



File / dossier : 6.01.07

Date: 2021-04-26

Edocs: 6551801

**Written submission from
Oliver Drerup**

**Mémoire de
Oliver Drerup**

In the Matter of the

À l'égard de

BWXT Medical Ltd.

BWXT Medical Ltd.

Application for a Class IB nuclear substance
processing facility operating licence

Demande pour un permis d'exploitation d'une
installation de traitement de substances
nucléaires de catégorie IB

Commission Public Hearing

Audience publique de la Commission

June 9, 2021

9 juin 2021

FROM: Oliver Drerup

Sent on April 10, 2021:

I am opposed to a facility in Kanata intended to process medical isotopes. My reason for this is that Canada's Nuclear Regulatory fraternity rationalizes future nuclear development based on previous use. What is today an isotope facility could become something quite different.

For example, Chalk River morphs from a mothballed research facility to a location intended for near surface permanent storage of nuclear waste because the area is already contaminated and has a workforce accustomed to the danger associated with such material.

The majority of the isotopes processed in Kanata would require to be transported throughout the Region and perhaps the world. I want none of this anywhere near my family or my neighbors. I am opposed to ANY further nuclear development. Any Boy Scout leader would be responsible enough to realize that locating a latrine upstream of a water source was bad camping protocol. Chalk River should not be used for waste storage and Kanata should not be a place where isotopes are processed.

Sent on April 15, 2021:

Dear Ms. Levert,

Thank you for responding to my note.

I have spent time reviewing the material you forwarded to me and find the breadth of the approach camouflages the issues at hand. I get really nervous when I read about efforts to manage over-conservatism.

The issues must remain as simply stated as possible.

1. Nuclear activities, because of their inherent dangers, should be segregated away from population centres as much as possible. This was the original justification for the location of the Caulk River Facility.
2. These activities understandably grow in scale once a licence has been obtained. The political and economic pressure to continue extending the life of such a facility is difficult to prevent. This is why Pickering, which should now be closed, remains in operation! It is why this current application of BWXT is under consideration. This is why Caulk River is being suggested as a waste facility.

The implications are clear. Society's ability to maintain control of these processes are constantly being eroded. I am vehemently opposed to your granting this license. Worse, placing nuclear waste upstream of a number of Canadian cities all of whom draw drinking water from the river is unconscionable as is the continued operation of the Pickering Reactor.

Thank you for placing these comments into the record.

Sincerely,

Oliver Drerup