

1 **CAMECO COPORATION:**

2 **Application for an amendment to the operating**
3 **licence for the Blind River refinery**

4
5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** The next item on the
6 agenda this afternoon is the one-day hearing on the
7 matter of the application by Cameco Corporation for an
8 amendment to the operating licence for the Blind River
9 refinery.

10 I would like to begin by introducing the
11 members of the Commission that are with us today. On my
12 right is Dr. Moyra McDill and on my left is Mr. Alan
13 Graham as well as the assistant secretary of the
14 Commission, Kelly McGee. We also have Ms. Samantha
15 Maislin-Dickson with us, who is a senior counsel to the
16 Commission.

17 This is a one-day public hearing. The
18 Notice of Public Hearing 2007-H-109 was published on
19 March 27, 2007. The public was invited to participate by
20 written submission. April 3, 2007 was the deadline set
21 for filing by interveners and the Commission received no
22 requests for intervention.

23 The Commission has had an opportunity to
24 read the written submissions that were filed by the CNSC
25 staff as outlined in Commission Member Document 07-H105.

1 I am going to begin by asking CNSC staff if there is
2 anything they would like to add, would they like to give
3 a presentation or would they like to add anything to
4 their written presentation for the Commission.

5

6 **07-H105**7 **Written Submission**8 **CNSC Staff**9 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

10 Barclay Howden here. I'm with Henry
11 Rabski, David Werry and Avijit Ray.

12 We have nothing further to add other than
13 what is in the CMD as you have it. We are here to
14 respond to questions. Thank you.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

16 Then I will turn to Cameco Corporation and
17 to the Vice-President of Fuel Services.

18 Mr. Steane, have you got anything that you
19 would like to add today?

20 **07-H105.1**21 **Written submission**22 **Cameco Corporation**23 **MR. STEANE:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

24 Bob Steane for the record.

25 I have with me Chris Astles, our Manager

1 of the Blind River operation to my left and to my right
2 is Joe DeGraw, Superintendent of Compliance and Licensing
3 at Blind River.

4 Madam Chair, no, Cameco does not have
5 anything in addition to add to the application and we are
6 here and happy to answer any questions that come up
7 during these proceedings.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I should have noted for
9 the record that the written submission from Cameco
10 Corporation was 07-H105.1.

11 Therefore, the floor is now open for
12 questions from Commission members to either the applicant
13 or Cameco Corporation.

14 Dr. McDill, would you like to start?

15 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you, just a few
16 questions.

17 As I recall, you had hoped to make this
18 step a little sooner. I was wondering if you could -- I
19 guess, when did the provincial revised C of A come
20 through? What has sort have been happening since we saw
21 you last?

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

23 The requirements for the news standards on
24 dioxins and furans came in at December 31st, 2006. The
25 incinerator has been shut down since that time and the

1 contaminated combustible materials are being stored
2 awaiting the incinerator approval.

3 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

4 My second question is with respect to
5 H-105, one of the modifications recommended in the
6 proposed licence is on page 3, point (b):
7 "The maximum discharge rate for uranium from the
8 incinerator is recommended to be reduced from 1200 grams
9 per hour to 10 grams per hour averaged over the time
10 period."

11 Could you explain that for me please? I
12 guess I should ask staff because it's your CMD.

13 **MR. RAY:** This is Avijit Ray for the
14 record.

15 The reason of that drastic reduction was
16 that when we got this other rate of approval there was a
17 limit on particulates of 17 milligrams per meter cubed,
18 and that translates to a certain number which if we kept
19 that 1200 it would have exceeded that, so we had to
20 reduce that number.

21 The other constraint was when we did the
22 environmental screening report and the number was --
23 there was a number in that. So those two constraints
24 gave the 10 grams per hour.

25 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

1 My last question in this round I guess is
2 the difference between the maximum discharge
3 concentrations on page 11 of 21 and the action levels. I
4 realize the action levels are lower more or less a tenth,
5 but I wasn't sure of the acid balance, the difference
6 between the action levels and the maximum discharge.
7 They seem to be a little closer than I might have
8 expected so perhaps I could ask staff to clarify that and
9 then perhaps Cameco has some comments.

10 So the maximum discharge concentrations
11 are in Table 1, page 11 of 21, that's in Appendix C, and
12 the action levels are Table 1, Appendix F.

13 For example, the maximum discharge for
14 nitrate is 1,000 and the action level is 100, uranium is
15 2 versus 20; radium is 11 versus 1, but the acid balance
16 -- the direction is correct. I'm just wondering why the
17 numbers are as they are.

18 Cameco looks like it's --

19 **MR. STEANE:** Bob Steane for the record.
20 I'm sorry, I thought the question was to staff.

21 The action levels and tables you have
22 referenced are for the effluent as opposed to the
23 incinerator.

24 **MEMBER MCDILL:** Yes, they are on the --
25 they are part of the document.

1 **MR. ASTLES:** Chris Astles for the record.

2 Those limits haven't changed from the
3 existing or the previous licence, so those values have
4 been maintained.

5 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you. That was fine.
6 Does staff have any comment?

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

8 As pointed out by staff, the modifications
9 to the incinerator what we are addressing in the
10 amendment relate to the incinerator stack and in that
11 case we are proposing a new action level for the
12 incinerator Stack No. 3 and the action level of five
13 grams per hour. So that is a significant change from the
14 current action level on the licence and that was the
15 purpose of the amendment.

16 **MEMBER McDILL:** So with respect to the
17 stack emissions, the five is the maximum discharge rate
18 for action level and 10 is the maximum discharge rate on
19 the stack. Is that correct?

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

21 That is correct. Again, the item before
22 the Commission is the incinerator stack.

23 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

24 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Graham.

25 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

1 Just a follow up to Dr. McDill's question
2 with regard to the operation of the new incinerator, the
3 proposed changes. It hasn't been in operation since the
4 first of the year because of regulations. Pending
5 approval, from the time of approval, what would the
6 timeframe be before the new incinerator or the new
7 equipment could be functional, operational?

8 **MR. ASTLES:** Chris Astles for the record.
9 Depending on the time you get the
10 approval, I'd like to say approximately about a month to
11 starting it up.

12 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** So you have the equipment
13 on site -- I mean it's not a matter of waiting for a
14 manufacturer to produce something and then get it. You
15 have it to install.

16 **MR. ASTLES:** Chris Astles for the record.
17 Yes, it's all on site.

18 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Backlog will be -- it's
19 all of 2007's production you have been storing. How long
20 will it take you to deplete the inventory that you have
21 been storing? I know you are going to go from four or
22 five hours a day for a couple of days a week to seven to
23 12 -- 10 to 12 hours a day and so on. How long will it
24 take you to use up that inventory?

25 **MR. ASTLES:** Chris Astles for the record.

1 One of the things we have to consider is
2 the commissioning of the equipment, which may slow down
3 the actual feed process until we get everything operating
4 properly. We would like to make the assumption that
5 within a month we would be about caught up to the backlog
6 of inventory.

7 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** My other question in this
8 relationship, I know you are going to burn some oil, use
9 oil that comes up from Port Hope. I think through one of
10 the other hearings that we have had over this, on this
11 subject, it's a matter of a few barrels a month, it's not
12 large quantities

13 Why does the incinerator have to work say
14 three to 400 times more than what it is right now? Is it
15 a slower feed? Why do you have to run 10 to 12 hours a
16 day compared to what you are now once the backlog is
17 depleted?

18 **MR. DeGRAW:** Joe DeGraw for the record.

19 The application was also to burn
20 contaminated combustible material from Port Hope, which
21 would be much more volume than just the oil.

22 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** But the feed to the
23 incinerator is not slowed down then the feed will be at
24 the same speed or approximately the same as what it has
25 been under the old circumstances.

1 **MR. DeGRAW:** There is a design rate for
2 the incinerator. I believe it is 309 kilograms per hour.
3 That won't change.

4 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** One other question I have,
5 Madam Chair, and that is to CNSC staff.

6 Are the PDPs and the financial guarantees,
7 all in good standing on this project with the licensee?

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

9 Currently, there is an approved PDP for
10 the facility and a financial guarantee.

11 At the Day Two hearing that was held in
12 November CNSC staff made a commitment that the PDPs and
13 financial guarantees would be updated. We will be coming
14 to the Commission shortly with those revised financial
15 guarantees based on currently approved PDPs. They will
16 be before the Commission within the next several months.

17 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** So there is nothing
18 outstanding. The PDPs are approved. It's just to get
19 the new financial guarantee in place. Is that correct?

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

21 We are waiting to get that before the
22 Commission so that the new financial guarantee can be put
23 in place.

24 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Does the licensee have any
25 comments on that? You don't foresee any major problems

1 there, do you?

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

3 No, there will be no problems with the
4 financial guarantee.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** That was what we wanted
6 to hear.

7 Thank you.

8 Any further questions? Dr. McDill, any
9 further questions?

10 Thank you very much then.

11 With respect to this matter I propose the
12 Commission confer with regards to the information we have
13 considered today and then determine if further
14 information is needed or if the Commission is ready to
15 proceed with the decision and we will advise accordingly.

16 Thank you very much. This brings to a
17 close the hearings of the Canadian Nuclear Safety
18 Commission today.

19 Thank you very much. Sorry again for the
20 delay.

21 --- Upon adjourning at 5:18 p.m.