

*Projet de modification des installations de stockage des déchets radioactifs  
et réfection de Gentilly-2*

---

**Sierra Club of Canada**

*Information complémentaire concernant la gestion des déchets radioactifs  
de moyennes et de faibles activités*

**octobre et novembre 2004**

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 2004 10:44:16 -0400  
From: "Info" <info@cnsccsn.gc.ca>  
To: <shawnp@sierraclub.ca>  
Subject: Re: document request - questions  
X-eSafe-inspection-result: Mail clean

## Annexe I

Content-Type: text/html  
Content-Description: HTML

Dear Mr. Stensil,

Starting with the 2nd quarter 2003, the Rapport trimestriel sur l'exploitation Centrale nucléaire de Gentilly-2 are protected because of the shift workers names. Copies of the reports can be made available without this information upon request.

No, the Atomic Energy Control Board (now the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission) didn't have any formal procedures for tracking down these recommendations.

The CNSC has required all the waste facility permit holders at nuclear generating stations to conduct robustness study of their waste facilities. These studies are presently under review by the CNSC.

We have no single indicators to reflect the aging, but we have indicators to monitor the performance of the nuclear power plants.

Thank you for contacting the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

Judith Daoust

Inquiries Officer

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

>>> "Shawn-Patrick Stensil" <shawnp@sierraclub.ca> 2004-10-04 3:44:36 PM >>>

Hi Sunni (or whomever is monitoring this email),

Following up on the September 16th hearing on AECL's financial guarantee for the Chalk River, I would like to make a document request. Reading over the transcripts, Commissioners and CNSC staff all referred to a letter that CNSC staff sent to AECL in response to its decommissioning plan of June 2004. I believe in the letter they outlined 4-points for making the PDP meet CNSC regulations. Would I be happy to have a copy of this letter sent to me? I could also pick it up on the 2nd floor if need be.

On another note, I was just in the CNSC library and noted that a number of the utilities, such as Hydro-Quebec, have chosen it appropriate to make their quarterly technical reports confidential. Up until 2003 all of Hydro-Quebec's quarterly reports are available on the stacks at the library. I was wondering if I could have a quick explanation on what reasoning/policy permits Hydro-Quebec to make such a decision.

Finally, I've been reading over a 1994 report put out by Quebec's Bureau d'audience publiques concerning the construction of the dry storage site at Gentilly-2. The BAPE Commission, which is part of Quebec's environmental assessment procedure, makes a number of recommendations to the provincial government as well as Hydro-Quebec and the former Atomic Energy Control Board. I'd like information or a suggestion on how I could track down such information what, if any thing, the former AECB did with these recommendations.

One such recommendation is the following (typed without French accents):

"La commission estime qu'il serait important que la CCEA établisse un indice qui représenterait l'état de vieillissement d'une centrale nucléaire et dont elle se servirait lors de l'évaluation des demandes de renouvellement des permis d'exploitation."

There are others. The name of the document is "Stockage a sec du combustible nucléaire irradié de la centrale Gentilly-2." Its ISBN is 2-550-09830-7 (1994)

Anyhow, let me know if you need any clarifications on these questions.

Thanks again.

Shawn-Patrick Stensil, Sierra Club of Canada

## Annexe II

November 11, 2004

Mr. Michael Taylor - AECL  
Mr. Michel Rheaume - Hydro-Quebec  
Mr. Laurie Comeau - New Brunswick Power

On October 14, 2004 OPG provided briefing material on the proposal for a deep geologic repository for low and intermediate level waste at the Waste Management Facility. I would like to provide further clarification on a number of points in the agreement between OPG and the Municipality of Kincardine on this subject.

First of all, throughout the next decade and more, we will need to obtain a number of approvals and licences leading to the anticipated operation of the facility in 2007. There will be ample opportunity throughout for public review, scrutiny and consultation. The next milestone will be a local community consultation exercise scheduled for early 2005.

Secondly, the agreement is quite specific in defining acceptance criteria for the type and source of wastes to be handled and disposed at the deep geologic repository. Included are low and intermediate level wastes from the operation and decommissioning of the twenty reactors owned by OPG in Ontario, with provisions for these types of wastes from new nuclear builds in Ontario. The agreement does not allow used nuclear fuel from any source and does not provide for low and intermediate level waste from AECL, New Brunswick Power or Hydro Quebec.

Both the Municipality of Kincardine and OPG would be happy to provide further information on request. You may also view the website <http://www.opg.com/ops/NwasteIAS10.asp>.

Sincerely,

Ken Nash