

1 **Atomic Energy of Canada Limited:**
2 **Application for the renewal of**
3 **the Nuclear Substance Processing**
4 **Facility Operating Licence for**
5 **the New Processing Facility at**
6 **the Chalk River Laboratories**

7
8 **05-H21.1B**

9 **Oral Presentation by**
10 **Atomic Energy of Canada**
11 **Limited**

12 **MR. VAN ADEL:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

13 Mr. Van Adel -- I'm sorry; Robert Van
14 Adel, the CEO of Atomic Energy.

15 I feel that my remarks earlier this
16 morning covered this section and I will turn it
17 directly over to Dr. Hedges for the purposes of moving
18 things along.

19 Thank you.

20 **DR. HEDGES:** Good morning, Madam Chair,
21 Members of the Commission. For the record, I am Ken
22 Hedges, Vice-President, Dedicated Isotopes Facilities.

23 I should note that the presentation
24 that's being put on the screen is for the MAPLE
25 reactor and not the New Processing Facility.

1 Do you wish me to wait or continue?

2 I guess this is part of our continuous
3 improvement process. I am pleased today to provide
4 clarifications that the Commission members requested
5 at Day One of the public hearing. I am also pleased
6 to provide an update on a project work and a licensing
7 commitment schedule in support of the application for
8 the two-year licence for the New Processing Facility.

9 Each bullet in the outline shown on
10 this slide addresses one of the requests for
11 clarification at Day One of the public hearing. I
12 will address each one of these topics in my
13 presentation.

14 NPF staffing levels. As mentioned
15 early this morning in the MAPLE reactor presentation
16 the DIF operations organization includes operating
17 staff for the New Processing Facility. There are
18 sufficient staff to support the non-nuclear operations
19 and inactive commissioning. This staff includes seven
20 trained hot cell technicians. There are sufficient
21 staff in training to support nuclear operations and
22 active commissioning. Additional staff have been
23 recruited to support nuclear operations for isotope
24 reduction.

25 Turning now to the NPF training

1 program, it has been established, documented and
2 implemented to support commissioning activities. As
3 changes to system equipment and processes are
4 completed, the training documentation will be updated
5 and will be provided to the hot cell technicians and
6 supervisors. For the hot cell technicians who have
7 completed the current training program, refresher
8 training/continuous will be provided as required to
9 support maintenance of skills and knowledge.

10 I am pleased to provide the Commission
11 members further clarification on the doses to NPF
12 workers during the current licensing period.
13 Radioactive sources are used to calibrate radiation
14 monitors. For 2003 and 2004, iodine-131 was used to
15 test charcoal absorbers in the active ventilation
16 system.

17 Currently, testing has been suspended
18 with the agreement of CNSC staff, to avoid
19 accumulating unnecessary worker doses. The testing of
20 the charcoal absorbers will resume before active
21 commissioning commences.

22 The support staff also perform work in
23 other CRL facilities and have accumulated doses from
24 that work. The doses to the NPF staff are consistent
25 with doses that other staff receive at CRL and are

1 well below regulatory limits.

2 I would like to provide the Commission
3 Members with some background on the ongoing work in
4 NPF.

5 When the inactive commissioning tests
6 were completed in June of 2000, the tests results
7 identified production performance and maintenance
8 issues. While work proceeded to resolve these issues,
9 the NPF systems were turned over to DIF operations to
10 train operation staff.

11 During the training of the staff, the
12 staff identified further operational and maintenance
13 issues. It was decided to conduct the NPF Integrated
14 Inactive Testing Program. The integrated testing
15 identified technical, operation and maintenance issues
16 with the NPF systems.

17 Testing was discontinued in 2003 and a
18 review of NPF commissioning results against the design
19 requirements and the FSAR requirements was conducted.

20 Since 2003, November, work has been
21 underway to address these issues.

22 At the Day One hearing, the Commission
23 requested additional information on the progress made
24 in the NPF. For the Target Processing System, we have
25 successfully demonstrated slicing of the targets with

1 a decladder. The cutting wheels have been made more
2 corrosion-resistant and the decladder elevator drive
3 train has been made more robust.

4 The central off-gas delay system--
5 commissioning of the additional overpressure
6 protection capabilities installed in the system was
7 completed. New compressors to resolve performance
8 issues associated with moisture build-up and starting
9 against back pressure are currently undergoing
10 testing.

11 For the calcination system, performance
12 issues related to filter heating, the condenser, the
13 scrubber, the system vacuum control and the can
14 welding device were resolved. We are collaborating
15 with the supplier to test potential solutions related
16 to improvements in the production through-put.

17 For the cementation system, we are
18 working with the supplier to make improvements to
19 facilitate maintenance and to solve performance
20 issues. These improvements are currently being tested
21 in NPF.

22 For the closed-loop cooling system,
23 design changes are in progress to address various
24 activation of pressure-relief valve and difficulties
25 in filling and starting the system.

1 The design for a back-up connection --
2 the fire water system required to provide emergency
3 cooling for the decladder dissolver and high level
4 liquid waste tanks -- is also in progress.

5 For the active ventilation system, work
6 is being done to balance the room pressures and air
7 flows. The fan and damper controls have been revised.
8 The intermittent loss of room pressure control has
9 been fixed. Rebalancing and commissioning of the
10 system is in progress.

11 In response to your request at the Day
12 One hearing, our CMD provides the NPF's work schedule
13 showing the target dates for major activities and
14 associated key milestones.

15 The key milestones for NPF are: start
16 of active commissioning, completion of active
17 commissioning and in-service. The work schedule
18 contains significant uncertainties associated with the
19 ability of the MAPLE 1 to provide irradiated targets
20 because of the positive power coefficient discussed
21 this morning.

22 In response to your request, this slide
23 shows the licensing issues and the targets dates for
24 completion. These target dates are consistent with
25 the work schedule shown on the previous slide.

1 These licensing issues are described in
2 our CMD.

3 Turning to the small diesel, it was
4 procured and installed to provide the closed-loop
5 cooling system with additional backup power. This was
6 done to improve reliability of the dissolver cooling.

7 We have submitted the third-party
8 review of the fire hazards associated with the small
9 diesel generator and other relevant information to
10 address comments from the CNSC staff.

11 We are awaiting approval from CNSC
12 staff to load diesel fuel and to complete the inactive
13 commissioning.

14 We plan to have the small diesel
15 commissioned and available before the start of active
16 commissioning of NPF.

17 The procurement and installation of the
18 small diesel generator was accepted by the CNSC staff.
19 The power supply reliability for the active
20 ventilation system was therefore considered closed.

21 In response to your question on
22 document baselines, the DIF operations document
23 baseline has been issued. All documentation required
24 for safe operation of NPF will be placed in the
25 control area before start of active commissioning.

1 In summary, Madam Chair and Members of
2 the Commission, I believe this presentation has
3 addressed the information requests from the Commission
4 on Day One of the public hearing.

5 We have done significant work to
6 improve the performance of the NPF systems. We have
7 provided updates on the schedule and status of the
8 licensing issues in the CMD.

9 We are committed to safe operation of
10 the new processing facility.

11 This ends my presentation in support of
12 AECL's application for a two-year licence for the new
13 processing facility.

14 Thank you.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Mr. Van
16 Adel and Dr. Hedges.

17 We will now move then to the
18 presentation by CNSC staff outlined in CMD document
19 05-H20A and I will turn to Mr. Barclay Howden, who is
20 the Director General responsible.

21 Mr. Howden, the floor is yours, sir.

22 **05-H21A**

23 **Oral presentation by**

24 **CNSC Staff**

25 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you.

1 Madam Chair, Members of the Commission,
2 for the record, my name is Barclay Howden.

3 With me today are Mr. Greg Lamarre,
4 Director of Research Facilities Division, Mr. Étienne
5 Langlois, Project Officer for the new processing
6 facility and the rest of the CNSC licensing team for
7 this facility.

8 Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has
9 applied for the renewal of their licence to operate
10 the new processing facility at the Chalk River
11 Laboratories.

12 During the Day One hearing, CNSC staff
13 presented to the Commission CMD 05-H21, which
14 contained recommendations on this application for your
15 consideration.

16 Following the Day One hearing, CNSC
17 staff has prepared CMD 05-H21A, which contains
18 additional information for the Commission concerning
19 this application.

20 I will now turn the presentation over
21 to Mr. Langlois.

22 **MR. LANGLOIS:** For the record, my name
23 is Étienne Langlois.

24 CMD 05-H21A, concerning which I will
25 now make a short presentation, answers some questions

1 on the small diesel generator -- a topic of interest
2 to the Commission during Hearing Day One -- and
3 recommends some additional changes to the proposed
4 licence.

5 First, concerning the small diesel
6 generator, this small diesel generator which is being
7 installed is a backup to the diesel generator which
8 already exists to supply the dedicated isotope
9 facility's Class 3 electrical loads when the normal,
10 or Class 4, power supplies are lost.

11 This ensures that cooling of the target
12 dissolver is maintained, even if there is a loss of
13 Class 4 power, with failure to start of the diesel
14 generator while dissolving targets, thus preventing a
15 temperature increase of the target dissolver contents,
16 which would cause a pressure increase leading
17 eventually to the opening of a relief valve and thus
18 the release of radioactive material into the cell.

19 As the active ventilation system would
20 also be lost during this event and as the hot cell is
21 not leak-tight, having not been designed as a
22 containment, the releases from the cell could result
23 in doses to the operating staff in excess of
24 regulatory limits.

25 The completed installation of this

1 small diesel generator had been moved from the
2 requirements for the start of active commissioning to
3 in-service because the probability of this event
4 occurring during active commissioning is quite low,
5 since only a very limited number of targets are to be
6 processed during active commissioning.

7 For instance, the current commissioning
8 plan calls for the processing of only three individual
9 targets and two batches of four targets, as opposed to
10 the daily processing of targets once the facility is
11 in service.

12 However, as the installation of the
13 generator is progressing, one can avoid relying on
14 this time-at-risk argument by reinstating the
15 availability of the small diesel generator as a
16 requirement for the start of active commissioning,
17 which is now CNSC staff's position.

18 Next, as stated during the oral
19 presentation for CMD 05-H21, a condition for the
20 submission of a comprehensive preliminary
21 decommissioning plan for the Chalk River Laboratories
22 has been added to the proposed licence and a few minor
23 editorial changes made.

24 Since the Day One hearing, CNSC staff
25 has not become aware of any additional information

1 that would change the overall conclusions and
2 recommendations made in CMD 05-H21.

3 CNSC staff's conclusions thus remain
4 basically that the AECL is qualified to operate the
5 NPF, that its overall performance during the current
6 licence period is acceptable and should remain so
7 during the term of the proposed licence and that the
8 AECL is making adequate provisions for the protection
9 of the environment, health and safety, security and
10 Canada's international obligations and, finally, that
11 the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* does not
12 require an environmental assessment to be performed
13 for this licence renewal.

14 CNSC staff's recommendations to the
15 Commission are thus to accept staff's conclusion that
16 the CEAA does not require an environmental assessment
17 to be performed for this licence renewal, to renew the
18 proposed operating licence for NPF for a 24-month term
19 and, finally, because of schedule uncertainty, CNSC
20 staff proposes to update the Commission on AECL's
21 progress towards the start of active commissioning of
22 the NPF by means of a mid-term report.

23 This concludes my presentation. I will
24 now return the floor to Mr. Howden.

25 **MR. HOWDEN:** That concludes our

1 presentation, Madam Chair. Staff is ready to respond
2 to questions.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much
4 and I will now then ask Dr. Barnes to start the
5 question period.

6 **MEMBER BARNES:** A question to AECL: On
7 page 5 of your submission -- well, on page 4 of 5, you
8 provide more detail on the status of work of each
9 system. Most of it seems to be well in hand.

10 The one that I was more intrigued with
11 was the closed loop cooling system where in the last
12 two paragraphs you indicate that the design changes
13 are sort of in progress.

14 Could you give a little bit more detail
15 about whether that is in a sense roughly routine or
16 whether the scope of the design change might take
17 longer than expected in terms of your overall
18 schedule?

19 **DR. HEDGES:** For the record, Ken
20 Hedges.

21 Lawrence Lupton will respond to this
22 question.

23 **MR. LUPTON:** For the record, Lawrence
24 Lupton, Director of Engineering Procurement
25 Commissioning.

1 Changes to the closed loop cooling
2 system really are in two parts. One is to address
3 various activation of pressure relief valves and
4 difficulties we have had in the past filling and
5 starting the system.

6 The second set of design changes
7 address the backup connection of the firewater system
8 required to provide emergency cooling to the
9 dissolver/decladder and to the high-level liquid waste
10 tanks.

11 The design changes to cover both of
12 those have been put forward to our internal project
13 engineering change control team and have been
14 approved.

15 We have also presented these design
16 changes to our Change Control Board that is chaired by
17 our Chief Engineer and that has also been approved.
18 We will now proceed with a detailed design and we will
19 also be carrying out a design review before we
20 actually then go back to install them into the plant.

21 **MEMBER BARNES:** Madam Chair, I wonder
22 if I could ask a broader question that might apply to
23 all three since we are doing that for intervenors?

24 It's really a question, again, to AECL.
25 I think on all three submissions you are making today

1 you refer to issues of what I call highly-qualified
2 personnel staffing and training and so on.

3 Given the changing developments in the
4 nuclear industry in Ontario, the recent announcements
5 by Bruce and so forth, could you give a general
6 assessment whether you see in the longer term over the
7 next perhaps five to ten years the capability of
8 ensuring adequate-trained staff for particularly the
9 three facilities that you are here to discuss today?

10 And maybe within that, you could
11 indicate in general for your new staff that you
12 attract to what extent these typically come from the
13 Upper Ottawa Valley or to what extent you depend on
14 attracting them from, say, Southern Ontario in
15 general.

16 **DR. HEDGES:** Okay. Let me focus -- Ken
17 Hedges, for the record.

18 Let me focus on the New Processing
19 Facility and MAPLE. We have increased our complement
20 of staff by approximately 25 to 30 per cent over the
21 last few months. We have recruited extensively for
22 positions like hot cell technicians, NPF supervisors
23 and other positions and we have had very good success
24 in finding high quality candidates.

25 We don't foresee the growth of the

1 nuclear industry in Ontario as being likely to impact
2 on those kind of staff.

3 Maybe anyone else would like to make a
4 comment on the more broader issue of AECL and the
5 staffing for Bruce, but I think for these facilities
6 that we are talking about today, we have enough staff
7 and we don't see any long term issues.

8 **DR. TORGERSON:** Dave Torgerson, for the
9 record.

10 I would just like to say that I have
11 been in the nuclear industry -- upcoming events are as
12 exciting as when I entered the industry.

13 I think that excitement is starting to
14 get through to students and people that are interested
15 in coming into the industry. So I am quite excited
16 about the future from that point.

17 If you have a vision, people want to
18 get connected to that vision and I think that's what
19 is happening here in Canada.

20 I am also told by colleagues in the
21 academic community that more and more people are
22 taking interest in things that are nuclear.

23 In the United States, nuclear
24 engineering courses enrolment is up substantially. I
25 like giving lectures in universities and I just find

1 the students very enthusiastic; in fact, they never
2 want to stop asking questions.

3 So I just have to say that I really
4 feel quite strongly that we are attracting some very
5 good people into the industry and I just see that
6 being enhanced over the years.

7 **MEMBER BARNES:** And given these
8 exciting new developments, does AECL see any need for,
9 I will say, programs to improve the retention?

10 **DR. TORGERSON:** Dave Torgerson, for the
11 record.

12 Yes, of course, knowledge preservation
13 is extremely important to us.

14 Traditionally, at AECL what we have
15 done is bring in young scientists and engineers to
16 work under the tutelage of more senior scientists and
17 engineers and that is the most important way for
18 passing knowledge down through the organization.

19 As someone once said, the intellectual
20 capital of AECL goes home every night. So we have to
21 make sure that we preserve that.

22 We are participating in a number of
23 programs that I won't go through at this point, but I
24 will just say that knowledge preservation has a very
25 high priority for our corporation, especially as we

1 move forward.

2 If I could just say this, we have a
3 long term vision of where we want to take the
4 technology over the next 40 years and part of that
5 technology is not only reactors we are working on now,
6 Generation III, but we also have Generation IV
7 technology that the Canadian government is now
8 committed to in an international program.

9 So we have this very long-term
10 requirement for preserving our knowledge for
11 development work but also for our current activities
12 ongoing at Chalk River and elsewhere.

13 So it's a very important topic to us.

14 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. McDill.

15 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

16 Two questions with respect to the
17 contamination around the welding zone in the
18 calcination system. I wonder if you could elaborate a
19 little bit on that?

20 **DR. HEDGES:** For the record, Ken
21 Hedges.

22 Lawrence Lupton will respond to the
23 calcination and weld contamination.

24 **MR. LUPTON:** For the record, Lawrence
25 Lupton.

1 The contamination of the weld area as a
2 result of the calcination is based on the current
3 design of the calcination process that takes place in
4 the can and what we are seeing is during the
5 evaporation process, we get uranium solution that
6 comes up onto the weld area.

7 We are in the process of redesigning
8 the internals of the calcination can so that the
9 process will maintain a clean weld zone for subsequent
10 welding when we are finished the calcinations of each
11 can.

12 **MEMBER McDILL:** Is it the fusion zone
13 that is affected or the entire fusion zone, heat-
14 affected zone and right out to the base metal?

15 **MR. LUPTON:** No, it's just -- it stays
16 within the can.

17 It's just the current can design allows
18 basically uranium nitrate to deposit on the weld zone.
19 The new design takes that away. It's a change in the
20 design.

21 **MEMBER McDILL:** If I could ask staff if
22 they are satisfied with the proposed solution?

23 **MR. LANGLOIS:** CNSC staff has not
24 received any detailed information concerning the
25 proposed solution. Final design changes are

1 still some time away and the CNSC staff intends to
2 review these once AECL has proposed -- has come up
3 with the final solution.

4 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

5 My other question is there is a change
6 to the wording of licence condition 2.5. I wonder if
7 someone could just read the entire -- staff could read
8 the new licence condition 2.5 out?

9 **(SHORT PAUSE)**

10 **MR. LAMARRE:** Greg Lamarre, for the
11 record.

12 The new proposed licence condition
13 reads:

14 "The licensee shall limit the
15 degeneration of fissile high-level
16 radioactive waste in the facility
17 such that no more than 1.2
18 kilograms of calcined waste will
19 be stored without the prior
20 written approval of the Commission
21 or a person authorized by the
22 Commission."

23 So it was a change to indicate the word
24 "stored" whereas previously the wording had been
25 "generated", which could have created a bit of

1 confusion.

2 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

3 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Graham.

4 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you.

5 I only have one question as the
6 questions with regard to succession and retention and
7 training have already been covered.

8 But my question to CNSC staff is
9 regarding the quality assurance audit that was done in
10 2005 in which the report identified certain
11 directives, action notices and recommendations and it
12 goes on to find out that about 75 per cent of these
13 actions will be completed by the end of 2005 and the
14 rest in 2006.

15 For this type of facility is that an
16 excessive amount of Q & A directives and notices or is
17 that pretty well standard for an audit of that type?

18 **MR. HOWDEN:** I am going to ask Paul
19 Wong, our Quality Management Specialist, to reply.

20 **MR. WONG:** For the record, my name is
21 Paul Wong, Quality Management Specialist.

22 The commissioning audit you are
23 referring to mostly covered the MAPLE reactor not the
24 NPF. Yes, it was a significant number of findings and
25 observations at that time but, as I say, it was only

1 the MAPLE reactors' commissioning.

2 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** But as it pertains to
3 this and, I guess, I didn't word my question correctly
4 -- as it pertains to this Application, this licence
5 application here, and as it relates to this, is it
6 excessive or do you feel that it is well in hand and
7 the targets of the end of 2006 or by 2006, give us the
8 feeling that we can proceed with licensing?

9 **MR. WONG:** For the record, my name is
10 Paul Wong.

11 Yes, the corrective actions will apply
12 obviously to the NPF facilities and in terms of the
13 timeframe, a lot of the actions have already been
14 taken. It is only the final sort of closing issues
15 that need to be addressed and the remainder will not
16 significantly affect the commissioning of NPF.

17 And we will expect the AECL to apply
18 the same measures that will be applied for the MAPLE
19 reactors.

20 **MEMBER BARNES:** I would presume that by
21 the mid-term report, where the commitment is that most
22 of these will be covered by the end of 2006, that this
23 will be addressed and then it will give us an overview
24 of exactly the status of each of these at the time,
25 will it?

1 **MR. LAMARRE:** Greg Lamarre, for the
2 record.

3 Yes, that will be our intention if this
4 licence renewal is granted, to bring back those
5 issues, provide you with an update of the follow-on
6 activities from that QA Audit at the time of the mid-
7 term.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Taylor.

9 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** Thank you, Madam Chair,
10 just two brief questions, first to AECL.

11 Does AECL have formal notification of
12 the staff's reinstating the requirement of this small
13 diesel generator as a prerequisite for active
14 commissioning?

15 **DR. HEDGES:** I think that the staff's
16 position and AECL's position has come together because
17 in their change they have brought it forward to start
18 up active commissioning and then in my presentation, I
19 reported that we would have it ready for the start of
20 active commissioning.

21 So I don't believe this is an issue.

22 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** Thank you for the
23 answer but I don't think you have ---

24 **DR. HEDGES:** Maybe I have missed ---

25 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** The question was: Have

1 you had formal notification of that requirement?

2 **DR. HEDGES:** The answer is not -- no.

3 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** Then my question is to
4 staff.

5 Do you intend to provide formal
6 notification of this requirement?

7 **MR. LAMARRE:** Greg Lamarre, for the
8 record.

9 The way that that was communicated to
10 AECL was, I believe, through our DIF monthly project
11 meetings. So to answer your question about whether or
12 not it was communicated formally the answer would be
13 "no" and our intention is to, yes.

14 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** Thank you.

15 I don't want to belabour the point, but
16 I think it is a really important issue in a project of
17 this complexity. I don't think the Commission should
18 be faced with uncertainties later on over what was or
19 wasn't required.

20 The second question: Can the staff
21 confirm that there is a minimum complement specified
22 for this facility for active operation and,
23 specifically, for active commissioning?

24 **MR. LAMARRE:** Greg Lamarre, for the
25 record.

1 Given AECL's timeline as presented in
2 their CMD today, there is still a substantial amount
3 of time before AECL proposes the start of active
4 commissioning. With that lag time, staff is
5 satisfied that with the ongoing efforts being
6 undertaken to train hot cell technicians, as an
7 example, that certainly before the start of active
8 commissioning the requisite number of qualified
9 trained staff will be in place.

10 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** Yes, okay, but is that
11 requisite number specified or will it be specified
12 before your commissioning happens?

13 **MR. LAMARRE:** Greg Lamarre, for the
14 record.

15 We don't believe that that has
16 necessarily been finalized at this point. It should
17 be embedded in a document like the OLCs but,
18 certainly, that would be a prerequisite to the start
19 of active commissioning.

20 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** Thank you.

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Dosman.

22 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you, Madam Chair.
23 I have two questions, one for staff and one for the
24 licensee.

25 On the issue of quality assurance in

1 documentation on pages 25-26 of the transcripts from
2 the Day One Hearing, Mr. Lafrenière assured the
3 Commission that some 64 per cent of documentation was
4 complete and I believe the AECL presentation today
5 indicated that 100 per cent of the documentation was
6 now complete.

7 I just would like to ask CNSC staff if
8 they concur that the documentation is now complete and
9 is appropriate.

10 **MR. LANGLOIS:** Étienne Langlois, for
11 the record.

12 AECL has forwarded the DIF baseline
13 documentation list to the CNSC staff last week. Its
14 review will take place fairly soon, but we have not
15 completed the review yet.

16 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** So the status is that
17 AECL has indicated that the documentation is 100 per
18 cent complete and the list has been forwarded, as you
19 said, but that there has not been an opportunity yet
20 for a review; is that the status?

21 I think you just said that and I think
22 I have repeated it.

23 **MR. LANGLOIS:** Étienne Langlois, for
24 the record.

25 AECL has forwarded several different

1 lists concerning -- related to the baseline
2 documentation.

3 There is one that concerns the
4 documentation to be available in the control room of
5 the MAPLE reactors and there are the documents
6 concerning the DIF baseline.

7 As I stated earlier, the review has not
8 been done of these documents. We have received them
9 last Thursday, or Wednesday, I believe, so I cannot
10 comment or answer further to that, whether AECL in
11 these lists claim that they are complete, or whether
12 there are still some gaps and further documents to be
13 issued.

14 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, may I just
15 confirm with the licensee that -- it is my impression
16 from the licensee's presentation that the
17 documentation is now complete. May I just confirm
18 that?

19 **DR. HEDGES:** Ken Hedges, for the
20 record.

21 In the MAPLE presentation, I stated
22 that the documentation baseline was complete and was
23 in the control room.

24 In the NPF presentation, I stated that
25 the document baseline would be in the control area

1 prior to start of active commissioning. And we are
2 still -- as staff has stated -- we are still
3 discussing the fine details of the NPF documentation.

4 But it will be there before the start
5 of active commissioning.

6 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you -- and
7 presumably would be the subject of ongoing review by
8 staff -- may I confirm that?

9 **MR. HOWDEN:** Dr. Dosman, that is
10 correct.

11 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** If I might a second
12 question -- this time to the licensee -- on the
13 seismic walkdown, I note that three of the eight
14 recommendations have yet to be completed.

15 And I note off the schedule that the
16 completion date is actually quite late -- it is
17 September of zero six -- and I just wanted to inquire
18 whether there are any perhaps unexpected implications
19 of that part of it that might delay implementation?

20 **DR. HEDGES:** For the record, Ken
21 Hedges.

22 Lawrence Lupton will respond to the NPF
23 seismic walkdown.

24 **MR. LUPTON:** For the walkdown, as you
25 have noted, there are three recommendations left.

1 Two require modifications to operating
2 manuals related to the operation of the facility.
3 They should not be an issue prior to start of active
4 commissioning and the third one relates to required
5 restraint to be added to one of the vessels.

6 And, again, that will not be an
7 impediment to the start of active commissioning, nor
8 to the schedule.

9 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are there any further
11 questions to the licensee and staff at this time?

12 I will now move then to the
13 interventions.

14 As noted by the following intervenors
15 during the MAPLE hearing earlier today, the Council on
16 Radionuclides and Radiopharmaceuticals, Messrs. Cole,
17 Brown, Merritt and Pyatt, MDS Nordion, the Canadian
18 Nuclear Workers Council and the Corporation of the
19 Town of Deep River have indicated that their
20 submissions are now complete and their earlier
21 interventions are to be considered as part of the new
22 processing facility hearing.

23 Unless Members have questions with
24 regard to these interventions -- are there any
25 questions from Members with regard to these further

1 interventions?

2 We will now then proceed to the written
3 interventions for this matter.

4 We will now then move to the written
5 submission from the Canadian Forces Base Area Support
6 Unit at Pettawawa, 05-H21.7.

7

8 **05-H21.7**

9 **Written Submission from the**
10 **Canadian Forces Base Area**
11 **Support Unit at Pettawawa**

12

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are there any
14 questions or comments from Commission Members with
15 regards to this written submission?

16 Noting none, I will move to the next
17 submission, the written submission from the
18 Corporation of the Town of Laurentian Hills, CMD 05-H-
19 21.8.

20

21 **05-H21.8**

22 **Written Submission from the**
23 **Corporation of the Town of**
24 **Laurentian Hills**

25

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there any

1 questions or comments from Commission Members with
2 regard to this submission?

3 Noting none, then I move to the next
4 submission, which is a written submission from Cheryl
5 Gallant, M.P. for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke,
6 CMD 05-H21.9.

7

8 **05-H21.9**

9 **Written Submission from**

10 **Cheryl Gallant, M.P. for**

11 **Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke**

12

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are there any
14 questions or comments from Commission Members with
15 regard to this written submission?

16 Noting none, I move to the next
17 submission, which is a written submission from the
18 County of Renfrew outlined in CMD 05-H21.10.

19

20 **05-H21.10**

21 **Written Submission from the**

22 **County of Renfrew**

23

24 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Are there any
25 questions or comments from Commission Members with

1 regard to this written submission?

2 Noting none.

3 **MR. LEBLANC:** This completes the record
4 for the public hearing on the matter of the
5 application by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited for the
6 renewal of its nuclear substance processing facility
7 operating licence for the new processing facility at
8 the Chalk River Laboratories.

9 The Commission will deliberate and will
10 publish a decision in due course. It will be posted
11 on the CNSC website and will be distributed to
12 participants.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

14 We will now take a one-hour break
15 before we move to the next hearing.

16 We will see you in one hour, which
17 means 1:25.

18 Thank you.

19 --- Upon recessing at 12:25 p.m.

20 --- Upon resuming at 1:28 p.m.

21 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** The next item on the
22 agenda is a one-day hearing on the matter of the
23 application by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to
24 continue operation of the National Research Universal,
25 or NRU, reactor, beyond its currently scheduled

1 shutdown for December 31st, 2005.

2 **MR. LEBLANC:** This is a one-day public
3 hearing. The Notice of Public Hearing 2005-H15 was
4 published on June 30th, 2005 and a revised notice was
5 published on August 5th, 2005.

6 The public was invited to participate,
7 either by oral presentation or written submission.
8 September 19th was the deadline set for filing by
9 intervenors. The Commission received 11 requests for
10 intervention.

11 A submission from the County of Renfrew
12 was filed after the published deadline. The panel of
13 the Commission agreed to accept this late submission.

14 A further submission received
15 significantly after the deadline was rejected by the
16 panel of the Commission.

17 A record of decision will be sent to
18 the affected participants.

19 October 12th was the deadline for filing
20 of supplementary information. I note that
21 supplementary information has been filed by CNSC
22 staff, AECL and an intervenor.

23 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** As I have mentioned
24 for the other hearings that we have had today, we are
25 conducting three parallel hearings today on MAPLE

1 reactors, the new processing facility and the NRU
2 reactor.

3 The Commission notes that the
4 facilities are within the same general site and share
5 a number of common systems, facilities and programs.

6 Therefore, to reduce repetition and to
7 ensure that there is a complete record for all
8 hearings, the Commission in making its decisions may
9 consider any relevant information regarding those
10 common elements that may be presented during the
11 course of these hearings.

12 I would now like to start the hearing
13 today with a presentation from Atomic Energy of Canada
14 Limited, which are outline in CMD documents 05-H28.1,
15 05-H21.1A and I will turn then to Mr. Van Adel,
16 President and CEO of AECL.

17 Mr. Van Adel, if you would like to have
18 any remarks, the floor is yours, sir.
19