September 13, 2012

Minutes of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) Meeting held Thursday, September 13, 2012 beginning at 9:06 am at the Public Hearing Room, 14th floor, 280 Slater Street, Ottawa, Ontario.

Present:

M. Binder, President
A. Harvey
R. Velshi
M. J. McDill

M. Leblanc, Secretary
L.Thiele, General Counsel
T. Johnston and M. Young, Recording Secretaries

CNSC staff advisors were: R. Jammal, G. Rzentkowski, F. Rinfret, M. Régimbald, D. Howard, P. Elder, S. Oue, Z. Bounagui, G. Schwartz, B. Poulet, P. Corcoran, C. Purvis, R. Cawthorn and C. McDermott

Other contributors were:

- Ontario Power Generation: B. Duncan and R. MacEacheron
- Bruce Power: F. Saunders
- Hydro-Québec : C. Gélinas
- New Brunswick Power: P. Thompson
- Natural Resources Canada: D. Metcalfe
- AECL: J. Miller, G. MacLean and R. Mellor

Constitution

1. With the notice of meeting, CMD 12-M45, having been properly given and a quorum of Commission Members being present, the meeting was declared to be properly constituted.

2. Since the meeting of the Commission held August 14 and 15, 2012, Commission Member Documents CMD 12-M45 to CMD 12-M50 were distributed to Members. These documents are further detailed in Annex A of these minutes.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The revised agenda, CMD 12-M46.A, was adopted as presented.

Chair and Secretary

4. The President chaired the meeting of the Commission, assisted by M. Leblanc, Secretary, and T. Johnston and M. Young, Recording Secretaries.

Minutes of the CNSC Meeting Held August 14 and 15, 2012

5. The Commission Members approved the minutes of the August 14 and 15, 2012 Commission Meeting as presented in CMD 12-M49.

STATUS REPORTS

Status Report on Power Reactors

6. With reference to CMD 12-M50, which includes the Status Report on Power Reactors, CNSC staff presented updates on the following:

   - Bruce A Nuclear Generating Station (NGS), Unit 1, the Annulus Gas System is unavailable on 10% of fuel channels;
   - Darlington NGS, Unit 1 is in a guaranteed shutdown state until CNSC staff are satisfied that the heat transport heat pump failure has been fully investigated by Ontario Power Generation (OPG);
   - Darlington NGS, Unit 2 is in a safe shutdown state for a maintenance outage until September 16, 2012;
   - Gentilly-2 NGS (G2), Hydro-Québec (HQ) is preparing a work plan for repairs and inspection before the return to electrical production;
   - Pickering NGS B, Unit 6 is operating at 100% of full power; and
   - Point Lepreau NGS, is undergoing turbine commissioning and is now at 14% of full power.

7. CNSC staff provided further details regarding Bruce A, Unit 1. CNSC staff noted that when the heat transport system is hot, 10% of the fuel channels display blockages but the system blockages disappear when the unit is cooled down. CNSC staff explained that the risk of pressure tube leakage or rupture is minimal as they are new and have been extensively tested. CNSC staff noted that leak detection is still available through other alarms. CNSC staff further stated that it had issued an approval in accordance with the Bruce A operating licence to allow for further troubleshooting and restoration of the Annulus Gas System to meet operating requirements. CNSC staff noted that resolution of this issue is a prerequisite to releasing the regulatory hold point at 50% reactor power.

8. The Commission asked, under which heat conditions the fuel channels were affected. CNSC staff responded that the exact temperature at which the blockages occurred was unknown but it was a result of running primary heat transport system pumps.

9. The Commission asked CNSC staff to address whether there were any safety concerns regarding the duration of the root cause analysis investigation. CNSC staff responded that there were no safety concerns as the Annulus Gas System is only used to detect leaks before rupturing could occur in the pressure tubes. CNSC staff noted that the system had not previously gone through thermal cycles that would normally affect the condition of the pressure tubes.

10. CNSC staff provided further details in relation to the verbal event initial report regarding Unit 1 at Darlington NGS. CNSC staff explained, the unit underwent a pressure transient due to a valve failure in the primary heat transport purification circuit that caused the failure of a heat transport feed pump. CNSC staff stated that the reactor was safely shut down and remains in a guaranteed shutdown state. CNSC staff added that there is an investigation in progress to determine the cause of the valve failure.

11. The Commission asked for further details regarding the shutdown of Darlington Unit 1. A representative from OPG stated that a valve had failed in the open state and allowed air into the heat transport purification system. The OPG representative explained that, as the air entered the heat transport feed pump, it caused air locking of the pump and the loss of flow. The unit was safely shut down and the source of the problem was identified. CNSC staff commented that there were no safety implications as a result of this event. CNSC staff added that OPG would conduct a full investigation for its root cause analysis report. There will be no further report to the Commission in this item unless there are unanticipated findings in the root source analysis report.

12. The Commission asked if worst-case scenarios would be considered during the root cause analysis, as it was understood that this would be routine practice for forced shutdown events. CNSC staff responded, they were requiring that the unit remain in the guaranteed shutdown state until all scenarios and consequences could be tested and fully understood.

13. The Commission asked if probabilistic analysis was being conducted in addition to deterministic analysis. CNSC staff responded that probabilistic safety assessments were used to determine the probability and consequences of postulated event scenarios.

14. The Commission enquired as to how long the repairs and the inspection of G2 would take, and if there would be enough time to make operating the reactor worthwhile between now and the planned shutdown in December. A representative from HQ responded that due to the nature of the work and the fact it has

never been done in the facility, the preparation for the work was still being evaluated and no precise deadline could be provided. However, the representative from HQ advised the Commission that there would be time for operation until the end of December 2012. CNSC staff commented that the time required to do the work has relatively little importance as long as it gets done safely, and it would be up to HQ to decide if they would resume operating or not before the end of the year.

15. The Commission asked if CNSC staff has given HQ the approval to go forth with the repairs, and asked CNSC staff to explain whether this type of authorization was new to the CNSC. CNSC staff responded that it expected authorization to be issued in the coming days and that no problems were anticipated. CNSC staff noted that while it is not common, this type of authorization has been issued in the past.

16. The Commission asked if G2 would require special authorization to shut down its operations at the end of the year. CNSC staff responded that no special authorization is required for the reactor to remain in a guaranteed shutdown state. CNSC staff explained that in this state, the reactor cannot start by itself and that it can remain in the guaranteed shutdown state for an indefinite period of time.

17. The Commission asked for a progress update for the return to service activities at the Point Lepreau NGS (PL). CNSC staff and a representative from New Brunswick Power Nuclear (NB Power) responded that the return to service activities are progressing well and that NB Power is on schedule to return PL to service in the fall of 2012.

Event Initial Report (EIR)

Port Hope Conversion Facility

18. CNSC staff orally presented a brief event status update regarding a uranium spill at Cameco's Port Hope Conversion Facility that resulted in a potential contamination of the Port Hope Harbour. CNSC staff explained that following significant rainfall Saturday September 8, 2012, externally stored low-level waste bags leaked low-level waste and water that reached the storm water drainage system at the facility site. CNSC staff noted that, in addition to the storm water drainage system, Cameco has a number of catch basins as an additional safety precaution. CNSC staff stated that, as soon as the waste leak was noted, both the catch basins and the storm water drainage system were drained and pumped for treatment. Analysis showed elevated uranium concentration, in terms of micrograms per litre of water, in the first catch basin. CNSC staff noted that, in a recent analysis of the Port Hope Harbour water, measures did not exceed background levels.

19. The Commission enquired as to whether similar weather related events had happened in the past. CNSC staff responded that they would be able to provide more information following an upcoming facility inspection which is planned in the next couple of weeks.

ACTION
Report to Commission by March 2013

20. The Commission sought information regarding the number of bags stored and the amount of time they are kept on site for storage. CNSC staff stated that the low-level waste storage bags are kept on site temporarily before they are shipped to Blind River for incineration. CNSC staff noted that while it did not have precise information, it would examine the Port Hope Conversion Facility's inventory records during its upcoming inspection.

Discussion of Recent News Article

21. CNSC staff brought forth a matter that had appeared in a recent news article[1]. In 2010, an individual from Trois-Rivières acquired scrap pieces of an old diesel tank which were thought to be radiologically contaminated and allegedly originating from Hydro Quebec's (HQ) decommissioned Gentilly-1 Nuclear Generating Stating (G1). CNSC staff explained that the individual sold the tank pieces to ArcelorMittal for recycling and, upon entrance to the facility, they set off an alarm for contamination. The CNSC was notified immediately. With CNSC staff's recommendations, the individual hired Uni-Vert Tech to analyze the material and their report showed that only radioisotopes of natural origin and at background levels were present in the tank.

22. CNSC staff noted that, at approximately the same time in 2010, Atomic Energy Canada Limited (AECL) had removed a decommissioned oil tank from G2, and following an interior and exterior radiological analysis, no contamination was detected. CNSC staff added that, while the material was leaving G1, there was no indication of contamination detection and HQ confirmed this with a secondary inspection of the tanks.

23. The Commission enquired as to whether the CNSC had been working with the individual prior to the individual's approach to the media. CNSC staff responded that they had previously recommended that the individual hire a qualified consultant to handle and dispose the material in a safe way. CNSC staff stated that because the material contained radioisotopes of natural origin, it was exempt from the application of the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*[2] (NSCA) and its associated regulations. CNSC staff added that, regulatory oversight of naturally occurring radioactive material is under provincial jurisdiction, in this case, the province

[1] Trahan, Brigitte. "Aux prises avec du métal radioactif en provenance de Gentilly-1". Le Nouvelliste [Trois-Rivières] 7 Septembre 2012.
[2] Statutes of Canada (S.C.) 1997, c. 9.

of Quebec. CNSC staff explained that the individual did not want to follow CNSC staff's recommendations but rather wanted HQ or AECL to take the contaminated scrap pieces of the tank back.

24. A representative from AECL stated they have reason to believe that the scrap pieces of an old diesel tank acquired by the individual were not the same as those released from G1 or G2 based on the photos provided by the individual. A representative from AECL stated that they would work with the individual to determine if the tanks originated from AECL.

25. The Commission asked when AECL's tanks were originally released and where they had been during that time until present. CNSC staff responded that AECL released the tanks in 2010 from G1. CNSC staff added that these tanks spent a few weeks at ArcelorMittal, and since that time, the tanks could have been sold as scrap metal for recycling or for any other purpose for use in the public.

26. The Commission enquired as to who was responsible for the tanks, whether they came from HQ or AECL and, if the Government of Quebec has accepted the responsibility to help the individual with the matter of this material. CNSC staff stated that AECL and HQ released the material from G1 as being uncontaminated material since it met the unconditional clearance level defined in the CNSC's *Nuclear Substances and Radiation Devices Regulations*. CNSC staff responded that the *ministère du Développement durable, de l'Environnement et des Parcs* (Department of Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks) of Quebec has taken the files and is in the process of working with the individual.

27. The Commission asked if the contaminated material was considered dangerous in Quebec even though no contamination was detected upon leaving AECL's and HQ's facilities. CNSC staff responded that, under Quebec legislation, the contaminated scrap pieces from the tank, although low risk, were considered hazardous material since their disposal was not authorized under a CNSC licence. CNSC staff added that upon entry to ArcelorMittal, the portal monitor measured the contaminated material at 30 times the detection limit. CNSC staff noted that the origin of this contaminated material is doubtfully from G1 as there was absolutely no contamination detected when it left the facility.

28. The Commission asked what the potential risk to the public from the contaminated tanks has been over the last couple of years. CNSC staff responded that the tanks released from G1 showed no sign of contamination. A representative from AECL explained that the understanding is that the radiological contamination is from naturally occurring radioactive materials. CNSC staff stated that there is, and has been, no impact on human health or the environment.

29. The Commission asked CNSC staff to provide an update to the Commission when more information is available.

ACTION
Report to Commission by April 2013

Interim Status Reports

30. With reference to CMD 12-M47, CNSC staff presented an interim status report on the progress of decommissioning activities at Atomic Energy of Canada Limited's (AECL) Whiteshell Laboratories located near Pinawa, Manitoba. CNSC staff noted that a nuclear research and test establishment decommissioning licence had been granted to AECL for a 10-year period from January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2018, and in its decision to issue the licence, the Commission had directed CNSC staff and AECL to submit interim status reports at the three- and seven-year points in the licence period.

31. CNSC staff provided information regarding the work undertaken to-date during the licence period and on AECL's performance in relation to the safety and control areas CNSC staff uses in its compliance verification. CNSC staff stated that AECL had a rating of "satisfactory" or "fully satisfactory" in all safety and control areas, and that AECL had continued to decommission Whiteshell Laboratories in compliance with its licence, the NSCA and the Regulations made under the NSCA.

32. The Commission also received submissions from AECL, who provided information concerning the decommissioning activities undertaken during the licence period. AECL explained that it had completed the decommissioning of redundant, non-nuclear buildings, and was constructing new facilities to enable the decommissioning of the remainder of the site. AECL also provided information about its future plans, including waste management.

33. The Commission sought further information regarding the amount of decommissioning work that had been completed to date, as well as the expectations for the decommissioning schedule. A representative from AECL replied that, while AECL was reasonably on schedule, it was conducting a review to improve the schedule and complete the decommissioning sooner. The AECL representative explained that the decommissioning of certain buildings was delayed because AECL had determined that those buildings' services were still required. AECL's representative noted that the decommissioning of other buildings is on schedule.

34. The Commission sought more information regarding the changes made to the decommissioning schedule since the licence was issued in 2008. CNSC staff noted that the decommissioning schedule would be affected by the amount of funding from Natural Resources Canada's (NRCan) Nuclear Legacy Liabilities Program and that the overall schedule was more ambitious than the one presented in 2008.The AECL representative noted that it would be providing the revised schedule to NRCan by the end of the fiscal year. The AECL representative explained that there would be a long-term financial benefit to completing the work more quickly and stressed the importance of AECL being able to effectively manage the project. The AECL representative noted that AECL would also utilize international experience and expertise.

35. The Commission asked the representative from NRCan to comment on the matter. The NRCan representative responded that the government of Canada has recognized the necessary future costs and stated that funding would not be a concern.

36. The Commission asked for more information concerning AECL's recent proposed licence amendments for the site and asked whether it would be possible to implement the CNSC's reformed licence format, which includes a licence conditions handbook (LCH). CNSC staff responded that the proposed amendments were administrative in nature and noted that CNSC staff would be actively discussing licensing reform with AECL. An AECL representative responded that AECL was willing to work towards implementing the new licence format.

37. The Commission enquired about issues related to fire protection, including six unplanned events associated with the fire alarm monitoring system. A representative from AECL responded that AECL had recognized reliability issues with this system and noted that AECL has a plan in place to replace it by the end of 2014. CNSC staff commented that the safety significance of those events was low because AECL has several layers of fire protection in place. CNSC staff noted the difference between fire protection at an operating facility and one that is being decommissioned, and stated that AECL's performance with respect to fire protection was satisfactory.

38. The Commission asked for more information concerning the waste management areas at the site, including the quantities and types of waste being stored. A representative from AECL described the waste storage areas, including low-level waste bunkers and the recently-constructed Shielded Modular Above Ground Storage (SMAGS) facility, which also stores low-level waste. The AECL representative further described the storage of medium-level waste and high-level waste, i.e., reactor fuel, at the site.

39. The Commission asked for more information concerning the monitoring of the waste management areas. An AECL representative responded that AECL has an extensive monitoring program, which includes sampling wells as well as environmental monitoring in the Winnipeg River. AECL's representative noted that although some contamination had been observed within the waste management area, there are no concerns about the contamination migrating, as the groundwater movement through the clay soil leaches up to the surface rather than away from the site. The AECL representative noted that there is a small amount of contamination in the Winnipeg River that will naturally diminish over time. CNSC staff stated that it receives and reviews the monitoring data from AECL on an ongoing basis, and noted that it has not identified any concerns to date.

40. The Commission enquired about the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in the oversight of the site. An AECL representative responded that the IAEA conducts on-site inspections and noted that AECL provides the requisite information to the IAEA.

41. The Commission asked about the future plans for the waste onsite. An AECL representative responded that while no final decisions have been made regarding the long-term management of all waste types, an important aspect of the federal government's Nuclear Legacy Liabilities Program is to determine the appropriate options and final solutions for all of the waste generated as part of the decommissioning activities carried out under that program. AECL noted that the low-level waste may remain on site until it has decayed below unconditional release limits. The AECL representative further stated that fuel waste would eventually be placed in the national used fuel repository that is currently planned by the Nuclear Waste Management Organization.

42. The Commission, noting that there were more lost time injuries at the Whiteshell Laboratories site than at operating nuclear power plants, enquired about AECL's reporting of lost-time injuries. The AECL representative responded that, in the past it had used a different definition of lost time injury compared to that used by the operating nuclear power plants, and that it would now be reporting using the same definition as that used by the CANDU Owners Group. The AECL representative noted that this would allow for a better means of comparison.

43. The Commission asked for more information concerning the public information program for the site, including the level of interest and engagement from the public. The representative from AECL responded that the local community was engaged in the environmental assessment and licence application for the

decommissioning project, and that the public had continued to participate through public liaison committees. The AECL representative noted that AECL had recently introduced a community newsletter and stated that the local public was supportive of AECL's activities and level of involvement with the community.

44. The Commission enquired about the number of Aboriginal employees working for AECL. An AECL representative responded that the most recent annual AECL Employment Equity Report indicated that 35 individuals had self-declared as having this status.

45. The Commission sought further information concerning the number of workers and members of the public who had visited the site, and the dose information for the site. An AECL representative responded that there are approximately 350 staff members on site, and that AECL has dose information for all workers and members of the public who had visited the site, including contractors. CNSC staff noted that anybody who had been on the site would have been issued a dosimeter and all of the doses from the site were reported to the National Dose Registry.

46. The Commission, noting that AECL had total suspended solids, iron, mercury, oil and grease exceedances against its internal guidelines in the Active Liquid Waste Treatment Centre discharges, enquired about liquid releases of hazardous substances. CNSC staff responded that internal guidelines were used as an early warning system to ensure that releases would not reach the regulatory limits. CNSC staff explained that the releases would be monitored and any issues addressed if required. A representative from AECL confirmed that AECL's internal limits were set to ensure that discharges do not have any impact or effect on the environment. The AECL representative noted that AECL had implemented improvements to reduce the aforementioned releases.

47. The Commission enquired about AECL's relationship with the Manitoba government and other regulatory bodies. A representative from AECL responded that AECL provides the Manitoba government with a copy of its annual environmental monitoring report and noted that the Manitoba Conservation Authority is a member of the public liaison committee. The AECL representative further noted that AECL would inform Environment Canada of any exceedances of federal regulations. CNSC staff noted that, as part of the "joint regulatory group," they have invited other federal and provincial agencies to accompany them when conducting site inspections. CNSC staff noted that these other agencies had not identified any issues to-date.

48. The Commission, noting that the next comprehensive interim status report would be at the seven-year point in the licence, sought more information about CNSC staff's plans for reporting during the remainder of the licence period. CNSC staff responded that it was not planning to incorporate the monitoring results into its annual reports to the Commission because Whiteshell Laboratories is undergoing decommissioning, which means that it does not have ongoing operational releases. The Commission notes, however, that CNSC staff is expected to present annual compliance updates to the Commission on all AECL facilities starting in 2013.

ACTION
by end of 2013 (ongoing)

49. The Commission sought more information regarding the long-term plan for the site. An AECL representative responded that, in the environmental assessment for the decommissioning project, the end-state for the site was anticipated to be "greenfield"[3] except for an area that would remain under institutional control and require ongoing monitoring until the remaining activity has decayed to below the limits for uncontrolled release.

DECISION ITEMS

Regulatory Document RD-99.1, *Reporting Requirements for Operating Nuclear Power Plants*, and Guidance Document GD-99.1, *Guide to the Reporting Requirements for Operating Nuclear Power Plants*

50. With reference to CMD 12-M48, CNSC staff presented to the Commission its recommendation that the Commission approve Regulatory Document RD-99.1 and Guidance Document GD-99.1 for publication, and approve the initiation of the process for the amendment of applicable operating licences to include reference to RD-99.1 by June 30, 2013, with RD-99.1 to come into effect on January 1, 2014.

51. CNSC staff further recommended a phased approach for the reporting of specific safety performance indicators (SPIs) with certain SPIs required to be reported by January 1, 2014 and others by January 1, 2015. CNSC staff proposed several new SPIs to be reported in addition to revisions of those in the existing regulatory document S-99, *Reporting Requirements for Operating Nuclear Power Plants* (2003). CNSC staff explained that the modernized SPIs include seven overall SPIs for benchmarking of safety performance against national and international practices and 31 specific SPIs for compliance monitoring.

[3] 'Greenfield' denotes the end-state of the site where the site has been cleared for unconditional use.

52. A representative from Bruce Power, speaking on behalf of the power reactor industry, expressed concerns with the recommendations from CNSC staff. The Bruce Power representative expressed the view that, while the industry supported the updating of S-99, it disagreed with many of the new SPIs proposed by CNSC staff and suggested that several should be amended or removed. The Bruce Power representative explained that the proposed changes would require more effort and resources in reporting and data management, but felt that they would not necessarily be meaningful performance indicators. The Bruce Power representative also expressed the industry's reservations at making certain information publicly available, either directly or through the CNSC. The Bruce Power representative noted that the industry had participated in the comment periods in the CNSC process for developing RD-99.1 and GD-99.1, as well as the new SPIs, and that it had expressed its views and concerns throughout the process. Representatives from OPG, NB Power and Hydro-Quebec concurred with the remarks from the Bruce Power representative.

53. The Commission asked CNSC staff to explain the rationale for choosing certain SPIs, such as for reporting accident severity. CNSC staff responded that the CNSC is focused on safety and the effectiveness of the licensees' programs, and, consequently, the SPIs would not necessarily be consistent with what the licensees report to other organizations, such as the Canadian Electrical Association (CEA). CNSC staff stated that some of the SPIs would be used to establish and monitor trends when viewed on a year-to-year basis. The Bruce Power representative disagreed with CNSC staff's assessment of certain SPIs and felt that the reporting results would be misleading or uninformative.

54. The Commission enquired about the phased implementation proposed by CNSC staff. CNSC staff responded that they intended to use the implementation phase to clarify any discrepancies in the understanding of reporting requirements between CNSC staff and the licensees, and to minimize the impact of the transition to the new documents.

55. The Bruce Power representative asked if, under the new requirements, the industry could submit reports that had been provided to other regulatory bodies, such as the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, the Ontario Ministry of Labour, and Environment Canada, so as to not duplicate reporting under RD-99.1. The Commission sought clarification in this regard. CNSC staff responded that RD-99.1 would permit licensees to submit a copy of those reports without needing to reformat them.

56. The Commission asked for more information concerning the development of the two documents, including the lessons learned from the process. CNSC staff described the process, which included several rounds of consultation with the industry and opportunities for members of the public to comment. CNSC staff noted that it had established a joint industry working group to develop the SPIs. CNSC staff further noted the importance of benchmarking with other regulators and the IAEA in the development of the SPIs. CNSC staff also stressed the importance of involving technical specialists in the process and in ensuring ongoing consultation. The Bruce Power representative noted that it was important that the objectives for each SPI, as well as the impact in terms of workload, be clear and well-understood.

57. The Commission noted that not all of the safety and control areas used by CNSC staff for compliance monitoring had associated SPIs, and questioned the reason for this. CNSC staff responded that this was because some SPIs had been removed during the consultation period in response to the industry's concerns regarding sensitive information. CNSC staff noted that the ultimate objective would be to have SPIs for each area and clarified that the 31 specific SPIs for compliance monitoring were never intended for external reporting.

58. The Commission noted the disconnect between the views of CNSC staff and the industry and questioned how these issues could be resolved. CNSC staff proposed that the agreed-upon SPIs could be implemented and that CNSC staff would continue to work with the industry to clarify the requirements for the remainder. The Commission noted the amount of work that would be required to implement the changes and questioned whether it would be prudent to proceed before all of the details had been worked out.

59. The Commission expressed the view that the documents should be consolidated, clarified and simplified. Further, the Commission stated that the implementation should be practical, using international experience if possible.

60. After considering the recommendations submitted by CNSC staff and the views expressed by the nuclear industry, the Commission has decided not to approve Regulatory Document RD-99.1, *Reporting Requirements for Operating Nuclear Power Plants*, and Guidance Document GD-99.1, *Guide to the Reporting Requirements for Operating Nuclear Power Plants*, for publication and use at this time. The Commission directs CNSC staff to streamline and simplify the documents, and consolidate them into a single document for the Commission's consideration at a future Commission meeting. In addition, the Commission asks that the

DECISION

CMD to be filed in support of the revised RD/GD-99.1 identify clearly, for each of the proposed SPIs, where CNSC staff and the industry are in agreement and where they are not, as well as the points of contention. Furthermore, the Commission notes that CNSC staff should take the lessons learned from this process into consideration when developing the new document.

Closure of the Public Meeting

61. The meeting closed at 3:06 pm.

Sophie Gregoire Gos — 2012-11-16
Recording Secretary — Date

Michael Young

Tanya Johnston — 2012-11-16
Recording Secretary — Date

M L — 16-11-12
Secretary — Date

APPENDIX A

CMD DATE File No

12-M45 2012-08-16 Edocs #3990765
Notice of Meeting of September 13, 2012

12-M46 2012-08-29 Edocs #3997014
Agenda of the meeting of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission to be held on Thursday, September 13, 2012, at the Public Hearing Room, 14th floor, 280 Slater Street, Ottawa, Ontario

12-M46.A 2012-09-06 Edocs #4000398
Updated agenda of the meeting of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission to be held on Thursday, September 13, 2012, at the Public Hearing Room, 14th floor, 280 Slater Street, Ottawa, Ontario

12-M47 2012-08-28 Edocs #3990749
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited: Interim Status Report on the Progress of Decommissioning Activities at Whiteshell Laboratories – Oral presentation by CNSC staff

12-M47.A 2012-06-18 Edocs #3903480
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited: Interim Status Report on the Progress of Decommissioning Activities at Whiteshell Laboratories – Contains prescribed security information and is not publicly available

12-M47.1 2012-08-24 Edocs #3995844
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited: Interim Status Report on the Progress of Decommissioning Activities at Whiteshell Laboratories – Oral presentation by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited

12-M47.1A 2012-09-05 Edocs #4000350
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited: Interim Status Report on the Progress of Decommissioning Activities at Whiteshell Laboratories – Presentation by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited

12-M48 2012-09-05 Edocs #4000350
RD-99.1 and GD-99.1: Nuclear Power Plant Reporting Requirements and Guidance – Oral presentation by CNSC staff

12-M49 2012-09-12 Edocs #4003075
Approval of Minutes of Commission Meeting held August 14-15, 2012

12-M50 2012-09-05 Edocs #4000012
Status of power reactor units as of September 5, 2012