

**Canadian Nuclear
Safety Commission**

**Commission canadienne de
sûreté nucléaire**

Public hearing

Audience publique

Cameco Corporation:

Application by Cameco
Corporation for the renewal of
Class IB Nuclear Fuel Facility
Operating Licence for Cameco Fuel
Manufacturing Inc. in Port Hope, Ontario

Cameco Corporation :

Demande de Cameco Corporation
Pour le renouvellement du permis
D'exploitation de son installation de
combustible nucléaire de catégorie IB
pour l'installation Cameco Fuel
Manufacturing Inc., située à Port
Hope en Ontario

January 18th, 2012

Le 18 janvier 2012

Town Park Recreation Centre
62 McCaul Street,
Port Hope, Ontario

Centre récréatif Town Park
62, rue McCaul
Port Hope (Ontario)

Commission Members present

Commissaires présents

Dr. Michael Binder
Dr. Moyra McDill
Mr. Dan Tolgyesi
Dr. Ronald Barriault
Mr. André Harvey

M. Michael Binder
Mme Moyra McDill
M. Dan Tolgyesi
M. Ronald Barriault
M. André Harvey

Secretary:

Secrétaire:

Mr. Marc Leblanc

M. Marc Leblanc

General Counsel :

Conseillère générale:

Ms. Lisa Thiele

Mme Lisa Thiele

1 --- Upon resuming at 8:09 p.m. /L'audience est reprise à
2 20h09

3 **THE CHAIRMAN:** We're back. The next item
4 on the agenda today is Hearing Day One on the matter of
5 ---

6 **MR. LEBLANC:** Day Two, a mistake. Day Two.

7 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I just read what's in front
8 of me here.

9 **(LAUGHTER/RIRES)**

10 **THE CHAIRMAN:** It says Day One. So, first
11 thing, let me start again.

12 The next item on the agenda today is
13 Hearing Day Two on the matter of the application by Cameco
14 Corporation for the Renewal of Class IB Nuclear Fuel
15 Facility Operating Licence for the Cameco Fuel
16 Manufacturing Facility in Port Hope.

17 Marc.

18 **MR. LEBLANC:** Yes, this is Day Two of the
19 public hearing. The first day of the public hearing, or
20 Day One, was held on November 3rd, 2011 in Ottawa. The
21 Notice of Public Hearing 2011-H-09 was published on August
22 24th, 2011.

23 Presentations were made on Day One by the
24 applicant, Cameco, under CMDs 11-H17.1 and .1A and by
25 Commission staff under 11-H17.

1 The public was invited to participate
2 either by oral presentation or written submission.
3 December 19th was the deadline set for filing by
4 intervenors. The Commission received 48 requests for
5 intervention. January 11th was the deadline for filing of
6 supplementary information. I note that supplementary
7 information has been filed by CNSC staff, Cameco, as well
8 as intervenors.

9 Participant funding was available to
10 intervenors to prepare for and participate in this
11 hearing. The Commissioner received no requests for
12 funding regarding the chemical fuel manufacturing
13 facility.

14 Mr. President.

15 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Marc.

16 I'd like to start the hearing by calling on
17 the presentation by Cameco, as outlined in CMD H17.1B and
18 H17.1C.

19 And, Mr. Thorne, you're still with us? Go
20 ahead.

21
22 **Cameco Corporation:**

23 **Application by Cameco**

24 **Corporation for the Renewal of**

25 **Class IB Nuclear Fuel Facility**

1 **Operating Licence for Cameco**
2 **Fuel Manufacturing Inc. in**
3 **Port Hope, Ontario**

4
5 **11-H16.1B/and 11-H16.1C**
6 **Oral presentation from**
7 **Cameco Corporation**

8
9 **MR. THORNE:** Thank you, President Binder.
10 For the record, my name is Andy Thorne and I'm the Vice-
11 President of Cameco's Fuel Manufacturing -- sorry -- Fuel
12 Services Division. It's late.

13 It's my pleasure to introduce Alex Kodarin
14 and Mike Longinov.

15 Alex joined Cameco's Fuel Manufacturing
16 Business as General Manager in June 2009. He's
17 responsible for the production of CANDU fuel assemblies in
18 CFM's licence facility in Port Hope, as well as activities
19 in Cobourg that include the forming, welding, brazing and
20 machining of the zirconium alloys for the nuclear industry
21 in Canada and abroad.

22 Alex previously served as Vice-President
23 for George Weston Bakeries Ltd. where he oversaw bakery
24 operations for the Ontario and Atlantic regions.

25 Prior to that, he worked for a consulting

1 firm in Boston that focused exclusively on engagements in
2 the areas of operations, supply chain and new product
3 introduction.

4 Mike serves as Manager of Environment and
5 Occupational Health and Safety and joined the company in
6 1997. In this position, he oversees areas that include
7 occupational and industrial safety, radiation safety,
8 environmental monitoring, security and licensing.

9 Prior to that, Mike worked for two nuclear
10 consulting firms over an eight-year period that
11 specialized in waste management, decommissioning, health
12 physics, transportation and licensing.

13 I now turn the presentation over to Alex.

14 **MR. KODARIN:** Thank you. Good evening.
15 For the record, my name is Alex Kodarin. I am the General
16 Manager of Chemical Fuel Manufacturing.

17 I'm pleased to provide some supplementary
18 information that addresses several questions that were
19 asked during our Day One Hearing in November.

20 Specifically, I will speak to flood studies
21 and groundwater management.

22 CFM currently operates with a licence that
23 became effective March 1st, 2007. Our primary business is
24 to manufacture fuel bundles for CANDU reactors in Canada
25 using natural and depleted EO₂.

1 our buildings are well above the maximum flood elevation.
2 And the maximum rainfall event in West Gages Creek would
3 not create a flood event that would impact CFM's
4 operations.

5 The slide shown here predicts the extent of
6 flooding at West Gages Creek, and north is roughly at the
7 top of the page. The modelled 100-year flooding area is
8 shown in red. The CFM licence facility is shown near the
9 bottom middle of the slide, outlined in yellow.

10 And as you can see, the flooding in the
11 watershed falls well short of the licence facility and it
12 falls short of our employee parking lot on the east side
13 of our property as well.

14 At Day One Hearing, CFM was also asked to
15 provide further detail on our groundwater management
16 program. Our program has been in place for several years
17 now, and CFM is committed to continuing with it.

18 We now include some 76 wells in our
19 groundwater monitoring program. With the assistance of
20 third-party experts, CFM has continued to enhance its
21 understanding of the extent of historical uranium in
22 groundwater.

23 During the licensing period, 23 additional
24 wells were added to our inventory to help with
25 delineation. With this further delineation, experts have

1 concluded that uranium concentration in groundwater is not
2 increasing and that there is no evidence indicating off-
3 site migration.

4 We have also reconfirmed that the on-site
5 concentration patterns are consistent with historic use of
6 uranium. There are no uranium sources from current
7 operations.

8 This figure depicts the concentration of
9 uranium in groundwater for the overburden. A similar
10 diagram exists for the bedrock, which we have included in
11 the CMD update document. The red dots are the new wells
12 drilled for further delineation and the blue dots were
13 wells in place prior to this latest licensing period.

14 Both the overburden and bedrock diagrams
15 indicate that the uranium in groundwater is isolated to
16 the northeast corner of our main facility. As I mentioned
17 earlier, our studies confirm that the source of uranium in
18 groundwater is from historic activities and that uranium
19 is not migrating off site. We will continue to monitor
20 the situation.

21 And as part of our continual improvement
22 program, we will further assess the nature of this
23 historic source of contamination and take appropriate
24 action in 2012.

25 The material we outlined during Day One in

1 November, along with the information provided today, both
2 demonstrate that CFM has operated the facility in a safe,
3 clean and reliable manner and is qualified to receive a
4 new 10-year licence.

5 The facility continue to comply with the
6 *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*, all relevant regulations
7 and our current licence.

8 We are proud of our past performance and
9 remain committed to operating in a compliant manner in the
10 future.

11 Thank you for your time.

12 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

13 I'd now like to move to the presentation
14 from CNSC as outlined CMD H17.B.

15 Mr. Elder, please proceed.

16
17 **11-H17.B**

18 **Oral presentation by**

19 **CNSC staff**
20

21 **MR. ELDER:** Good evening, Mr. President,
22 Members of the Commission. My name is Peter Elder,
23 Director General at the Directorate of Nuclear Cycle and
24 Facilities Regulation.

25 At the front table with me today are Mr.

1 B.R. Ravishankar, Director of the Nuclear Processing
2 Facilities Division and Mr. Julian Amalraj, the Senior
3 Project Officer in the same division. We also still have
4 our members of the CNSC staff here as well as those
5 available in Ottawa by teleconference.

6 We are here to present CMD -- Commissioner
7 Member Document -- 11-H17 and 11-H17B in regard to the
8 licence application for Cameco Fuel Manufacturing in Port
9 Hope.

10 Similar to our presentation on the
11 conversion facility we will go over very briefly the
12 Cameco Fuel Manufacturing, our overall licensing
13 performance, the Day Two supplemental information and then
14 our conclusions and recommendations.

15 Cameco Fuel Manufacturing, we refer to as
16 CFM, is owned and operated by Cameco Corporation. It is a
17 Class 1B facility, which you can see is located in Port
18 Hope, a few kilometres away from the conversion facility.

19 CFM employs approximately 190 people in
20 various capacities and has been in operation since 1965
21 under various management. It manufactures uranium dioxide
22 pellets and assembles nuclear fuel bundles for use in
23 CANDU -- in Canadian nuclear reactors. It has and is
24 capable of handling depleted natural and enriched uranium.

25 The current licence expires this February

1 and as Cameco's noted they've applied for a licence with a
2 term of 10 years.

3 So now Mr. Julian Amalraj will quickly go
4 over our assessment.

5 **MR. AMALRAJ:** Thank you, Mr. Elder.

6 Good evening, Mr. President, and Members of
7 the Commission.

8 For the record, my name is Julian Amalraj,
9 Senior Project Officer at the Nuclear Processing
10 Facilities Division.

11 During Day One Public Hearing staff
12 presented details on CNSC compliance verification plan and
13 associated activities which included 15 on-site
14 inspections for this facility.

15 From their review of CFM's compliance
16 performance in the current licence period CNSC staff find
17 that CFM continues to maintain comprehensive and mature
18 core programs in all safety and control areas.

19 CNSC staff's assessment of CFM's overall
20 performance in all 14 safety and control areas is
21 satisfactory.

22 As part of Day Two supplemental information
23 we now present key statistics in safety and control areas
24 of radiation protection, environmental protection and
25 conventional health and safety.

1 Presented here in this graph is the maximum
2 effective dose to a member of the public for CFM.

3 From the review of the data presented CNSC
4 staff conclude that the maximum effective dose to a member
5 of the public from CFM's radiological emissions remains a
6 very small fraction of the regulatory limit of one
7 millisievert per year with the maximum value of 0.037
8 millisievert recorded for the year 2011.

9 The increase in 2011 values were attributed
10 to temporary storage of manufactured fuel bundles at the
11 facility. CFM is working to reduce this increase by
12 constructing a shielded storage facility that is expected
13 to be operational in 2012.

14 This slide presents the annual effective
15 dose for a nuclear energy worker at CFM. The data is
16 taken from CFM's annual compliance reports for 2006
17 through 2010.

18 As evident from the graph, the average
19 effective dose to workers at CFM during the current
20 licensing period is low and the maximum effective dose is
21 well below regulatory limits.

22 Of relevance to CFM due to production
23 workers handling of uranium pellets manually is the annual
24 extremity and skin doses, hence we have presented the same
25 here.

1 Again CFM has monthly and quarterly action
2 levels for these parameters. The annual average extremity
3 and skin radiation doses, as well as the maximum extremity
4 and skin doses received by nuclear energy workers at CFM
5 are well below regulatory limits.

6 We now present key statistics for the
7 safety and control area of environmental protection.

8 Statistics presented here show releases by
9 the facility to the environment and in subsequent slides
10 we present the receiving environment monitoring results to
11 show impact.

12 In this slide we show CFM's total annual
13 uranium releases for the current licence period. There
14 are 12 stacks monitored at this facility.

15 The current licence limit is based on
16 derived release limits with the regulatory limit of one
17 millisievert dose to public as the basis. For the
18 proposed new licence CNSC staff have proposed a more
19 stringent value using 50 microsievert dose to public based
20 on ALARA principles.

21 The facility is also governed by action
22 levels that ensure the overall emissions are monitored and
23 controlled effectively.

24 CFM's annual uranium in air emissions are
25 well below licence limits with the maximum values recorded

1 in 2008.

2 CFM's total annual uranium and liquid
3 effluent releases for the current licence period is show
4 here. CFM's annual uranium and liquid effluents are well
5 below regulatory limits with the maximum values recorded
6 in 2010.

7 We now present monitoring data on the
8 receiving environment starting with uranium concentrations
9 in ambient air around CFM.

10 The graph shows CFM's results from four
11 high volume air samplers located at the facility when
12 compared with the Ontario Ministry of Environment's
13 proposed air quality standard for uranium which is 0.03
14 micrograms per meter cubed.

15 Uranium concentrations in ambient air
16 around CFM facility are well below Ontario's air quality
17 standard.

18 This slide presents the average uranium
19 concentrations in soil at the CFM facility. The values as
20 reported here are from the licensee and based on a soil
21 monitoring program which includes 23 locations around the
22 facility with results reported on an annual basis.

23 The average uranium concentrations in soil
24 at CFM are below Ontario MOE's guideline for uranium in
25 soil for residential land of 23 micrograms per meter

1 cubed.

2 Another key component of monitoring
3 receiving environment is groundwater. During Day One
4 Public Hearing the Commission requested data on
5 groundwater flow direction as well as historical
6 contamination data. This information is submitted to CNSC
7 by the licensee on an annual basis with the last report
8 submitted by April 2011.

9 CNSC staff are satisfied with the
10 information submitted in the last annual groundwater
11 report as well as information provided by CFM for Day Two.

12 Another safety and control area of interest
13 to the Commission and public presented here is
14 conventional health and safety. For CFM there were no
15 safety significant events during the review period.

16 CNSC staff is satisfied with CFM's event
17 detection reporting, investigation processes and timely
18 implementation of corrective and preventative actions.
19 Overall performance of the licensee in this safety and
20 control area was satisfactory.

21 During Day One Public Hearing on November
22 3rd, 2011 Commission requested additional information on
23 outstanding action items from compliance inspections
24 related to management systems and radiation protection.
25 They also requested information on maximum probable flood

1 line for CFM facility and groundwater well locations and
2 historical contamination data at this facility.

3 CMD 11-H17.B presents status updates on
4 outstanding action items from inspections. All but one
5 action item have been closed by CNSC staff. CFM has
6 committed to completion of the open action item associated
7 with design control by February 2012.

8 CFM has submitted information on
9 groundwater well locations as well as historical
10 contamination as part of CMD 11-H17.1B as well as in
11 today's presentation here.

12 CNSC staff are satisfied with the
13 information presented.

14 Mr. Elder will now present CNSC staff
15 conclusions and recommendations for this facility.

16 **MR. ELDER:** CNSC staff conclude and based
17 on the licensee's application and past performance and the
18 licensee's -- and also our review of the programs and
19 resources in place, that CNSC's application -- CMF's
20 application for licence renewal meets the requirement of
21 the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*. Cameco has operated
22 CMF facility in compliance with the (inaudible) regulatory
23 requirements during the current licence period and is
24 qualified to carry out the activities as per the proposed
25 licence for a 10-year term.

1 Additional information presented here today
2 does not affect CNCS's staff's conclusion and
3 recommendations that were presented at Day One.

4 Our recommendations to conclusion are, to
5 the Commission are that they approve the issuance of a 10-
6 year nuclear fuel facility operating licence to Cameco
7 Fuel Manufacturing Incorporated and they also accept CMF's
8 revised financial guarantee of \$19.5 million. This is an
9 increase from the current one of \$17.9 million. This
10 concludes staff's presentation, we are now available to
11 answer any questions.

12 **MR. CHAIRMAN:** What we're going to do is a
13 little bit different. We'll reserve all our questions for
14 the last round and we'll go right into the intervention
15 and starting with the Municipality of Port Hope as
16 outlined in CMD 17.14 and 17.14A, Mayor Thompson the floor
17 is yours.

18
19 **11-H17.14 / 11-H17.14A**

20 **Oral presentation by**

21 **Linda Thompson**
22

23 **MAYOR THOMPSON:** Thank you, for the record
24 Mayor Linda Thompson and with me is our CAO Carl Cannon of
25 the Municipality of Port Hope. And again on behalf of all

1 the municipality's residents, Members thank you for being
2 in Port Hope.

3 I believe you have a good understanding of
4 our community profile and we are very pleased that you do.

5 I would just comment on, in regards to our
6 community, in some questions that were asked in the
7 earlier hearing in regards to the conversion facility and
8 that is in regards to a Centre of Excellence. Port Hope
9 has been very actively involved in economic development
10 and part of our economic development strategy includes a
11 Centre of Excellence.

12 And in fact since back since 2007 we have
13 worked extremely cooperatively with Cameco, with our local
14 MP, MPP and a number of post-secondary education
15 facilities to build on that Centre and that is something
16 that we are, we support as a community through our
17 economic development strategy and through other areas.

18 I just wanted to make one other note
19 outside of my regular presentation. Listening to the
20 hearings over a period of time, I was first elected back
21 in 2000 and I've been very privileged to be re-elected
22 four times in Port Hope. I get relicensed every four
23 years now as opposed to three.

24 Back during that time, Cameco and attending
25 hearings and that, there was often not lot information in

1 the community. If there was an incident at Cameco we
2 didn't always know about it. I know I have every faith
3 that the CNSC did.

4 That is very different, back in the last
5 hearing, to the standards and communication that happened
6 today are like night and day. And I think there has been
7 a continuous improvement that from my perspective, as an
8 elected official in this community, it is like night and
9 day.

10 The information that is provided to Cameco
11 to the community, the information that is provided by the
12 CNSC staff, the open houses that are held, the forums.
13 There is a huge amount of information out there and I will
14 say I think we've gone from one end of the spectrum to the
15 other. And the more information you provide the more
16 questions that get asked and that's good but sometimes you
17 can also go a little too far, in my personal opinion.

18 On having said that, you know we do, as a
19 municipality, do our due diligence and we have hired
20 Stantec Consulting to do a review of Cameco's Port Hope
21 conversion facility. And through that peer review -- here
22 we go, sorry -- just some general comments as we made
23 before, we appreciate that the licence renewal is clear
24 and concise; Cameco has made substantial improvement to
25 operations and community relations. They have responded

1 to several key challenges that emerged during the previous
2 licence period and have maintained and improved its public
3 information program during the current licence period.
4 Cameco's staff participates in those regular meetings with
5 the Mayor, CAO and provide regular updates to Council,
6 staff and the community.

7 And the key changes noted in Cameco's
8 safety culture including the improvements to management
9 system with the implementation of a corrective action
10 process and incident reporting system, including reporting
11 to the municipality, a positive development promoting
12 higher standard of safety and environmental performance
13 going forward.

14 The Stantec review did identify key
15 challenges. There is a, as is identified in our written
16 submission, Cameco has identified large quantities of
17 combustible, non-combustible and low-level radioactive and
18 recyclable waste, currently stored on-site. And they've
19 acknowledged that this, the inventory and lack of
20 available low-level radioactive management facility as a
21 key operational challenge.

22 Storage of large quantities of combustible
23 waste in a populated area is inappropriate and no plan is
24 provided for disposition of this waste. Cameco should be
25 encouraged to construct an appropriate, secure low-level

1 radioactive waste storage facility and determine a long-
2 term approach to waste management.

3 In regards to the decommissioning plan, we
4 raised the same concerns that we raised previously with
5 the conversion facility and to ensure that a facility is
6 available and those costs are appropriate for the
7 assumption of low-level radioactive waste arising from
8 decommissioning.

9 In regards to the proposed new licence, we
10 are very supportive of the shorter, more transparent
11 licence and the new licence condition handbook. And where
12 changes have been implemented they generally enshrine
13 processes, procedures already developed by Cameco and
14 represent an incremental tightening of radiation
15 protection or emission standards.

16 The municipality advocated during the
17 previous licence renewal process for a reduction in
18 release limits and is very pleased to see the reduction
19 reflected in the proposed new licence. We also support
20 the additional requirements introduced for recording
21 acquisition inventory and disposition of nuclear
22 substances and the reduction action levels of uranium in
23 air quality and liquid affluent monitoring.

24 A 10-year licence represents a long period
25 of time during when, which many changes could occur.

1 During the past 5-year licence period the CFM facility
2 changed ownership, underwent an environmental assessment
3 and cancelled their new production line. Enhancement to
4 management and safety culture are relatively recent and
5 processes bring CFM into alignment with other Cameco
6 facilities is ongoing and we believe very successful.

7 The municipality does believe a 5-year
8 licence or a 10-year licence with the commitment to a mid-
9 term review would be more appropriate.

10 Again, we thank you for the opportunity and
11 reaffirm that the municipality has a very positive
12 relationship with Cameco. They're an important member of
13 our community, both economically and socially, and we
14 strongly support the renewal of Cameco's Nuclear Fuel
15 Facility operating licence for the Port Hope fuel
16 manufacturing facility.

17 Thank you.

18 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Questions?
19 Monsieur Harvey.

20 **MEMBER HARVEY:** We start with a challenge
21 which is the storage on the site of different waste or
22 products. So we start by the staff asking, is there a
23 limitation to store on site Cameco decide how all the
24 different wastes are managed on site?

25 What's in the licence?

1 **MR. PETER ELDER:** In the licence, they are
2 allowed to store the waste produced from their facility in
3 accordance with a waste management plan and that plan has
4 to -- has to describe how they will deal with the waste
5 streams.

6 So there is now -- and this is a fairly new
7 requirement to make sure that there is a waste management
8 plan for each facility.

9 So some of the -- in some ways, some of the
10 challenges Cameco has identified are the fact that we
11 forced them to write down their plans.

12 So this is something we are aware of but
13 there's nothing that says there's a certain volume you can
14 store. You must be able to store it safely on site.

15 **MEMBER HARVEY:** But do you have on hand
16 such a plan now?

17 **MR. PETER ELDER:** Yes, there is a plan and
18 it's -- it describes what they -- they intend to do was to
19 send it somewhere else in Canada and there they're saying:
20 Well, there isn't a facility right now to send it to.

21 So in that regard, you may have heard this
22 is not an issue that is unique to Canada -- to Cameco and
23 we have been encouraged and encouraging NRCan discussions
24 with all the owners of low-level waste about some sort of
25 central approach or centralized approach to low-level

1 waste.

2 So NRCan does have a working group that
3 includes the -- well, I'll say the "small owners of waste"
4 other than OPG that has a proposal for their repository
5 for low-level waste.

6 So there is a group. I believe Cameco has
7 been participating in that one. If they're not, we'll get
8 them in touch with the people in NRCan.

9 **MEMBER HARVEY:** I turn to Cameco and have
10 their comment.

11 What are your intentions about that
12 storage?

13 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
14 record.

15 **MEMBER HARVEY:** And give us some indication
16 what's in your plan. What is in the plan?

17 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
18 record.

19 We, obviously, are -- are sensitive to the
20 sensitive to the fact that there is storage on site of
21 low-level waste.

22 We have, over the last year, put a
23 significant effort into developing plans to deal with that
24 waste. We have very specific plans for all the types of
25 waste and we intend, over the next several years, to

1 execute those plans.

2 So it is our intention to dispose of this
3 low-level contaminated waste.

4 **MEMBER HARVEY:** That just ---

5 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Can I jump in?

6 Can we stop dancing around this? Why don't
7 you give us the short-term? Is it in the short-term, the
8 next two/five years, keep the waste on site? And the next
9 five years, find some area or the long-term view is for a
10 facility yet to be built?

11 I'd really like to know a little bit more
12 details about what is the plan.

13 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
14 record.

15 We have several types of waste there. We
16 have -- we have contaminated combustible waste which we
17 have several options available to us.

18 One is that we did mention in Day 1 hearing
19 was to have that incinerated in Blind River. We're just
20 in the beginning of the discussions around that
21 possibility. That is a viable option for -- for CFM.

22 We have other ways such as metal
23 contaminated wastes which we are actually already in the
24 process and started last year, about mid-last year, to
25 start to process that waste. We have two -- two options

1 available to us there which we've already started to use.

2 One is to clean the waste on site which is
3 we started to do and, for waste that we cannot clean on
4 site and recycle, we have an outlet with our Port Hope
5 conversion facility to do some grip blasting and
6 processing on their site.

7 So that process is already under way.

8 So when I say we've got a plan in place, in
9 fact, we are already starting to execute again some of
10 that plan. We also have, over the last year, dealt with
11 some contaminated oil and found an outlet for that.

12 So I can provide more details, I suppose,
13 and we have the plan in place -- it's rather lengthy --
14 but the reality is we do have a short-term, a near-term
15 plan and also a long-term plan not to store the waste but,
16 in fact, to dispose of the waste.

17 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

18 Monsieur Havery?

19 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Yes. The total volume on
20 your side, waste volume, it's the result of how many years
21 of operation?

22 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
23 record.

24 Some of the -- the waste that's stored on
25 site is up to 20 years old. That's not all the waste.

1 It's anywhere from 20 years to as recently as last year.

2 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Each year, you add to that,
3 I suppose, and what would be the percentage of new volume
4 coming each year?

5 I think of the actual volume.

6 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
7 record.

8 The estimate that we've -- we've -- we have
9 right now is that the -- we're adding about a 100 drums of
10 waste per year to the inventory. That amounts to roughly
11 30,000 tons -- sorry, 30 tons.

12 **MEMBER HARVEY:** In the Port Hope written
13 submission, on page 3 of 5, they mention the -- Cameco
14 identify using 41 intermodal freight containers for the
15 storage.

16 This is the -- this is part of the volume
17 on site?

18 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
19 record.

20 Drums and metal waste, other contaminated
21 waste are stored in trailers. That's the storage
22 mechanism right now. So it's drummed and then stored in
23 trailers, on site.

24 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Just turning to the staff,
25 so you don't see any problem with the current plan to

1 manage waste on site?

2 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** Ravishankar, for the
3 record.

4 The waste management program was -- a
5 document was submitted to us in March of 2011 and this
6 information had been provided and that was found
7 acceptable by CNSC.

8 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Have you been on the site
9 since and have you been -- did you do some kind of
10 inspection of the -- of that storage?

11 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** Yes.

12 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Yes?

13 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Question?

14 Dr. Barriault?

15 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 I'm looking at the CNSC slide, page 3. The
17 trailers that you're describing, are those behind the
18 plant that we see? Those white trailers?

19 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
20 record.

21 Yes, those are the trailers.

22 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Are they in a fireproof-
23 secure state?

24 In other words, if one of them caught fire,
25 what would happen to the rest of them?

1 Are they on rubber wheels or flat beds or?

2 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the
3 record.

4 There is access there for proper
5 firefighting. We have been in consultation with the Port
6 Hope Fire Department. They are aware of that -- that
7 storage area and they're -- they're also okay with the --
8 the means or the access they have to those -- those
9 trailers.

10 For the most part, the trailers don't --
11 are not combustibile as well so there is that piece of the
12 -- the puzzle there as well there.

13 The contents inside are drums or metal so
14 the contents themselves are not highly combustibile.

15 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Do you have a sprinkler
16 system in these or are they just -- just regular trailers?

17 **MR. ALEX KODARIN:** The trailers do not have
18 sprinkler systems.

19 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** So theoretically,
20 there's potential for -- for a fire?

21 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I think the Fire Marshall is
22 still here and he may want to comment from his perspective
23 on this.

24 **MR. OLAF LAMERZ:** Olaf Lamerz, for the
25 record.

1 When it comes to the facility and the way
2 that the Municipality has an agreement with them operating
3 and as long as they're following all the appropriate rules
4 and regulations that apply to that type of storage and the
5 way that they're set up, you know, that's an issue for the
6 Municipality and their By-law Division as well as the Fire
7 Service to decide whether or not it meets all the
8 appropriate regulations in place for that type of storage.

9 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** If I understand
10 correctly, the Municipality would prefer to have a secure
11 fireproof environment for these?

12 **MS. THOMPSON:** To clarify, yes, the
13 Municipality and the Municipal Fire Department does have a
14 memorandum of understanding and works extremely closely
15 with Cameco in regards to their site.

16 We would support any assistance that could
17 be provided to deal with these materials.

18 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** How does Cameco feel
19 about that?

20 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.

21 I should add that the picture you're all
22 looking at is an old picture, older picture, and since
23 that picture was taken, a fair number of those trailers
24 have been removed from site. In fact, probably more than
25 half of them are now no longer there.

1 So I think we are, in the last six months,
2 we've made quite an extensive progress on dealing with
3 this stored waste -- both metal waste which we've
4 processed more than 20,000 Kg, kilograms of waste.

5 So we're moving some of those trailers that
6 contain metal waste and also our drummed combustible waste
7 has also been, for an interim basis, moved off site, out
8 of trailers and into a secure storage at our Dorset Street
9 location.

10 So, again, we are obviously taking this
11 very seriously and trying to make positive steps to deal
12 with this long-term storage issue of waste and also make
13 the facility safer; obviously, store the waste in the
14 safest manner as possible.

15 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** So all of that is low-
16 level waste?

17 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.
18 Yes, it's all low-level waste.

19 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** With regards to
20 complying with the wishes of the community, are there any
21 steps towards construction of an appropriate, secure area
22 for this?

23 **MR. THORNE:** Andy Thorne, for the record.
24 Just to give a little bit of a divisional
25 perspective to this discussion.

1 So we have set up the Fuel Services
2 Division and that creates some opportunities for us in the
3 fact that we can create synergies from the fact that we're
4 operating three licensed facilities together.

5 Alex and Dale, who you've met earlier, is a
6 part of the same management team and as a result of that,
7 we're able to have dialog in relation to areas that we can
8 help each other.

9 Alex has given you some examples of some of
10 the historic waste we see at CFM. It's material that's
11 been there for many, many years and I think it's fair to
12 say, in the past, the facility has struggled to find
13 viable outlets for that waste material.

14 As a result of the purchase of Zircatec,
15 Cameco's purchase of Zircatec, we've been able to leverage
16 some of those synergies. We're in the infancy stage of
17 that synergy, leveraging those synergies. But this last
18 year has been quite successful for us.

19 We have a great blaster that Alex mentioned
20 at the Port Hope conversion facility, which is
21 underutilized, has some spare capacity. And we've been
22 utilizing that capacity to deal with contaminated scrap
23 steel and we've been quite successful at doing that.

24 We also have, at Dorset Street location, a
25 warehouse that was also mentioned in the Port Hope

1 hearing. It's a licensed facility, it's a secure licensed
2 facility, clean and well-maintained.

3 And as a result of, again, a conversion
4 facility working with Cameco Fuel Manufacturing, CFM are
5 now able to utilize that storage space and that secure and
6 clean and safe storage place for the waste material while
7 we look at options to deal with that on a permanent basis
8 and moving forward.

9 So, you know, we've talked about some of
10 the discussions, very early discussions we've had with
11 staff in relation to options related to contaminated
12 combustible waste material going to Blind River. We also
13 have other options outside of Canada for dealing with that
14 material.

15 So I think it's fair to say that we're
16 addressing some of the legacy issues that we've got in a
17 proactive manner and we're committed to making sure we do
18 that safely and protecting the environment.

19 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** If I understand
20 correctly, you've also got combustible oils.

21 Do you have a great deal of those? Are
22 they radioactive?

23 **MR. THORNE:** Andy Thorne, for the record.

24 So, again, the Port Hope conversion
25 facility has a lot of history with dealing with

1 contaminated oils. We have a specialist on staff who
2 reports to the Director of Compliance and Licensing who's
3 a specialist in waste and waste management, has a lot of
4 experience with dealing with oils and liquids.

5 Those oils that we see at CFM do contain
6 small amounts of uranium and they have to be dealt with
7 appropriately and the appropriate waste streams found to
8 deal with those.

9 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** If you were going to put
10 a timeframe on the management of this in a permanent
11 manner, what would you be looking at?

12 **MR. THORNE:** Andy Thorne, for the record.

13 So we have had some discussions internally
14 in relation to this.

15 We have -- we've set ourselves a strategic
16 goal of trying to eliminate all historic waste that we see
17 on site over the next five-year period and, in addition to
18 that, creating plans to make sure that waste in the future
19 has a viable outlet.

20 So those are really -- we're still
21 formulating those plans, but that's -- we're trying to set
22 ourselves some goals in the long term here.

23 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, we've got to get
24 moving. Staff, last word on this, please.

25 **MR. ELDER:** Just I'm going to go briefly to

1 our fire protection specialist, Grant Cherkas in Ottawa
2 because these containers are one of the things that we do
3 look at during our fire inspections.

4 **MR. CHERKAS:** For the record, my name is
5 Grant Cherkas, Fire Protection Specialist with CNSC staff.

6 We wanted to confirm that the hazards
7 represented by the storage of combustible and non-
8 combustible materials external to the facility were
9 evaluated by a detailed fire hazard analysis.

10 The analysis concluded that there was
11 adequate segregation and separation of the material from,
12 between the different piles and between the buildings and
13 other external equipment such as transformers and liquid
14 hydrogen storage tanks; that there was not an unreasonable
15 fire risk and not a risk of propagation to the main
16 facility; that gave staff the assurance that there's
17 adequate fire prevention protection measures being
18 maintained.

19 We concur with the recommendation that
20 reduction of combustibles is always desirable. Thank you.

21 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, any other subject?
22 No, no, just the intervenor.

23 Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

24 The next presentation is a presentation by
25 Mr. Dan Rudka, as outlined in CMD H17.24.

1 Mr. Rudka, the floor is yours.

2 **11-H17.24**

3 **Oral presentation from**

4 **Dan Rudka**

5

6 **MR. RUDKA:** Thank you very much, Mr.

7 Binder, and good evening to all.

8 As you know, I'm a former nuclear energy
9 worker and I want to give you some perspective on some of
10 the things that I've run into in my past because we've
11 been hearing a lot of positive reports on lost-time
12 injuries at Cameco's two facilities, but I'm wondering if
13 you're getting the full picture.

14 It's concerning the various exposures of
15 uranium that cause illness, cancer disease as well, and
16 well after the initial exposure. This is due to a latency
17 period before symptoms and, therefore, it's usually not
18 regarded, if ever, related to the nuclear exposure or
19 contamination.

20 As a former employee of Zircatec, now
21 Cameco, I was twice tested for lung burden counts in a
22 questionably short period of time. It was with less than
23 a year's time. I was told that the test indicated my
24 lungs were fine.

25 In 2001, after some years of suffering with

1 serious lung problems, I was diagnosed with a rare, near-
2 fatal lung disease. Testing in 2007 verified my lungs
3 were contaminated with Zircatec, now Cameco's uranium,
4 resulting in severely damaged disease and failing lungs.
5 I was tested for lung count at Cameco and their plant, I
6 don't know why, they didn't catch the contamination at
7 that point.

8 I also wore the ring fingers to monitor my
9 skin dose. My arms, hands, face are covered in scars that
10 are quite visible to you. It's a recognized secondary
11 condition of exposure to radiation.

12 Yet, no one at the company or the CNSC has
13 ever acknowledged this obvious condition as related to
14 nuclear exposure and it's most disappointing because I
15 would think that it's the CSNC's job to know. It also
16 would be the company's job to know.

17 So detection methods, I would say,
18 obviously in my case, have not been reliable.

19 Now, a few recollections that will always
20 be in question. The day that I was not issued a
21 dosimeter, I was told basically they didn't have one for
22 me and they sent me off to work. Or the Friday evening,
23 when I was leaving the plant and set off the radiation
24 detection system at the security office, I set that off
25 three times and I was told that it would be taken care of

1 first of the week. Monday I went in and there was no
2 report, no nothing issued. Nobody knew anything about it,
3 apparently, other than the security guard. And years ago,
4 it was discovered that contaminated water was piped into
5 the drinking water and shower water of the plant.

6 Now, I, along with many others, was exposed
7 to this, but it was discovered while we were on temporary
8 layoff. We were never officially told afterwards or
9 warned of that incident.

10 Now, I guess, you know -- before I get to
11 that, as reported, this plant's highest dose, the CFM
12 plant, was like 9.5 millisieverts in 2008. But the
13 company, Zircatec, reported that I may have received well
14 over 30 millisieverts in 1993-94. I expect the dose was
15 higher due to inhalation and, sadly, the CNSC itself has
16 not done, as Linda Keen, former Chairperson of the Board
17 had directed some time ago for the company, that's Cameco,
18 Health Canada, and the union, I expect under the CNSC's
19 guidance, to find a resolution to my situation. That has
20 never been done.

21 Surely the CNSC has no interest in the
22 medical end of exposure to workers. This is left as a
23 union responsibility, and no one forces any obligation for
24 the union to respond. This is a union that you've already
25 heard from today, a union that will not respond and is not

1 accountable to a member, that is me, contaminated under
2 their watch. Excuse me.

3 So a person in my position seeks outside
4 assistance by way of occupational health clinics. After a
5 lot of scurrying around trying to find where to go, I was
6 advised of a certain individual that could help me with
7 the Workers' Safety Insurance Board claims. And the
8 expert that I was directed to for the nature of my uranium
9 exposure turned out to be a former Cameco doctor, and he
10 has never mentioned this conflict of interest. Needless
11 to say, I don't see him any more.

12 When I attempted to speak to our former
13 local MPP, Lou Rinaldi, who has written a written
14 submission about my exposure, he asked of my doctors.
15 When I attempted to explain the difficult issues around
16 diagnosing this type of exposure, he stated, "Your doctors
17 are no good." And I was quite perturbed by that because I
18 have some of the best respirology(ph) doctors in the
19 country and along with a few others.

20 And when I explained that to him, he
21 reiterated that they were no good.

22 So after 17 years of no effort, or with
23 lots of effort with no resolution, I can attest that the
24 present system within around the nuclear system or nuclear
25 industry is perfect in regards to failing the exposed

1 worker and that is why lost time is never shown by way of
2 exposure injury.

3 This must change. There is a need for a
4 separate compensation system for nuclear energy workers.

5 In my experience, the CNSC either ignores
6 or does not understand the face of exposure when it's been
7 dropped on their doorstep and, either way, the CNSC is
8 doing a disservice to the people that they are to protect
9 and this lends reason to the need of independent medical
10 testing, studies and treatment.

11 I would ask that you consider the following
12 suggestions for both licence applications.

13 First, the industry needs an independent
14 medical watch for workers and public support, professional
15 medical people that have the ability to test people for
16 radiation, uranium exposure and treat them, and there is
17 treatment. This town, because the nature of the main
18 industry, needs medical observation that has never been
19 allowed and should have been in place long ago.

20 And long overdue with no excuse not to be
21 here is a CNSC office on site in this town. You have CNSC
22 offices at all of the nuclear plants, but it's
23 surprisingly absent from Port Hope, and I would wonder if
24 they'd like to respond to this afterwards. With all that
25 is happening around this town in regards to nuclear for

1 the next 10, 15, 20 years, the CNSC should be camped out
2 in this town's backyard and they should have been here
3 long ago.

4 Now, it would also be important to keep the
5 townspeople informed. Yes, there's been a far better
6 effort at that over the years, but I think it would be
7 productive for the CNSC to hold regular public meetings,
8 regardless of licensing, with Cameco and the Port Hope
9 Area Initiative reporting on plans, progress, problems,
10 concerns and solutions with public input.

11 And lastly, I would hope that the CNSC
12 Board Members could understand that a two-year licence
13 period would better serve this community. It's the
14 community that will most be affected by the future of the
15 nuclear industry, the clean-up, storage and all else
16 around these projects. However, I know the CNSC will
17 relicense Cameco regardless of many issues.

18 But with the state of the soil, the water,
19 the wells all around these plants, the air and the
20 environment in general as ongoing issues and considering
21 health issues, too, I really think that their licence, in
22 reality, should not be renewed.

23 This is the time, if there ever was one, to
24 consider removing these facilities from the lakefront and
25 the town to a much safer location. If you must renew this

1 licence, use the next two years to come up with a viable
2 plan for relocation.

3 Two comments I will end with. One was from
4 CEO Tim Gitzel from Cameco that stated, "We look for
5 people who fit our culture and line up to our values."
6 And these people are some of the same people that
7 overlooked the exposure, resulting illness and disability
8 that so seriously affects me, burdens my family and has
9 changed the future of all that we, as a family, had ever
10 hoped for.

11 Is this the fit, the culture and values
12 that this company is striving for, you know, the absence
13 of exposure incidents by way of refusal to acknowledge and
14 assist in the face of evidence?

15 And finally, retiring CEO Jerry Grandey
16 stated to the CNSC and Globe and Mail that he learned it's
17 most important to be transparent about mistakes. If these
18 words held true, I would probably not be here tonight.

19 Thank you very much.

20 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Questions?

21 Dr. Barriault.

22 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 It begs the question, really. I would
24 assume that you worked through Workers' Compensation of
25 Ontario?

1 **MR. RUDKA:** I just explained the reasons
2 that I have tried to go through the compensation system.
3 Workers' Compensation does not understand anything about
4 radiation nuclear. As you people yourself said, it's
5 complicated. They need an outside source to go to. They
6 return to people like the CNSC for answers or to the
7 industry, and that doesn't work, so...

8 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** The second issue with
9 regards to the physician that does not disclose that he
10 was, quote unquote, "a company physician", you had the
11 option of reporting that to the College of Physicians and
12 Surgeons of Ontario.

13 Did you go that route at all, or...?

14 **MR. RUDKA:** Reporting to the College of
15 Physicians and Surgeons. No, I haven't.

16 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** They're the licensing
17 body for these physicians, is the reason why I'm asking
18 that.

19 **MR. RUDKA:** No, I realize that.

20 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Okay.

21 **MR. RUDKA:** I understand that with that
22 conflict, but I have enough on my plate without having to
23 pursue another problem, sir, thank you.

24 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Okay, thank you.

25 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Can I just jump on that?
2 There is a Durham medical officer, isn't there, in the
3 region? There's a public -- I don't know what the exact
4 title is, but there is a medical authority in the region.

5 I'd expect that that particular individual
6 or the institution would be very well conversed with
7 medical issues associated with radiation. Did you go
8 there?

9 **MR. RUDKA:** No, I have not.

10 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Why not?

11 **MR. RUDKA:** I'm having trouble, obviously,
12 getting direction. I have no union support, no company
13 support. The CNSC is distant. So I'm left to my own
14 means. And like I said, the system is set to fail.
15 There's so many things going against you from the
16 politicians right through to doctors that fully don't
17 always understand the nature of radiation poisoning and
18 especially in regards to latency periods.

19 Of course, they're starting to understand
20 better, but they don't seem to have all the information
21 that they should have.

22 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Anybody else,
23 questions? No?

24 Mr. Tolgyesi.

25 **MEMBER TOLGYESI:** When you're saying, Mr.

1 Rudka, that CNSC has no interest in medical end of
2 exposure to the workers, you mean medical or you mean
3 compensation?

4 **MR. RUDKA:** No, sir, I mean medical, not
5 compensation. I refer to medical.

6 We have to first recognize the medical
7 before you can go compensation, obviously, and I can't get
8 people to recognize the medical even though it's -- I wear
9 it, physically.

10 **MEMBER TOLGYESI:** The staff has any
11 comments on this?

12 **DR. THOMPSON:** Patsy Thompson, for the
13 record.

14 I would say that that's obviously the case.
15 The mandate of the CNSC is to protect workers' health and
16 safety as well as members of the public through the
17 Radiation Protection Regulations.

18 There is very stringent requirements in
19 terms of radiation protection programs, including
20 monitoring of doses to workers, and, as Mr. Rudka said,
21 you know, the workers have to submit urine samples.
22 There's body dosimeters that are being worn as well as
23 extremity dosimetry.

24 The CNSC process when, for example, action
25 levels are exceeded is that the licensees have to take

1 action to restore the effectiveness of the radiation
2 protection program and if there is a suspicion of an
3 exceedance of a dose limit, there's a procedure where the
4 worker is -- this is reported to the CNSC, the worker is
5 removed from radioactive work until an investigation is
6 done and the doses are confirmed through independent
7 verification.

8 All the -- this information is reviewed by
9 CNSC technical specialists in dosimetry and assessed to
10 determine whether these are personal doses or if it's a
11 dosimeter, for example, that's been left exposed without
12 been worn.

13 As far as I know, all the information was -
14 - that we have reviewed over the years for Mr. Rudka, we
15 have not had any indication of exposures above the worker
16 dose limits for whole body dose, as well as for a skin
17 dose and that -- that's the information we have right now.

18 But certainly we do take very strong
19 actions on monitoring and controlling worker doses and
20 we've taken certainly actions on potential overexposures.

21 One of my duties as a designated officer of
22 the Commission is to review potential overexposures and
23 not return workers to work until we are assured that there
24 are adequate mechanisms in place to correct the situation
25 and make sure it doesn't happen again.

1 **MEMBER TOLGYESI:** Are your comments and
2 results available to provincial authorities like
3 Compensation Board if requested?

4 **DR. THOMPSON:** Patsy Thompson, for the
5 record.

6 As we've explained in the past, the -- all
7 worker doses are -- the dosimetry is reviewed and approved
8 by the CNSC. We licence Dosimetry Services and the
9 Dosimetry Services have to submit every single radiation
10 dose for workers to Health Canada's National Dose
11 Registry.

12 In the case of a compensation case with a
13 provincial authority, I'm not sure what the process would
14 be, but Health Canada are the keepers of the dosimetry
15 information. If we were asked to provide assistance we
16 certainly would.

17 I don't know if -- I'll just check with my
18 colleague.

19 Mr. Bundy will speak of the CNSC's
20 experience in terms of assisting with provincial
21 authorities.

22 **MR. BUNDY:** For the record, Kevin Bundy.

23 Yes, I have been -- we have been, in the
24 past, approached by the different Workers' Compensation
25 Boards across Canada -- very infrequently, not that often

1 -- and been asked to make a judgment on certain cases on
2 radiation -- on an instance of a disease and possibly due
3 to radiation. We have not been asked, as far as I know,
4 with respect to Mr. Rudka's case.

5 **MR. RUDKA:** Okay to comment?

6 **THE CHAIRMAN:** By all means, go ahead.

7 **MR. RUDKA:** As far as Patsy Thompson has to
8 say, then I look to you and say, what happened; how did
9 you miss me.

10 I know I'm under the regulatory limits, but
11 obviously we are learning that less than 2 millisieverts
12 can cause problems.

13 And again, I told you how the WSIB returns
14 to the CNSC for answers and you're not going to get them
15 there. I mean, what I heard from Ms. Thompson here is I
16 should be fine and I'm not. And that's what is most
17 bothersome and I think what's really bothersome to me is a
18 bit of a phrase I left out of here about some of the
19 incidents that happened to me and they may have
20 contributed to my exposure, but I am going to tell you the
21 truth.

22 It is something more sinister that that can
23 happen and it is not an unfamiliar knowledge amongst a
24 number of people within the plant. So maybe that's why
25 Ms. Thompson is not getting her information properly, but

1 whatever you're doing is not working because here I am
2 with an obvious case of radiation exposure. It's
3 recognized by doctors, by Medic Alert; I have the first
4 and only bracelet printed in Canada for radiation
5 poisoning and yet we sit here and say that well, we are
6 under the limit so I guess I might as well go home and
7 pretend I am okay. It doesn't work that way.

8 **THE CHAIRMAN:** But I -- but if you do have
9 a medical professional doctor who actually deem you to be
10 radiation, I don't understand -- somewhere along the line
11 another institution which is the Workmen's Compensation
12 Board, some other medical authority has to accept that.

13 And I do not -- forget about CNSC, if a
14 couple of doctors are say that is what happened, I don't
15 understand why that's not in evidence that will be
16 considered by the Board.

17 So there's something we can, cannot do no
18 matter what we would say -- I'm talking about the CNSC --
19 it has to be such an institution would deem, you know,
20 that you have gone through some sort of radiation
21 poisoning. It can't be us.

22 **MR. RUDKA:** But sir, as I said, you go to
23 those institutions, then come back to the CNSC for answers
24 and you say it can't be you.

25 **THE CHAIRMAN:** No, whatever CNSC has, it is

1 just giving the raw data of dose -- dosimeters and I think
2 that's what really happening here.

3 Cameco, do you have a medical -- somewhere
4 in the organization, medical doctors that actually have
5 the ability to determine whether somebody is, you know,
6 medically got overdosed; let me put it that way?

7 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.

8 While we do have a comprehensive medical
9 surveillance program at our facility, I don't believe we
10 have physicians who make -- would make that type of
11 diagnosis.

12 I can get back to you, but it's our belief
13 right now.

14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So the medical person that
15 Mr. Rudka identified as a company doctor who actually told
16 him that; on what basis did he say that?

17 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.
18 I'm not familiar with the specifics of that comment or the
19 details.

20 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Dr. Barriault?

21 Just so that you know, we -- Mr. Rudka, we
22 -- you operate in front of us now for many, many years; I
23 mean, we know your file pretty well. I know staff have
24 been trying to help as much as it can and I'm just trying
25 to figure out if there's anything new that you can bring

1 to this story, so to speak.

2 Dr. Barriault?

3 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** Just bear with me. I'm
4 just trying to understand this. This happened when? How
5 long ago since this incident happened?

6 **MR. RUDKA:** I worked from 1993 to 1995, but
7 I only worked 53 weeks in that period due to some layoffs.

8 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** So this was in '95 this
9 happened. Have you been to any occupational health clinic
10 or occupational physician since then and what was the
11 outcome of that? And I do not want to get into your
12 personal ---

13 **MR. RUDKA:** No, no, I've been to, again,
14 occupational health clinics and doctors and they
15 recommended me to a health clinic and, again, I go to this
16 clinic, as I said, and I find that the clinic was run by a
17 Cameco -- former Cameco company doctor.

18 **MEMBER BARRIAULT:** This particular clinic
19 that you went to, but if I understand correctly, there are
20 some occupational health clinic in Toronto or in Hamilton
21 that you could go to to get professional opinion if you
22 want to if you have a -- and if you do, then, obviously,
23 Worker's Comp is too as well, and if you are not satisfied
24 with them then there's an appeal process at Worker's
25 Compensation Board that you can get into.

1 So there's a variety of avenues. I don't
2 know how much of this you pursued and I'm sure you
3 probably pursued all of the avenues, but ---

4 **MR. RUDKA:** Sir, I have pursued more
5 avenues. I'm surprised that -- in 2001, my doctors told
6 me that I would not make 2003 probably. I'm lucky to be
7 here.

8 But you have to understand; fighting with
9 Compensation Board against this corporate giant is
10 extremely difficult and I don't know if it'll ever succeed
11 and I think it is going to be up to the company to step up
12 to the plate, at some point.

13 That's why I suggested we need a different
14 compensation system; something like the fire people -- the
15 firemen have because it's not working as it is.

16 Okay, I have exhausted so many avenues and
17 I said my biggest concern now is longevity, mortality and
18 some of the news isn't good about my lungs and into my --
19 apparently, my diaphragm is collapsing; they can't do
20 anything with it.

21 So I'm going to abandon a wife who's not
22 going to be able to retire and she's been a nurse for over
23 30 years because the 17 years of disability; she still
24 works and when I am gone she's going to continue and she's
25 going to be listed -- she's going to be left with a debt

1 that we have accumulated over all this.

2 And again, you know, to go through
3 compensation -- again, through all the expense and
4 everything it's lost, it would take me a year to sort it
5 all out as it is. It's been so extensive.

6 But that's again why I've mentioned in here
7 that we need a different system that can work with workers
8 because obviously 50 millisieverts a year is just -- you
9 know, don't even talk to me about that.

10 All's you have to do is inhale a little bit
11 of this stuff. One particulate is 4.5 million electron
12 volts to the tissue around it so you can imagine what
13 that's doing. It gets very difficult when you get into a
14 Compensation Board, you try to explain this. You people
15 here probably far better understand it. The company does.
16 I understand it far better than I ever did because of all
17 the years I've put into it, but -- it's not beyond our
18 understanding -- but when you get medical people, a lot of
19 things that I have look like other things, it gets
20 confusing. And when the Compensation Board sees anything
21 that's of any doubt, you're out and you're on the appeal
22 process.

23 So, I don't know, I'm lost for what to do
24 because I have exasperated just about all of my avenues, I
25 would think.

1 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, thank you. Anybody
2 else? Thank you very much.

3 **MR. RUDKA:** Thank you very much, sir.

4 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I'd like to move now to the
5 next submission from Mr. Victor Allan Glover, as outlined
6 in CMD H17.30. Mr. Glover, the floor is yours.

7

8 **11-H17.30**

9 **Oral presentation by**

10 **Victor Allan Glover**

11

12 **MR. GLOVER:** For the record, my name is
13 Victor Allan Glover. Good evening.

14 I've been employed as a quality assurance
15 specialist at Cameco Field Manufacturing since August
16 2008. I work out of the Cobourg facility.

17 I would like to thank everyone that has
18 submitted a letter to the CNSC regarding the relicensing
19 of Cameco. It shows that you care about this relicensing
20 and, like me, you want your opinion to be heard.

21 I won't go through my letter as I know that
22 you have already reviewed it. I would like to touch on
23 one point and that's with regards to safety. Safety at
24 Cameco is a culture, not just a slogan or a bumper
25 sticker. It's a belief.

1 also submitted the written submission for the conversion.
2 And I think, I don't know if it was a new submission and I
3 remember somebody mentioning that Cameco actually failed
4 three years ago the 14001 ISO test. In fact, somebody
5 said it failed miserably. Can anybody, are we talking
6 about that facility or the conversion facility.

7 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin for the record.

8 It was the CFM facility but I will clarify
9 that our certification is a certification that happens for
10 both facilities; both Cobourg non-licensed facility and
11 for the facility in Port Hope, the licensed facility.

12 We have had an effective environmental
13 protection program in the Port Hope facility for the
14 entire licence duration so the failure was really a more
15 holistic implementation of ISO 14,000 that was
16 troublesome.

17 A lot of the work that has been performed
18 over the last year to become certified in fact has been to
19 instil many of the existing programs from Port Hope into
20 our Cobourg facility in such that both facilities are
21 operating at a higher level than they were prior to the
22 certification. Hope that clarifies things.

23 **MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Tolgyesi.

24 **MEMBER TOLGYESI:** Are you saying that you
25 were conducting monthly audits? You do that in

1 conjunction with workers participation or union
2 participation or it's only the supervision and employers
3 staff who are doing these audits (inaudible).

4 **MR. GLOVER:** Allan Glover, for the record.

5 We use internal auditors from the shop
6 floor right through to SMT, so it's a full cross section
7 of people.

8 **MEMBER TOLGYESI:** Who orders the follow-up
9 after the audit? Is there a report and its answer from
10 the employer from the company?

11 **MR. GLOVER:** Allan Glover, for the record.

12 These audits would have an audit report
13 issued and any findings or corrective actions would be
14 entered into SERS and be addressed in that manner.

15 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Anybody else? Okay, thank
16 you. I think that this is all we can do tonight for all
17 presentation. But we're not over yet. So what we're
18 going to try to do is some written material and written
19 submissions. So Marc would you take us, guide us through
20 this?

21 **MR. LEBLANC:** This is correct, we had
22 already scheduled a number of oral interventions for this
23 evening and we've gone through them. The fourth one that
24 we were supposed to do was from the Canadian Nuclear
25 Worker's Council and they've asked us to consider their

1 oral presentation as a written submission.

2 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So why don't we start with
3 that.

4 **MR. LEBLANC:** That's right. I will deal
5 with it in the order it was received if I may.

6 So the first written submission is from Mr.
7 Gerald Crawford as outlined in CMD 11-H17.2. Any
8 questions from the Members?

9

10 **11-H17.2**

11 **Written submission by**

12 **Gerald Crawford**

13

14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Wait a second, we've got to
15 find it.

16 **MR. LEBLANC:** If it assists the Members, I
17 could also say whether it's already been dealt with as
18 part of the conversion facility file because many of them
19 are repeat, people have filed with respect to the two or
20 three Cameco facilities. And this is one that we've dealt
21 with.

22 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay.

23 **MR. LEBLANC:** The second or the next
24 written submission is from Mr. Donald Ketcheson as
25 outlined in CMD 11-H17.3. Any questions?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

11-H17.3

Written submission by

Donald Ketcheson

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill.

MEMBER MCDILL: I wonder if I could ask staff to comment on the (inaudible), I'm not sure I can ask staff to comment on the Secretariat, however, I guess that's the only way to do it. Is the Secretariat heavily weighted with people from the nuclear world? It appears there's nobody from the non-nuclear side in areas such as law or medicine. I'm not sure whether to ask my President or staff to comment on that but ---

MR. ELDER: I'll, going back in saying, I don't know if she's talking about the Secretariat in terms of Mr. Leblanc, who is a lawyer, or staff in general. We actually, and for the last number of years, I'll start with the legal one as we do actually have a number of lawyers, a good compliment of lawyers who helped us on this one and I'll ask Dr. Thompson to talk about her medical background.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

Actually when I read the intervention, I

1 thought Secretariat meant the Commission, but I will
2 provide an overview of the staff expertise in terms of
3 health- and environmental-related programs.

4 Essentially, the directorate that I'm
5 responsible for, we have approximately 72 staff members in
6 areas related to radiation protection, dosimetry,
7 radiation biology, epidemiology, toxicology. There's a
8 wide number of expertise represented within our
9 directorate with many people having PhDs and a number of
10 people with Masters degrees. All of the staff are hired
11 based on their qualifications, their expertise, their
12 experience with the subject matter of the CNSC's
13 responsibly. And we have a number of staff who have been
14 active participants in international committees such as
15 UNSCEAR or ICRP and others where they're known and
16 recognized for their expertise.

17 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

18 Without the intervenor here to clarify the
19 questions it's a little difficult.

20 Since the intervenor has raised the
21 question, and I realize it doesn't relate to CFM, but on
22 the second page there's some discussion about water coming
23 from the Fukushima plant across the Pacific, and since
24 you're here maybe you could take a stab at addressing
25 that.

1 For example, the intervenor said we should
2 avoid eating mussels and fish from the Pacific.

3 **DR. THOMPSON:** Patsy Thompson, for the
4 record.

5 Essentially this relates to the -- my
6 understanding, to the Fukushima events. Following the
7 Fukushima events with the -- there's obviously a large
8 amount of contaminated water that has been discharged to
9 the Pacific Ocean. The Japanese government put in place
10 an extensive monitoring program of fish and shellfish that
11 are used for human consumption.

12 The information that we have and the
13 dispersion is that this certainly doesn't represent a risk
14 to Canadians and the -- on the Canadian side of the
15 Pacific there's no likelihood of having increased levels
16 of caesium and some of the other radionuclides that are
17 associated with that accident.

18 The controls that have been put in place
19 for human consumption of shellfish in Japan and those that
20 are for export comply with, for example, the World Health
21 Organization standards and don't represent a risk for
22 human health.

23 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Again, I'd like everybody to
24 remember what is the CNSC mandate and what other agency
25 mandate. We have another agency called the Canadian Food

1 Inspection Agency in Canada whose responsibility is to
2 make sure that they will issue any warning about any risk
3 associated with any fish or anything - or any food that
4 may contain higher level of radiation that is not fit for
5 human consumption. It is not CNSC's responsibility to do
6 that.

7 What we would like to be able to do is just
8 put on our website whatever happened internationally and
9 also on what CFIA, for example, would rule so there's one
10 place you can go and find some objective information.

11 Did I get it right?

12 **DR. THOMPSON:** Patsy Thompson, for the
13 record.

14 Yes, that's correct. The Canadian Food
15 Agency is responsible for health advisories or food
16 advisories.

17 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Dr. McGill?

18 Anybody else?

19 Thank you.

20 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
21 Ms. Marilyn Routly as outlined in CMD 11-H17.4.

22

23 **11-H17.4**

24 **Written submission from**

25 **Marilyn Routly**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
Ms. Jackie Brimblecombe as outlined in CMD 11-H17.5

11-H17.5
Written submission from
Jackie Brimblecombe

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
Mr. Mike Kube as outlined in CMD 11-H17.6.

11-H17.6
Written submission from
Mike Kube

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
Mr. Kevin Wharmby as outlined in CMD 11-H17.7.

Do you want to go back?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mike Kube?

MR. LEBLANC: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just because I'm curious, he
was talking about something called -- we've developed
programs more importantly -- I'm looking at -- well, does
anybody know what the LOTO program is, L-O-T-O? I'm just
-- lock out tag?

1 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.

2 Lock out tag out is a safety program we
3 have in place to safely disconnect and effectively lock
4 out the electro connection on pieces of equipment before
5 you enter them and do work or trouble shooting.

6 So it's -- we call it LOTO. It's lock out
7 -- lock out the machine or tag it out with a tag with a
8 name on it.

9 **THE CHAIRMAN:** So that's a common kind of a
10 safety, it's not only for the uranium business, it's a
11 general one?

12 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin.

13 Yes, that's correct.

14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, thank you.

15 **MR. LEBLANC:** I'll go back to CMD 17.7
16 from Mr. Kevin Wharmby.

17

18 **11-H17.7**

19 **Written submission from**

20 **Kevin Wharmby**

21

22 **MR. LEBLANC:** Any questions?

23 The next submission is from Mr. Ron Smith
24 as outlined in CMD 11-H17.8.

25

1 **11-H17.8**

2 **Written submission from**

3 **Ron Smith**

4 **MR. LEBLANC:** Monsieur Harvey?

5 **MEMBER HARVEY:** In the last paragraph we're
6 talking of zero emissions of any pollutant. My question
7 appears strange, but how far are we from zero?

8 I mean, we saw earlier that you are
9 lowering the limits for certain contaminants and we
10 recognize the fact that zero emissions are almost
11 impossible when you've got a plant.

12 But to what extent we can approach zero
13 emission? Are the emissions -- the current emissions
14 almost near the limit we can go or there is a space with
15 more efforts that we could go lower than we are today?

16 A strange question.

17 **MR. ELDER:** Peter Elder, for the record.

18 You always at least look if there are ways
19 to reduce the emissions, and as part of when we look at
20 the reviews and the applications and how we look on a
21 routine basis every two years or so, we expect the
22 licensees to go through all their programs and see where
23 emission reduction is possible. So it's not -- and it's
24 part of continuous improvement, you always look where you
25 can.

1 I guess my point was zero is really depends
2 on your detection limit, you know, and we are detecting --
3 our detection limit for uranium air, let's say, is very
4 low. We put it on the graphs when you do it in kilograms
5 per hour where there are already a lot of zeros on the
6 graph.

7 That said, we expect Cameco to continually
8 look at is there ways that they can reduce those emissions
9 even further.

10 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Have you ever compared the
11 -- I don't know how many facilities exist like that
12 facility. We've got two here but ---

13 **MR. ELDER:** Well, we'll compare and we're
14 starting to compare and this is one of the things the
15 annual report will do is compare those emissions.

16 The other fuel fabricator in Canada is not
17 fully comparison because they do -- Cameco is split. Some
18 things they do in Cobourg, which is not with radioactive
19 material. GE Hitachi, which is the other one, splits it
20 differently between two sites.

21 So we'll look at in terms of -- we'll start
22 to give you comparisons and you'll be able to see, you
23 know, where there are goals. Because I know even the
24 licensees do look at how they can reduce emissions even
25 when they are quite low.

1 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Cameco, can you add
2 something to that? Do you think you made huge efforts and
3 it'll be difficult in the future to go farther than we are
4 today?

5 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.
6 Cameco CFM is committed to lowering
7 emissions as much as reasonably is possible, and the ALARA
8 principle is still something that obviously we manage to
9 on a daily basis. Our emissions, both water and air, are
10 very low and we will continue to look for areas of
11 improvement as we see them materialize.

12 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Thank you.

13 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Again this is way out of
14 left field, but you know the many laboratory work in a --
15 what do they call it -- negative vacuum or -- nothing gets
16 out, everything gets sucked in and recycled, et cetera.
17 Is that sort of not doable in a large commercial thing or
18 is it like -- would require a completely brand new
19 structure?

20 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.
21 We have, in the past, looked at such a
22 negative pressure system. From ALARA perspective, it
23 becomes not a viable alternative for the building,
24 particularly with some of the legacy installations with
25 the building. It's an older building and there's -- if

1 you were to design it again probably you might make a few
2 different decisions. The way it sits right now it's not
3 possible to get to purely a zero emission state in an easy
4 fashion.

5 **MR. RAVISHANKAR:** B.R. Ravishankar for the
6 record.

7 I just wanted to give you a comparative
8 emission between Port Hope Conversion Facility, Blind
9 River Refinery and Fuel Manufacturing. I'm going to give
10 this a 2010 emission data in grams per hour. For Port
11 Hope Conversion Facility it was 5.7 grams per hour. For
12 Blind River it was 0.1 grams per hour. And for fuel
13 manufacturing it was 0.0035 grams per hour.

14 **MEMBER HARVEY:** It's difficult to compare
15 each plant.

16 **MR. ELDER:** Right, and -- Peter Elder, for
17 the record.

18 What we want to do in the annual report is
19 compare our fuel fabricator to the fuel fabricator so --
20 and you'll start to see -- I can say they're in the
21 ballpark but we'll start coming to you with that data.

22 Some of them, like the conversion
23 facilities, will -- initially, there's no other thing in
24 Canada. Maybe we'll start looking if we can get data from
25 the other plants in the world

1 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Would it be possible to do
2 it in the annual reports?

3 **MR. ELDER:** The Canadian comparison ---

4 **MEMBER HARVEY:** Yes.

5 **MR. ELDER:** I'll promise you the first time
6 as we get better at this one, we'll look at -- see if we
7 can get more information from other comparators as well.

8 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Tolgyesi?

9 **MEMBER TOLGYESI:** The intervener is talking
10 about accumulation of the contaminants. How far the
11 monitoring data collected can demonstrate the level of
12 accumulation of contaminants?

13 **MR. KODARIN:** Alex Kodarin, for the record.
14 I'll hand the mic over to my colleague Mike
15 to answer that question.

16 **MR. LONGINOV:** For air deposition, we do,
17 over the last few years, annual soil sampling. We take
18 that soil sampling and we do provide that information to
19 the CNSC.

20 Over the licensing period we have been
21 seeing a gradual decrease in the average soil
22 concentration -- average uranium in soil concentration,
23 typically around four to five parts per million, which is
24 approximately twice what we'd expect as a background
25 number.

1 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, Marc?

2 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
3 the Port Hope and District Chamber of Commerce as outlined
4 in CMD 11-H17.9.

5
6 **11-H17.9**
7 **Written submission from the**
8 **Port Hope and District**
9 **Chamber of Commerce**

10
11 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
12 Ms. Diane Flesch as outlined in CMD 11-H17.10.

13
14 **11-H17.10**
15 **Written submission from**
16 **Diane Flesch**

17
18 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
19 the Friends of Music as outlined in CMD 11-H17.11.

20
21 **11-H17.11**
22 **Written submission from the**
23 **Friends of Music**

24
25 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from

1 Mr. Gerhard Heinrich as outlined in CMD 11-H17.12.

2

3 **11-H17.12**

4 **Written submission from**

5 **Gerhard Heinrich**

6

7 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from

8 Mr. Alvin Barr as outlined in CMD 11-H17.13.

9

10 **11-H17.13**

11 **Written submission from**

12 **Alvin Barr**

13

14 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from

15 Mr. Bruce Cooper as outlined in CMD 11-H17.15.

16

17 **11-H17.15**

18 **Written submission from**

19 **Bruce Cooper**

20

21 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from

22 the Northumberland Players as outlined in CMD 11-H17.16.

23

24 **11-H17.16**

25 **Written submission from**

1 **Northumberland Players**

2

3 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
4 Ms. Suzanne Frankcom-Wright as outlined in CMD 11-H17.17.

5

6 **11-H17.17**

7 **Written submission from**

8 **Suzanne Frankcom-Wright**

9

10 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
11 the Cobourg Dragon Boat and Canoe Club as outlined in CMD
12 11-H17.18.

13

14 **11-H17.18**

15 **Written submission from the**

16 **Cobourg Dragon Board and**

17 **Canoe Club**

18

19 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
20 the Heart & Stroke Foundation of Ontario as outlined in
21 CMD 11-H17.19.

22

23 **11-H17.19**

24 **Written submission from**

25 **Heart & Stroke Foundation**

1 of Ontario

2

3 MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
4 Community Care Northumberland as outlined in CMD 11-
5 H17.20.

6

7 11-H17.20

8 Written submission from
9 Community Care Northumberland

10

11 MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
12 HMC Consulting as outlined in CMD 11-H17.21.

13

14 11-H17.21

15 Written submission from
16 HMC Consulting

17

18 MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
19 Mr. John Morand as outlined in CMD 11-H17.22. We already
20 had an oral presentation from Mr. Morand and he'll be
21 participating tomorrow on behalf of a property value
22 organization.

23

24 11-H17.22

25 Written submission from

1 **John Morand**

2

3 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next written submission
4 was also an oral submission that was heard earlier from
5 the Physicians for Global Survival, and this one is
6 outlined in CMD 11-H17.23.

7

8 **11-H17.23**

9 **Written submission from the**
10 **Physicians for Global Survival**

11

12 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
13 Mr. David Henderson as outlined in CMD 11-H17.25.

14

15 **11-H17.25**

16 **Written submission from**
17 **David Henderson**

18

19 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
20 Mr. Marcin Ryglewicz as outlined in CMD 11-H17.27.

21

22 **11-H17.27**

23 **Written submission from**
24 **Marcin Ryglewicz**

25

1 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
2 Ms. Donna Snowden as outlined in CMD 11-H17.28.

3

4 **11-H17.28**

5 **Written submission from**

6 **Donna Snowden**

7

8 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
9 Mr. Michael Murchie as outlined in CMD 11-H17.29.

10

11 **11-H17.29**

12 **Written submission from**

13 **Michael Murchie**

14

15 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
16 Ms. Maricela Vosburgh as outlined in CMD 11-H17.31

17

18 **11-H17.31**

19 **Written submission from**

20 **Maricela Vosburgh**

21

22 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
23 the Northumberland Manufacturers' Association as outlined
24 in CMD 11-H17.32.

25

1 **11-H17.32**
2 **Written submission from**
3 **Northumberland Manufacturers'**
4 **Association**

5
6 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission which
7 was an oral presentation that was switched to a written
8 submission was from the Canadian Nuclear Workers Council
9 in CMD 11-H17.33.

10
11 **11-H17.33**
12 **Written submission from the**
13 **Canadian Nuclear**
14 **Workers Council**

15
16 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
17 Mr. Lou Rinaldi, M.P.P., Northumberland-Quinte West as
18 outlined in CMD 11-H17.34.

19
20 **11-H17.34**
21 **Written submission from**
22 **Lou Rinaldi, Former M.P.P.,**
23 **Northumberland-Quinte West**

24
25 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from

1 Ms. Rose Campbell as outlined in CMD 11-H17.35.

2

3 **11-H17.35**

4 **Written submission from**

5 **Rose Campbell**

6

7 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from

8 Mr. Lorne VanderDussen as outlined in CMD 11-H17.36.

9

10 **11-H17.36**

11 **Written submission from**

12 **Lorne VanderDussen**

13

14 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from

15 the Northumberland Labour Council as outlined in CMD 11-

16 H17.37. This organization did an oral presentation

17 earlier today.

18

19 **11-H17.37**

20 **Written submission from**

21 **Northumberland Labour Council**

22

23 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next written submission

24 is from the Northumberland Services for Women as outlined

25 in CMD 11-H17.38.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

11-H17.38
Written submission from
Northumberland Services
for Women

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
Ms. Kathy Krakenberg as outlined in CMD 11-H17.39.

11-H17.39
Written submission from
Kathy Krakenberg

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
the United Steelworkers Local 14193 as outlined in CMD 11-
H17.41.

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
Habitat for Humanity Northumberland as outlined in CMD 11-
H17.42.

11-H17.42
Written submission from
the Habitat for Humanity Northumberland

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from

1 Scientists in School as outlined in CMD 11-H17.43.

2

3 **11-H17.43**

4 **Written submission from**

5 **Scientists in School**

6

7 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission, which
8 we've also heard earlier today, is from the Canadian
9 Nuclear Association as outlined in CMD 11-H17.44.

10

11 **11-H17.44**

12 **Written submission from**

13 **Canadian Nuclear Association**

14

15 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
16 Mr. Graeme Lawson as outlined in CMD 11-H17.45.

17

18 **11-H17.45**

19 **Written submission from**

20 **Mr. Graeme Lawson**

21

22 **MR. LEBLANC:** The next submission is from
23 Atomic Energy of Canada Limited as outlined in CMD 11-
24 H17.46, which is an oral presentation we also heard
25 yesterday evening.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

11-H17.46

**Written submission from
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited**

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
Ms. Jean Huffman as outlined in CMD 11-H17.48.

11-H17.48

**Written submission from
Ms. Jean Huffman**

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from
Mr. Tyler Rouse as outlined in CMD 11-H17.49.

11-H17.49

**Written submission from
Mr. Tyler Rouse**

MR. LEBLANC: This, Mr. President,
concludes the list of written submissions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

I think we're going to stop here and we
have -- can you tell us who is -- when are we going to
start tomorrow and who is left in terms of some oral

1 presentations?

2 **MR. LEBLANC:** Okay, we're going to start at
3 8:30 tomorrow morning.

4 There are three oral presentations left,
5 after which we will have a round of questions for the
6 Commission Members, after which we will do the Blind River
7 licensing renewal hearing. It is scheduled for 11:00
8 tomorrow morning.

9 This being said, I've discussed with Cameco
10 and should we have time at the end of the Cameco Fuel
11 Manufacturing, we may want to start a bit earlier with the
12 Blind River hearing. Depending if the intervenors are in
13 the room or not, we may proceed with the written
14 submissions first and then proceed at 11:00 as scheduled,
15 as the notice of public hearing was issued.

16 I know that we have Earth Watch here, so I
17 don't know if Madame Lloyd would be available a bit
18 earlier tomorrow should we start a bit earlier.

19 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** (off mic)

20 **MR. LEBLANC:** If I have a list, that's what
21 I -- we'll proceed in that fashion; thank you.

22 And again, this is just tentative. We may
23 just need all the time. You've seen how successful I was
24 in my timing today.

25 **THE CHAIRMAN:** You did a fine job, Marc.

