

Record of Proceedings, Including Reasons for Decision

In the Matter of

Proponent Hydro-Québec

Subject Environmental Assessment Screening Report
for the Proposed Modifications to the Gentilly
Radioactive Waste Management Facilities and
the Refurbishment and Continued Operation of
the Gentilly-2 Nuclear Generating Station until
2035

Dates of
Hearing November 7 and 8, 2006

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Proponent: Hydro-Québec

Address: 4900 Bécancour Boulevard, Gentilly, Bécancour, Quebec
G9H 3X3

Purpose: Environmental Assessment Screening Report for the Proposed Modifications to the Gentilly Radioactive Waste Management Facilities and the Refurbishment and Continued Operation of the Gentilly-2 Nuclear Generating Station until 2035

Application received: June 20, 2006

Dates of hearing: November 7 and 8, 2006

Location: Auberge Godefroy, 17575, Bécancour Boulevard.
Saint-Grégoire Sector, Bécancour, Quebec

Members present: L.J. Keen, Chair
A. Harvey
J.G. Paquet

Secretary: M.A. Leblanc
Recording Secretary: P.D. Bourgeau
General Counsel: Jacques Lavoie

Applicant Represented by		Document Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• R. Cacchione, President, Hydro-Québec Production• R. Landry, Senior Director, Nuclear Development and Production Project• M. Désilets, Director, Nuclear Production• J.G. Giguère, Director, Gentilly-2 Projects, Government Authorizations and Security• C. Drouin, Chief, Refurbishment Pre-project• M. R. Rhéaume, Spokesperson, Hydro-Québec Production, Gentilly-2		CMD 06-H25.1 CMD 06-H25.1A
CNSC Staff		Document Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• P. Thompson• C. David• M. Lupien• S. Hamlat	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• K. Lafrenière• D. Howard• C. Moses	CMD 06-H25
Intervenors		
See Appendix A		

Decision and Reasons:

Date of Decision:

November 8, 2006

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Decision	4
Issues and Commission Findings	4
1. Thoroughness of Screening Report	4
2. Probability and Significance of Environmental Effects	5
Adequacy of Assessment Method	6
Environmental Effects of the Project	7
<i>Refurbishment of Gentilly-2 NGS in 2011-2012 and Continued Operation</i>	7
<i>Construction and Operation of Storage Facilities</i>	7
<i>Failure and Accidents</i>	8
<i>Conclusion</i>	8
Environmental Effects on the Project	9
Cumulative Effects of the Project	9
3. Nature and Extent of Public Concerns	10
Follow-up Program	11
Conclusion	12

Introduction

1. Hydro-Québec has, in a letter to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC¹), stated its intent to refurbish the Gentilly-2 Nuclear Generating Station (NGS) and to submit a licence amendment in order to authorize the modification of the Gentilly-2 Radioactive Waste Management Facilities (proposed project). Gentilly-2 NGS is located in Bécancour, Quebec.
2. The proposed project includes the following:
 - refurbishment of Gentilly-2 NGS and continuation of its operation until 2035;
 - construction of a new *Solid Radioactive Waste Management Facility* (SRWMF) dedicated to solid radioactive waste from:
 - current operation of Gentilly-2 NGS until 2011;
 - refurbishment work in 2011-2012;
 - continued operation of the plant until 2035; and
 - increase in capacity in the *Used Fuel Dry Storage Area* (UFDSA).
3. Under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*² (CEAA), the CNSC is a “federal authority” and is thus subject to certain obligations with respect to the federal environmental assessment (EA) under the Act. The CNSC may also be a “responsible authority”³ under the CEAA and may thus be required to ensure that a federal EA is conducted on a project involving an amendment to a CNSC licence. An EA screening report has been prepared for this purpose.
4. For the Hydro-Québec project, the CNSC staff ensured, as the responsible authority, that an EA was completed and an EA screening report was prepared. The purpose of the EA screening report is to enable the Commission, drawing on the environmental effects review and recommendations by CNSC staff, to make a decision on the EA of the project, pursuant to section 20 of the CEAA.
5. Before making a decision on the proposed project under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*⁴ (NSCA), the Commission must, in accordance with the requirements of the CEAA, make a decision on the EA screening of the project. This report describes the Commission’s review of the EA screening report and its reasons for decision. The Commission is the sole authority responsible for the EA.

¹The 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.

² S.C. 1992, c. 37.

³ For the purpose of the environmental assessment, the responsible authority is determined under s. 11(1) of the CEAA.

⁴ S.C. 1997, c. 9.

6. Federal authorities and various interested parties, including the public, had the opportunity to comment on the guidelines and the draft EA screening report. The final report, along with responses to comments from interested parties and federal authorities, are contained in Appendix A of document CMD 06-H25.

Guidelines

7. At the public hearing held on June 26, 2003, on the *Environmental Assessment Guidelines*⁵ (Guidelines) for the EA screening of the proposed modifications to the Gentilly Radioactive Waste Management Facilities, CNSC staff was of the opinion that no amendment to the Gentilly-2 NGS operating licence would be required for its refurbishment project. On August 29, 2003, the Commission approved the Guidelines.
8. CNSC staff subsequently revised its opinion and indicated that an amendment to the plant operating licence would be required in order to authorize the plant refurbishment with a view to continue its operation until 2035. CNSC staff recommended that the Commission revoke its original decision of August 2003 so that the EA could take into account the refurbishment work and cumulative effects of plant operations until 2035.
9. Further to a public hearing held on September 15, 2005, the Commission revoked the decision of August 29, 2003, and approved the revised guidelines (attached to CMD 05-H31) incorporating an expanded scoping. The guidelines define the scope of both the project and the assessment to be conducted. CNSC staff used them to delegate production of the EA report, in preparation for the EA screening report, to Hydro-Québec, in accordance with section 17 of the CEAA.

Approval of Proposed Project

10. Should the Commission approve the EA Screening Report, authorization would be required before the new radioactive waste and irradiated fuel management facilities could be constructed and subsequently operated. This would require amendment of the operating licence for the storage areas, pursuant to subsection 24(2) of the NSCA.
11. CNSC staff also identified a need to amend the Operating Policies and Principles (OP&Ps) for the plant, referred to in the licence, in order to authorize its refurbishment. CNSC staff also established that the Gentilly-2 NGS restart would be subject to regulatory requirements in order to permit its operation until 2035. Those requirements will require approvals in terms of its operating licence issued under subsection 24(2) of the NSCA.

⁵ *Record of Proceedings, Including Reasons for Decision – Hydro-Québec – Redetermination – Environmental Assessment Guidelines (EA Guidelines) for the Proposed Modifications to the Gentilly Radioactive Waste Management Facilities and Refurbishment of the Gentilly-2 NGS, October 6, 2005.*

12. As a corporation whose sole shareholder is the Government of Quebec, Hydro-Québec is subject to the environmental impact assessment and review procedure provided in section 31.1 et seq. of the *Environmental Quality Act*⁶ and paragraph 2(m) of the *Regulations Respecting Environmental Impact Assessment and Review*.⁷
13. Consequently, Hydro-Québec was required to conduct an environmental impact review of the proposed modification to the radioactive waste storage areas at the Gentilly NGS further to a directive from Quebec's Minister of Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks. The environmental impact review was published in January 2004, and the project was the subject of a public hearing by Quebec's Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement (BAPE), whose report was filed with the Minister in March 2005 and published by the latter in May 2005. The Government of Quebec will announce its decision on the project as an order-in-council authorizing or rejecting the project, with or without modifications and under conditions set by it. The refurbishment and continuation of operations at Gentilly-2 NGS are not subject to the provincial procedure.

Factors Considered

14. In its consideration of the EA screening report, the Commission had to determine the following:
 - (a) whether the EA screening report was complete;
 - (b) whether, given the mitigation described in the EA screening report, the project was likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects;
 - (c) whether the project should be referred to the federal Minister of the Environment for review by a panel or for mediation, pursuant to paragraph 20(1)(c) of the CEAA; and
 - (d) whether the Commission would consider the application to amend the licence under the NSCA, in accordance with paragraph 20(1)(a) of the CEAA.

Hearing

15. In making its decision, the Commission considered the information presented for a public hearing held on November 7 and 8, 2006, in Bécancour, Quebec. The hearing was conducted in accordance with the Commission's decision-making procedures pursuant to the CEAA and the *Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Rules of Procedure*.⁸ During the hearing, the Commission received written submissions and heard oral presentations from

⁶ R.S.Q., c. Q-2.

⁷ c. Q-2, s. 9.

⁸ S.O.R./2000-211.

Hydro-Québec (CMD 06-H25.1 and CMD 06-H25.1A), CNSC staff (CMD 06-H25) and 49 intervenors, as listed in the Appendix to this Record of Proceedings.

Decision

16. Based on its consideration of the matter, as described in detail in the following sections of this Record of Proceedings, the Commission decides the following:

- (a) that the EA screening report, annexed to CMD 06-H25, is complete; that the scope of both the project and the assessment were determined appropriately, in accordance with sections 15 and 16 of the CEAA, and that all factors were considered;
- (b) that, given the mitigation described in the EA screening report, the project is unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects;
- (c) that there is no need to refer the project to the federal Minister of the Environment for review by a panel or for mediation;
- (d) that the Commission will consider the application to amend the licence, in accordance with the provisions of the NSCA and paragraph 20(1)(a) of the CEAA.

Issues and Commission Findings

17. The Commission's decision for each of the four factors listed in paragraph 14 above was based primarily on the following considerations: (1) thoroughness of the EA screening report, (2) probability and significance of environmental effects, and (3) nature and extent of public concerns. Its conclusions are summarized below.

1. Thoroughness of EA Screening Report

18. In order to establish whether the EA screening report was complete, the Commission had to determine whether the assessment adequately defined the scope of the project and the factors for consideration.
19. CNSC staff stated that it had established EA Guidelines, including statements of the scope of the project and the factors for consideration, in accordance with sections 15 and 16 of the CEAA. In its opinion, the EA screening report contained information on the full scope of the project and on each factor requiring screening, in accordance with section 16 of the CEAA and as set out in the *Environmental Assessment Guidelines* approved by the Commission on September 15, 2005.

20. CNSC staff stated that the EA screening report contained basic information on the project, a description of both the project and the existing environment, the results of EA studies, recommendations on required mitigation, recommendations on the follow-up program, and conclusions by CNSC staff on the EA results.
21. The CNSC stated that it was the sole authority responsible for the screening under the CEAA and that, under the *Regulations Respecting the Coordination by Federal Authorities of Environmental Assessment Procedures and Requirements*⁹ made pursuant to the CEAA, Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Health Canada, Natural Resources Canada and the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada were advised of the project and asked to define their role as responsible authorities or federal authorities having specialist information or knowledge.
22. Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Health Canada and Natural Resources Canada stated that, although they were not responsible authorities within the meaning of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, they wished to participate in the assessment as federal authorities having specialist information or knowledge. The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada was of the opinion that it had no role in the assessment but asked specifically that the Wôlinak Abenaki be consulted during the assessment.
23. All work related to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the radioactive waste storage areas is subject to the Quebec and Canadian EA processes, while the refurbishment of the plant and its continued operation are subject to the federal process.
24. CNSC staff conducted a screening-type EA and wrote an EA screening report, to comply with the requirements of the CEAA. As well, CNSC staff exercised its discretion by inviting public comment on the EA screening report pursuant to subsection 18(3) of the CEAA. Appendix 2 of CMD 06-H25 contains a summary of public comments.
25. Based on this information, the Commission is satisfied that the EA and the EA screening report are complete and that no additional factors are required to define the scope of the project.
26. The Commission concludes that, based on the information contained in the EA screening report, it can proceed with an examination of the probability and significance of environmental effects, the adequacy of the proposed mitigation and public concerns about the project.

2. Probability and Significance of Environmental Effects

27. This section deals with the Commission's findings from its consideration of whether the project, in light of the mitigation described, was likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. In considering this issue, the Commission first addressed the adequacy of the review methods applied to determine and assess potential environmental

⁹ S.O.R./97-181.

effects, and then examined the anticipated effects on the relevant environmental components.

Adequacy of Assessment Method

28. With respect to the methods applied to assess the project's interactions with the environment, CNSC staff noted that the first step was to identify potential interactions between project-related activities and environmental components. Adverse effects are studied to determine which ones can be measured and to identify the mitigation required for effects that are considered adverse. Once the mitigation has been implemented, the extent of adverse residual effects can be assessed.
29. CNSC staff notes that valued ecosystem components (VECs) were selected on the basis of components or attributes recognized for their scientific, cultural, economic, health or aesthetic value, in consultation with the public. The selected components were then confirmed by CNSC staff, starting from the early stages of the EA.
30. CNSC staff notes that, of the initial list of 42 VECs identified in the study area, 27 VECs were selected because they could be directly or indirectly affected by the project's execution.
31. With respect to consultation with interested parties, CNSC staff stressed the extent of consultation with the community, interested parties and the government, throughout the EA process.
32. Throughout the EA process, that is, during development of guidelines and preparation of both the environmental impact assessment and the EA screening report, various participants, including the community affected by the project, the public, agencies from various levels of government and the Wôlinak Abenaki Band Council (Abenaki Band Council), were kept informed of and were invited to the consultations.
33. Following a meeting between Hydro-Québec and the Abenaki Band Council, the latter sent the president of Hydro-Québec a letter and a resolution setting out its opposition to the project. Subsequent invitations from Hydro-Québec to the Abenaki Band Council were declined.
34. In the pre-project period, Hydro-Québec implemented a communication program to inform and consult with the public, primarily through meetings with target groups from different areas of activity, public meetings with local populations and periodic meetings with community representatives.
35. Hydro-Québec also stressed that the radioactive waste management area project also received public scrutiny under a mandate of the BAPE, which published a report of enquiry and public hearing in May 2005.

36. The Commission is satisfied that the consulting methods used during the EA, including the possibility of commenting on and examining the EA screening report, are acceptable and provide a suitable basis for assessing public concerns about the project. Its conclusions on the subject are addressed below, in the “Nature and Extent of Public Concerns” section.
37. Based on its consideration of the EA screening report and according to the information received, the Commission concludes that the EA methods are acceptable and appropriate and that the EA screening report is complete and meets the requirements of the CEAA.

Environmental Effects of the Project

Refurbishment of Gentilly-2 NGS in 2011-2012 and Continued Operation

Physical, Biological and Human Environment

38. The EA screening report raises a number of probable adverse effects on the physical, biological and human environment during the Gentilly-2 NGS refurbishment. For example, it refers to adverse effects on soil profile and stability; adverse effects on water quality; fluctuations in liquid discharge into aquatic environments; significant thermal and hydrodynamic fluctuations in the current plume; probable adverse effects related to the use of wildlife resources. On the other hand, CNSC staff notes that the EA screening report describes at length the various mitigation measures that Hydro-Québec would introduce to minimize those impacts.
39. CNSC staff emphasized that, taking into account the application of the mitigation proposed by Hydro-Québec, the residual environmental effects of the Gentilly-2 NGS refurbishment are not considered significant. CNSC staff also noted that, given the various special mitigation and risk management measures proposed, in its view, the refurbishment and continued operation of the station under normal circumstances until 2035 are unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, including those on VECs.

Construction and Operation of Storage Facilities

Physical, Biological and Human Environment

40. The EA screening report identified a number of probable adverse effects on the physical, biological and human environment during refurbishment, construction and operation of the storage facilities, including adverse effects on the following: soil profile and stability; changes in the tritium content of surface water, groundwater and air; effects on aquatic and land biota; worker exposure to radiation, although below the regulatory limit. On the other hand, CNSC staff notes that the EA screening report lists all the mitigation measures that Hydro-Québec would introduce to minimize those impacts.

41. CNSC staff stressed that, taking into account the application of proposed mitigation by Hydro-Québec, the residual environmental effects of construction and operation of storage facilities are not considered significant. CNSC staff added that, given the various special mitigation and risk management measures proposed, in its view, the construction and operation of the storage facilities under normal circumstances are unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, including those on VECs.

Failure and Accidents

42. With respect to the residual adverse effects on the environment, CNSC staff indicated that, in the EA screening report, a number of failure and accident scenarios were examined in detail to identify the significance of their effects. Tables 8.3 and 8.4 of the EA screening report summarize the consequences of all events related to failure or accident scenarios, which include chemical and radioactive spills, nuclear accidents and fires at the plant.
43. Taking into account the various risk management measures proposed, including multiple plant protection measures for the purpose of minimizing risk, the protection programs, the emergency measures plan and the low probability that such events would occur, CNSC staff is of the opinion that the project is unlikely to cause significant adverse effects in failure and accident scenarios.

Conclusion

44. The Commission asked CNSC staff to explain how it will ensure that the various mitigation measures proposed by Hydro-Québec would be established and followed up. CNSC staff indicated that the EA process has identified activities that could interact with the environment as well as appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, a number of such measures are already in place. In the case of refurbishment activities, the operating licence would stipulate that Hydro-Québec must establish both an environmental management system, to identify any activities that could affect the environment, and mitigation measures. Conditions would be included in the licence, if one is issued, to ensure that the proposed mitigation are introduced and that the necessary environmental follow-up are performed. CNSC staff would conduct document reviews and on-site inspections for this purpose.
45. Based on its review of the EA screening report and based on the above information and considerations, the Commission concludes that, given the mitigation that Hydro-Québec would introduce, the Gentilly-2 NGS refurbishment and the construction and operation of storage facilities are unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Environmental Effects on the Project

46. In addition to taking into account the extent to which the project could cause adverse environmental effects, the assessment must also include, in accordance with the CEEA, an examination of the adverse effect that the environment itself could have on the project.
47. CNSC staff stated that the EA focused on possible interactions between potential natural hazards and the project, the effects of any such interactions, the mitigation available and the significance of any probable residual adverse effect on the environment. Natural events considered in the analysis included flooding, high winds and tornadoes, earthquakes, lightning, cave-ins and landslides, meteorites and climate change. Human activities, including fires, traffic accidents, airplane crashes and projectiles, were also considered.
48. CNSC staff determined that the environmental effects identified were unlikely to have significant negative residual effects on the project. Design plans and operational measures, as well as emergency plans that have already been implemented and will continue to be updated, will make it possible to avoid or reduce the potential effects in question.
49. Based on the information received, the Commission concludes that the environment is unlikely to cause adverse effects on the project.

Cumulative Effects of the Project

50. Concerning the requirement to consider cumulative effects, the EA screening report identifies potential interactions between sources of cumulative project effects in combination with other projects or actions by humans, and environmental components. The assessment focused on the potential effect of radiation contamination on environmental quality (air, water, soil and biota) and on population health and welfare. These issues were selected because they are likely to be affected by the project and are among the concerns expressed by the public.
51. CNSC staff concluded that, taking into account the proposed mitigation, the residual cumulative effects likely to be caused by the project combined with other past, present or future human actions are not to be considered significant.
52. In response to questions by the Commission related to Gentilly-1's¹⁰ potential impact on cumulative effects, CNSC staff indicated that its conclusion on cumulative project effects considers all the factors in the existing environment, including the effects of the Gentilly-1 NGS.

¹⁰ The Commission notes that Gentilly-1 NGS has been on permanent shutdown since 1979. It was confirmed in the hearing that Gentilly-1 NGS is owned by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

53. Based on the information received, the Commission concludes that the project is unlikely to cause adverse effects on the environment.

3. Nature and Extent of Public Concern

54. On the issue of public concerns in the context of the Commission's review to determine whether the project should be referred to the Minister of the Environment, the Commission considered comments received during the public consultations described under "Adequacy of Assessment Method," as well as submissions during the public hearing.
55. The Commission heard several intervenors who expressed concerns about consequences of accidents (related to human error or equipment breakdown) or terrorism. While the Commission is of the opinion that it is inappropriate to discuss security issues in a public forum, in order to protect both the plant and the public, it was deemed necessary to question Hydro-Québec on the subject. Hydro-Québec explained that the reactor is designed to be protected, regardless of the damage incurred by the plant as a result of an event, incident or accident. The Commission also asked CNSC staff about plant security. CNSC staff confirmed that robustness analyses were submitted, in compliance with the licence. CNSC staff is satisfied with these analyses, noting that no significant vulnerability to this type of event exists.
56. The Commission is satisfied with the responses received and, specifically, with the fact that accident scenarios are adequately covered in section 8.2 of the EA screening report, which deals with failure and accident scenarios.
57. The Commission also heard several intervenors who support the proposed project, including some from representatives of Gentilly-2's labour unions and several of its retirees, who testified that its operations were safe, reliable and secure.
58. The Commission questioned some intervenors on their satisfaction with the EA, the results obtained, the EA screening report and the data contained therein. Although the intervenors expressed a number of concerns about the project, the majority of the comments received were positive.
59. One intervenor raised historical issues concerning the process used by the CNSC to fulfil its obligations under the CEEA. When questioned by the Commission about this, CNSC staff replied that, while scoping the EA for the Gentilly-2 facility, it had reconsidered the matter of authorizations required for the refurbishment and continued operation of the plant. However, CNSC staff is satisfied that the EA screening report, as presented in CMD 06-H25, meets all the requirements under the CEEA, in terms of both extent and public consultation.

60. In the hearing, several intervenors raised points dealing with economic matters. The Commission points out that the CNSC's raison d'être is not economic and thus its decisions are based not on the economic impact of a facility but on public safety, security, health, and environmental protection.
61. CNSC staff is satisfied that the concerns raised do not justify referring the project to the federal Minister of the Environment. CNSC staff indicated that it had examined the concerns and considered each comment before finalizing the EA screening report.
62. After reviewing the EA screening report, including the record of public comments and the intervenors' comments at the hearing, the Commission concludes that the concerns were examined appropriately when the EA screening report was finalized and that any relevant issues could be considered in the follow-up program and at the time of the future consideration of the licence application.
63. The Commission accordingly decides that it will not refer the project to the Minister of the Environment for review by a panel or for mediation, pursuant to paragraph 20(1)(c)(iii) of the CEAA.

Follow-up Program

64. CNSC staff stated that the purpose of the follow-up program is to check the accuracy of the anticipated effects of the project and to determine the effectiveness of the mitigation measures. The follow-up program may also be used to check that environmental and social commitments made in the pre-project stage are respected, and that mitigation measures are applied in such a way as to maximize their effectiveness in the field.
65. As the responsible authority under the CEAA, the CNSC is responsible for approving the follow-up program. Accordingly, the CNSC will have to ensure at the follow-up program's finalization stage, that Hydro-Québec has consulted with the interested parties, as required. The follow-up program will also have to be included in a licence condition concerning the radioactive waste storage areas and the plant restart after the refurbishment work planned in 2011-2012. Program results will have to be submitted to CNSC staff for verification. Implementation of the follow-up of the environmental components on which the program focuses may have to be incorporated into the existing monitoring program at Gentilly-2 NGS.
66. CNSC staff described the monitoring programs in detail in Table 11.1 of the EA screening report, which lists the VECs to be followed up during implementation of various aspects of the project, as well as actions to be taken during project execution.
67. Hydro-Québec Production undertook to initiate various programs, including the following: give the information and exchange table an official and permanent status; arrange for periodic meetings; establish an environmental follow-up committee and an ad

hoc ALARA committee; and, conduct a review of risk perception. The environmental follow-up committee would include representatives from departments, the CNSC and the neighbouring population.

68. The Commission is satisfied that the CNSC's follow-up program, aimed at verifying the accuracy of anticipated effects of the project and to determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures, will be effective and will make it possible, where necessary, to determine whether additional mitigation is required.

Conclusion

69. The Commission considered all the information and submissions presented by the proponent and CNSC staff that were placed on the record for the hearing. The Commission also considered all the intervenors' comments, as well as any interventions placed on the record for the hearing.
70. The Commission concludes that the EA screening report, enclosed with CMD 06-H25, is complete and satisfies all the applicable requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.
71. The Commission decides that it will not refer the project to the federal Minister of the Environment for review by a panel or for mediation. Furthermore, it concludes that the project is unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, given the mitigation described in the EA screening report.
72. Consequently, in accordance with paragraph 20(1)(a) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, the Commission decides that it will carry out the review of the licence application pursuant to the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*. If the application is approved, the project may proceed.

Linda J. Keen
Chair
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Date of decision: November 8, 2006

Date of release of Reasons for Decision: December 22, 2006

Appendix – Intervenors

Intervenors	Document Number
Auger Groupe Conseil Inc., represented by R. Auger	CMD 06-H25.2 CMD 06-H25.2A
Mouvement Vert Mauricie, represented by P. Rasmussen	CMD 06-H25.3
Centre local de développement (CLD) de la MRC de Bécancour, represented by D. Daviault	CMD 06-H25.4
Michel Ross	CMD 06-H25.5
Georges Addul-Nour	CMD 06-H25.6
Grégoire Vandal	CMD 06-H25.7
Serge Lafrenière	CMD 06-H25.8
Fédération des travailleurs et travailleuses du Québec (FTQ), represented by H. Massé, R. Perrault and S. Bousquet	CMD 06-H25.9
Henri Marois	CMD 06-H25.10
Canadian Nuclear Association (CNA), represented by P. Guimond	CMD 06-H25.11
Roland Boucher	CMD 06-H25.12
Chambre de commerce et d'industrie de Trois-Rivières, represented by C. Durand	CMD 06-H25.13
SNC-Lavalin Inc., represented by J. Victor	CMD 06-H25.14 CMD 06-H25.14A
Syndicat Professionnel des Ingénieurs d'Hydro-Québec (SPIHQ), represented by R. Chahine	CMD 06-H25.15
General Electric of Canada, Energy Division, represented by B. Lamarche	CMD 06-H25.16
Syndicat des spécialistes et professionnels d'Hydro-Québec, Local 4250 CUPE-FTQ, represented by B. Bouchard and M. Lupien	CMD 06-H25.17 CMD 06-H25.17A
Consultants VFP inc., represented by R. Houle	CMD 06-H25.18
L-3 Communications MAPPS Inc., represented by B. Weiss	CMD 06-H25.19
Jeune Chambre de commerce de la Mauricie, represented by J.P. Montreuil and G. Dallaire	CMD 06-H25.20
Louis Charest	CMD 06-H25.21
Ville de Bécancour, represented by M. Richard	CMD 06-H25.22
International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, AFL-CIO, CLC, UNI, represented by B. Lawson	CMD 06-H25.23
ENvironnement JEUnesse, represented by S. Bourdon and A. Trottier-Picard	CMD 06-H25.24
Greenpeace, represented by S.P. Stensil	CMD 06-H25.25
Society of Professional Engineers and Associates, represented by R. Beaudoin	CMD 06-H25.26
NUCLEONEX Inc., represented by M.A. Petrelli	CMD 06-H25.27
Association de l'industrie du Québec, represented by J.F. Samray and M. Dubeau	CMD 06-H25.28

Michel Duguay	CMD 06-H25.29 CMD 06-H25.29A
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, represented by B. Shalaby	CMD 06-H25.30 CMD 06-H25.30A
Paul J. Lafrenière	CMD 06-H25.31
Canadian Union of Public Employees, locals 957, 1500, 2000 and 4250, represented by S. Bousquet, C. Mailhot, M. Lupien, G. Isabelle and M. Manseau	CMD 06-H25.32 CMD 06-H25.32A
Canadian Nuclear Society, Quebec Section, represented by É. Varin	CMD 06-H25.33 CMD 06-H25.33A
Chambre de commerce de Bécancour, represented by Ms. Pépin	CMD 06-H25.34
Marcel Jetté	CMD 06-H25.35
Canadian Nuclear Workers Council, represented by D. Shier and S. Bousquet	CMD 06-H25.36
Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility, represented by G. Edwards	CMD 06-H25.37
Ville de Trois-Rivière, represented by Y. Lévesque	CMD 06-H25.38
Opti-Conseil Inc.	CMD 06-H25.39
Ganotec Inc.	CMD 06-H25.40
Société du parc industriel et portuaire de Bécancour	CMD 06-H25.41
North American Young Generation in Nuclear	CMD 06-H25.42
Association professionnelle des cadres de premier niveau d'Hydro-Québec (APCPNHQ)	CMD 06-H25.43
Greenspirit Strategies Ltd.	CMD 06-H25.44
Pluritec & Johnston-Vermette	CMD 06-H25.45
International Safety Research	CMD 06-H25.46
Institut de génie nucléaire	CMD 06-H25.47
Ordre des ingénieurs du Québec	CMD 06-H25.48
Jacques Dagenais	CMD 06-H25.49 CMD 06-H25.49A
Health Professionals for Global Survival	CMD 06-H25.50 CMD 06-H25.50A