threats by the CNSC of
10 licence revocation, now well over a year ago.

11 And the CNSC finds this adequate to renew
12 their licence and to extend it a further five years,
13 presumably due to the "consistent and good history of
14 operating compliance"? And we, as citizens, are supposed
15 to be reassured by this. I find this truly patronizing.

16 I'm a trauma doctor. I work in a busy
17 urban ER. I would like the Board to imagine a scenario in
18 which your son or daughter is in a severe car accident and
19 brought to my ER, clinging to life with a crushed chest.
20 An OPP officer brings you to the hospital, where I tell
21 you I need to perform a dangerous emergency procedure that
22 involves cutting the chest open to drain blood that is
23 preventing the lungs from expanding and then sticking a
24 long needle into the covering of her heart to relieve
25 life-threatening bleeding and pressure. If I don't do it,

1 she will die, as her heart gets crushed in its own blood.
2 If I do it, but accidentally puncture the muscle of the
3 heart, she will also die. But if I do it right, I'll save
4 her life, right there. But, I reassure you, "really you
5 have nothing to fear, she's in good hands, because
6 although I received an unacceptable grade in my advanced
7 trauma life support re-certification last year and was
8 threatened with licence removal, I've now recently been
9 re-evaluated and I got a C. So please sign the consent in
10 confidence." Tell me you'd feel reassured.

11 Emissions. Recent documents released by
12 Cameco demonstrate that they had "miscalculated previous
13 figures of emission release" and that, in fact, they were
14 double what was previously reported, based on the presence
15 of so-called fugitive emissions, which previously,
16 obviously for decades, went unrecorded, but are now all of
17 a sudden said to make roughly half of the emissions from
18 Cameco. It is unclear how accurate even the current
19 estimates are. How do you trust them now? Given the
20 known zero threshold level of radiation tolerance with
21 respect to DNA damage described earlier, the ALERA
22 principle of emission standards is simply not acceptable,
23 certainly not for a facility operating in the centre of a
24 populated area without a buffer zone. The CNSC seems to
25 have completely ignored this fact of gross misreporting of

1 emissions, much as how they stick their head in the sand
2 in regards to fire safety and continue to do.

3 There is demonstrated public concern about
4 emissions and Cameco's own public polling, as you know,
5 two-thirds of Port Hope recited the concerns of the
6 environment that should be one of the overarching values
7 and prerequisites for the Vision 2010 Project.

8 Ever increasing emissions are not
9 acceptable by any modern nuclear facility, let alone one
10 which stands in the middle of a town, without a buffer
11 zone. There is no system in place to measure the year-to-
12 year accumulation of these effects and ever-increasing
13 emissions, nor the cumulative health effects they may be
14 having.

15 I demand that Cameco and its subsidiary
16 Zircatec be held to declare their support, at least for
17 targeting a zero-emission standard, as set by defined
18 yearly emission goals that can be monitored independently.
19 These emission targets would pertain not only to uranium
20 dust but to all the other poisons that are spewed over our
21 town on a continual basis, hydrogen fluoride, ammonia,
22 nitrous oxide, just to mention a few.

23 A few further comments. I feel it
24 necessary to express a frustration that I believe I share
25 with a great many members of this community regarding this

1 process itself. With all due respect to the Committee
2 before me, is it any wonder the low level of credibility
3 that CNSC has with the Canadian public, as a champion of
4 environment or human health? Rather than choosing to
5 stand up for us, the citizens of the community, the CNSC
6 is generally seen as a necessary administrative adjunct of
7 the nuclear industry. I believe the CNSC has even
8 described itself, in past, as writing, to a member of this
9 community as "an enabler of the nuclear industry".

10 When as the public into fighting
11 transgressions by the nuclear industry in our town is to
12 appeal to the CNSC, a Commission which ultimately answers
13 to the very minister responsible for enabling and running
14 the nuclear program in this country, how can one not feel
15 that there are serious conflicts of issues at stake.

16 Who looks after the health and well-being
17 of the citizens of our town caught in the midst of this?
18 Who do we appeal to? It's not lost on the observant
19 members of the public that the CNSC does not possess a
20 strong vibrant group of health professionals, nor top-
21 notch environmentalists to confidently critique the
22 industry's often superficial and variably reassuring
23 statements about health safety and anticipated
24 environmental impact.

25 In short, the CNSC is focused on enabling

1 the nuclear industry. Its true mandate is not public
2 protection.

3 Perhaps, a small recent example of why some
4 people may hold the above perception was evidenced by what
5 transpired yesterday to the last speaker of the day,
6 Doctor Stan Blecher. After my father's presentation, at
7 the request of the Chair, a comment was made by one of the
8 CNSC staffers concerning a study on victims of Hiroshima
9 and Nagasaki and its finding with respect to Leukemia, in
10 particular. The comments made by the staffer, who is not
11 geneticist, clearly appeared to challenge the veracity of
12 the statements made by the presenter. Doctor Blecher did
13 not wish a debate, but merely a chance to reply to
14 comments that directly questioned his statements, much
15 like the Chair has allowed Cameco to reply and deliberate
16 all of the last two days in regards to comments directed
17 at them.

18 Had the Chair allowed him to speak, he
19 would have said that the author of that research was
20 Doctor James V. Neal. Doctor Neal is a true pioneer in
21 the field of medical genetics, a hero of my father's and,
22 as the first Chair of a department of medical genetics,
23 anywhere in North America, he's an icon. He spent his
24 career at the University of Michigan and Ann Arbor, where
25 my father was invited to spend a sabbatical year in 1989,

1 in part, due to the invite of Dr. Neal, who was still
2 alive at the time. During my father's time there, of
3 course, he had many discussions with Doctor Neal about his
4 work on radiation studies and, in particular ---

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** One minute, sir.

6 **DR. BLEACHER:** --- the question based on
7 data collected and analysed in the 1940s and '50s, 70
8 years ago, with techniques available at that time. His
9 view of that data now was no different from my father's.
10 We know that radiation causes mutation. It's additive and
11 there is no threshold. He also agreed that had the
12 techniques of today been available then, as they are now,
13 a relationship to cause and effect would have emerged, but
14 my father was silenced.

15 Should anyone at the CNSC who understands
16 medical genetics wish to have a debate with him on this
17 subject in a public forum on another occasion, he would be
18 more than happy to oblige.

19 Port Hope is in a unique and worrisome
20 situation. It is the only town in the world with a
21 nuclear fuel conversion facility operating in the middle
22 of a populous area with no buffer zone.

23 Even an equivalent facility in the former
24 Soviet Union, where human rights are meaningless, did not
25 operate with such cavalier grandeur; indeed, government-

1 sanctioned grandeur.

2 Port Hope is portrayed by itself, as well
3 as by the rest of Ontario, as a beautiful historic town.
4 In fact, it lays claim to being "the most historic main
5 street in Ontario". It's on the sign you passed on your
6 way into town. It's quaint, bucolic, an idyllic place
7 that has now for too long had to suffer the indignity of
8 being patronized by one level of government after another
9 ---

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, sir.

11 **DR. BLECHER:** --- into being told that
12 there is "nothing to worry about" without ever having been
13 given the benefit of help nor properly forcing industries
14 operating in our midst to comply with the very regulations
15 that are ever so gently imposed upon them by the nuclear
16 enablers.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Thank you
18 very much.

19 **DR. BLECHER:** Ma'am, my wife needs two
20 minutes and I'm going to usurp some of her time.

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** No, you cannot do that,
22 sir.

23 **DR. BLECHER:** (off microphone).

24 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** That is fine, sir.

25 **DR. BLECHER:** Will you allow me ---

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** No.

2 **DR. BLECHER:** I'm just going to read the
3 rest of my statement.

4 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** You probably missed
5 yesterday when we talked about the Canadian Nuclear Safety
6 Commission, so I will mention this to you about the
7 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

8 The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is
9 an independent quasi-judicial tribunal. It is an
10 independent organization that reports to Parliament. Its
11 mandate is to look at the evidence that is put before us
12 by the licensee, by CNSC staff and by, in this case, very
13 many intervenors, all who wish to put forward their views.
14 Every one of these intervenors, not just you, sir, every
15 one of these intervenors has a right to be heard and has a
16 right to put forward whether it's one page, 10 pages or
17 whatever, and this is our way to make sure that our time
18 in this community, the time in the community is shared
19 equally among people here. So that's why we have put
20 rules in place which I think everybody has so far felt
21 that they could look at.

22 **DR. BLECHER:** I don't agree with that.
23 There won't be any time saved by her reading the rest of
24 my statement, but if you choose to do that, that's okay.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** That's what we have

1 decided, sir, to do. In fact, the Commission has been
2 extremely, extremely open to people submitting one thing
3 and reading quite different things because they have
4 decided they want to change as they go along.

5 **DR. BLECHER:** We were instructed to do
6 that.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** No, the instructions are
8 that people submit something which is the basis of their
9 discussion, not to submit one thing and read another or
10 send another.

11 But anyway, I think that what I wanted to
12 say was, if you have proof that somebody wrote to anyone
13 in any community that the purpose of the CNSC is to be an
14 enabler of industry, I would be very, very interested in
15 receiving that, because I will assure you that that is not
16 authorized. There is no statement in the legislation of
17 the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission that says we enable
18 any industry. That is not our job, and I think that the
19 4,500 licences that we are responsible for, including
20 every hospital, cancer clinic in Canada, every -- there's
21 no provincial authorities -- the quality of the oversight
22 in those hospitals is based on the Canadian Nuclear Safety
23 Commission's staff.

24 I will also tell you that, about a month
25 and a half ago, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission,

1 the first nuclear regulator in the world, in the world,
2 has put into place a directorate of environmental
3 assessment and protection which is headed by Dr. Patsy
4 Thompson, which is one of the most pre-eminent
5 environmental oversight with a staff that is equally
6 qualified.

7 So actually, sir, I think that there is a
8 great deal of expertise in a number of areas in the CNSC
9 and, of course, that it can always be better and it always
10 will be better.

11 You're sitting across from a medical
12 doctor, a medical doctor who is also a member of the
13 Commission, along with geologists, chemists, Orders of
14 Canada, Orders of Saskatchewan, Orders of Quebec and who
15 are eminent people, who deserve -- who have been put on
16 this Commission, because they are Canadians that have been
17 asked to perform this task and who take this task very,
18 very seriously, as do the staff at the Commission.

19 So I appreciate that you have your right
20 for your opinions. I appreciate your views with regards
21 to the Commission, but I do feel it's important that I not
22 leave on the table, comments that insult the integrity and
23 the independence of this Commission.

24 Now, are there any questions or comments
25 from Commission Members on the content?

1 Yes, Dr. Dosman.

2 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, Dr. Blecher
3 wasn't here throughout the day, but he may refer to the
4 transcripts for what, I believe, was a very excellent
5 description of health effects of radiation and health
6 effects in this community.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Further questions,
8 comments?

9 Thank you very much, sir.

10 **DR. BLECHER:** Some of the translators have
11 left. I wonder whether if under the *Official Languages*
12 *Act*, we are still in compliance for simultaneous ---

13 **MR. LEBLANC:** As no one was using the
14 system, there is no non compliance. It's based on the
15 need to have the service, and nobody was requiring the
16 service. So at nine o'clock, they had to leave.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you for that point
18 of clarification.

19 Mr. Secretary.

20 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
21 submission, which is an oral presentation from Ms. Louise
22 Ferrie-Blecher. The floor is yours, Ma'am.

23 **MS. FERRIE-BLECHER:** Thank you, Madam Chair
24 and Commission.

25 **MR. LEBLANC:** I will just note the CMD

1 number for reference by the Members. It's 06-H18.65. So
2 06-H18.65 is the number of your submission. Thank you.

3
4 **06-H18.65**

5 Oral presentation by
6 Louise Ferrie-Blecher

7
8 **MS. FERRIE-BLECHER:** Thank you.

9 For the record, I would like to ask that
10 this be transcribed into the record -- that my
11 presentation is being transcribed.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Every presentation is
13 being transcribed and is the usual process of the Canadian
14 Nuclear Safety Commission.

15 **MS. FERRIE-BLECHER:** Thank you.

16 I do have one comment to make at the end,
17 but I feel it's important to complete the statement that
18 my husband was making, as I also concur with a lot of the
19 comments that he's making.

20 There is no doubt that years from now we
21 will look back at the situation in Port Hope with a
22 nuclear fuel conversion facility operating in the middle
23 of town with collective incredulity. The question is
24 when? I believe history will judge us and the enablers.
25 It will be a public record for everyone's children to view

1 this legacy.

2 I want to make it clear this is not a
3 matter of being anti-nuclear. In fact, for the record, Dr.
4 Blecher states that he's quite strongly pro-nuclear. He
5 likes to think that he's governed by science and logic and
6 not emotion. He is also not anti-Cameco. He is pro-
7 business, but he's also pro-health and safety, and by the
8 very definition of corporate governance, health and safety
9 cannot be Cameco's priority.

10 While we do not question the integrity of
11 any of the Cameco employees we have met in town, of
12 course, we believe they want the community in which they
13 live and we live to be as safe as us.

14 However, we do question their ability to do
15 anything about it even if they did have safety concerns.

16 Dr. Blecher has sat and continues to sit on
17 public boards. He understands corporate governance. Any
18 public company must, by law, operate exclusively for the
19 maximal benefit of its shareholders, which is profit
20 maximization. If an officer or a director acts in any way
21 that is not commensurate with this, they are breaking the
22 law.

23 To believe that Cameco's best interest at
24 heart is that of the health and safety of the citizens of
25 Port Hope is simply delusional.

1 To be concerned about our safety will cost
2 money. Spending money needlessly is clearly not in the
3 shareholder interest, but rest assured that Cameco's
4 recent doling out of moneys to various Port Hope
5 organizations and institutions is not because of misguided
6 benevolence. We don't begrudge them. Cameco, the
7 corporation, is behaving the only way it can.

8 Similarly, there will be no shortage, I'm
9 sure, of current and former beneficiaries of Cameco's
10 operations speaking before you and telling you that all is
11 okay. Of course, this has absolutely nothing, zero
12 bearing on the indisputable scientific facts. This is not
13 about a popularity contest.

14 For 50 years after the tobacco industry
15 knew that their product was killing people, 50 years,
16 executives and employees alike, swearing to God under oath
17 at one inquiry after another stated that tobacco was
18 absolutely non addictive and had no deleterious health
19 effects.

20 One cannot possibly count on objectivity
21 from a source when massive profit motives are at hand.
22 This is not science and the CNSC surely knows this.

23 The only way for Port Hope to ensure its
24 well being is by having tough legislation forced upon
25 Cameco and Zircatec with respect to operations and safety,

1 legislation that they actually must comply with.

2 And Cameco, rather than continuing the
3 perception that they buy off the citizenry through their
4 generous support of various local organizations and
5 events, should direct this money to reducing emissions and
6 improving safety.

7 I believe that any licence renewal for both
8 Cameco and Zircatec must be limited to a two-year period.
9 Long-term efforts should be made at this stage to relocate
10 these vital and important facilities in this industry to
11 nearby vacant lands within the township already in the
12 company's possession. This would allow for appropriate
13 buffer zones for the continued operation without any
14 economic loss to the region or local workers.

15 The decision to relocate Cameco to an area
16 with appropriate buffer zones should be based on health,
17 community and safety, not on marketing, advertising and,
18 frankly, in this heavily government-backed industry even
19 on primarily on economics.

20 In the meantime, if the two-year licence
21 renewal is to occur, we leave the Committee with a request
22 to answer the following three questions:

23 One, will the CNSC commit to ensuring that
24 the residents of Port Hope get proper funding for proper
25 health studies which have been denied them throughout the

1 73-year history of the nuclear industry's presence in this
2 town.

3 Two, would Committee, on behalf of the
4 CNSC, commit to ensuring that when recommendations and
5 action directives are mandated of Cameco and Zircotec that
6 they're followed through upon? In other words, when
7 deadlines pertaining to correcting safety transgressions
8 are exceeded, will licence revocation take place as is
9 threatened but never in the past followed through upon by
10 the CNSC? In short, will there be accountability?

11 Three, will the Commission commit to
12 forcing Cameco and Zircotec to aim for zero emission
13 strategy that will involve stringent, defined targets for
14 emission reduction that are to be monitored independently
15 and must be met and tied directly to licence continuation?

16 Respectfully submitted by Dr. Blecher and
17 myself, Louise Ferrie-Bletcher.

18 I have one other question. Yesterday -- or
19 I'm sorry, it may have been earlier today -- there was a
20 discussion between the Town of Port Hope and Cameco with
21 respect to the rationale for deferral of the Fire and
22 Building Code. In this statement, I believe it was Mr.
23 Steane but I may be mistaken -- spoke about the difference
24 between mandatory versus not necessarily mandatory
25 measures which had to be met. I was at a loss a little

1 bit in the debate. My background is in law and my
2 understanding of when an order is made that the order is
3 to be followed through, and I haven't seen anything in any
4 of the documentations that would differentiate between an
5 order having a difference between the mandatory measures
6 that the CNSC is ordering and those being not necessarily
7 mandatory.

8 And I believe the statement was that these
9 not necessarily mandatory measures were based on Cameco's
10 decision of what was not necessarily mandatory in terms of
11 Fire and Building Code regulations.

12 So I would like to ask for a clarification
13 on that point and, as well, if someone from Cameco could
14 speak to -- or someone from CNSC can speak to who
15 determines what's mandatory and what's not mandatory in
16 terms of your orders and why is there a differentiation.
17 If it's not necessarily mandatory, then why is it part of
18 an order?

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much. I
20 think it is important to clarify the word "order" under
21 the *Canadian Nuclear Safety and Control Act* is a very
22 specific action. There are licence requirements. There
23 are regulatory requirements. There are standards and
24 guidelines and I can appreciate that there is differences
25 between those and those are interesting.

1 But I would like the staff to, with regards
2 to this particular issue, use that as an example. But the
3 word "order" isn't used very often. The CNSC issued an
4 order to nuclear plants after 9/11 which was the first
5 emergency order that had been used since the Act was put
6 in, in 2006, so it gives you a sense of the word "order",
7 what that means.

8 But could the CNSC staff start and then
9 there was -- the transcripts will show the detail of the
10 exchange on this but I think it's important to clarify.

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

13 In the case of the Fire Code, there was no
14 order issued under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*.
15 What was done with our reviews and audits, there was two
16 sets of actions. One we're required to come into
17 compliance with the Fire Code and that's the mandatory
18 compliance that was spoken about. Then, as we do these --
19 as our specialists go through it, we also look at good
20 engineering practices that could be adopted by the
21 licensee and we make those in forms of recommendations
22 which are not mandatory.

23 In this case, my understanding is, is
24 Cameco has accepted all of the recommendations and is in
25 the process of implementing those as good engineering

1 practices.

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So I think the difference
3 yesterday was between items to put them in full compliance
4 with the requirements and versus good engineering
5 practices. But I'll ask Cameco to differentiate.

6 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

7 These codes consist of a number of aspects
8 to them that address varying things in terms of
9 retroactivity and the applicability of applying
10 retroactivity as codes change. And within the codes the
11 items can be broken down into items that are mandatory;
12 items that are legal non-conforming. That is, something
13 that was -- it was in compliance with the code at the time
14 it was put there and a new code it may not be conforming
15 but it is acceptable because the code sees that it was in
16 compliance at the time of the structure being put there.
17 And a third is good engineering design.

18 So when I was talking about what we had
19 completed, I was saying we had completed all of those
20 items from a 2000 audit that were identified in the code
21 as being mandatory items and we had also -- we've done
22 some prioritization and we have been working these legal
23 non-conforming and we had also looked at what are a good
24 engineering practice and we are implementing those.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** The order -- quite often

1 we use orders in a very severe situation. We had one
2 quite recently where we ordered a company in terms of some
3 very serious environmental issues, for example.

4 With regards to the other items you
5 mentioned, there has been significant discussion and
6 evidence put forward with regards to health studies.
7 There was a summary read into the record for Day One,
8 which is in the Day One transcript on health studies, and
9 that was summarized and repeated today. A number of
10 interventions talked about the issue of health studies and
11 the need for them.

12 The Commission will deliberate with regards
13 to that and look at what we have heard as a group. We
14 work as a group and just make a decision with regards to
15 that.

16 There was considerable discussion about the
17 emissions and there were considerable interventions about
18 the topic that you raised, which was the recalculation of
19 the emissions and there was considerable questioning of
20 the applicant by the Commission with regards to that. And
21 again, that will be a subject of the decisions that come
22 out of the Commission and the reasons for decisions which
23 usually come out in about six weeks. We are going towards
24 a very busy time but usually about six weeks. We have
25 bilingual ones coming out.

1 Was that the questions that you asked?
2 Okay. Thank you very much.

3 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
4 submission, which is an oral presentation from Mr. Steven
5 Sneyd, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.68.

6 The floor is yours, sir.

7
8 **06-H18.68**

9 Oral presentation by
10 Stephen Sneyd

11

12 **MR. SNEYD:** Thank you. I should do this in
13 English, then? I'll do it in English.

14 My name is Stephen Sneyd. I'm basically
15 just a concerned resident, and I'd like to thank the
16 Commission for coming to Port Hope so we can do this in
17 person. It's a nice change from the last time.

18 We seem to have the smartest people in the
19 world in this room and, yet, we still have this problem in
20 Port Hope.

21 The last few presenters illustrated to me
22 over a couple of issues -- the two main issues seemed to
23 be health concerns, health effects, and fire protection.
24 And out of the last couple of presenters we have had two
25 medical doctors that seemed to have read different sides

1 of the medical book. They're completely opposite in their
2 evaluation of the situation.

3 The other main concern seems to be fire
4 protection and it's come up a lot. I would have to agree
5 with my brother firefighter that eight out of 10 fires are
6 put out by the first pump in, but I doubt if very many or
7 any at all of those 80 per cent were going to a nuclear
8 facility and you could run into quite a very different
9 result.

10 Anyways, I would just like to read my
11 statement now. I'll be very brief.

12 As I understand it, the mission of the
13 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is to regulate the use
14 of nuclear energy and materials to protect health, safety
15 and security and the environment and to respect Canada's
16 international commitments on the peaceful use of nuclear
17 energy.

18 Now, we are the people of Port Hope. We
19 have asked for health studies. We have asked to be
20 protected. We have asked for safety measures and adequate
21 fire protection and an emergency evacuation plan and on
22 and on and on. We are in receipt of information from
23 hundreds of sources, just like we've heard today. We've
24 heard about alarming disturbing health trends. We have
25 heard of allowable limit, acceptable emissions and

1 guidelines and mandates. We know of jobs and commerce and
2 responsibility. We know the town's role and the country's
3 energy plan now and in the future. We know of projected
4 cleanups, restorations, everyday we hear more. We
5 question, we argue, we live in fear and in hope.

6 At the end of everyday we hope that you, as
7 our Commissioners, have done your job. We hope that
8 you've not just ensured that the proper codes have been
9 followed, that the correct wire or pipe was used or that a
10 discharge is safe because it fits in a scale and it's been
11 approved.

12 As a concerned citizen I would like you to
13 look at it the same way I do, and I'm just a citizen and a
14 father and a family person. Would any of you have your
15 son or daughter raise your grandchildren downwind of this
16 stack or in this buffer zone that is Port Hope? Can you
17 search your souls and truthfully say to the people of Port
18 Hope that they are at no elevated risk? Would you sleep
19 as sound knowing that your own blood is dependent on your
20 judgements?

21 You all know what your mandate is. Is that
22 all it should be? If the town has the truth and all the
23 truths, we can make the proper choices. So I ask you once
24 and for all, have you completed your mandate to the letter
25 of its wording and in the realms of your conscience have

1 you done all that is right?

2 Thank you.

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

4 Are there any questions or comments from
5 the Commission Members for this intervenor?

6 Dr. Dosman.

7 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I would like
8 to inform the person that made the last comments that
9 earlier today and throughout the days we've had a number
10 of discussions on health issues and CNSC staff has
11 outlined the available evidence on health effects in
12 general and on health effects in this community. And I
13 would advise you to consult those transcripts when the
14 time comes.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

16 Thank you very much, sir, for coming.

17 **MR. LEBLANC:** May I ask, sir, if you plan
18 to do your presentation tomorrow at Zircatec or can we
19 consider your intervention tonight as also being
20 applicable for tomorrow's hearing.

21 **MR. SNEYD:** I don't believe I was down for
22 Zircatec, as far as I know.

23 **MR. LEBLANC:** We have you down, perhaps
24 mistakenly. So I think I got my answer.

25 Thank you.

1 **MR. SNEYD:** I'd come back though.

2 **MR. LEBLANC:** You'd come back. If you want
3 to come back you're welcome, sir. It's your right.

4 **MR. SNEYD:** Thank you.

5 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will move to the next
6 submission, which is an oral presentation from Ms.
7 Danielle Sneyd, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.69.

8 The floor is yours, Ma'am.

9

10 **06-H18.69**

11 Oral presentation by

12 Danielle Sneyd

13

14 **MS. SNEYD:** Thank you.

15 My name is Danielle Sneyd. I am a former
16 resident of Port Hope. I moved away because I was worried
17 about the health and safety of my family living in this
18 poisoned town. I was not prepared to put them in harms
19 way the way the government has.

20 We lived on a soon to be remediated truck
21 route. Since we moved 7 out of 10 of the houses in our
22 direct vicinity have also moved, and lack of a better
23 term, I believe they moved to higher ground.

24 The east beach that now lays on the scenic
25 centre pier that this government let us play on, my two-

1 month old niece played on, was contaminated. We never
2 knew that. They did.

3 Without any exaggeration, and you speak of
4 health effects, sir, when I lived here I could point to
5 the 10 properties and without exaggeration say "Cancer,
6 cancer, cardiovascular disease, cancer, cardiovascular
7 disease, cancer." That's in the immediate vicinity.

8 I saw a 12-year old boy die of an
9 aggressive brain tumour. It took him five months to pass
10 away. At his funeral I stood there as his mother walked
11 behind his casket and grabbed my arm and said "Don't ever
12 let another child in Port Hope die this way." It is for
13 that I sit as Vice-Chair on the Port Hope Health Concerns
14 Committee. Health studies are our mandate.

15 My submission: In your words, copy and
16 pasted from the website of your Commission, "Understanding
17 Radiation", a CNSC publication: (As Read)

18 "When exposure to low-levels of
19 radiation is examined it is more
20 difficult to predict the effects. In
21 any given population some people will
22 get cancer or pass on genetic defects.
23 This is a normal process, the natural
24 order of life. Exposure to air
25 pollution, toxic chemicals, sunlight,

1 viruses, smoking, et cetera, may
2 contribute to the incidents of health
3 effects, but since we know that
4 radiation can cause these effects, to
5 be on the safe side nuclear regulators
6 assume that there is some risk
7 involved at low doses and take
8 appropriate measures to protect health
9 and safety."

10 It later goes on to say:

11 "Gamma radiation; gamma radiation is a
12 very penetrating type of radiation.
13 It is usually admitted immediately
14 after the injection of alpha or beta
15 particle from the nucleus of an atom.
16 It can pass through the human body.
17 It is almost completely absorbed by
18 denser materials such as concrete or
19 lead."

20 That is directly taken from your website.

21 I now ask you to review the photographs
22 that I sent in of the -- first of all, the diagram of the
23 1976 GammaCam gamma radiation map attached to the
24 photographs that also can correspond to the red areas on
25 that map.

1 Do you have those?

2 So the first one is taken from the GammaCam
3 website, and the red areas show the gamma radiation. To
4 me, and I'm not a scientist, that looks kind of scary.
5 Knowing where those sites are in the red, if you move on
6 to the first photograph, it is a picture of the welcome
7 waste site, next to it is a farm, and in the background a
8 horse. That's a red area.

9 The second photograph is a postcard of Port
10 Hope. Sites 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 are the town
11 with no buffer zone.

12 Site 23 is the -- what is that -- that's
13 the storage site. Houses are located hundreds of yards
14 away. Houses pictured in the photo behind are behind the
15 trees on the right. A former resident of that house has a
16 brain cancer.

17 It is my opinion that you, the
18 Commissioner's of the CNSC, are failing to meet your own
19 mission statement, and I quote; "To protect health,
20 safety, security and the environment." These people of
21 Port Hope who stood before you in the past two days are
22 some of the finest people I have ever met. They are
23 people who have endured public pressure, public harassment
24 and ridicule to be here today. These people I speak of
25 have integrity, intelligence and pride and hope.

1 I hope you, the Commissioners, can honour
2 them and make the right decision with their health, their
3 safety, their security and their environment.

4 Thank you.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Ma'am.

6 I would like to ask the CNSC staff with
7 regards to the excerpt from the website regarding the
8 words "low doses", some risk at "low doses". There is
9 also -- you've also over the last two days talked about
10 the doses that are the regulations with regards to doses,
11 and you've also talked about the doses that are at the
12 Cameco site -- that are released in the Cameco site. And
13 I think it might be helpful to provide some clarity about
14 this.

15 I think, Ma'am, you're also talking about
16 the issues of the low-level waste clearly in here. As
17 you're aware, that's going to be the subject of further
18 discussion as we look at the creation of the low-level
19 waste site and moving low-level waste from various parts
20 of Port Hope to that, but that is not the subject of the
21 Cameco discussion today. We're talking about that
22 specific site. I know it sounds a bit bureaucratic to
23 talk about it in different ways but that's the way the
24 licences go.

25 So if I could ask the staff to do a quick

1 overview of that.

2 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you. Barclay Howden
3 speaking.

4 I'm going to ask Chris Clement, the
5 Director of Radiation Protection Division to speak to the
6 regulatory dose limits and the doses that are estimated to
7 the population and the relative risks.

8 Thank you.

9 **MR. CLEMENT:** Thank you. Chris Clement for
10 the record.

11 I guess I'll cover a number of things
12 fairly briefly. There is a legislative limit on the dose
13 to members of the public from any nuclear licensees
14 operation of one milliSievert per year. Licensees are
15 required to estimate doses to the public and this
16 particular licensee Cameco has done so as well. Doses to
17 the public from their operation have been estimated as a
18 small fraction of one milliSievert per year. In fact, in
19 2005 their estimate is that we agree with this .023
20 milliSieverts per year. That's just the beginning though.
21 Let me talk for a minute about the potential for risks
22 effects at very low doses.

23 When we talk about low doses in terms of
24 effects of radiation, we talk about doses that are in the
25 range of tens of milliSieverts and lower, to be on the

1 conservative side. So when we talk about doses to members
2 of the public, and even the regulatory limits on doses to
3 members of the public, we're talking about doses that are
4 actually quite, quite low.

5 I would say that most health physicists
6 would agree that the most likely health outcome at these
7 very, very low doses is no negative health effect.

8 However, that being said, we do have a
9 requirement for doses to be maintained ALARA as low as
10 reasonably achievable, to be on the safe side. So
11 regardless of a dose limit, we also require that licensees
12 make sure the doses are as low as possible, as low as
13 reasonable achievable. This is because there is some
14 uncertainty about risks at very low levels, even though we
15 believe that the most likely health outcome is no negative
16 health effect.

17 As a precautionary measure, we require
18 licensees and including this licensee to make sure doses
19 are as low as they can be reasonably achieved. I hope I
20 have answered your question.

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Could you give us a sense
22 of the background, natural radiation levels that we would
23 see in background as compared to one milliSievert?

24 **MR. CLEMENT:** Certainly. Chris Clement,
25 for the record.

1 Typically in Canada, doses to anybody range
2 in the two to three milliSieverts per year range, just
3 from natural background that comes from naturally
4 occurring radioactive substances in the soil. It comes
5 from radiation from the sun, from outer space. It comes
6 from radon that's naturally occurring in buildings.
7 That's about two to three milliSieverts.

8 As I said, the public dose limit is one
9 milliSievert. In addition to that, any doses that are
10 projected from this operation are .02 -- on the order of
11 .02 milliSieverts. So we're talking about increments of
12 perhaps one per cent above the natural background that are
13 estimated.

14 I would add too that these estimates are
15 quite conservative. The actual doses to any actual member
16 of the public are likely much smaller. As discussed very
17 briefly earlier, the public doses calculated are to a
18 critical receptor, which is a hypothetical person who has
19 somewhat extreme lifestyle habits and exposed to the
20 highest or very high levels measured at fence lines of
21 facilities.

22 So we're quite confident that doses
23 received by any actual member of the public are a small,
24 small fraction of doses that are received every day by
25 every person, anywhere in the country. And in fact, as

1 you move from house to house, community to community, city
2 to city, the variations in doses received naturally are
3 much greater than the projected dose to the public from
4 this facility.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much for
6 your intervention.

7 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will now move to the next
8 submission, which is an oral presentation from Ms. Diane
9 Taylor, as outlined in CMD 06-H18.62. 06-H18.62 Ms.
10 Taylor, the floor is yours.

11
12 **06-H18.62**

13 Oral presentation by
14 Diane Taylor

15
16 **MS. TAYLOR:** Madam Chair, and all the
17 others, thank you for coming to Port Hope.

18 I came to Port Hope four years ago, a
19 complete innocent. I came knowing very little about
20 uranium refineries or conversion facilities. I came not
21 knowing there was one of these conversion facilities in
22 town.

23 When the real estate agent showed me the
24 one house on the market that was in my price range, I like
25 it. I liked it a lot. It was in Port Hope, on Highland

1 Drive. She drove me up the hill and waved off to the
2 right telling me there was a storage facility back there.
3 I thought she meant storage units for extra furniture. I
4 wasn't too interested as I didn't have extra furniture.

5 It wasn't until I had signed papers with an
6 offer that an Oshawa friend, whose father had owned land
7 on Highland Drive, said to me, "You do know about Port
8 Hope, don't you?" "Know what", I said. And so she told
9 me about the decades of awful realization, contamination,
10 radiation, cancer and clean-up, and clean-up, and clean-
11 up. The main words she used was "heart ache". My own
12 heart constricted not a little. What was I doing moving
13 into such a problematic and possibly toxic town? So I
14 looked into it.

15 The pie office gave me a video. I asked
16 questions, went on a tour of the new storage facility off
17 Baulch Road and it seemed to me that Port Hope was doing
18 the responsible thing, making the town safe. I moved in.
19 I was in seventh heaven.

20 The *Port Hope Evening Guide* and the
21 *Northumberland News* had articles about something totally
22 new to me, SEU, Slightly Enriched Uranium. I didn't want
23 to think about it. I wanted it to go away. I wanted my
24 home, my place of personal safety to be in some town other
25 than Port Hope. But here I most definitely was. Moving

1 was out of the question.

2 I joined others who were asking for a panel
3 review. There was a positive outcome. SEU now will not
4 be made in Port Hope. This was very good news, but the
5 other issue of Cameco being in town has not gone away, and
6 there are reason a plenty why Cameco's licence should not
7 be renewed. Here are three: the floodplain that the
8 buildings sit on, lack of adequate buffer zone and
9 decreased property value.

10 About the floodplain. I know the Ganaraska
11 Region Conservative Authority completed Part One of a
12 study that was presented to the Board on September 15,
13 2005, and that information from it relates to runoff will
14 be used, I was told, to help flood-proof the SEU facility
15 against regional storms, such as Hurricane Hazel, but not
16 against the hundred year storm.

17 This worries me. We have seen what the
18 hundred year storm can do in New Orleans. Further, we
19 have all heard time and again, that with global warming,
20 hurricanes seem to be increasing in intensity. We know
21 that water can be a critical ingredient leading to a
22 criticality. If you lived in Port Hope would you or would
23 you not want further exploration of this issue for the
24 protection of the town and the town's people for
25 generations to come.

1 Interestingly, Mark Peacock of the
2 Ganaraska Conservation Authority told me this morning that
3 the Part One of the study does not include climate change.
4 It doesn't take climate change into account. This seems
5 to me a rather serious omission.

6 About the buffer zone. Because Cameco's
7 uranium conversion facility is in the town of Port Hope,
8 part of Port Hope is within what should have been set
9 aside as the buffer zone. I am not against Cameco, nor am
10 I against nuclear energy. I feel the conversion facility
11 should be outside the highly populated town of Port Hope.
12 Would it make more sense for it to be relocated closer to
13 an enrichment plant?

14 About property values. Jacques Whitford has
15 pointed out that property values in Port Hope are about 12
16 per cent lower than they should be. This doesn't sit well
17 with me as someone who has spent 20 years saving for a
18 house. No doubt there are others in town who have similar
19 feelings.

20 It's time for the uranium conversion
21 facility to relocate in closer proximity to other uranium
22 friendly facilities and leave greener pastures behind
23 them.

24 Thank you.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Ms. Taylor.

1 I would like to note that in addition to
2 Mr. Peacock's testimony, there was a great deal of
3 discussion back and forth about climate change yesterday,
4 and so the transcripts will talk extensively about the
5 studies that were done by Cameco and discussions back and
6 forth about the implications and possible scenarios under
7 climate change.

8 So I think you will find that to be helpful
9 on that particular issue, noting as we did that Mr.
10 Peacock said that that was not part of their study --
11 terms of reference for that study.

12 Are there any questions or comments for
13 this intervenor?

14 Thank you very much for your testimony
15 today. Thank you for coming.

16 **MR. LEBLANC:** We will now be moving to the
17 written submissions, of which there is a large amount, so
18 before we start with the written submissions we will take
19 a five-minute break and resume in five minutes.

20 --- Upon recessing at 9:52 p.m.

21 --- Upon resuming at 22:02

22 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** If people could take
23 their seats. I realize it has been a very long day, but
24 we are going to continue with the written submissions.

25 I would like to note again, as I noted at

1 the beginning, that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
2 takes the written submissions into account just as we do
3 the oral ones. We will be asking the Commission members
4 if they have any comments with regard to these written
5 submissions.

6 Thank you.

7 **M. LEBLANC:** Merci, Madame la Présidente.

8 It has been two days of hearings. A lot of
9 information has been shared. The members, as the
10 President alluded to, have already read the submissions.

11 We did, for efficiency purposes, group the
12 submissions by areas of concerns or interest. In that
13 context I will be listing the intervention in those
14 groupings. I will give the last digits of the number of
15 the CMD and the name of the intervener, after which the
16 President will ask the members if they have questions on
17 any of those interventions that were so listed, after
18 which we will proceed with another group of interventions.

19 The first group of interventions, which
20 reflects similar comments, have been submitted to the
21 Commission by the following persons or groups, who are
22 mostly Cameco employees:

23 CMD 06-H18.76 from Mr. and Mrs. Flesch

24 77 from Ms. Anna Mosher

25 82 from Brett Stephens

1	83 from Gerhard Heinrich
2	85 from Cynthia Adams
3	88 from Barry Sanders
4	89 from Laurie Johnson
5	90 from Christina Ingalls
6	91 from David Ingalls
7	92 from Bob Routly
8	93 from Marilyn Routly
9	94 from Tom Fraser
10	96 from Doug Westlake
11	97 from Chris Watt
12	102 from Shane Watson
13	103 from Mikhail Ioffe
14	104 from John Mulligan
15	106 from Michael Murchie
16	108 from Rob Brulé
17	109 from Laurie Batchellor
18	110 from Lori Altman
19	111 from Lori Cater
20	114 from Ed Lam
21	115 from Doug Choiniere
22	116 from Debbie Hoselton
23	119 from Sam Fleming
24	125 from Margaret Bradley
25	126 from Fraser Mumford

1 129 from Mike Wladyka
2 131 from Dave McElroy
3 132 from Darren Clarke
4 133 from Ms. Tairova
5 136 from Terry Highfield
6 137 from Mr. and Mrs. McBride
7 139 from Neil Pemberton
8 144 from John Krause
9 146 from Myron Szalawiga
10 149 from Marc Boucher
11 150 from Aldo D'Agostino
12 155 from Esther Valliant
13 156 from Peter Wieczorek
14 157 from Simon Reid
15 160 from Raymond Foote

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Hearing this list of
17 interventions, are there any interventions that the
18 Commission members wish to ask questions of the licensee
19 or of the staff, or make any comments with regard to this
20 list of interventions?

21 Seeing no questions on these specific
22 interventions I will turn back to the secretary.

23 **MR. LEBLANC:** The following interventions,
24 which reflects similar comments, have been submitted to
25 the Commission by the following members of the public:

1 06-H18.73 from Mr. Brian Parr
2 74 from Mr. Lou Rinaldi, MPP,
3 Northumberland
4 75 from Ian P. Tate
5 78 from George Harvey
6 79 from Linda Hook
7 84 from David Doherty
8 86 from Wayne Byers
9 87 from Stewart Raynor
10 95 from Ed Lloyd
11 98 from Gordon Walter
12 99 from Paul Macklin
13 100 from Mr. and Mrs. Adams
14 101 from Sarah van Steijn
15 105 from Carl Griese
16 107 from Edna Bosnell
17 112 from Doug Hodgins
18 113 from Robert Wallace
19 117 from Mr. and Mrs. Hennessy
20 118 from Mr. and Mrs. Blanchard
21 121 from Gillian McNamee
22 122 from Marleen Campbell
23 123 from Rebecca Peters
24 127 from Rick Norlock
25 27 from Nina Murchie

1 45 from James Hunt

2 63 from John Floyd

3 164 from Roger Carr

4 The last four I just named were oral
5 interventions that were substituted into written
6 submissions.

7 I will continue with the list:

8 130 from Betty Finnie-Hunt

9 134 from Russel Boate

10 141 from Mr. and Mrs. Dobie

11 142 from Michael Marsh

12 143 from Roldano Dalla Rosa

13 145 from Rose Campbell

14 147 from Liz Stewart

15 148 from Jackie Brimblecombe

16 151 from 1145 residents of Northumberland

17 County

18 152 from Elizabeth Benne

19 154 from Anita Blackwood

20 158 from Carol Kirton

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** After reviewing these
22 written submissions from interveners, do the Commission
23 members have any questions for the licensee or for staff,
24 or have any comments with regard to this list?

25 Seeing no comments, I ask the Secretary to

1 continue.

2 **MR. LEBLANC:** The following interventions,
3 which reflect similar comments, have been submitted to the
4 Commission by the following companies, community-based
5 organizations, or business organizations:

6 06-H18.13 from Arie Ashkenazy & Associates

7 80 from Nor-Ag Resources Inc.

8 120 from Habitat for Humanity

9 Northumberland

10 124 from Community Awareness and Emergency

11 Response

12 135 from Northumberland United Way

13 138 from William Oliver Excavating and

14 Grading Ltd.

15 140 from Vandemeer Toyota

16 151 from Hill and Dale Manor

17 159 from Wakely Transportation Services

18 Limited

19 165 from Northumberland Hills Hospital

20 Madame la Présidente.

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** After reading these
22 written submissions from these interveners, are there any
23 comments or questions the Commission members wish to make
24 to either the licensee or to the CNSC staff in that
25 regard?

1 Seeing no questions, Mr. Secretary.

2 **MR. LEBLANC:** The following interventions,
3 which reflect similar comments, concerns or requests, have
4 been submitted to the Commission by the following members
5 of the public:

6 06-H18.8 from Rose Bungaro
7 9, Rod and Joan Parrott
8 10, Ray Morand
9 34, Farley Mowat
10 35, Stephen Smith
11 163, Mary Birkett
12 44, Glynnis Tomkinson
13 51, Celeste Stewart-McNamara
14 53, Derrick Kelly
15 55, Pat McNamara
16 61, Ashlea Tombs

17 Those were interventions that were filed as
18 oral interventions but were substituted as written
19 submissions.

20 We also have an additional number of such

21 CMDs:

22 16 from Mr. Gary Donais
23 17 from Mr. John Belle
24 57 from Mr. Ian Angus
25 128 from Ms. Anna Mutton

1 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** After having read these
2 written submissions, are there any comments or questions
3 from the Commission members to either the licensee or to
4 CNSC staff with regard to these.

5 Dr. McDill.

6 **MEMBER MCDILL:** Thank you. I have two
7 questions, one on 06-H18.55. There is a comment on page 2
8 of 9. I would like staff's opinion on it.

9 It is the fourth full paragraph beginning
10 with the word "But". The comment by the intervener is
11 that a request was sent to the CNSC for clarification and
12 the CNSC responded by blocking emails to senior staff. I
13 would like an interpretation of that please.

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

15 Dr. McDill, could you give me the
16 reference? We have the reference. We are just trying to
17 find the point.

18 **MEMBER MCDILL:** It is page 2 of 9, the
19 fourth full paragraph. The fifth paragraph if you include
20 the two sentences at the top.

21 "But considering our municipal
22 governments, et cetera, I sent a
23 request to CNSC for clarification.
24 The CNSC responded by blocking my
25 emails to senior staff."

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

2 I'm not aware of any blocking of emails.

3 What we do is when emails come in we route
4 it through a particular process which goes through
5 communications and then eventually it gets rolled up and
6 normally sent out by Mr. Pereira, the executive
7 vice-president, but there is no blocking of emails.

8 Sometimes emails bounce back when the
9 server is having problems, but other than that that
10 doesn't occur.

11 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

12 My second question is with respect to
13 06-H18.57. It relates again to communication. This is a
14 question for Cameco. It is in "Part 2: Emissions". The
15 intervener, Mr. Angus, says in his intervention that he
16 sent some information on filters to Cameco and has not yet
17 received an answer or an acknowledgment. I would like to
18 know if Cameco would like to comment to that please.

19 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.

20 Yes, we did receive information from Ian
21 Angus. We had responded to him. We received a subsequent
22 bit of information and we have responded to that.

23 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

24 My colleague just asked me for the page
25 number. It is page 2, part 2.

1 Thank you for your answer.

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Dr. McDill.

3 Are there any other questions or comments
4 from the Commission members? Thank you.

5 Mr. Secretary.

6 **MR. LEBLANC:** The following interventions,
7 which reflect similar comments, concerns or requests, have
8 been submitted to the Commission by the following
9 organizations:

10 CMD 06-H18.72 from the Canadian Coalition
11 for Nuclear Responsibility

12 38 from the Port Hope Yacht Club

13 54 from the Port Hope Nuclear Environmental
14 Watchdogs.

15 Those three CMDs were oral interventions
16 that were considered as written submissions in the absence
17 of the interveners.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Having read these
19 submissions, are there any questions or comments from
20 Commission members with regard to those noted items?

21 Seeing none, Mr. Secretary.

22 **MR. LEBLANC:** This was the end of the
23 written interventions.

24 I understand that Cameco would like to make
25 a statement and the President will conclude this

1 proceeding.

2 **MR. STEANE:** For the record, there has been
3 a lot of discussion and presentations and interventions
4 through the day and I have heard the term "buffer zone"
5 time and time again. I just wanted, for the record, to
6 have it on the record that I know a buffer is a means of
7 providing something between two things and that a buffer
8 could be provided by a zone, such that there is a distance
9 between what you are trying to keep apart or separate
10 from. A buffer may also be provided through containment,
11 so you could have an engineered buffer or a physical
12 distance buffer.

13 The philosophy and the design, construction
14 and operation of the Port Hope facility was that it be a
15 containment process. A containment buffer zone was
16 incorporated in the building.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

18 This brings these two-day hearings to an
19 end for the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

20 We would like to thank the community for
21 participating and getting involved at all levels, people
22 that had various points of view to give to the Commission.

23 With respect to this matter, I propose that
24 the Commission confer with regard to the information that
25 we have considered yesterday and today, and then we will

1 determine if further information is needed or if the
2 Commission is ready to proceed with the decision and we
3 will advise accordingly.

4 Thank you very much. We will be back here
5 tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m. to commence the Zircatec
6 hearing.

7 Thank you very much.

8 --- Upon adjourning at 10:19 p.m.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25