

# Record of Proceedings, Including Reasons for Decision

In the Matter of

Applicant Cameco Corporation

---

Subject Application for the Renewal of the Nuclear Fuel  
Facility Operating Licence for Cameco  
Corporation's Refinery in Blind River, Ontario

Hearing  
Dates October 5 and December 13, 2006



## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Decision</b> .....	2
<b>Issues and Commission Findings</b> .....	2
<b>Radiation Protection</b> .....	2
<b>Environmental Protection</b> .....	5
<b>Operations</b> .....	7
<b>Emergency Preparedness and Response</b> .....	8
<b>Fire Protection</b> .....	8
<b>Quality Assurance</b> .....	9
<b>Security</b> .....	10
<b>Safeguards</b> .....	10
<b>Financial Guarantee and Preliminary Decommissioning Plan</b> .....	10
<b>Public Information</b> .....	11
<b>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act</b> .....	12
<b>Licence Length and Interim Reporting</b> .....	12
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	13

## **Introduction**

1. Cameco Corporation (Cameco) has applied to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC<sup>1</sup>) for the renewal of its Class IB Nuclear Fuel Facility Operating Licence for its Blind River facility, located near the town of Blind River, Ontario. The current operating licence FFOL-3632.0/2007 expires on February 28, 2007. Cameco has requested a five-year licence term.
2. The Blind River facility refines various milled uranium concentrates (yellowcake) received from various sources to produce uranium trioxide powder (UO<sub>3</sub>), an intermediate product of the fuel cycle. The primary recipient of the product is Cameco's Port Hope Conversion Facility. The Blind River facility is currently licensed to produce up to 18,000 tonnes of uranium as uranium trioxide during any calendar year.

## Issue

3. In considering the application, the Commission was required to decide, pursuant to subsection 24(4) of the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*<sup>2</sup> (NSCA):
  - a) if Cameco is qualified to carry on the activity that the licence would authorize; and
  - b) if, in carrying on that activity, Cameco would make adequate provision for the protection of the environment, the health and safety of persons and the maintenance of national security and measures required to implement international obligations to which Canada has agreed.

## Public Hearing

4. The Commission, in making its decision, considered information presented for a public hearing held on October 5 and December 13, 2006 in Ottawa, Ontario. The public hearing was conducted in accordance with the *Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Rules of Procedure*<sup>3</sup>. During the public hearing, the Commission received written submissions and heard oral presentations from CNSC staff (CMD 06-H20, CMD 06-H20.A and CMD 06-H20.B) and Cameco (CMD 06-H20.1, CMD 06-H20.1A and CMD 06-H20.1B). The Commission also considered oral and written submissions from 16 intervenors (see Appendix A for a detailed list of interventions).

---

<sup>1</sup> In this *Record of Proceedings*, the *Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission* is referred to as the "CNSC" when referring to the organization and its staff in general, and as the "Commission" when referring to the tribunal component.

<sup>2</sup> S.C. 1997, c. 9.

<sup>3</sup> S.O.R./2000-211.

## **Decision**

5. Based on its consideration of the matter, as described in more detail in the following sections of this *Record of Proceedings*, the Commission concludes that Cameco is qualified to carry on the activity that the licence will authorize. The Commission is also satisfied that Cameco, in carrying on that activity, will make adequate provision for the protection of the environment, the health and safety of persons and the maintenance of national security and measures required to implement international obligations to which Canada has agreed. Therefore,

the Commission, pursuant to section 24 of the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*, renews the Nuclear Fuel Facility Operating Licence for Cameco's uranium refining facility located in the Town of Blind River, Ontario. The licence, No. FFOL-3632.0/2012, is valid from March 1, 2007 until February 29, 2012.

6. The Commission includes in the licence the conditions recommended by CNSC staff, as set out in the draft licence attached to CMD 06-H20 and CMD 06-H20.B.
7. With this decision, the Commission requests that CNSC staff present a status report to the Commission on the performance of the facility during the first half of the licence term. The status report will be presented at a public proceeding of the Commission as soon as practical after the mid-point of the licence term.

## **Issues and Commission Findings**

8. In making its licensing decision under section 24 of the NSCA, the Commission considered a number of issues relating to Cameco's qualifications to carry on the proposed activities, and the adequacy of the proposed measures for protecting the environment, the health and safety of persons, national security and international obligations to which Canada has agreed.
9. The findings of the Commission presented below are based on the Commission's consideration of all of the information and submissions available for reference on the record for the hearing.

## **Radiation Protection**

10. As part of its evaluation of the adequacy of the provisions for protecting the health and safety of persons, the Commission considered the past performance and future plans of Cameco in the area of radiation protection.
11. Cameco reported that the licensee's Radiation Protection Program in place has been

reviewed and updated as part of the current licence renewal process. Cameco reported that its Radiation Protection Program includes the use of dosimeters for external radiation dosimetry, urinalysis, whole body counting, a workplace air sampling program with fixed sampling locations in the plant, and radiation surveys and contamination surveys on vehicles and materials leaving the site.

12. Cameco stated that, as part of its on-going efforts to further reduce the potential for employee radiation exposures, a number of workplace dust control improvements were initiated during the current licensing period. Cameco reported the commissioning of a new Spencer turbine in 2005 to improve fume removal in various processing areas of the facility, undertaking work at the facility's double drum dumper over the last several years to reduce the potential for worker exposure to dust, and improving the fume removal at the scrap digester used to dissolve scrap UO<sub>2</sub> pellets. Cameco added that it will replace the current uranium trioxide drumming platforms this year with a new automated uranium trioxide drum filling station that will further reduce the potential for workers to be exposed to airborne dust.
13. Cameco reported that in conjunction with CNSC staff, it has set action levels for various radiological and environmental parameters which will serve as an early warning of a condition that warrants further investigation. Cameco reported four action level exceedances during the licence period. CNSC staff stated that it reviewed and accepted Cameco's response to each occurrence.
14. CNSC staff reported that Cameco did not exceed the regulatory dose limits for workers at the facility during the current licence period. CNSC staff expressed the opinion that Cameco's Radiation Protection Program for workers is adequate, that it incorporated appropriate action levels, and that it effectively applies the principles of ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable), social and economic factors taken into account. CNSC staff added that its review of workers' dose data for the period January 2002 to March 2006 indicates that radiation doses are being adequately controlled. CNSC staff reported that its review of Cameco's performance in controlling radiation doses to the workers and controlling releases of uranium to the environment at the facility met requirements.
15. CNSC staff stated that the *Radiation Protection Regulations*<sup>4</sup> introduced a dose limit for effective dose, which is the sum of both external and internal dose. CNSC staff noted that prior to April 1, 2003, Cameco was exempt from the requirement to ascertain the internal dose. CNSC staff explained to the Commission that Cameco had since designed and implemented an internal dosimetry program, effective April 1, 2003. The method was developed and tested by Cameco and Health Canada, and was reviewed and accepted by the CNSC's Internal Dosimetry working group. CNSC staff pointed out that it was currently reviewing Cameco's application for an internal dosimetry service licence.
16. Cameco reported that during the current licensing period, it purchased a new lung

---

<sup>4</sup> S.O.R./2000-203.

counter that was commissioned in 2003. Cameco stated that the current method of assigning dose based on lung count results is currently being reviewed internally, and thus it was not able to provide the effective dose data for the workforce at this time.

17. The Commission was concerned with Cameco's inability to present the lung counter data at the time of the hearing and asked Cameco to explain the reason for the delay. Cameco responded that the delay was in part due to updating the analysis system in order to make it more automatic and less of a manual system. Cameco also stated that the volume of data from the past five years is taking time to process. In response to the Commission's question on when the data would become available, Cameco stated that it should have the data early in 2007.
18. The Commission questioned Cameco about the outstanding annual assessment of the Respirator Program which was brought up during the CNSC staff radiation protection inspection. Cameco explained that the annual assessment of the Respirator Program could not be conducted before the end of the calendar year and that it should be completed at the beginning of 2007.
19. One intervenor expressed concerns about Cameco's radiation protection performance at the refinery and was particularly concerned that average and maximum and whole body and skin dose results for the employees of the refinery showed an increase since 2002. The intervenor expressed concern with the number of action levels and directives Cameco received during the licence period. The intervenor also expressed concern over the lung dose rates which have, overall, increased during the licensing period for two of the four work groups.
20. The Commission sought more information regarding the concerns raised by the intervenor. On these matters, CNSC staff noted that Cameco has set targets on doses to workers and has an acceptable ALARA program in place. CNSC staff stated that it could not comment on an increase trend for lung dose rates since it does not have enough data on hand. As noted above, CNSC staff stated that its review of workers' dose data for the period January 2002 to March 2006 indicates that radiation doses are being adequately controlled. Furthermore, CNSC staff's review of Cameco's performance in controlling radiation doses to the workers at the facility met requirements.
21. CNSC staff reported to the Commission that the operation of the facility during the licence term has not posed an unreasonable risk to workers or the public. CNSC staff added that the continued operation of the facility with full implementation of the Radiation Protection Program should not pose an unreasonable radiation risk to the health and safety of persons.
22. Based on the information provided, the Commission is of the opinion that Cameco has made, and will continue to make, adequate provision for the protection of workers and the public from radiation. However, the Commission is concerned with the lack of data regarding lung counter data and requires that this information come before the

Commission as an information item at the earliest possible time.

### **Environmental Protection**

23. To determine whether Cameco will make adequate provisions to protect the environment while carrying on the proposed activities at its facility in Blind River, the Commission considered the potential for the continued operation to adversely affect the environment.
24. Cameco reported that its Environmental Monitoring Program (EMP) is comprised of sampling of both air and water emissions through high-volume air sampling of ambient air and ambient sampling of soil, surface water and groundwater monitoring. Cameco also reported that five new groundwater monitoring wells were installed during the current licensing period.
25. Cameco reported that there were three action level exceedances in 2002 but that since then, the facility has not exceeded CNSC's regulatory levels with respect to environmental performance. Cameco pointed out that the combination of operative controls on emission and effluent abatement equipment, coupled with timely and effective response to any process upset-triggered events having potential effluent or emission implications, has led to strong environmental performance over the current licence period.
26. CNSC staff noted that Cameco maintains a comprehensive environmental protection program to comply with all applicable federal and provincial regulatory requirements. This program includes policies, guidance and procedures to identify, control and monitor all releases of nuclear and hazardous substances from the facility into the environment, and to protect the environment.
27. CNSC staff explained to the Commission that Cameco performed an Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) following the January 2002 licensing hearing and reported the results to the Commission in CMD 03-M33<sup>5</sup>. CNSC staff reviewed the ERA and concluded that it meets requirements. CNSC staff also reported that an environmental compliance inspection was conducted during the licensing period and that no significant issues of non-compliance were identified.
28. Cameco reported that its groundwater monitoring to date for the current licensing period shows little change in groundwater results over the course of the licensing period and that the results as a whole are lower than those reported during pre-operational monitoring activities in the early 1980s.
29. Cameco reported that liquid effluent and stack emissions during the current licensing

---

<sup>5</sup> *Information from Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Regarding Cameco Corporation Port Hope and Blind River Facilities – Staff Report on the Design and Implementation of an Environmental Effects Monitoring Program in the Vicinity of Cameco Corporation's Port Hope and Blind River Facilities.*

period are at historical lows for the facility and will be focussing its efforts during the next licensing period on reducing fugitive emissions via the plant HVAC system, as this source is now the most significant contributor to overall uranium emissions.

30. Cameco stated that the average soil sampling results from the 2002 to 2006 period show a stable and somewhat decreasing downward trend. Cameco submitted a recent phytotoxicology report issued by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) in 2005 which confirms that there are no measurable uranium emissions from Cameco in either of the two neighbouring communities. Cameco reported that these results closely mirror the results from its own soil sampling program.
31. CNSC staff reported to the Commission that based on the effluent and environmental monitoring results, and the verification done through compliance inspections, CNSC is of the view that Cameco's implementation of its environmental protection program meets requirements and that, with the mitigation measures in place, the continued operation of the facility does not pose unreasonable risk to the environment or members of the public.
32. The Commission sought clarification on Cameco's statement regarding the information as of June 30, 2006 in CMD 06-H20.1, page 7, Table 5, that overall there is a clear downward trend in total uranium emission for the Blind River facility. Cameco responded that overall uranium emissions have remained in the 12-15 kg/year range over the last several years. Cameco added that while the total over the last few years has increased slightly because the number of operating days has increased, there has been continued focus and success in reduction of emissions on an operating unit basis.
33. An intervenor expressed the view that Cameco's environmental performance raises concerns related to worker health and safety, the environment and public health. The intervenor expressed the view that Cameco's submission misrepresents some aspects of its environmental performance. The Commission sought further information regarding the intervenor's comments that suggest the average dose has increased with time and that Cameco's performance is not what is written in its submission. Cameco replied that the average doses are remaining within a very tight band from year to year. Cameco added that skin exposure was the highest value reported and was only four percent of the allowable limit, and thus still well below regulatory limits.
34. Another point raised by the intervenor concerned Cameco's report regarding the uranium in soil concentrations around the refinery's perimeter and the fact that the MOE's sample results were higher than Cameco's. The Commission sought further information on the issue. MOE answered that its sampling technique was basically the same as Cameco's but the variance may be due to a different analysis technique. CNSC staff commented that Cameco's and MOE's maximum concentration measures are approximately in the same range of numbers and the variance is of negligible significance.
35. The Commission expresses its concern with respect to what appears to be discrepancies

in Cameco's and the MOE's monitoring results. The Commission recommends that the monitoring processes and result analysis be reviewed with the objective that results monitored at one source can be validated by another source. The Commission also recommends that Cameco have its monitoring data verified by an independent third party.

36. Based on the information received, the Commission is satisfied that Cameco has made, and will continue to make, adequate provision for the protection of the environment during the proposed licence period.

### **Operations**

37. CNSC staff reported that it inspects Cameco's Blind River facility on a quarterly basis to verify that the licensee's safety programs to achieve compliance with the CNSC regulatory requirements are being implemented effectively. CNSC staff reported that it also monitors the licensee's compliance through review of its quarterly and annual compliance reports submitted as required by its licence.
38. CNSC staff reported that some deficiencies were found during the compliance inspections, but the nature of the deficiencies did not pose an unreasonable risk to the health and safety of persons, the environment and national security. CNSC staff stated that the deficiencies raised have been or are being corrected by Cameco. Overall, the facility inspections met with CNSC staff expectations and there were no significant events reported during the review period.
39. With respect to conventional safety, Cameco reported that the Blind River facility continues to be a Cameco leader in this area. Cameco noted that in the fall of 2004, the facility developed a Safety Charter detailing its employees' commitment to safety which was signed off by all employees. Cameco reported seven injuries to persons, which resulted in lost time; however none of them was of a serious nature. The type of injuries included two knee injuries, two hand injuries, an ankle injury, a back injury and an aggravation of a pre-existing medical condition
40. CNSC staff stated that it was satisfied with Cameco's implementation of its conventional safety program at the Blind River facility.
41. Based on the information received, the Commission concludes that the operating performance at Cameco's Blind River facility provides a positive indication of Cameco's ability to adequately carry on the proposed activities under the licence and that Cameco has in place the necessary programs to assure continued acceptable performance at the facility.

### **Emergency Preparedness and Response**

42. Class IB Nuclear Facility licensees, such as Cameco's facility in Blind River, are required to have a documented emergency preparedness and response plan to respond to credible emergencies arising from internal and external hazards. Licensees are responsible for developing these plans in accordance with their risk assessments and in collaboration with off-site authorities responsible for protecting the public and environment during emergencies at their facilities.
43. Cameco reported that it continues to carry out routine emergency response and first aid attendant training and drills. Cameco reported that it conducted a full drill involving the site emergency response team and the local hospital in the fall of 2002 and another exercise involving local hospital and ambulance staff is planned. Cameco reported that during the current licensing period it routinely sent emergency response team members for training. Cameco noted that it purchased a hazardous material trailer for on-site emergency use in 2004 and also purchased a dedicated emergency response vehicle for off-site response to transportation emergencies.
44. CNSC staff reported to the Commission that Cameco submitted a copy of its revised Emergency Preparedness and Response Manual, dated March 2006. CNSC staff stated that Cameco's implementation of its emergency preparedness and response program is acceptable and compliant with CNSC Regulatory Guide G-225<sup>6</sup>.
45. CNSC staff reported to the Commission that CNSC staff from the Emergency Management Division observed Cameco's Emergency Response simulation exercise on-site in October 2006. CNSC staff informed the Commission that the exercise met expectations.
46. Based on the information received, the Commission concludes that emergency preparedness at Cameco's fuel facility in Blind River is adequate for the proposed licensing.

### **Fire Protection**

47. CNSC staff stated that Cameco is required to comply with the *National Building Code* (1995) and the *National Fire Code of Canada* (1995). CNSC staff performed an inspection of the facility for compliance with the *National Fire Code of Canada* (1995). CNSC staff stated that some deficiencies were found during the inspection but the nature of the deficiencies did not pose an unreasonable risk to the occupants or the environment. CNSC staff informed the Commission that Cameco has corrected the deficiencies and that Cameco's implementation of the fire protection program meets requirements.

---

<sup>6</sup> CNSC Regulatory Guide G-225, *Emergency Planning at Class I Nuclear Facilities and Uranium Mines and Mills*, August 2001.

48. Cameco reported that during the current licensing period it routinely sent emergency response team members for training and continues to carry out routine fire training and drills. Cameco noted that all Cameco Emergency Response Training members and ten members from the Town of Blind River Fire department attended training provided by instructors from the Lambton Fire College.
49. During Public Hearing Day One, the Commission directed CNSC staff to meet with Cameco representatives to discuss their concerns that the proposed licence would not provide any transitional period for the implementation of a proposed new fire safety standard<sup>7</sup>. CNSC staff explained that the main area where it would impact Cameco's operations is the requirement to perform a Fire Hazard Analysis, including completion of any potential actions arising from the analysis to further upgrade fire provisions. During Day Two of the Hearing, CNSC staff explained to the Commission that based on its discussion with Cameco and Cameco's commitment to enhance the Blind River facility's existing fire safety program, a transitional period of one year was proposed. CNSC staff stated that this transitional period would not pose an unreasonable risk to persons or the environment considering the fire protection provisions that Cameco currently has in place.
50. Based on the information presented, the Commission is satisfied that Cameco is making, and will continue to make adequate provisions for fire protection at its Blind River facility. The Commission agrees with CNSC staff's recommendation for a one year transitional period for the implementation of the new fire safety standard.

### **Quality Assurance**

51. The Commission examined the quality assurance program for the safe operation of the facility which is a documented, planned and interrelated system of processes, approved by senior management, identifying how requirements are to be met and how processes are to be implemented and maintained.
52. Cameco reported that it has established an operations quality assurance program at the facility and that the quality assurance program manual was updated in 2006 to meet CNSC expectations.
53. CNSC staff reported that it has recently reviewed the quality assurance program and that all comments have been resolved to its satisfaction. CNSC staff informed the Commission that a formal training audit was conducted in May 2006. CNSC staff identified issues pertaining to the lack of formal training processes and procedures. Cameco is now addressing these issues by establishing a Systematic Approach to Training based training program.

---

<sup>7</sup> *National Fire Protection Association, NFPA-801: Standard for Fire Protection for Facilities Handling Radioactive Materials, 2003 edition.*

54. CNSC staff stated that although improvements are required to address the identified weaknesses, the risk of the training program and its performance falling significantly below requirements in the short term remains low. CNSC staff stated that it will continue to monitor the licensee's performance in this area to ensure that full compliance is achieved.
55. Upon consideration of the above information, the Commission concludes that Cameco is taking adequate steps to comply with all CNSC quality assurance requirements.

### **Security**

56. CNSC staff noted that there are no nuclear materials processed, used or stored at the Cameco Blind River facility which fall under the application of the CNSC *Nuclear Security Regulations*<sup>8</sup>.
57. CNSC staff reported that the facility meets all applicable security requirements and that Cameco has made adequate provisions for national security.
58. Based on this information, the Commission concludes that Cameco has made, and will continue to make, adequate provisions for ensuring the physical security of the Blind River facility and has made adequate provisions for national security.

### **Safeguards**

59. CNSC staff reported that the Cameco, Blind River facility came under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards for the first time during the licensing period under review, due to a change in IAEA policy. CNSC staff reported that Cameco has complied fully with IAEA and CNSC requests related to the safeguards.
60. Based on the information received, the Commission is satisfied that Cameco has made, and will continue to make, adequate provisions in the areas of safeguards and non-proliferation at its facility in Blind River that are necessary for maintaining national security and measures necessary for implementing international agreements to which Canada has agreed.

### **Financial Guarantee and Preliminary Decommissioning Plan**

61. In order to ensure that adequate resources will be available to meet the regulatory requirements for safety, environmental protection and security during the future decommissioning of Cameco's fuel facility in Blind River, the Commission requires that adequate plans and a financial guarantee for decommissioning and long-term management of waste be put in place and maintained acceptable to the CNSC.

---

<sup>8</sup> S.O.R./2000-209

62. In this regard, CNSC staff stated it has partially reviewed the updated Preliminary Decommissioning Plan (PDP) and financial guarantee cost estimate that Cameco submitted in September 2006 for its Blind River facility. CNSC staff stated that it requires further revision before it can recommend acceptance of the proposed financial guarantee to the Commission. Once Cameco's revised PDP and financial guarantee cost estimate are received, reviewed and recommended by CNSC staff, the financial guarantee will be forwarded to the Commission for its consideration and decision. CNSC staff informed the Commission that subject to its acceptance of the new financial guarantee, CNSC staff will request that Cameco submit an amended letter of credit to cover the full cost of the proposed financial guarantee in accordance with licence requirements.
63. The Commission reiterates the importance for the licensee to have an acceptable financial guarantee in place, for the protection of the environment and the health and safety of its workers and the public. The Commission is not satisfied that Cameco has not filed important documentation with CNSC staff in time for its consideration in advance of the hearing. The Commission expects that Cameco will submit an amended letter of credit to cover the full cost of the financial guarantee in accordance with licence requirements, once the revised financial guarantee has been accepted by the Commission.
64. The Commission is of the opinion that the current situation regarding the lack of an acceptable financial guarantee does not pose an unreasonable risk for the time being for the purpose of the proposed licence renewal. The Commission accepts CNSC staff recommendation to consider the financial guarantee at an upcoming Commission proceeding, as soon as CNSC staff's analysis of the revised PDP and associated cost estimates is complete.

### **Public Information**

65. Cameco stated that it continues to maintain good relations with the Town of Blind River and the Mississauga First Nation, Cameco's closest permanent neighbours. Cameco stated that copies of the environmental sections of the quarterly reports are regularly submitted to the Blind River Area Environmental Monitoring Committee, the Mississauga First Nation and to the Town of Blind River. Cameco also stated that it met with all three groups in the spring of 2005 to discuss plans for increasing licensed production of the facility. Cameco reported that it held an open house in November 2005 which was attended by 74 members of the public. Cameco reported that it also held a meeting with the Mississauga First Nation chief and band council in February 2006 to discuss the production capacity increase project.
66. With respect to the requirement for an acceptable public information program, CNSC staff reported that it conducted an assessment of the public information program submitted by Cameco for its Blind River facility. CNSC staff concluded that the

program meets requirements.

67. The Commission sought more information from Cameco regarding the Blind River Area Environmental Monitoring Committee and the reason why so few meetings are held each year. The Commission also sought further information as to why other interested parties, such as Northwatch, are not invited to take part in the Committee. Cameco explained that the monitoring committee was established in the early 1980s and is actually a sub-committee of the Council of Blind River. Cameco explained that its role is to attend the meetings, make presentations on its environmental performance and answer questions. Since it is a town sub-committee, Cameco explained that it does not have control over how often it meets or who is invited to participate.
68. The Commission is concerned with the public information program as it is presently structured. The Commission suggests that Cameco implement improvements to its public information program following the benchmarking of its current practices in Blind River against its own best practices at its other facilities and those of the industry in general. The Commission also suggests that Cameco consider disseminating more information to the public, possibly by means of the internet.
69. The Commission expects improvements to be made to the public information program during the proposed license period and notes that it will expect an update at the mid-term status report regarding Cameco's improvements on this matter.
70. However, for the purposes of this proposed license period, the Commission is satisfied that Cameco's public information program for its Blind River facility is adequate.

### **Canadian Environmental Assessment Act**

71. Before making a licensing decision, the Commission must be satisfied that all applicable requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*<sup>9</sup> (CEAA) have been fulfilled. In this case, CNSC staff submitted that no environmental assessment was required under the CEAA as the renewal of the licence to continue operations is not considered a trigger for such an assessment under section 5(1) of the CEAA.
72. The Commission therefore concludes that an environmental assessment of the proposed continued operations of Cameco's facility in Blind River, pursuant to the CEAA, is not required before the Commission may render a decision on the licence application for renewal.

### **Licence Length and Interim Reporting**

73. Cameco applied for a five-year renewal of its licence. CNSC staff recommended that the Commission accept and grant the proposed five-year term. In support of this

---

<sup>9</sup> S.C. 1992, c. 37.

recommendation, CNSC staff noted that the hazards associated with the operation of the facility are well characterized, and that CNSC staff is satisfied that the continued operation of the facility does not pose an unreasonable risk to the health and safety of persons or the environment. Furthermore, CNSC staff noted that the licensee has shown a consistent and good history of compliance in carrying out the licensed activities.

74. In order to keep the Commission informed of the licensee's performance, CNSC staff offered to present a status report on the performance of Cameco to the Commission following the approximately mid-point in the five year licence term, in the fall of 2009.
75. Based on the information received, the Commission concluded a five-year licence term would be appropriate in this case. With this decision, the Commission requests that CNSC staff present a performance report at a future Commission public proceeding.

### **Conclusion**

76. The Commission has considered the information and submissions of Cameco, CNSC staff and intervenors as presented in the material available for reference on the record.
77. The Commission is of the opinion that Cameco is qualified to carry on the activities that will be permitted under the licence. Furthermore, the Commission is of the opinion that in carrying on those activities, Cameco will make adequate provision for the protection of the environment, the health and safety of persons and the maintenance of national security and measures required to implement international obligations to which Canada has agreed.
78. The Commission therefore issues, pursuant to section 24 of the NSCA, the Fuel Facility Operating Licence No. FFOL-3632.0/2012 to Cameco Corporation's Blind River Facility, Ontario. The licence is valid from March 1, 2007 until February 29, 2012.
79. The Commission includes in the licence the conditions recommended by CNSC staff, as set out in the draft licence attached to CMD 06-H20 and CMD 06-H20.B.
80. With this decision, the Commission requests that CNSC staff provide the Commission with a report on the performance of the facility following the approximate mid-point in the term of the licence. The mid-term performance report will be presented at a public proceeding of the Commission. At that time, the Commission expects to be informed on actions taken by Cameco with respect to its environmental monitoring program and its public information program.
81. As noted in relevant sections of the Record of Proceedings, the Commission expresses its dissatisfaction that Cameco has not filed important documentation with CNSC staff in time for its consideration, namely regarding workers' lung sample data and the

financial guarantee. The Commission thus expects that these matters will come before the Commission at an upcoming Commission public proceeding.

Linda J. Keen,  
President  
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Date of decision: December 13, 2006

Date of release of Reasons for Decision: February 26, 2007

## Appendix A – Intervenors

<b>Intervenors</b>	<b>Document Number</b>
Canadian Uranium Alliance, represented by P. Penna	CMD 06-H20.2
Northwatch, represented by Brennain Lloyd	CMD 06-H20.3
Blind River Festivals Committee	CMD 06-H20.4
Town of Blind River	CMD 06-H20.5
Timber Village Museum	CMD 06-H20.6
W.C. Eaket Secondary School	CMD 06-H20.7
Milltown Motors Ltd.	CMD 06-H20.8
Alzheimer Society of Sault Ste. Marie and Algoma District	CMD 06-H20.9
St. Mary's Catholic School	CMD 06-H20.10
Blind River District Health Centre	CMD 06-H20.11
Rotary Club of Blind River	CMD 06-H20.12
Kidney Foundation of Canada – Blind River	CMD 06-H20.13
Blind River Home Hardware Building Centre	CMD 06-H20.14
École St-Joseph de Blind River	CMD 06-H20.15
Huron Pines Golf and Country Club	CMD 06-H20.16
Kidney Foundation of Canada – Sault Unit and Greater Ontario Branch	CMD 06-H20.17