

1 **HEARING DAY 1**

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

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Item no. 8 on
5 today's agenda is Hearing Day One on the
6 application from Cameco Corporation Industries for
7 a licence to operate the Port Hope Nuclear Fuel
8 Facility.

9 October 16th was the deadline set
10 for filing by applicant and by CNSC staff;
11 November 8th was the deadline for filing of
12 supplementary information for applicant and
13 Commission staff. No supplementary information
14 was submitted by staff.

15 I would like to start with the
16 oral presentation by Cameco Corporation as
17 outlined in CMD documents H32.1 and H32.1A.

18 Mr. Michel.

19

20 **01-H32.1/01-H32.1A**

21 **Oral Presentation by Cameco Corporation**

22 MR. MICHEL: Thank you, Madam
23 Chair. I will ask John Jarrell to proceed
24 immediately with his oral presentation to the
25 Commission.

1 MR. JARRELL: For the transcript
2 record of the hearings, my name is John Jarrell,
3 and I am Vice-President of Environment and Safety.

4 As in the previous hearing on
5 Blind River, I will give a summary of the written
6 presentation and ask Bob Steane at the end to
7 provide a summary and discuss future outlook.

8 First, I should point out that the
9 Port Hope conversion facility is about 600
10 kilometres from its sister Blind River Refinery,
11 which supplies it its purified UO_3 powder. This
12 feedstock is converted to the chemical and
13 physical forms necessary for the next stage of
14 processing toward nuclear fuel.

15 Cameco's Port Hope operation is
16 the oldest nuclear facility in Canada. In fact,
17 it is likely one of the oldest nuclear facilities
18 in the world still in operation. The facility
19 started in 1932 as a radium refinery, owned by
20 Eldorado Gold Mines, extracting radium 226 for
21 radioisotope use. The facility's first chief
22 chemist was actually a graduate student of the
23 Curries.

24 In 1942 the emphasis shifted from
25 radium to uranium, and the federal government took

1 control of the company. Reactor produced
2 radioisotopes started to supplant uranium, and by
3 1953 radium production was shut down.

4 In 1955 a solvent extraction
5 uranium refinery was opened using technology
6 similar to that employed at Blind River today.

7 The facility operated as a federal
8 crown corporation until 1988, when Cameco was
9 formed and assumed operatorship for this now
10 almost 70-year-old facility.

11 As this picture shows, the plant
12 is situated directly on the lake shore, as was
13 commonplace for such facilities when operations
14 began. In fact, operations in 1932 started on
15 land already in use for industrial purposes.

16 The current plant site is about 20
17 acres in size. The original site, which housed
18 radium refining and then UO_3 refining plants, was
19 situated behind the large building on the left of
20 this picture, between it and the harbour. This
21 large building is the UF_6 plant. The building on
22 the far right of the picture, showing steam
23 plumes, is the UO_2 plant. The tall building more
24 or less in between the UF_6 plant on the left and
25 the UO_2 plant on the right was the original UF_6

1 plant which operated from 1970 through 1984.

2 There are two off-site storage
3 areas: a ten-acre Centre Pier site, which is the
4 strip of land behind the harbour in this picture;
5 and a five-acre Dorset Street warehouse site, in
6 the top left corner of this picture.

7 Unlike Blind River, the Port Hope
8 conversion plant is multi-product operation. The
9 site housed the UO_3 refinery from 1955 through
10 1984, the year following start up of its
11 replacement in Blind River.

12 Uranium metal production started
13 in 1957, first to supply natural uranium metal for
14 CANDU fuel technology development and later to
15 produce depleted uranium metal, which is produced
16 from the tails of the enrichment process being
17 depleted in its uranium 235 content.

18 UO_2 production for CANDU reactor
19 fuel started in 1958, and in 1970 UF_6 operations
20 began, this being the feedstock for uranium
21 enrichment plants.

22 The currently used UF_6 plant went
23 through environmental assessment with public
24 meetings in lieu of public hearings before its
25 start-up in 1984. This change in assessment

1 process resulted from the fact that the Port Hope
2 area had just hosted two extensive environmental
3 assessments for a planned new integrated refinery
4 and conversion plant in the late 1970s and early
5 1980s.

6 The most recent facility safety
7 report was carried out in 1997 in fulfilment of an
8 earlier AECB licence condition.

9 As previously noted, one of the
10 main UO_2 products is high purity ceramic-grade UO_2
11 powder used in CANDU reactors and for blanket fuel
12 and light water reactors. The UO_2 plant currently
13 operates on 24-hour, three-to-five day campaigns
14 with a nominal five-person crew working on 12-hour
15 shifts.

16 Depleted uranium metal is produced
17 from depleted UF_4 , which in turn is produced from
18 enrichment plant tails or depleted UF_6 . The UF_4
19 is mixed with magnesium metal, then heated until
20 reaction takes place, producing uranium metal and
21 magnesium fluoride.

22 At present the uranium metal
23 business is quite limited, focusing on fabrication
24 and refurbishment of radiotherapy radiation
25 shields, housings for radiography cameras and

1 aircraft wing counterweights. Actual new metal
2 production is very limited.

3 This picture shows the furnace
4 used to produce new metal when required. In the
5 bottom left corner is a picture of the ingot
6 formed from this furnace, and on the right side
7 corner is a picture of a finished product; in this
8 case, a shielding component for a radiotherapy
9 unit designed to ensure that the radiation beam is
10 focused in a specific direction.

11 The primary product from the Port
12 Hope operation is UF_6 . This is one of two such
13 facilities in North America, the other being
14 situated in Metropolis, Illinois.

15 As Bernard Michel noted in his
16 Blind River presentation, there are also UF_6
17 plants in Britain and France, for a total of four
18 in the western world. And to this we could add
19 that the Russians also have commercial UF_6
20 production capabilities.

21 The plant runs 24/7, with a
22 12-person crew, including three tradespersons and
23 a first line supervisor, working on 12-hour
24 shifts.

25 Since 1994, Port Hope has been the

1 home of the company's technology development
2 group. Much of the current work focuses on the
3 Port Hope production processes, looking for ways
4 to improve efficiency, reduce waste volumes, and
5 further reduce environmental risk and
6 environmental impact.

7 During the current licensing
8 period, the technology development group broadened
9 its contacts with Canadian universities, with the
10 objective of expanding the technical resource base
11 supporting nuclear fuel cycle activities, and
12 helping to raise nuclear industry awareness at
13 these universities, specifically bringing
14 engineering students to Port Hope for tours,
15 developing collaborative graduate level research
16 programs, and giving guest lectures on the nuclear
17 industry.

18 The most notable process change
19 during the current licensing period was the
20 installation of a liquid hydrogen storage system,
21 as shown in this picture. It is located in the
22 centre of the site, where the original UF₆ plant
23 flooring cell room existed.

24 Initially, Port Hope generated
25 hydrogen needed in both UO₂ and UF₆ plants from

1 anhydrous ammonia. This was replaced with a
2 compressed hydrogen gas supply system, then the
3 liquid supply system shown here.

4 A variety of steps are taken to
5 control worker exposure to radiological hazards,
6 primarily airborne uranium dust inhalation and
7 external beta gamma exposure. These steps are
8 based on the time, distance and shielding
9 principles, job specific procedures, training,
10 preventative maintenance and proper personnel
11 protective equipment.

12 Exposure is monitored by a number
13 of ways: external dosimetry and free uranium
14 inhalation by urinalysis and in vivo lung
15 counting. Shown in this photo is the current lung
16 counting facility. Although its four phoswich
17 detectors are very sensitive, it has limitations
18 from a dosimetry perspective, giving strong
19 influence of individual body shapes on the
20 counter's signals as well as the relatively
21 non-discriminating energy level specific signals
22 from specific radionuclide decays that it
23 measures; in this case, U235 and thorium 234.

24 Despite these limitations, the
25 lung counter has served us well for the past 20

1 years. The lung counter has generated no evidence
2 of significant accumulation of uranium when its
3 results are combined with the urinalysis program
4 results.

5 Establishing individual doses from
6 inhaled uranium dust is a fairly complicated
7 business, given the wide range of physical and
8 chemical forms of uranium found in a multi-product
9 site and the fairly extensive use of respiratory
10 protection to safeguard against inhalation while
11 equipment is opened.

12 During the current licensing
13 period a number of supporting studies were
14 undertaken with the objective of developing a well
15 integrated internal dosimetry system.
16 Specifically, particle size analysis, simulated
17 lung solubility testing and special lung counting
18 activities were carried out.

19 With the technical support of
20 Health Canada we were able to develop a dosimetry
21 test based on collective lung counting using
22 similar work groups. Testing of this new system
23 demonstrated that individual internal doses were
24 less than 5 milliSieverts per year, with no
25 indication of significant long-term accumulation

1 of uranium in any one given individual.

2 The proposal as described in
3 CMD 01-M35 considered at the May 30, 2001 CNSC
4 meeting led to a decision to purchase a new, more
5 decay energy sensitive lung counter, as shown in
6 this photo.

7 Over the current licensing period
8 radiological performance indicators such as
9 airborne uranium levels, whole body and skin
10 external dosimetry results, urinalysis and lung
11 counting results have been relatively stable,
12 providing evidence that personnel are following
13 procedures established to control exposure and are
14 using appropriate protective equipment.

15 During the current licensing
16 period one significant event report associated
17 with radiological exposure was issued. This
18 involved a non-routine urinalysis result from an
19 asbestos removal contractor, likely a combination
20 of ingestion, inhalation and absorption through
21 abraded skin.

22 Additional methods to prevent
23 uptake from contaminated insulation were
24 implemented.

25 A dust control improvement project

1 has been initiated to further reduce in-plant
2 airborne uranium levels. The primary focus was
3 initially focused on the UO₂ plant operation,
4 given the relative insolubility of UO₂ in the
5 lung.

6 The UO₂ product drum handling
7 process is being modified to provide more
8 automation and dust containment, as shown in this
9 picture.

10 As shown in this graph, which
11 plots the number of lost time injuries at the Port
12 Hope facility since Cameco's inception in 1988,
13 there has been significant sustained performance
14 improvement for this specific safety performance
15 indicator.

16 We believe this is reflective of
17 continued effort to both improved safety
18 performance and foster a constructive safety
19 culture. A trained and experience workforce, low
20 employee turnover, improved positive outlook for
21 the industry in recent years, as well as ongoing
22 communication efforts, all contribute to this good
23 performance, in our opinion.

24 Having said that, we must report
25 two lost time injuries in 2001, after 18 months

1 lost time free. Both occurred last week and
2 involved back pain from lifting and a broken ankle
3 from a slip on stairs.

4 In keeping with recent HRDC
5 changes to the Canada Labour Code, a new Policy
6 Health and Safety Committee has been established,
7 and work continues on the development of a formal
8 health and safety management system based on ISO
9 principles.

10 On February 18, 2000 the Port Hope
11 facility successfully registered its environmental
12 management system to the ISO 14001 standard and
13 demonstrated ongoing compliance to the standard in
14 2001. This quality assurance initiative
15 successfully integrated aspects of an existing
16 CNSC required operations QA program which was
17 initiated in 1984 associated with start-up of the
18 UF₆ plant. It is also integrated with various
19 product quality assurance programs.

20 One of the most significant new
21 features of this system is the formalization of
22 environmental continuous improvement processes.

23 Equipment and procedures to
24 protect workers inside the facility naturally also
25 serve to protect the public and the environment

1 outside the facility. These are not mutually
2 exclusive goals.

3 The combination of point of
4 release monitoring and ambient environmental
5 monitoring, particularly airborne related area
6 monitoring, is used to assess impact. Area
7 monitoring includes lime candles to measure
8 ambient fluoride levels, dust fall and soil
9 sampling to measure uranium deposition, high
10 volume air sampling for suspended uranium
11 concentrations, and vegetation sampling for
12 fluoride uptake.

13 These programs verify the point of
14 release monitoring results and help assess
15 environmental impact.

16 The data show some evidence of
17 continuing reduction in uranium emissions. These
18 reductions are believed due to good control on
19 emission abatement equipment, timely and effective
20 response to any action level exceedences on
21 process upsets, as well as formalized target
22 setting under this ISO 14000 environmental
23 management system.

24 There were four minor reportable
25 spills during the current licensing period, all

1 with negligible environmental impact. Corrective
2 action to reduce risk of reoccurrence were
3 implemented in all four cases.

4 To this must be added that on
5 October 22nd, about 10.5 litres of hydraulic oil
6 escaped from a heat exchanger into the harbour via
7 the cooling water system. This material was
8 contained and recovered.

9 The Port Hope site is subject to
10 Ontario Municipal Industrial Strategy for
11 Abatement, or MISA regulation. This requires
12 additional toxicity, total suspended solids and
13 metals testing of the cooling water and process
14 effluent discharges at locations such as the one
15 shown on this photo.

16 All acute toxicity tests using
17 rainbow trout fingerlings and *Daphnia magna* water
18 fleas passed except those utilizing chlorinated
19 town water. There were three such failures during
20 the current licensing period. The most common
21 test result has been zero per cent toxicity in
22 both test species.

23 Semi-annual chronic toxicity tests
24 have shown neither growth nor reproduction
25 inhibition effects. The only physical chemical

1 MISA parameter showing periodic exceedence was
2 total suspended solids. Two such failures
3 occurred in June of 2000, due to low flow and
4 resulting increased algae growth.

5 Strong water monitoring during the
6 current licensing period showed relatively
7 constant loadings of uranium, which are about
8 two-thirds of the initial survey results in 1996
9 through 1997, and are now about 40 kilograms per
10 year.

11 The groundwater monitoring program
12 continues to show that contaminant levels are both
13 relatively constant and historic in nature. Flow
14 is predominantly toward the harbour and the lake.
15 A consultant re-evaluated this program in the year
16 2000, and as a result additional upgrading at
17 wells were installed to better understand flow
18 patterns in the vicinity of the plant site.

19 Cameco's soil sampling program is
20 now in its fourth year of operation. It continues
21 to show some accumulation of uranium. However,
22 the observed increase cannot necessarily be
23 attributed solely to current period deposition.

24 For instance, predicted rates of
25 accumulation based on these soil tests plots would

1 result in area soil levels well above those
2 actually being measured. Furthermore, dust fall
3 monitoring results do not support the postulated
4 uranium deposition rate.

5 Accumulation of uranium in these
6 test plots may be due to re-entrainment, migration
7 of contaminated soil and other mechanisms, not
8 just current period deposition.

9 Quarterly compliance reports have
10 consistently been presented to the public since
11 1984 when the current UF₆ plant commenced
12 operations. Currently, these presentations are
13 made to the Municipality of Port Hope's Protection
14 to Persons and Property Committee.

15 Council has recently
16 re-established an Environmental Advisory
17 Committee. However, the mandate of this new
18 committee has not yet been finalized.

19 Council has requested that Cameco
20 continue to report to its council committee for
21 the time being.

22 Cameco periodically conducts
23 public open houses. The most recent was held on
24 October 27, 2001, offering the public tours of the
25 facility and poster presentations on such matters

1 as emergency response capabilities, environmental
2 monitoring, waste management and the current CNSC
3 relicensing process.

4 Previously Port Hope held an open
5 house in the fall of 1999.

6 The picture in this slide was
7 taken from the most recent open house taken three
8 weeks ago.

9 Cameco continues to work closely
10 with the municipality in establishing and
11 maintaining the community awareness and emergency
12 response program which was discussed earlier today
13 under the Zircatec public hearing. We have also
14 helped with the local emergency response
15 organization, the community awareness network,
16 which again was discussed at a previous hearing.

17 During the current licensing
18 period a revived Derived Release Limit report was
19 filed. This establishes emission levels which, if
20 continued for an entire year, would result in a
21 dose of one milliSievert per year, to the
22 maximally exposed member of the public.

23 Such a limit is obviously not a
24 relevant control point; rather, an Operating
25 Release Level, or ORL, report was filed to define

1 the actual emission control level. It is based on
2 both ALARA analysis and, in the case of gamma
3 exposure, a dose criterion of 0.3 milliSieverts
4 per year.

5 The ORL is proposed as a
6 replacement for the current limit, defined as a
7 derived operating limit, which was set at 10 per
8 cent of this DRL value, or 0.5 milliSieverts per
9 year. This was first established in the mid 1980s
10 when the public dose limit was 5 milliSieverts per
11 year.

12 Work is also being carried out in
13 responding to an Ontario Ministry of Environment
14 proposal to establish ambient air quality
15 standards for uranium, and a site-wide emission
16 inventory review was also initiated in 2001.

17 During the current licensing
18 period CNSC staff focused on a number of specific
19 programs for regulatory audit and assessment:
20 specifically on new pressure retaining component
21 licence conditions which were introduced in the
22 1999 licence; fire safety code compliance, which
23 has been discussed previously; IAEA safeguards
24 inspections; and an organization and management
25 assessment of the facility which focused on safety

1 performance.

2 We believe we have been making
3 satisfactory progress on issues which arose out of
4 these regulatory assessments.

5 In the case of the organizational
6 and management assessment, training was identified
7 as an area deserving additional attention. More
8 work on formalized training programs is expected
9 to support the variety of quality assurance
10 initiatives which have been discussed, as well as
11 address additional training pressures associated
12 with an aging workforce employee turnover.

13 In 2001 a one-month mill-scale
14 trial of fluoride product recycle was carried out
15 at the Key Lake mill. The objective is to
16 eventually license a permanent second outlet in
17 Canada. At present, the material is shipped to
18 the United States at a mill for uranium recovery.

19 As of June 30, 2001, only 343
20 drums of this material were in storage.

21 This photo shows the fluoride
22 product drum loading station, as well as picture
23 of the material itself.

24 Scrap metal is routinely
25 decontaminated and shipped to a steel mill for

1 recycle. These photos show sandblasting and
2 equipment disassembly for cleanup. High-pressure
3 water wash is also extensively used.

4 An estimated 615 tonnes of scrap
5 metal will be recovered over the current two-year
6 licensing period.

7 In 1996 a major program to
8 dismantle and decontaminate obsolete equipment and
9 facilities was initiated. One of the main
10 objectives of the cleanup crew formed to carry out
11 this work was to carry out site reclamation work,
12 which is all the more challenging, given the lack
13 of a general licensed low-level radioactive waste
14 management facility for this type of material.

15 The current focus is on the
16 removal of three buildings: a formal metallurgical
17 products building, an unused office building, and
18 the original UF₄ pilot plant.

19 The Port Hope plant has been
20 operated for 13 years without access to a low
21 level radioactive active waste disposal site. The
22 Port Granby facility shown in this picture was
23 shut down in June of 1988. As early as 1955,
24 Cameco's predecessors introduced a number of
25 conservation and recycle practices. In 1978,

1 increasing priority was given to environmental
2 issues resulting in formation of many of the
3 current recycling programs, specifically for
4 raffinate, which is now produced in Blind River,
5 ammonium nitrate and the fluoride which we just
6 discussed.

7 Scrap metal recycle, waste
8 incineration, waste oil paper and asphalt recycle
9 programs have also been implemented. On this
10 basis it would be fair to say that Cameco has
11 shown long-term commitment to improving Port Hope
12 waste management practices. The company has
13 adopted recycle initiatives where program costs
14 have clearly not been the prime driver. As a
15 result of waste minimization, improved chemical
16 reagent utilization and recycle, the facility has
17 managed to reduce its waste management
18 requirements by over 90 per cent since the late
19 1980s.

20 The Centre Pier site is leased
21 from the Port Hope municipality. The lease
22 expires on June 1st 2005. Cameco plans to
23 terminate active operations on or before the lease
24 expiry date, the site is used for drummed UO₂ and
25 waste storage. Significant remediation cannot

1 practically occur until a low level radioactive
2 waste site for Port Hope historic wastes is
3 established. In the meantime, the site will
4 likely continue to be licensed by Cameco.

5 The most recent updated
6 preliminary decommissioning plan was submitted to
7 the CNSC in May of 2001. We continue to work to
8 address staff comments on the current plan. Note
9 that the preliminary decommissioning plan has been
10 in place for the Port Facility since 1990. Cameco
11 has traditionally handled these decommissioning
12 plan costs as an accounting provision.

13 The picture in this slide shows
14 the removal of the former UF₆ plant cell room to
15 make room for the liquid hydrogen system which we
16 discussed earlier.

17 Cameco is also in the process of
18 revising its on-site emergency response plan with
19 the assistance of a specialized consultant, and in
20 conformance with the CNSC regulatory guide on such
21 programs. In the year 2000 a joint emergency
22 response drill was held with the municipality
23 involving a simulated chemical spill from a
24 hydrofluoric acid demonstration rail car. This
25 slide shows a photograph taken from that drill.

1 Representatives from the HF supplier led the
2 exercise providing classroom training and
3 instruction for Cameco, Port Hope, emergency
4 responders and representatives from the local
5 hospital. Regular tours and drills with the local
6 fire department are performed to promote
7 coordinated response should this be necessary in
8 the future.

9 Efforts to eliminate outside
10 chemical unloading facilities and a means of
11 further reducing risks continue. The nitric and
12 sulphuric acid tank farm in the north end of the
13 facility was eliminated. Currently only potassium
14 hydroxide is unloaded outside and we are currently
15 assessing this operation to see what can be done
16 to further reduce spill potential.

17 Improvements were made in the UF₆
18 plant for process upset, detection and
19 containment. This included installation of smoke
20 detectors to remotely sense UF₆ releases and
21 additional fluoride detectors to reduce response
22 time to process upsets. Emergency ventilation
23 capabilities have been expanded. Additional high
24 efficiency filters were installed on ventilation
25 equipment exhaust to reduce uranium emissions to

1 the environment.

2 I will now call about Bob Steane
3 to discuss the future outlook of the Port Hope
4 facility, to summarize this presentation and
5 introduce the Port Hope personnel joining us here
6 today.

7 MR. STEANE: Thank you, John.
8 Madam Chairman, Commissioners.
9 Now, I will address the future
10 outlook and summarize our submission.

11 There are no major changes in the
12 Port Hope operation that is currently contemplated
13 during our requested five year licensing period.
14 It is anticipated that production requirements
15 will continue to increase, but at a slow to
16 moderate pace as additional nuclear power plants
17 come into service and as the present trend to
18 higher capacity factors continues.

19 British Nuclear Fuels' decision to
20 exist the UF₆ conversion business in 2006 should
21 have a positive and lasting impact over the longer
22 term.

23 Now, this stable outlook is not to
24 suggest we will not continue to find ways to
25 enhance our operation, we will continue to seek

1 ways to further reduce environmental and safety
2 risk and impact.

3 We are also in the process of
4 implementing a number of quality assurance
5 initiatives and of particular note is the
6 corporate quality management system and the formal
7 health and safety management system.

8 Now, the Port Hope operation is
9 the Cameco quality assurance leader by virtue of
10 its regulatory history and finished products
11 focus. We expect the Port Hope operation will
12 continue to play a lead role within Cameco as
13 these QA programs evolve.

14 As well, we expect to be involved
15 in other topics of regulatory interest over the
16 next few years. The Port Hope Safety Report
17 provides a good tool to guide continuous
18 improvement and our risk reduction initiatives and
19 that is scheduled for update in 2002. The
20 facility will also continue to be involved in
21 local emergency response discussions to ensure
22 that good liaison is maintained with the community
23 response resources. It is also possible there
24 will be some modifications made to the public
25 reporting mechanisms for environmental information

1 but this will depend largely upon the wishes of
2 town council.

3 In any event, we are convinced
4 that regular, open discussion of our environmental
5 performance will continue as it has since 1984.
6 We also anticipate additional discussions arising
7 from studies undertaken to address the concerns
8 expressed by the Port Hope Community Health
9 Concerns Committee, as well as further discussion
10 on historic waste, specifically Centre Pier
11 decommissioning and Cameco's general support for
12 the current Port Hope historic waste initiative.

13 In summary, we believe that Port
14 Hope continues to demonstrate a strong commitment
15 to chemical plant safety. It has demonstrated
16 good control on radiation exposure while
17 maintaining steady production operations. It has
18 demonstrated good control on environmental
19 emissions, both chemical and radiological, while
20 also developing and maintaining ISO certification
21 for its formal environmental management system.

22 As shown, a responsible approach
23 to waste management by minimizing waste
24 generation, converting waste into products for
25 recycle and achieving a waste reduction greater

1 than ten-fold since closure of the site's low
2 level radioactive site over 13 years ago. And it
3 has sought to maintain an open dialogue with the
4 community and has been a leader in the development
5 of improved local emergency preparedness measures.

6 In conclusion, we believe
7 satisfactory levels of performance have been
8 demonstrated. Policies and programs for
9 protection of workers and the environment are in
10 place as are compliance control and assessment
11 measures.

12 In consideration of Cameco's
13 ability to operate the facility in a safe and
14 efficient manner, and in compliance with our CNSC
15 licence, we respectfully request licence renewal.
16 We believe that the combination of good follow up
17 by Cameco on issues as they evolve, priority to
18 continual improvement and strong existing
19 regulatory reporting and assessment measures are
20 compatible with longer licensing periods.
21 Accordingly, we are requesting a five year licence
22 term based on this record of safe and
23 environmentally responsible production.

24 I have with me today Hess Carisse
25 who is the Port Hope Manager of Technical Services

StenoTran

1 and Franko Dobri, the Superintendent of Quality
2 Assurance and Environmental Services. We have
3 assembled here this group of Cameco people here at
4 the hearing who can hopefully provide
5 clarification or address any questions which the
6 Commission may have on this presentation or any
7 other matters which the Commission wishes to
8 discuss today. If we are unable to adequately
9 address those issues, we will, of course, be
10 prepared to do so at the Day Two hearing currently
11 scheduled for January 17th.

12 In any event, we will be glad to
13 answer your questions either now or later in the
14 proceedings.

15 Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

17 With the permission of the
18 Commission members, I would like to turn to the
19 presentation by CNSC staff before we open the
20 floor for questions. I would like to call upon
21 Mr. Pereira to address the CNSC staff presentation
22 as outlined in CMD Document 01-H32.

23 Mr. Pereira.

24

25 **01-H32**

1 **Oral Presentation by CNSC staff**

2 MR. PEREIRA: Thank you,
3 Madam Chair.

4 For the record, my name is
5 Ken Pereira. I'm the Director General of the
6 Directorate Fuel Cycle and Materials Regulation.

7 The CNSC staff has reviewed a
8 document submitted by the Cameco Corporation in
9 support of the application for renewal of the
10 licence for operation of the Port Hope nuclear
11 fuel facility. Also the licensee's compliance
12 record of other facilities over many years has
13 been reviewed. CNSC staff conclude that there is
14 a good history of operating practices and
15 compliance at the facility. Further the licensee
16 has in place a well developed quality management
17 system which will help provide effective
18 protection health and safety and the environment
19 in the operation of the facility.

20 Based on this assessment, CNSC
21 staff recommend approval of a licence for the term
22 of five years.

23 I will now invite Mr. Michael
24 White, Head of the Uranium Processing Facilities
25 Section to elaborate on the basis for the CNSC

1 staff's conclusions and recommendation.

2 MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Pereira.

3 For the record, my name is Michael
4 White and I am the head of the Uranium Processing
5 Facilities Section.

6 Madam Chair, members of the
7 Commission, I will quickly summarize the key
8 points of the CMD concerning Cameco Corporation's
9 application for the renewal of the operating
10 licence for its nuclear fuel facility in Port
11 Hope, Ontario.

12 CNSC staff has determined that the
13 information that Cameco submitted in support of
14 licence renewal application meets the requirements
15 set out in the application regulations and that it
16 is acceptable for licensing purposes.

17 Sources of Risk: The activities
18 to be licensed pose risks to the workers at the
19 facility, members of the public and to the
20 environment arising from the radioactivity of the
21 uranium and the properties of the other hazardous
22 substances used in the conversion processes.

23 Risk Control Measures: The
24 measures employed to prevent unreasonable risk to
25 the environment, the health and safety of the

1 workers and the public and to national security
2 can be thought of as a series of barriers. First,
3 there are the built-in features of the processes
4 and equipment, to contain the hazardous substances
5 and to remove uranium and other pollutants from
6 emissions and effluents prior to their discharge
7 to the environment.

8 The second barrier is Cameco's
9 internal controls. These include the quality
10 assurance program; the radiation protection
11 program; and the environmental monitoring program.

12 The third barrier in the series is
13 the assessments and compliance verification
14 activities carried out by CNSC. These are
15 complemented by Ontario Ministry of the
16 Environment's review and approval of the emission
17 abatement systems.

18 Risk Control - Performance:
19 Details of the data from the radiation protection
20 program: the external radiation doses sustained
21 by workers and the results from analysis of urine
22 samples and thorax burden measurements are
23 reported in the CMD.

24 No external radiation dose
25 exceeded the applicable limit and almost all the

1 The Preliminary Decommissioning
2 Plan for the facility did not entirely satisfy
3 CNSC's expectations, however. It is expected that
4 the shortcomings identified will have been
5 remedied and that a suitable financial guarantee
6 will be in place before the Day Two Hearing on
7 Cameco's application. If this is not the case,
8 then at that time, CNSC staff will propose an
9 appropriate condition to be included in the
10 operating licence.

11 Other Relevant Information:
12 Canadian Environmental Assessment Act: Renewal of
13 the facility licence provides for activities
14 relating to a physical work. Thus the
15 environmental effects of the facility have to be
16 assessed before the Commission can make a decision
17 on renewal of the operating licence.

18 A screening report was prepared
19 for the facility prior to the renewal of the
20 licence in 1995. It was concluded at that time
21 that the activities to be carried on were not
22 likely to cause significant adverse environmental
23 effects with the mitigation measures in place.
24 The activities to be carried on under the proposed
25 new licence are the same as those assessed in

1 1995.

2 For that reason, the screening
3 report remains valid and, by virtue of the
4 provisions of the CEAA Exclusion List Regulations,
5 a new environmental assessment as a basis for the
6 Commission's decision making on this licence
7 application is not required.

8 Fire Safety Program: CNSC staff
9 and Cameco have taken a number of actions to
10 improve fire safety precautions at the facility,
11 to comply with the National Fire Code and National
12 Building Code. Certain work remains to be done to
13 meet the applicable requirements. CNSC staff will
14 check for the completion of these improvements
15 during future inspections. The absence of full
16 compliance at this time is not considered an
17 impediment to the renewal of the operating
18 licence, however.

19
20 Cost Recovery: Cameco has paid
21 the licensing fee for the facility.

22 Organization and Management: An
23 evaluation of the organization and management was
24 conducted at the facility in October, 2000. This
25 found a number of strengths as regards risk

1 control and various aspects where improvements
2 could be made. In light of the recommendations
3 Cameco is currently developing a training plan
4 strategy for facility staff.

5 Public Information: A notice of
6 the Commission's Hearings on Cameco's application
7 for renewal of its operating licence has been
8 published on the CNSC web site, in accordance with
9 the Commission's Rules of Procedure. Cameco has
10 made public presentations on the facility
11 performance and results from the environmental
12 monitoring program as reported by Mr. Jarrell in
13 his presentation earlier. CNSC staff consider
14 Cameco's program to communicate with the public to
15 be acceptable.

16 Changes to the Licence: The
17 proposed licence contains several changes from the
18 current one. These comprise the replacement of
19 the so-called "facility control equation" by an
20 operating release limit equation; a condition to
21 require a corporate quality assurance program to
22 complement the existing site quality assurance
23 program; five conditions concerning fire safety
24 and one requiring an annual compliance report for
25 the facility.

1 Licence Term: Cameco requested in
2 its application that the term of the licence be
3 extended from two to five years. CNSC staff
4 believes that a five year term should be
5 considered, for the reasons set out in the
6 CMD. These may be summarized as follows.

7 The hazards associated with the
8 activities to be carried on are well known. In
9 CNSC staff's opinion, Cameco has put appropriate
10 precautions in place to control the risks and the
11 results from the internal control programs
12 demonstrate the effectiveness of those measures
13 and Cameco's performance. There are no known
14 reasons which would militate against a longer term
15 for the licence.

16 CNSC Staff Conclusions: CNSC
17 staff concludes that:

18 (a) Cameco is qualified to carry
19 on the activities that the
20 proposed licence will
21 authorize.

22 (b) Cameco has made, in relation
23 to the activities to be
24 authorized, adequate
25 provision for the protection

1 of the environment, the
2 health and safety of persons
3 and the maintenance of
4 national security and
5 measures required to
6 implement international
7 obligations to which Canada
8 has agreed; and
9 (c) taking account of the
10 measures and programs which
11 Cameco has committed to
12 implement to control the
13 facility hazards, the risks
14 posed by the operation of the
15 facility to the environment,
16 the health and safety of
17 persons and to national
18 security are not
19 unreasonable.
20

21 CNSC Staff Recommendations: CNSC
22 staff recommends that the Commission:

23 (a) accept CNSC staffs assessment
24 that the applicant is
25 qualified to carry on the

1 activities that the licence
2 will authorize and will, in
3 relation to those activities,
4 make adequate provision for
5 the protection of the
6 environment, the health and
7 safety of persons and the
8 maintenance of national
9 security and measures
10 required to implement
11 international obligations to
12 which Canada has agreed;

13 (b) accept CNSC staff's
14 assessment that pursuant to
15 section 3 of the Exclusion
16 List Regulations and section
17 2 of Part I of Schedule 1 of
18 those Regulations, that an
19 environmental assessment
20 pursuant to the Canadian
21 Environmental Assessment Act
22 is not required; and

23 (c) consider issuing the proposed
24 Operating Licence
25 FFOL-3641.0/2007, for a

1 period of five years.

2 Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. The
4 floor is now open for questions for the licensee
5 and also to CNSC staff.

6 Mr. Graham.

7 MEMBER GRAHAM: Question to CNSC
8 staff.

9 There was considerable mention in
10 your presentation with regard to security, but
11 there is no mention to security whatsoever in it,
12 that I could find, in the licensing condition. It
13 has a subsection in all other licenses that we
14 came forward with today but it is not mentioned.
15 Can you explain that?

16 MR. PEREIRA: I will ask
17 Mr. Howden to respond to the question.

18 MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden
19 speaking.

20 Technically this security is
21 covered in item G-1, contents of the appendices
22 attached to the licence because it refers to
23 Appendix A which has the facility licensing manual
24 in it which includes the security provisions.

25 However, you are correct. There

1 is an inconsistency and for clarity in the other
2 licences we had a specific condition for security
3 and we will add one to make that consistent with
4 other licenses.

5 MEMBER GRAHAM: So it will be in
6 there on Day 2 for consistency purpose.

7 MR. HOWDEN: Yes.

8 MEMBER GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you.

9 The next question I have is to the
10 Port Hope people and that is: Is the entire site
11 fenced, including the waterfront and harbour and
12 so on?

13 MR. STEANE: Yes, the entire
14 licence site is fenced.

15 MEMBER GRAHAM: In the
16 presentation or in your documentation there was
17 some mention with regard to -- you had one
18 incident. How was that gained? Has there been
19 lessons learned on that, I guess, and can you
20 explain that further without breaching any
21 security? I think there was a mention that
22 security had been broken once by someone who got
23 into a warehouse or something.

24 MR. STEANE: There was a mention
25 in the document. It was a fisherman, or someone,

1 who went into the Crane property facility, just
2 inside the fence, to gather some bottles, or
3 something, and then exited again. He did not
4 enter in any of the warehousing facilities --

5 MEMBER GRAHAM: But he was inside
6 the fence.

7 MR. STEANE: He got inside the
8 fence. He climbed the fence.

9 MEMBER GRAHAM: Okay. I don't
10 want to ask a question maybe of security reason,
11 so I will have to -- no, that's okay. We will
12 leave it until later.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Graham, you
14 can ask the question. I will just let you know if
15 you can get an answer to it.

16 --- Laughter / Rires

17 MEMBER GRAHAM: My question is:
18 Are your fences monitored?

19 MR. STEANE: On that property the
20 fences are not monitored, but the warehousing
21 facilities are. You cannot access or enter those
22 buildings without triggering alarms. There are
23 sensing devices that will do that.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: That would be
25 sufficient. Thank you.

1 --- Laughter / Rires

2 MEMBER GRAHAM: That's sufficient.
3 Okay.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

5 MEMBER GRAHAM: That's fair. One
6 other question I have -- and I don't want to
7 belabour it because I know we have a long day --
8 inventory controls. Have you ever had any of your
9 finished product ever -- has your inventory always
10 met with what production was?

11 MR. STEANE: To the best of my
12 knowledge that is true. I will ask Carisse or
13 Franko if they have any experience.

14 My experience is only a few years
15 at Port Hope. Their experience is much longer.

16 MR. CARISSE: Bob, you are
17 correct. Even in the long term we have not had
18 any incidences of material being missing from the
19 site.

20 MEMBER GRAHAM: Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Further
22 questions?

23 Dr. Giroux.

24 MEMBER GIROUX: To Cameco first.
25 I would like some further explanations. On page 7

1 of the first document that we had, you refer to
2 the "toxicity tests" and you mention that there
3 were failures which you say were related to the
4 chlorine contained in the town's potable water.

5 The implication of that is that
6 the town's water doesn't meet the toxicity
7 standards of Ontario. Is that a correct
8 inference?

9 MR. STEANE: That would be
10 correct. Chlorinated water, commonly potable
11 water, is toxic to fish and small organisms. I
12 suppose that is why chlorine is added.

13 MEMBER GIROUX: What the town does
14 is not your business, but did you convey these
15 results to the town authorities?

16 MR. STEANE: Yes, sir. The town
17 is aware of those. That is not peculiar to Port
18 Hope. That is any chlorinated water system. If
19 you own an aquarium you need to be very careful,
20 if you put water out of your tap in your aquarium.

21 MEMBER GIROUX: Thank you. That
22 answers that question.

23 My second question refers to page
24 8 where you refer to the soil sampling program. I
25 am not sure I understood completely what you say.

1 I read that there are some test plots of the
2 entire Ministry of the Environment which showed
3 some readings which, if projected to the area,
4 would exceed what is being measured.

5 I was wondering how many measuring
6 points you have. There are test plots where you
7 have measurements, then you refer to another area
8 where you have measurements also.

9 MR. STEANE: Yes, there are a
10 number of soil plots that both Cameco has and the
11 Ministry of Environment has, as well as we have
12 dust fall sampling locations.

13 With that I will ask either Hess
14 or Franco to talk about that in a little bit more
15 detail.

16 MEMBER GIROUX: But I think the
17 basis of my question is that there are
18 inconsistencies between the measurements that you
19 take and those that are obtained by the Ontario
20 Ministry.

21 MR. STEANE: That's why I say that
22 I think Franko can give you some more information.

23 MR. DOBRI: For the record my name
24 is Franko Dobri and I am the Superintendent of
25 Quality Assurance and Environmental Services.

1 I have an overhead of the area
2 around the plant. What it shows is all of our
3 assembling locations. Now, our numbers refer to
4 the stations. For example, Station 1 is the
5 waterworks and beside it it indicates that there
6 is a dust fall, lime candle and a soil plot.

7 Between the Ministry and ourselves
8 we have five soil plots. We have one at position
9 11, we have one at position 1, and one at
10 position 9. The Ministry has soil plots in the
11 vicinity of 5 and 7.

12 In 1996, the Ministry put out 30
13 soil plots and the idea was that every year they
14 would take out three. What they were trying to
15 assess was what the effect of the deposition was
16 and they had installed soil plots because in the
17 area there is the additional concern of historic
18 waste. So they felt that by installing soil plots
19 that they would actually be able to quantify what
20 the deposition effect was having on soil.

21 I think the results indicate that
22 there is an increase, but the results also
23 indicate that the mechanisms are quite complex.

24 If you take Station 9, for
25 example, which is one of our stations, if we use

1 the information that we get from the soil data,
2 from the soil plot itself, we would predict that
3 after 60 years of operation, under current
4 emissions which are actually lower than
5 historical, we should see 42 parts per million.

6 If you look at the dust fall data,
7 because in that location we also have a dust fall
8 jar, we would predict 3.2. What the actual
9 background is there is 4. But if you go the
10 waterworks which is 1, the soil plots would
11 indicate that it should be 30 after 60 years, the
12 dust fall, say 5, and what we are actually
13 measuring is about 17, and that is in area where
14 there is some historical contaminated soil.

15 So the data is in conflict and all
16 that we can conclude is uranium and soil is a
17 complex issue and we are trying to resolve what
18 exactly the data is telling us.

19 MR. JARRELL: If I could just
20 summarize that and add to it. I think in our
21 presentation we tried to indicate that our current
22 view is that there are probably a number of
23 mechanisms at play and certainly, I think as
24 Franko indicated, there is a fairly substantial
25 effect of the historical activity that occurred on

1 that site, particularly close by. So we will
2 continue the soil plots, and I could expect to see
3 some ambiguity in the data continue.

4 But I think as we continue we will
5 probably try to get a better understanding of what
6 the -- what we are trying to do is sort out what
7 is current deposition from sort of historical
8 effect, and I think we are going to have to
9 continue to study that for some time.

10 MEMBER GRAHAM: I wonder if we
11 could get a better copy of that on hard cover for
12 Day 2 because it's a little hard to follow there.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Actually, what
14 we will do is have it copied, if we could, right
15 now and it will be available before we leave
16 today. If that's fine with the licensee, if the
17 licensee agrees. Thank you.

18 Ms MacLachlan.

19 MEMBER MacLACHLAN: CMD 01-H32,
20 page 15. There is a table that summarizes
21 groundwater monitoring. It appears that may be
22 elevated levels of arsenic.

23 May I have a comment from staff
24 and applicant on this?

25 MR. PEREIRA: I will invite

1 Dr. Thompson to comment.

2 MS THOMPSON: CNSC staff reviewed
3 the data on the variety of contaminants that are
4 found in soils and groundwater around the Port
5 Hope facility.

6 From the information we have, the
7 studies were done by Cameco to characterize the
8 contaminants coming out of their stack, and recent
9 information shows that arsenic is not coming out
10 of the stack now and so the conclusion is that the
11 arsenic that is found in groundwater is from
12 historical practices rather than from current
13 emissions.

14 MEMBER MacLACHLAN: Thank you.

15 On page 14, just preceding that,
16 again CMD 01-H32, the statement is made that:

17 "There are no federal or
18 provincial established limits
19 or guidelines for uranium in
20 ambient air".

21 I suspect this is why you have the
22 derived levels. Is that correct? And why are
23 there no levels set in either the federal or the
24 provincial regulations.

25 MR. PEREIRA: I will ask

1 Dr. Thompson to comment.

2 MS THOMPSON: Historically uranium
3 was controlled on the basis of potential doses to
4 the members of the public from emissions to the
5 environment from the facility. Over time there
6 are questions being asked about the accumulation
7 of uranium in soils and its chemical toxicity.

8 CNSC staff have looked at derived
9 release limits and derived air concentrations on
10 the basis of both the radiation effects to people
11 as well as the chemical toxicity to kidneys.
12 There are additional questions about accumulation
13 in soils.

14 The Ontario Ministry of the
15 Environment has conducted studies looking at
16 essentially accumulation in soil with a soil
17 threshold level to protect soil biota and back
18 calculating uranium concentrations in the air, but
19 that work isn't finalized. As it stands now there
20 are no limits on uranium in air simply because in
21 the past it wasn't seen as a priority. But the
22 action levels on the emissions for the facility do
23 result in air concentrations that are well below
24 concentrations that would be toxic for people, for
25 kidneys or for radiation effects.

1 MEMBER MacLACHLAN: Thank you.

2 One more question. The statement
3 is made on page 15 in CMD 01-H32 that:

4 "No process wastewater from
5 the facility is discharged to
6 the municipal sewer system".

7 But it doesn't indicate, at least
8 that I see, where that process water goes.

9 MS THOMPSON: Lake Ontario.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Perhaps we could
11 ask the licensee to comment. There has been a
12 series of questions where we have not given you an
13 opportunity to comment from Ms MacLachlan. So if
14 you would like to comment on that or go backwards
15 into other questions, please feel free to do so.

16 MR. STEANE: We will start with
17 the last one first which is the water. The
18 process effluent is not discharged. The process
19 effluent to the town sewer goes to our process
20 effluent system which consists of an evaporator.
21 All of the process water we evaporate and then
22 condense it. It is the condensed and essentially
23 distilled water that we release to the harbour.

24 The other question about the
25 arsenic content, that material is historical from

1 the days of bringing ore from Northern
2 Saskatchewan and for radium processing into Port
3 Hope. That's the source of the arsenic, not the
4 current operation.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Barnes.

6 MEMBER BARNES: Just three or four
7 quick comments now.

8 I too would have comments on the
9 soil sampling program which I felt were really
10 quite abbreviated because when we reviewed the
11 previous licence we had a representative from the
12 Ministry of the Environment and we had really
13 quite an extended discussion on the difficulty of
14 finding appropriate sites, action of soil
15 organisms, worms, and redistributing uranium, and
16 so on and so on.

17 At that time it was the early
18 phase of the soil plot so they were not able to
19 give a reasonable time series of their analysis.
20 So I would have thought at this stage we should
21 have had that information.

22 So again, I come back to the kind
23 of information you are providing for us, assuming
24 that there might be public concern on the
25 distribution of particulate matter. In the

1 document there is no map. You have given us one
2 now, the one you just provided. You have given us
3 no information on prevailing winds. Two of the
4 three Cameco plots, as I see it, numbers 1 and 11,
5 are on the Windwood side of the facility and
6 probably would be least affected assuming that
7 prevailing winds come from the southwest or west.
8 They might be good sites because they are readily
9 undisturbed, but at least you have control of the
10 sites, and so on, but whether they would attract
11 much of the particulate matter coming out of
12 stacks, and so on, is a concern.

13 So from our viewpoint, that one
14 paragraph in the middle of page 8, which really
15 gives no information, is I think just inadequate
16 for us to make any assessment of an aspect which
17 really must be one of the principal environmental
18 concerns.

19 So I hope in Day 2 that we will,
20 in fact, hear some information from the Ministry
21 of the Environment. Perhaps that same person
22 might come along and give some of their results
23 and compare it to those of the applicant.

24 I was interested to see that the
25 Council was reestablishing the Environmental

1 Advisory Committee and you indicated it's sort of
2 in process. It might be useful to have a report
3 either from the Council, or someone from the
4 Council -- a report is probably sufficient to tell
5 us how that is being done, how the Council is
6 being established, who is represented on the
7 Council, and so on.

8 You said that you had a public
9 open house in late October. How many would have
10 attended that. Do you recall?

11 MR. STEANE: Yes. We had 65
12 participants.

13 MEMBER BARNES: I think that will
14 be fine.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Giroux.

16 MEMBER GIROUX: I had the same
17 question that Dr. Barnes mentioned about the open
18 house.

19 Was that a visit of the facilities
20 or just a presentation? We had a photograph
21 showing a room with chairs and a few people.

22 Basically, how did the meeting go?
23 Was it very active? I am referring to previous
24 meetings of the Commission in Port Hope, which
25 were very active indeed.

1 MR. STEANE: The format for that
2 was that there was advertising and people were
3 invited to come. The picture you saw was of the
4 main meeting room at the Port Hope facility.
5 People came throughout the day. It was on a
6 Saturday.

7 They were given explanations and
8 also went for a tour through the facility, went in
9 small groups. We had people together and talked
10 with them about various aspects of the operation
11 and then took them through in tour groups of no
12 larger than ten; typically, between five and ten.

13 It was well received. All the
14 people I met were quite interested and very
15 interested in what we were doing and happy for the
16 occasion.

17 Yes, there are some people in Port
18 Hope who have other opinions of our industry.
19 None of those people chose to avail themselves of
20 the opportunity.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

22 I make the same comment that I
23 made earlier on the Blind River application: that
24 with a five-year licence application I would
25 expect on Day Two that we would have a forecast of

1 what this facility would look like over the next
2 five years and what would be the issues, either on
3 licensing or on the facility that we would see;
4 and what issues could arise in a period of time of
5 two, three, four, five years, in that time.

6 You can read the transcript from
7 the earlier one. I would appreciate having that
8 information.

9 On that basis, this brings to the
10 end the question period for this hearing.

11 This hearing will continue on the
12 17th of January, 2002, here in the CNSC offices.

13 According to the Commission's
14 Rules of Procedure, Rule 18.3, the applicant is
15 required to be present at that date. Commission
16 staff also are required to be present.

17 The public is invited to
18 participate, either by oral presentation or
19 written submission, on Hearing Day Two. Persons
20 wishing to intervene on that date must file
21 submissions by December 14, 2001.

22 This hearing is now adjourned to
23 January 17, 2002.

24 That brings to the end the public
25 hearing portion of the Commission. We will go in

1 camera for a brief period, and we will look at
2 what portions of the meeting we will be able to
3 hold for the CNSC this afternoon.

4 Thank you all for participating in
5 the hearings. We will be back in a few minutes
6 with an announcement one way or another.

7 --- Upon recessing at 4:10 p.m.

8 --- Upon resuming at 4:25 p.m.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ladies and
10 gentlemen, because of the hour, we are going to be
11 in effect postponing the major parts of the
12 meeting today. However, on that basis I do want
13 to call the meeting to order, which was under
14 CMD M72 and M72.A. The agenda has been tabled.

15 However, the Commission has made a
16 decision to postpone all the items in the
17 Commission meeting agenda, but specifically we
18 want to make reference to two items: M77 and M78.
19 These items were part of the transition plan for
20 the Commission for the new legislation.

21 They are the Unlicensed Uranium
22 Tailings Management Sites, 01-M77, to which we
23 expected an oral presentation today, with
24 recommendations for a decision; and Waste
25 Management Areas Owned by the Crown, Historic

1 Contaminated Lands, Landfills and Radium-
2 luminescent Devices, M78 and M78.A.

3 With agreement of Members, we are
4 postponing this item. We will inform by note on
5 the web site the exact timing for that.

6 However, in making this decision,
7 the Commission is mindful of the requirements of
8 the General Nuclear Safety and Control
9 Regulations, and we are satisfied in granting a
10 two-month extension to the exemptions. We feel
11 that this is acceptable under the circumstances.

12 However, we wish to have a fulsome
13 discussion on that.

14 We are extending the exemptions
15 until January 31, 2002. That does not mean that
16 is the length of time it will take for us to
17 discuss this item. We just want to make sure
18 there is sufficient extension of the transition
19 plan to that time.

20 I apologize for those of you who
21 have waited for particular items on the agenda.
22 However, we feel the time and the hour is such
23 that we will be postponing the meeting.

24 Thank you very much.

25 --- Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 4:30 p.m.