



CMD 26-H100.1A

Date: 2026-09-28

Supplementary Information

Renseignements supplémentaires

Written Submission from Canadian Nuclear Laboratories

Mémoire des Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

In the matter of the

À l'égard des

Canadian Nuclear Laboratories

Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

Application to amend the licence and
licensing basis for the Gentilly-1 Waste
Facility

Demande concernant la modification de
leur permis et du fondement
d'autorisation pour l'installation de
gestion des déchets de Gentilly-1

**Hearing in writing based on written
submissions**

**Audience par écrit fondée sur des
mémoires**

July 2026

Juillet 2026



**Supplemental Commission Member Document:
Additional Information for Consideration in respect of
the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction
61-508760-041-000**

Revision 0

Authored by:	<u>Katie Shorter</u>	<u>2026/09/28</u> Date
Authored by:	<u>Julie Therrien</u>	<u>2026/09/28</u> Date
Authored by:	<u>Danielle Waldman</u>	<u>2026/09/28</u> Date
Reviewed by:	<u>Sarah Brewer</u>	<u>2026/09/28</u> Date
Approved by:	<u><i>Kristan Schruder</i></u> Kristan Schruder Gentilly-1 Site Licence Holder	<u>2026/09/28</u> Date

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 1 of 77

This page is for Content Controls that apply to this document. If no Content Controls apply,
none will be listed.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 2 of 77

Revision History

Rev. No.	Date	Details of Rev.	Authored By	Reviewed By	Approved By
0	2026/09/28	Issued for Approval.	K. Shorter J. Therrien D. Waldman	S. Brewer	K. Schruder
D1	2026/09/18	Issued for “Review and Comment”.	K. Shorter J. Therrien	S. Brewer M. MacKay K. Schruder J. Tidmarsh D. Waldman	

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 3 of 77

Table of Contents

Section	Page
1. Purpose of this Submission	4
2. Scope of the Application	4
2.1 Activities within the Scope of the Application.....	4
2.2 Activities outside the Scope of the Application	5
2.2.1 Transportation	5
2.2.2 Storage, Treatment, Management and Disposal of Waste	5
3. Consultation and Engagement.....	5
3.1 Broader Engagement Context.....	6
3.2 Engagement with Kebaowek First Nation	6
4. Closing	7
5. References	8
Appendix A Engagement Summary - Kebaowek First Nation to 2026 September	9
Appendix B Key Records.....	27

Tables

Table 1: Response to KFN Information Requests	7
---	---

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 4 of 77

1. Purpose of this Submission

Further to the Procedural Direction issued by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC or Commission)¹ dated 2026 August 28 [1], this supplemental Commission Member Document (CMD) is provided to assist the Commission by clarifying certain matters raised in the interventions and documents written or submitted to the Commission regarding Canadian Nuclear Laboratories Ltd.'s (CNL) application (Application) to amend the licence for the Gentilly - 1 Waste Facility (G1WF) [2]. Specifically, this supplemental CMD provides the Commission with additional information and factual context regarding the scope of the requested licence amendment and engagement activities undertaken by CNL with Kebaowek First Nation (KFN) related to the G1WF since CNL's previous submission to the Commission to support a complete and accurate hearing record for purposes of the proceeding.

This supplemental CMD is not intended to respond to all matters raised in the interventions received by the Commission, nor does it address issues that are the responsibility of the Commission or CNSC staff, including, but not limited to, questions related to hearing processes, procedural matters, or other regulatory determinations.

2. Scope of the Application

CNL submits additional information regarding the scope of the requested licence amendment as set forth in the Application [2]. The following sections clarify the activities which are within the scope of the Application before the Commission, and those activities which are out of scope. CNL has prepared the Application in accordance with all applicable legal and regulatory requirements.

2.1 Activities within the Scope of the Application

The Application [2] seeks to amend the existing Waste Facility Decommissioning Licence (WFDL), Licence WFDL-W4-331.00/2034 [3] and associated regulatory documents, to allow CNL to transition G1WF from the currently authorized storage-with-surveillance activities to a phase that enables the execution of decommissioning activities.

If the Commission amends the G1WF licence as requested in the Application, storage-with-surveillance activities will continue, and CNL will begin additional activities, including the decommissioning and removal of all above ground and limited underground buildings and structures at G1WF that are operated or managed by CNL. CNL's Application [2] demonstrates how the waste resulting from the decommissioning of the G1WF will be safely managed in accordance with applicable legal and regulatory requirements, including the General Nuclear Safety and Control Regulations (GNSCR) [4], as currently enabled by the existing WFDL [3].

¹ The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is referred to as the "CNSC" when referring to the organization and its staff in general, and as the "Commission" when referring to the tribunal component.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 5 of 77

2.2 Activities outside the Scope of the Application

Several written interventions, and the document added to the record pursuant to the Procedural Direction [1] suggest that transportation, storage, and ultimate disposition of spent fuel² and/or waste from the G1WF, should be subject to approval under the current Application before the Commission.

The Application was developed in accordance with the CNSC's established regulatory framework and licensing structure [5]. Within that framework, transportation, and the licensing of receiving storage and disposal facilities are addressed through separate regulatory requirements and oversight processes. As such, information regarding these activities have not formed part of the basis for the current Application.

2.2.1 Transportation

The Application [2] does not seek approval for any past or future transportation of waste away from the Gentilly-1 site. As a result, the Commission is not making a decision with respect to the transportation of radioactive material in the current proceeding.

Transportation of nuclear waste is regulated pursuant to separate legislative and regulatory frameworks administered by Transport Canada [6] and the CNSC (Package and Transport of Nuclear Substances Regulations (PTNSR)) [7].

2.2.2 Storage, Treatment, Management and Disposal of Waste

The storage, treatment, management, or disposal of waste at receiving facilities is subject to separate regulatory oversight and licensing processes applicable to such receiving facilities. These activities which occur at a receiving facility are not within the scope of the Application [2] or the WFDL [3]. The Commission is therefore not making a decision regarding the storage, treatment, management or disposal of waste at receiving facilities in these proceedings.

3. Consultation and Engagement

CNL understands the Commission has a duty to consult³ regarding the conduct requested to be authorized by the licence amendment as set forth in the Application - namely, the transition from storage-with-surveillance to decommissioning and demolition at the G1WF. As described above, this will include decommissioning of all above ground and limited underground buildings and structures that are operated or managed by CNL. CNL submits that consultation on

² For clarity, the transfer of spent fuel from G1WF was completed in 2025.

³ The Commission has a duty to consult Indigenous peoples whenever it contemplates conduct that might adversely affect actual or potential Aboriginal rights or title [8]. Consultation obligations only arise when a current decision may impact Aboriginal rights and title. These obligations are not triggered by historical or hypothetical future decisions [9].

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 6 of 77

potential impacts of these activities, and these activities alone, is all that is required at law for the Commission to approve the Application.

The Application does not seek any new approvals relating to the transportation or the eventual storage, treatment, management, and disposal of waste at receiving facilities. These activities are permitted by other authorizations, either past or future. Any concerns related to consultation for such separately regulated past or future activities at receiving sites are properly addressed through the regulatory or legal processes for the applicable authorization(s).

3.1 Broader Engagement Context

The documentation submitted by CNL in support of the Application [2] was developed in accordance with the applicable regulatory framework and focused on the activities for which authorization is being sought through the requested licence amendment. In support of the regulatory review process, CNL submitted environmental [10] [11], technical [12] [13] and safety documentation [14] describing the proposed decommissioning activities, anticipated environmental effects, and associated mitigation measures. CNL also conducted significant engagement with Indigenous Nations, communities and organizations and other stakeholders, which is summarized in the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Indigenous Communications Supplementary Report (2023 January-2026 February) [15] and the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Public Communications Supplementary Report (2023 January-2026 February) [16].

3.2 Engagement with Kebaowek First Nation

As the Procedural Direction was issued in response to KFN's communication to the Commission Registry, CNL wishes to provide the Commission with additional information related to CNL's engagement with KFN on the Application and the G1WF. CNL's engagement with KFN up to 2026 February was captured in the Indigenous engagement summary [15] submitted with the Application. Appendix A to this supplemental CMD includes CNL's record of engagement with KFN on the Application, the G1WF and issues and concerns raised by KFN which KFN suggests are relevant to the Application, to ensure the Commission has the complete factual context on the record to consider the Application. Appendix B to this supplemental CMD includes copies of certain communications and engagement with KFN, as noted in Appendix A.

During CNL's engagement activities, KFN raised concerns related to the prior transportation of spent fuel from the G1WF and the management of radioactive waste at the Chalk River Laboratories site, including KFN's position regarding consent for same. Consultation on issues that relate to separate past or future approval processes is not relevant to the current Application. While these matters are not part of the licence amendment currently before the Commission, CNL engaged with KFN on these concerns through meetings, correspondence and responses to information requests. CNL remains available to continue those discussions as we understand that they are of importance to KFN, even though they are not relevant to the current Application or Commission decision.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 7 of 77

CNL and/or CNSC staff also responded to KFN's information requests as summarized in the table below.

Table 1: Response to KFN Information Requests

Request	Response
Environmental review(s), environmental effects review(s), or equivalent environmental assessment documents for G1WF decommissioning	CNL notified KFN when the requested documents were available on the CNSC website.
CNL licence to transport application	CNSC shared the transport licence and package certificate, which includes the pertinent information from CNL's application for the license to transport.
Safety analysis of the transportation package (SAR)	CNL advised KFN that CNL is unable to disclose this document due to it containing confidential and proprietary information.
Transport Security Plan	CNL advised KFN that CNL is unable to disclose this document due to the confidential nature of the document and applicable security restrictions in accordance with applicable law.

4. Closing

The authorization sought from the Commission in the Application [2] is approval to proceed with decommissioning activities at the G1WF. CNL submits that the information provided on the record demonstrates the robustness of the technical evaluation and Indigenous and public engagement conducted in respect of the G1WF and the Application before the Commission.

CNL's Application and this supplemental CMD respond to the major themes identified in the interventions and documents submitted on the record for this proceeding. The Application and this supplemental CMD were prepared in accordance with the applicable regulatory framework and requirements, and CNL submits that the Commission has all of the information required to decide the matter before it.

CNL remains committed to continuing discussions with KFN and other Indigenous Nations, communities and organizations and the public regarding matters of interest, including transportation, waste strategies and future regulatory initiatives, where applicable, in accordance with CNL's Public Information Program [17].

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 8 of 77

5. References

- [1] Email, A. Tanguay (CNSC Registry) to J. Therrien (CNL), *Procedural Direction – Application to Amend the Licence and Licensing Basis for Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (26-H100)*, 61-NOCN-26-0019-E, 2026 August 28.
- [2] Letter, K. Schruder (CNL) to C. Salmon (CNSC), *Revised Application for Licence Amendment to Proceed with Execution of Decommissioning at the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility*, 61-CNNO-26-0003-L, 2026 April 15.
- [3] Waste Facility Decommissioning Licence, Gentilly-1 Waste Facility, WFDL-W4--331.00/2034, Expiry date: 2034 December 31.
- [4] General Nuclear Safety and Control Regulations, SOR/2000-202.
- [5] [Regulatory Framework Overview](#) (CNSC website)
- [6] Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations, SOR/2001-286.
- [7] Packaging and Transport of Nuclear Substances Regulations, 2015, SOR/2015-145.
- [8] *Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests)*, 2004 SCC 73, [2004] 3 SCR 511, at para. 35.
- [9] *Chippewas of the Thames First Nation v. Enbridge Pipelines Inc.*, 2017 SCC 41, [2017] 1 SCR 1099, at para. 41.
- [10] *Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment Application Environmental Protection Measures for Decommissioning and Demolition*, 61-03710-ENA-005514, Revision 1.0, 2026 April 08.
- [11] *Environmental Risk Assessment for Gentilly-1 Waste Facility*, 61-505210-ASD-001, Revision 2.0, 2025 May.
- [12] *Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Detailed Decommissioning Plan Volume 1 – Program Overview*, 61-508310-DDP-001817, Revision 1, 2024 August.
- [13] *Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Detailed Decommissioning Plan Volume 1 Program Overview – Addendum*, 61-508310-DDP-010801, Revision 0, 2026 January.
- [14] *Safety Analysis Report for the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility*, 61-03610-SAR-001, Revision 3.1, 2025 August.
- [15] *Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Indigenous Communications Supplementary Report (2023 January – 2026 February)*, 61-513130-REPT-011919, Revision 0, 2026 April.
- [16] *Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Public Communications Supplementary Report (2023 January-2026 February)*, 61-513000-REPT-011931, Revision 0, 2026 April.
- [17] *Public Information Program for Canadian Nuclear Laboratories*, CW-513430-REPT-001, Revision 10.0, 2024 October 08.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 9 of 77

Appendix A Engagement Summary - Kebaowek First Nation to 2026 September

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 10 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
2023-10-12	Email	CNL provided KFN with the Chalk River Laboratories (CRL) Overview Decommissioning and Cleanup Plan (ODCP) in response to a request for this document to support the mid-term CRL licence review. The ODCP details waste management area expansion work for fuel to be received from G1WF, among other CNL sites.	KFN confirmed receipt.
2024-02-26	Meeting	During a meeting between KFN, CNL and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL), the G1WF waste being consolidated at CRL was a point of discussion and how another CNL project proposed at CRL would reduce liabilities associated with AECL's nuclear waste.	Discussion focused on the other project and how it may process material from the G1WF.
2024-04-03	Email	CNL provided KFN with an invite to the April webinars on CNL's G1WF Decommissioning and Whiteshell Laboratories Restoration Program being held on 2024 April 09.	No confirmation of receipt received from KFN.
2024-07-16	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and AECL focused on projects posted on the Impact Assessment Act Registry. Waste transportation was discussed generally in the context of modification to waste management areas at CRL. CNL explained that most waste currently being generated at CRL is not new operation waste, but legacy waste resulting from decommissioning, emphasized that new waste generation is small by comparison. CNL discussed future waste inventories using the IWS, explained that forecasted waste volumes are largely driven by legacy liabilities rather than new waste	KFN emphasized concerns regarding Section 82 projects, including a lack of early notification and meaningful engagement before public postings, insufficient transparency regarding how project decisions are made, and limited information available on the Registry. Highlighted a need to support Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and Crown consultation obligations. KFN stressed that it is not seeking to delay or stop projects but wants information in advance to determine whether a project is of interest and whether engagement is required. KFN noted that Indigenous Nations should not be expected to rely solely on public

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 11 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		streams. CNL repeatedly emphasized the need to view individual waste projects within the broader context of the Integrated Waste Strategy (IWS). CNL acknowledged that public registry processes may not provide Indigenous communities with the type of advance notice KFN is seeking. CNL proposed developing a system to identify projects of interest to KFN before formal postings occur and agreed to establish a standing agenda item on upcoming Section 82 projects. Explained interactions between CNL and AECL as the federal authority to provide additional context on how Section 82 projects are handled.	registries when proactive consultation remains a Crown responsibility. KFN pointed to engagement models used in Quebec where Indigenous communities receive advance notice of upcoming projects and participate in discussions before formal consultation processes begin, highlighting that this would help establish trust and improve efficiency. KFN expressed concern surrounding waste importation and waste management, raising broader concerns about the continued generation of nuclear waste. KFN repeatedly emphasized the importance of understanding the "whole picture" of waste management rather than receiving information on isolated projects.
2024-07-19	Email	CNL shared a publicly available link to CNL's IWS, explicitly stating CNL's strategy for high-level waste is consolidating high-level waste from G1WF and Whiteshell Laboratories (WL) in waste management areas at CRL. CNL also re-provided the CRL ODCP.	KFN confirmed receipt.
2025-07-17	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and CNSC staff was dedicated to discussions on G1WF, including supporting information and further context on waste transfers to CRL, notification concerns and Section 82 obligations. CNL responded to KFN's concerns, referenced previous engagement activities on CNL's IWS, noting that information has been shared through public webinars, KFN representatives have participated in at least one webinar, and the publicly available nature of	KFN expressed concern that they had not been informed directly of the fuel transfer despite ongoing engagement and relationship-building efforts. KFN also noted the absence of a notice on the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada registry, questioned the application of Section 82 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> , and sought clarification regarding why CNSC, rather than AECL, was acting as the federal authority. KFN requested a pause on

Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 12 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		the IWS, which can be found on CNL's website. CNL emphasized that waste transfer from AECL-owned sites to CRL is consistent with CNL's broader waste management approach and had been discussed with KFN in previous meetings. CNL proposed future engagement approaches and reoccurring discussion topics on G1WF.	federal lands assessments until a clear process is established and emphasized the need for greater clarity on consultation requirements and compliance with UNDRIIP Article 29(2).
2025-07-31	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and CNSC staff included discussion on G1WF licence amendment and future engagement planning. CNL clarified that G1WF is undergoing a licensing change from a storage facility to an active decommissioning project and currently is not a Section 82 project. CNSC similarly noted that the current activity relates to a licensing decision and that a decision beyond the existing licensing basis could trigger additional CNSC processes but that the current G1WF activity is not a Section 82 assessment. CNSC indicated a willingness to participate in an additional discussion on the G1WF and Section 82 matters following a future meeting, while noting that project-specific questions might require input from the appropriate project team.	KFN raised a request for dedicated discussion time on broader Chalk River projects at an upcoming workshop, including G1WF and other Section 82-related activities, citing ongoing interest in understanding projects that may affect their rights and interests. KFN noted that CNSC had been identified as the authority for the G1WF discussion and suggested that time be set aside to discuss the G1WF and related regulatory processes. KFN expressed interest in understanding larger plans at Chalk River and receiving updates on other projects.
2025-08-07	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and AECL included a focused presentation on the IWS, and a follow up discussion on G1WF decommissioning, high level waste transportation and waste-import concerns. During the presentation CNL explained that the IWS is a publicly available long-term planning framework for	KFN sought clarification on the relationship between G1WF and Chalk River, particularly regarding the movement of waste from the G1WF to CRL. KFN indicated that it was unclear how the G1WF fit within the broader waste management strategy and expressed concern about the

Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 13 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		managing waste across CNL-managed sites. CNL emphasized that the strategy is a planning tool rather than a decision-making document and includes the consolidation of certain waste streams at CRL. CNL reiterated that the G1WF is an AECL-owned facility managed by CNL and is undergoing decommissioning, whereas Gentilly-2 is owned by Hydro-Québec and is not associated with CNL's waste liabilities or management responsibilities. Certain waste transfers from the G1WF to CRL have occurred under existing authorizations, while future decommissioning activities are being pursued through a staged licensing approach. CNL expressed a willingness to work with KFN to develop a similar engagement approach that would allow KFN to be informed about and involved in discussions regarding waste movements to and from CRL. CNL agreed to continue discussions on waste management and explore how KFN would like to participate in future engagement regarding waste transportation and consolidation activities at Chalk River.	transportation of waste and the consultation obligations associated with those activities. KFN emphasized that its primary concern was not the decommissioning project itself, but rather the transportation and consolidation of waste at Chalk River. KFN questioned whether adequate consultation had occurred regarding the movement of high-level waste and raised concerns about how consultation obligations, including those related to UNDRIP principles, apply to waste transportation activities.
2025-08-12	Meeting	The meeting between KFN, CNL and CNSC staff included discussion of G1WF waste transportation. CNL explained that G1WF decommissioning activities are being carried out within the framework of CNL's IWS, reiterating that the receipt and storage of waste at CRL has been contemplated through existing licensing processes and that decommissioning activities focus on	KFN focused on concerns related to G1WF waste transfers to CRL and the lack of early notification and consultation. KFN sought clarification on how waste transfers from G1WF have been authorized under existing licences and whether the proposed decommissioning licence amendment will result in additional waste being transferred to CRL. KFN

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 14 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		minimizing, sorting, reusing, and diverting waste wherever possible. CNL clarified that the environmental review for the G1WF focuses on impacts in the Gentilly region, while impacts associated with receiving and managing waste at CRL are considered through separate CRL regulatory and licensing processes. In response to concerns about waste transfers, CNL acknowledged the importance of improved communication and engagement with KFN. CNL stated that while specific shipment timing is generally not disclosed for security reasons, there is an opportunity to develop a more structured process for sharing information about waste management activities. CNL proposed establishing a recurring discussion on waste management matters, including updates on waste inventories, implementation of the IWS, and information on waste transferred to CRL.	questioned how federal lands assessments and licensing reviews are being applied to the project and emphasized that communities should receive direct notice whenever activities have the potential to impact Indigenous rights, regardless of whether a licence amendment or hearing is required. KFN also highlighted that recent awareness of additional G1WF waste arriving at CRL reinforced concerns about being informed after decisions or activities have already occurred, rather than being engaged at the outset. KFN stated that consultation, early notification, and meaningful involvement in decisions related to waste transportation and storage remain fundamental concerns and requested greater involvement in future G1WF discussions.
2025-08-18	Email	CNL shared information on the IWS in follow-up to the 2025 August 07 meeting.	No confirmation of receipt received from KFN.
2025-09-04	Meeting	This KFN, CNL and AECL meeting included discussion on tracking waste at CRL and the IWS. CNL proposed making the IWS a recurring agenda item at future monthly meetings to provide regular updates on waste management activities at CRL. CNL suggested establishing a standing update on waste volumes, including what waste exists, where it originates from, and where the waste is being sent and/or stored. CNL drew attention to the IWS, specifically the Waste	KFN expressed support of the concept of a waste tracking tool and noted that some waste transfer details may be restricted for security reasons, but KFN's access to waste inventories and tracking information is important. Emphasized the need for regular reporting on waste generation, storage and disposition. KFN indicated that waste inventories that are more current than 2022 would be useful.

Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 15 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		Inventory and Forecast (Section 5) and Table 1-4.1: Existing Inventory of Waste Across CNL as of 2022. CNL highlighted that waste volumes have changed since 2022 due to decommissioning activities across AECL-owned sites.	
2025-10-02	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and AECL focused on Section 82 projects, including G1WF. CNL noted that they are interested in understanding the scope of interest from KFN and that CNL and AECL work with rights-bearing communities in these areas. CNL explained that the Section 82 assessment for the G1WF does not consider the movement of waste to CRL but instead focuses on the environmental assessment associated with project activities at the Gentilly-1 site. CNL reiterated that the receipt and storage of waste at CRL is already authorized under CRL's existing licence. CNL emphasized that KFN's concerns appear to be centred on waste importation and long-term waste management at CRL rather than impacts occurring near the G1WF. CNL reiterated the importance of developing processes that allow KFN concerns about impacts to rights, including those related to waste management and cleanup activities, to be incorporated at the outset of project planning and decision-making.	KFN described how KFN's interest in the G1WF is not primarily related to environmental effects at the Gentilly-1 site itself, but rather to the importation, exportation, transportation, and storage of waste, particularly where waste may be transferred to CRL. KFN suggested that other projects involving waste transfers to CRL, including activities at sites such as Whiteshell, also be tracked. KFN stressed the importance of being involved early in project planning and assessment processes rather than receiving notification after decisions have already been made. KFN linked this to its newly developed FPIC protocol and emphasized the need for a collaborative approach that considers Indigenous rights, cumulative effects, and Indigenous law when making decisions about nuclear projects and waste management activities.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 16 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
2025-12-03	Email	This email from CNL to KFN provided advance notice of the Notice of Intent and section 82 assessment process for the G1WF, and provided additional information and context regarding when the Notice of Intent would be posted, associated timelines, and CNL and AECL's commitment to continuing to meaningfully engage with KFN. A copy of this communication is included in Appendix B of the supplemental CMD.	KFN confirmed receipt.
2025-12-11	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL, and AECL included discussions on G1WF fuel transfer and the G1WF section 82 assessment, and Notice of Intent. CNL and AECL explained that the G1WF Section 82 process differs from Section 82 projects at CRL because both AECL and CNSC are the federal authorities who have to issue a determination. AECL noted that G1WF decommissioning has been underway for several years through a phased approach and that the current review relates to ongoing decommissioning work. It was also noted that ongoing waste transfers to CRL are part of the decommissioning work. CNL provided additional historical context surrounding the G1WF and associated operations and maintained that having a clearer understanding of KFN's concerns, rights impacts, and Indigenous law considerations would help CNL better identify which projects and activities should be brought forward for engagement. CNL emphasized that it wants to develop solutions collaboratively with KFN and explore approaches that can be presented to regulators as	Discussion focused on KFN's concerns regarding waste transfers from the G1WF to CRL, the regulatory processes governing those transfers, and how such activities will fit within KFN's developing assessment and consultation framework. KFN noted that projects connected to CRL through waste transfers can contribute to cumulative impacts on Indigenous rights, wildlife, water, and the environment, and therefore require meaningful consultation and early involvement. KFN requested information on when radioactive fuel rods and other waste were removed from the G1WF and transferred to Chalk River. KFN further questioned whether future transfers of waste from the G1WF to CRL would trigger additional regulatory reviews. KFN expressed concern that, without a clearly defined Section 82 process, it is difficult to understand how projects involving waste transportation and storage can be properly incorporated into KFN's Assessment Law and FPIC

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 17 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		jointly developed processes for future project reviews.	framework.
2025-12-11	Email	This email from CNL to KFN followed up with a written list of questions that KFN asked about the G1WF during the 2025 December 11 meeting and CNL sought KFN's confirmation that the questions had been accurately captured. The questions related to the Section 82 processes related to G1WF, interactions between the AECL and CNSC related thereto, waste transfer to CRL and deferral of the Notice of Intent while a consultation/engagement process is developed with KFN. A copy of this communication is included in Appendix B of the supplemental CMD.	KFN confirmed receipt and added an additional question related to the development of a Section 82 process between KFN and CNL. A copy of this communication is included in Appendix B of the supplemental CMD.
2025-12-15	Email	This email from CNL to KFN shared that the Notice of Intent for the proposed decommissioning of the G1WF is now available on the Impact Assessment Registry. CNL provided a link and additional information for KFN's review and input. A copy of this communication is included in Appendix B of the supplemental CMD.	KFN responded on 2025 December 18.
2025-12-18	Email	KFN noted that the Notice of Intent posted on the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada's registry does not provide sufficient information for KFN to conduct the activity screening under section 10 of the KFN Rights and Responsibilities Law. KFN noted that CNL and AECL are to send KFN a Project Description prior to written comments. KFN noted that the posting immediately before the holidays does not provide a reasonable opportunity to comment on the project. A copy of this communication is included in Appendix B of the	AECL responded 2025 December 19.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 18 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		supplemental CMD.	
2025-12-19	Email	Email from AECL to KFN confirming the G1WF will be available for comment until 2026 February 5, in light of the concerns articulated by KFN in their 2026 December 18 email. A copy of this communication is included in Appendix B of the supplemental CMD.	
2025-12-19	Email	This email from KFN to CNL revised some of the written question set related to the G1WF (originally sent to KFN by CNL on 2025 December 11). KFN noted that additional funds may be required to support engagement and consultation with AECL, if AECL's process under Section 82 imposes an additional burden on KFN. KFN indicated that once CNL provides the answers to the G1WF questions and KFN sees the first draft of the Section 82 framework, KFN can provide a more definitive response on the amount of funding required.	CNL confirmed receipt.
2026-01-14	Email	This email from CNL to KFN provided additional follow-up information on G1WF decommissioning in response to KFN questions. CNL provided additional information on the G1WF decommissioning, including links to the general Gentilly-1 website page, information on transportation, a Gentilly-1 transportation factsheet, CNL's IWS, and a Gentilly-1 Public Webinar. CNL clarified that AECL's G1WF section 82 determination will be based on activities that are proposed to take place at the Gentilly-1 site near Bécancour, Quebec, and re-confirmed that the comment period has been extended	KFN confirmed receipt.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 19 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		to 2026 February 05. CNL also shared the Overview Detailed Decommissioning Plan.	
2026-01-15	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and CNSC staff included a discussion on Section 82 projects and their integration into KFN's Rights and Responsibilities Assessment Law. CNL expressed interest in understanding how collaboratively developed processes can be incorporated into the assessment framework and sought clarity on how tripartite and bilateral discussions will fit into KFN's process. CNSC similarly emphasized the need for a clear roadmap, milestones, and process documentation to support ongoing Section 82 discussions and implementation.	The G1WF received only limited discussion during this meeting. KFN noted that it had received both a response letter from CNSC and additional information from CNL regarding G1WF. No substantive discussion occurred on the details of the project, licensing process, or waste movements during this meeting. Instead, the G1WF was referenced as one of the Section 82 matters that KFN continues to review as part of its broader efforts to understand how federal assessment and consultation processes will interact with KFN's Assessment Law. KFN noted that future discussions will focus on defining roles, responsibilities, negotiation processes, and decision-making pathways between KFN, CNL, and CNSC.
2026-01-16	Email	This email from CNL to KFN provides a draft Section 82 process outline to move and collaborate on the topic.	KFN confirmed receipt.
2026-01-23	Meeting	This meeting between KFN and CNL included a discussion of G1WF section 82 assessment, licence amendment, waste transfers to CRL, and transportation. CNL and KFN discussed capacity for engagement on the Regulatory Oversight Report (ROR) participation and Section 82 activities and proposed a different approach to supporting KFN capacity. Rather than funding individual projects such as G1WF separately, CNL proposed developing a broader funding	KFN stated that its priorities remain G1WF funding, ROR funding, and Section 82 framework negotiation funding. KFN flagged that funding provided by the CNSC was insufficient to support its review of the G1WF process and noted that KFN had already incurred costs while responding to tight regulatory deadlines. KFN indicated it had been operating on the understanding that funding gaps might be addressed through discussions with

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 20 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		arrangement focused on issues affecting CRL. CNL suggested creating a work plan addressing topics such as the IWS, potential impacts to traditional rights around CRL, and concerns related to waste transportation and management. CNL and KFN discussed the scope of the G1WF Section 82 assessment and that it is focused on the physical activities occurring at the Gentilly-1 site and associated licence amendments. CNL stated that waste transportation is separate from the G1WF licence and is therefore not included within the scope of the licence amendment. The parties also discussed the NWMO DGR and waste management, CNL explained that waste transfer sequencing is still being developed and that CRL fuel is not expected to be among the first materials transferred to a future repository. CNL also clarified that, under the broader Canadian waste strategy, organizations generally remain responsible for managing their own low-level waste streams and that the NSDF is not intended to receive all low-level waste generated across Canada. CNL offered to arrange a discussion with technical experts to provide more information on CRL fuel inventories, future waste transfers, and repository planning.	CNL. KFN emphasized that many issues are interconnected, including waste transportation, storage, waste inventories, and cumulative impacts, and questioned whether CNL's proposed funding approach could support work on these broader issues. KFN stressed that dialogue should address the bigger picture of how waste is moving, where it is being stored, and how these activities affect KFN rights and interests. KFN questioned why the transportation of waste from the G1WF was excluded from the Section 82 scope and sought clarity on when and how project scope is determined. KFN expressed an interest in understanding licensing processes, how licence amendments occur, and how transportation-related issues are considered. KFN also raised questions about the Deep Geological Repository (DGR), including future waste transfers and whether CRL stored fuel bundles would eventually be moved there. KFN expressed interest in understanding overlaps between the DGR, NSDF, and other national waste management initiatives, particularly where new waste streams may be involved.
2026-01-27	Email	This email from KFN to CNL requested copies of any internal Environmental Review(s), Environmental Effects Review(s), or equivalent environmental assessment	CNL confirmed receipt.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 21 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		documents prepared (or currently relied upon) along with any additional information CNL had planned to send regarding G1WF decommissioning.	
2026-01-29	Meeting	This in-person meeting in Kebaowek between CNL and KFN included discussion on capacity for supporting engagement on the G1WF and timeline for engagement. CNL acknowledged KFN's concerns regarding the G1WF and the importation of waste into CRL and indicated this was what CNL wanted to address through a dedicated engagement process. CNL proposed a pool of funding, previously offered, that could be used to develop a workplan focused on waste importation, future engagement and preparation for the 2028 CRL relicencing process.	KFN repeatedly linked the G1WF to broader concerns about waste being transported to CRL, and that the project highlighted shortcomings in the current Section 82 process because transportation of waste was not included within the scope of the review. KFN expressed concern that issues such as transportation and cumulative effects hadn't been appropriately considered because KFN had effectively been "scoped out" of the G1WF review process. KFN emphasized that transportation risks cannot be separated from disposal risks, citing previous non-nuclear environmental incidents and expressed concern that a single transportation accident could have significant consequences.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 22 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
2026-02-02	Email	This email from CNL to KFN provided an invitation to CNL's Environmental Remediation Management Webinars on 2026 February 10. Webinar topics include Gentilly-1 Decommissioning: Decommissioning and Licensing, CNL's Transportation of Dangerous Goods Program, and Whiteshell's Underground Research Laboratories Final Experiment. Provided registration details and other pertinent logistics.	No confirmation of receipt received from KFN.
2026-02-05	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and AECL included a focus presentation on Transportation of Dangerous Goods and Emergency Planning for CRL.	KFN's primary concerns centered on public notification of environmental events, emergency planning implications of projects occurring on AECL-owned sites, transparency, transportation risks, flooding and climate-change scenarios, and Indigenous involvement in emergency planning. KFN noted that the transportation of nuclear and radioactive materials would continue to be a topic of concern, identifying that community members do not distinguish between environmental impacts and public safety impacts, as both affect lands, wildlife, fish and people.
2026-02-05	Letter	Letter response from KFN to CNSC and CNL (on behalf of AECL) outlining KFN's comments on the Section 82 Assessment for the Proposed G1WF Decommissioning. KFN highlighted concerns on the CNSC's approach to consultation regarding the G1WF. Comments relate to the duty to consult, FPIC, outstanding information	AECL acknowledged receipt of the letter on 2026 February 06.

Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 23 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		requests and the licencing and assessment process and scope for the G1WF, among other things. A copy is included in Appendix B of the supplemental CMD.	
2026-05-04	Email	This email from CNL to KFN shared an update related to the decommissioning of the G1WF. CNL provided a link to the CMD for the licence amendment hearing on the G1WF. CNL highlighted that several documents form the CMD, including the G1WF Licence Amendment Application Environmental Protection Measures for Decommissioning and Demolition, the Detailed Decommissioning Plan, and two supplemental reports relating to engagement activities. This email also responded to KFN's request of 2026 January 27.	KFN confirmed receipt.
2026-05-14	Letter	Letter response from KFN to CNSC, CNL, AECL and other government representatives outlining Kebaowek First Nation's " <i>Demand for respect for KFN's right to be consulted and FPIC obtained prior to the transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste on our traditional territories</i> ". Comments relate to the duty to consult, FPIC and the licencing and assessment process and scope for the G1WF, among other things. KFN claims that FPIC extends to waste moving through their territory. A copy is included in Appendix B of the supplemental CMD.	Requests contained within the letter were not directed at specific addresses. CNL responds in 2026 July.
2026-05-25	Site Tour	CRL Site Tour with the KFN Assessment Committee, KFN representatives and CNSC staff regarding another project at CRL.	Discussions related to waste storage focused on the long-term management of radioactive waste at CRL, the proposed NSDF, and the broader implications of accepting waste from other sites.

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 24 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
			KFN raised concerns about the volume of waste already stored at CRL, and questioned the classification, characterization, and long-term containment of low-level and intermediate-level waste. CNL committed to providing KFN with further information on waste located at CRL and the role of the IWS in managing radioactive waste across CNL-managed sites.
2026-06-17	Site Tour	Site Tour with the KFN Assessment Committee, KFN representatives and CNSC staff regarding another project at CRL.	Discussions touched on waste consolidation, with CNL describing plans to reduce the overall waste footprint at CRL through decommissioning and centralized waste management, while noting that waste from other AECL-owned sites would continue to be managed at CRL.
2026-06-23	Letter	Letter response from CNSC sent to KFN in response to 2026 May 14 KFN letter.	CNL received this letter from CNSC staff 2026 August 31 in response to the Procedural Direction.
2026-06-30	Meeting	Meeting with KFN Assessment Committee and CNSC staff regarding another project at CRL.	Discussions focused on long-term radioactive waste management and storage and the future waste inventory at CRL, with questions regarding future high-level waste storage needs and ongoing efforts to optimize existing storage capacity before new facilities are required.
2026-07-03	Email	CNSC staff email to KFN sharing information requested in KFN's 2026 May 14 letter.	CNL received this email from CNSC staff 2026 August 31 in response to the Procedural Direction.
2026-07-15	Email	CNSC staff shared with CNL an email exchange with KFN requesting CNL documents regarding the G1WF spent	-

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 25 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
		fuel retrieval and transfer.	
2026-07-29	Email	This email from CNL to KFN provided a response in relation to the CNSC staff-KFN email exchange shared with CNL. CNL indicated that the request for documents contained within the 2026 May 14 letter was not clear to whom the request was made, and only CNL's CEO was on the email. CNL reiterated who the correct contacts are for document requests. CNL informed KFN that the requested G1WF SAR (proprietary 3rd party information) and Transport Security Plan (security protected information) are both confidential and cannot be released. CNL informed KFN that all pertinent details from the requested license to transport application is reproduced in the CNSC transport licence and the certificate for the package that CNSC staff had already shared. CNL offered to bring a subject matter expert to a monthly meeting with KFN to talk about the safety, packaging, and transport of used nuclear fuel. CNL shared publicly available information the transportation of waste.	KFN confirmed receipt of the email and stated that the information request seeking disclosure of these documents was included in KFN's submissions on the CNL ROR dated 2026 January 28, and follow-up correspondence and submissions have since repeated this request.
2026-08-06	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and AECL included a discussion on CRL relicensing and waste storage at CRL. The G1WF project was not discussed as a standalone agenda item, indirect topics relevant to KFN's concerns regarding Gentilly-1 were discussed.	-

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment
pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 26 of 77

Date	Engagement Activity	Summary	Relevant Comments/Feedback
2026-08-06	Letter	KFN letter to CNSC staff in response to CNSC communications dated 2026 June 23 and 2026 July 03.	CNL received this letter from CNSC staff 2026 August 31 in response to the Procedural Direction.
2026-08-08	Email	CNL responded to questions raised by KFN's Assessment Committee related to another project at CRL.	Questions focus on the origin of waste destined for CRL, the risks associated with the storage of waste at CRL, whether CNL will seek KFN's consent prior to transporting and storing waste at CRL, the risks associated with the transportation of waste to CRL and CNL's contingency plan in the event the DGR is not pursued.
2026-09-03	Meeting	This meeting between KFN, CNL and AECL included a discussion on G1WF procedural direction issued by the CNSC. CNL indicated it wants to better understand any remaining information gaps that KFN may have regarding the Application and committed to providing available information where possible. CNL acknowledged concerns related to the importation and transportation of project materials through KFN territory and expressed interest in working collaboratively with KFN on related matters, including emergency response considerations. KFN planned to discuss the matter further and was determining whether it would submit additional interventions beyond its most recent letter to the CNSC.	-

**Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction**

61-508760-041-000 Rev. 0

Page 27 of 77

Appendix B Key Records

Waldman, Danielle

From: Thompson, Margot
Sent: December 3, 2025 12:20 PM
To: Justin Roy
Cc: Lance haymond; rosanne van schie; Waldman, Danielle; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL); MacKay, Mitch; LeBlanc, Nicole; Chennette, Rachel; Cox, Haleigh; >ERM Stakeholder Relations; Riopelle, Alexandra; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL); Kerrie Blaise
Subject: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Good afternoon Justin,

Earlier this year CNL made an application to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) to amend the current Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (G1WF) licence, which would authorize CNL to proceed with the last phase of decommissioning activities at the G1WF. CNL's application for a licence amendment outlined plans to complete the decommissioning of the facility by dismantling all remaining buildings and structures associated with the G1WF. In addition to the licensing process, the proposed activities require a federal lands assessment in accordance with the Impact Assessment Act (IAA). Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL), the owner of the G1WF, as well as the CNSC are both responsible for making an Environmental Effects Determination under section 82 of the IAA.

The Notice of Intent will be posted on the [Canadian Impact Assessment Agency Registry](#) by December 15, 2025. This notice will remain available on the Registry for a minimum of 30 days for comments from Indigenous Peoples and the public. After that time, AECL and the CNSC must determine whether the proposed activities are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. AECL will make a section 82 determination separately and prior to the CNSC's determination.

Note, the licensing process continues in parallel to the IAA process. The CNSC is conducting a hearing in writing on CNL's application to amend the licence and licensing basis for the G1WF in July 2026. For more information, please see the CNSC's [Notice of Hearing in Writing and Participant Funding](#).

AECL and CNL are committed to continuing to engage Kebaowek First Nation throughout this process. Once the Notice of Intent is posted, we will share a direct link to the Registry posting.

Please reach out if you have any questions in advance of our meeting tomorrow.

Migwech,

Margot

Margot Thompson (she/her)
 Manager, Communications and Indigenous Engagement
margot.thompson@cnl.ca

519-501-1596

www.cnl.ca



Canadian Nuclear Laboratories | Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

Waldman, Danielle

From: Chennette, Rachel
Sent: December 19, 2025 2:42 PM
To: >ERM Stakeholder Relations
Subject: FW: Gentilly-1 Questions for Response by CNL/AECL

From: Justin Roy
Sent: December 19, 2025 2:32 PM
To: Waldman, Danielle
Cc: vansch3 ; madison.fraser96 ; Katharine Brack ; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) ; Chennette, Rachel ; LeBlanc, Nicole ; Cox, Haleigh ; MacKay, Mitch ; Shorter, Katie ; kerrie
Subject: [External] Re: Gentilly-1 Questions for Response by CNL/AECL

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Danielle,

Just wanting to get back to you regarding funding for G- and a quick comment on the question summary,

Can you modify the last question as stated below:

Are CNSC and AECL communicating and coordinating on the Section 82 assessment? If so, what does this look like?

1. How do two authorities, and two reviews, impact Section 82 consultation?
2. What information will be relied on in each review? Will they happen together? How will the two authorities coordinate their review processes?

I look forward to receiving the answers to all these very soon.

With regard to your follow up question, the \$40,000 is sufficient to cover KFN's engagement and consultation with CNSC.

KFN may require additional funds to support engagement and consultation with AECL, if AECL's process under section 82 imposes an additional burden on KFN. Specifically, if AEC—as part of its process of determining whether the proposed activities are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects—requests comments, participation in studies or analyses, or otherwise seeks KFN's input, KFN may require additional funds to engage in these activities.

At this time, there is insufficient information about the scope and process of AECL's review for us to definitively determine whether the \$40,000 in funding is adequate or not.

Once CNL provides the answers to questions below and we see the first draft of the Section 82 framework, we can provide a more definitive response.

Happy holidays and happy new years!

Thank you,

Justin Roy
Councillor
Director of Economic Development
Kebaowek First Nation
 110 Ogima Street
 Kebaowek, QC
 (819) 627 3309
Jroy@kebaowek.ca
www.kebaowek.ca

From: Waldman, Danielle <danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2025 5:05 PM
To: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>
Cc: vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; madison.fraser96 <[REDACTED]>; Katharine Brack <kbrack@firstpeopleslaw.com>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh <haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>; Shorter, Katie <katie.shorter@cnl.ca>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>
Subject: RE: Gentilly-1 Questions for Response by CNL/AECL

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Thanks Justin.

Yes, I left that one off as I understood it as an action for CNL separate from the request to respond in writing to the questions KFN had regarding G1. We are working on that as well and will deliver something to KFN on or before January 16th as we discussed.

Danielle

Danielle Waldman
 Canadian Nuclear Laboratories Ltd.
 c. 613.602.0153

From: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>
Sent: December 11, 2025 2:22 PM
To: Waldman, Danielle <danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>
Cc: vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; madison.fraser96 <[REDACTED]>; Katharine Brack <kbrack@firstpeopleslaw.com>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh <haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>; Shorter, Katie <katie.shorter@cnl.ca>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>
Subject: [External] Re: Gentilly-1 Questions for Response by CNL/AECL

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email

Report Suspicious

Hi Danielle,

I can confirm that you captured the questions we had correctly, missing one from your list was regarding a protocol/process on s.82s between KFN and CNL, but we confirmed on the call we will wait to receive a draft from you come mid-January,

Let me get back to you shortly on your second confirmation regarding Gentilly-1 and funding,

Thank you,

Justin Roy
Councillor

Director of Economic Development

Kebaowek First Nation

110 Ogima Street

Kebaowek, QC

(819) 627 3309

[Jroy@kebaowek.ca](mailto:jroy@kebaowek.ca)
www.kebaowek.ca

From: Waldman, Danielle <danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>

Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2025 12:15 PM

To: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>

Cc: vansch3 <[REDACTED]>; madison.fraser96 <[REDACTED]>; Katharine Brack <kbrack@firstpeopleslaw.com>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh <haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>; Shorter, Katie <katie.shorter@cnl.ca>

Subject: Gentilly-1 Questions for Response by CNL/AECL

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Hi Justin,

I noted the following as your questions related to the Gentilly-1 (G1) Project, which you asked us to respond in writing. Can you please confirm whether I have captured these correctly, and if not, please make any adjustments so we can respond with the information you are seeking.

1. Confirm the federal authority(ies) for the project.
2. When the G1 fuel transfer occurred, was the Section 82 process for the G1 Project between CNSC and AECL in place?
3. What activities are in scope and out of scope for the Section 82 assessment? For example, transportation.
4. Is there another process to consult on the movement of waste to Chalk River Laboratories from G1?
5. Would AECL/CNSC consider delaying the posting of the Notice of Intent for the G1 Project while CNL, AECL and KFN work through a process to consult and engage on Section 82 projects?
6. Are CNSC and AECL communicating on the Section 82 assessment?

We'll get back to you before the end of next week on these, and if we need further time with any will let you know then.

I have one follow up question for you – if CNL can provide additional funding to KFN for the project, does the \$40,000 requested from CNSC encompass KFN's full review of the G1 project? More specifically, if CNL can provide \$29,000 in funding, will this cover KFN's expected costs to engage and consult on the G1 project with AECL as part of its Section 82 process, and with the CNSC as part of their Section 82 and licensing amendment process? Any insight will be helpful for us to engage with the project to determine what funding may be available to support KFN's engagement and consultation in the Section 82 process with both AECL and CNSC.

Thanks,
Danielle

Danielle Waldman

Senior Legal Counsel, Major Projects
Canadian Nuclear Laboratories Ltd.
c. 613.602.0153

danielle.waldman@cnl.ca



Canadian Nuclear
Laboratories

Laboratoires Nucléaires
Canadiens

This email is confidential between the sender and the intended recipient specified in the message, and may contain proprietary or otherwise protected information of the intended parties. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and confirm you have deleted this message. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or reliance on this information may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited.

This email is confidential between the sender and the intended recipient specified in the message, and may contain proprietary or otherwise protected information of the intended parties. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and confirm you have deleted this message. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or reliance on this information may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited.

Waldman, Danielle

From: Adrienne Fournier <AFournier@aecl.ca>
Sent: December 19, 2025 4:06 PM
To: Thompson, Margot; Justin Roy
Cc: Lance haymond; vansch3; Waldman, Danielle; MacKay, Mitch; LeBlanc, Nicole; Chennette, Rachel; Cox, Haleigh; >ERM Stakeholder Relations; Riopelle, Alexandra; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL); kerrie
Subject: [External] RE: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email

[Report Suspicious](#)

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF - TLP-Green/Vert

Good afternoon, Justin,

Following our discussion yesterday, the Notice of Intent for proposed Gentilly-1 decommissioning activities will now be available for comment on the Impact Assessment Registry until February 5, 2026. Fred and I appreciated your concerns about comment period timelines and trust this extension accounts for the holiday break.

As per Danielle's email, CNL will follow up with further information about the section 82 process and activities proposed at the Gentilly-1 site in Quebec.

In the meantime, wishing you and your family a safe and happy holiday.

Many thanks,

Adrienne

Adrienne Fournier

Director, Indigenous Relations | Directrice des relations avec les Autochtones



1500 – 270 Albert St | 1500 – 270 rue Albert

Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5G8

www.aecl.ca

From: Thompson, Margot
Sent: December 15, 2025 3:25 PM
To: Justin Roy
Cc: Lance haymond ; vansch3 ; Waldman, Danielle ; Adrienne Fournier ; Mitch MacKay (CNL) ; Nicole LeBlanc (CNL) ; Rachel Chennette (CNL) ; Cox, Haleigh ; >ERM Stakeholder Relations ; Alexandra Riopelle (CNL) ; Arpad Kaltenecker ; kerrie
Subject: RE: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Good afternoon Justin,

In follow-up to our previous email, the Notice of Intent for the proposed decommissioning of the G1WF is now available on the Impact Assessment Registry: [Decommissioning of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility](#). This notice will remain available on the Registry for a minimum of 30 days for comments from Indigenous Peoples and the public. After that time, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) must determine whether the proposed activities are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. AECL will make a section 82 determination separately and prior to the CNSC's determination.

Happy to discuss further at our next meeting. Please note, we will be sending our responses to your questions from our last meeting as soon as possible.

Migwech,

Margot

Margot Thompson (she/her)

Manager, Communications and Indigenous Engagement

margot.thompson@cnl.ca

519-501-1596

www.cnl.ca



Canadian Nuclear
Laboratories | Laboratoires Nucléaires
Canadiens

From: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>

Sent: December 3, 2025 1:03 PM

To: Thompson, Margot <margot.thompson@cnl.ca>

Cc: Lance haymond <lhaymond@kebaowek.ca>; vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; Waldman, Danielle <danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>; LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh <haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; >ERM Stakeholder Relations <ERMStakeholder@cnl.ca>; Riopelle, Alexandra <alexandra.riopelle@cnl.ca>; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL) <akaltenecker@aecl.ca>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>

Subject: [External] Re: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good Afternoon Margot,

Confirming receipt of email regarding the upcoming notice of intent for Gentilly-1,

In the meantime, if we have any questions, we will be sure to reach out,

Thank you,

Justin Roy

Councillor

Director of Economic Development

Kebaowek First Nation

61-508760-041-000
110 Ogima Street

Page 35 of 77

Kebaowek, QC

(819) 627 3309

jroy@kebaowek.cawww.kebaowek.ca**From:** Thompson, Margot <margot.thompson@cnl.ca>**Sent:** Wednesday, December 3, 2025 12:20 PM**To:** Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>**Cc:** Lance haymond <lhaymond@kebaowek.ca>; vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; Waldman, Danielle <danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>; LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh <haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; >ERM Stakeholder Relations <ERMStakeholder@cnl.ca>; Riopelle, Alexandra <alexandra.riopelle@cnl.ca>; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL) <akaltenecker@aecl.ca>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>**Subject:** Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Good afternoon Justin,

Earlier this year CNL made an application to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) to amend the current Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (G1WF) licence, which would authorize CNL to proceed with the last phase of decommissioning activities at the G1WF. CNL's application for a licence amendment outlined plans to complete the decommissioning of the facility by dismantling all remaining buildings and structures associated with the G1WF. In addition to the licensing process, the proposed activities require a federal lands assessment in accordance with the Impact Assessment Act (IAA). Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL), the owner of the G1WF, as well as the CNSC are both responsible for making an Environmental Effects Determination under section 82 of the IAA.

The Notice of Intent will be posted on the [Canadian Impact Assessment Agency Registry](#) by December 15, 2025. This notice will remain available on the Registry for a minimum of 30 days for comments from Indigenous Peoples and the public. After that time, AECL and the CNSC must determine whether the proposed activities are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. AECL will make a section 82 determination separately and prior to the CNSC's determination.

Note, the licensing process continues in parallel to the IAA process. The CNSC is conducting a hearing in writing on CNL's application to amend the licence and licensing basis for the G1WF in July 2026. For more information, please see the CNSC's [Notice of Hearing in Writing and Participant Funding](#).

AECL and CNL are committed to continuing to engage Kebaowek First Nation throughout this process. Once the Notice of Intent is posted, we will share a direct link to the Registry posting.

Please reach out if you have any questions in advance of our meeting tomorrow.

Migwech,

Margot

Margot Thompson (she/her)

Manager, Communications and Indigenous Engagement

margot.thompson@cnl.ca

519-501-1596

www.cnl.ca

Canadian Nuclear Laboratories | Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

This email is confidential between the sender and the intended recipient specified in the message, and may contain proprietary or otherwise protected information of the intended parties. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and confirm you have deleted this message. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or reliance on this information may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited.

This email is confidential between the sender and the intended recipient specified in the message, and may contain proprietary or otherwise protected information of the intended parties. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and confirm you have deleted this message. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or reliance on this information may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited.

Waldman, Danielle

From: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>
Sent: December 18, 2025 4:42 PM
To: Thompson, Margot
Cc: Lance haymond; vanschie3; Waldman, Danielle; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL); MacKay, Mitch; LeBlanc, Nicole; Chennette, Rachel; Cox, Haleigh; >ERM Stakeholder Relations; Riopelle, Alexandra; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL); kerrie; Dermarkar, Fred (AECL); Katharine Brack; Charlotte Connolly; kerrie; Erin LaRocque; madison.fraser96
Subject: [External] Re: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act
Attachments: KFN Rights Responsibilities Assessment Law (FINAL) (BCR Attached).pdf

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email

[Report Suspicious](#)

CNL and AECL,

Please find attached a copy of KFN's Rights and Responsibilities Assessment Law, ratified on November 27, 2025.

In accordance with Section 7 of the Law, proponents are expected to complete Appendix B: Project Description for a Physical Activity to commence the assessment process.

The Notice of Intent posted on the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada's registry does not provide sufficient information for KFN to conduct the Project Screening under section 10 of the Law.

Written comments on the Gentilly-01 project can only be provided once CNL or AECL provides a Project Description that is sufficiently complete in accordance with the requirements of Appendix B.

Also, the initiation of the 30-day public comment, immediately before the commencement of the holiday break, is not an appropriate time limit. KFN has not been given sufficient information to provide comment or a reasonable opportunity to consider the project.

We will await to receive the necessary information as requested above and be in touch from there if additional information is required or if what is provided at that time is suffice for project screening under section 10 of our law,

Thank you,

Justin Roy
Councillor
Director of Economic Development
Kebaowek First Nation
 110 Ogima Street
 Kebaowek, QC

(819) 627 3309

[Jroy@kebaowek.ca](mailto:jroy@kebaowek.ca)www.kebaowek.ca

From: Thompson, Margot <margot.thompson@cnl.ca>**Sent:** Monday, December 15, 2025 3:24 PM**To:** Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>**Cc:** Lance haymond <lhaymond@kebaowek.ca>; vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; Waldman, Danielle <danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>; LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh <haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; >ERM Stakeholder Relations <ERMStakeholder@cnl.ca>; Riopelle, Alexandra <alexandra.riopelle@cnl.ca>; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL) <akaltenecker@aecl.ca>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>**Subject:** RE: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Good afternoon Justin,

In follow-up to our previous email, the Notice of Intent for the proposed decommissioning of the G1WF is now available on the Impact Assessment Registry: [Decommissioning of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility](#). This notice will remain available on the Registry for a minimum of 30 days for comments from Indigenous Peoples and the public. After that time, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) must determine whether the proposed activities are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. AECL will make a section 82 determination separately and prior to the CNSC's determination.

Happy to discuss further at our next meeting. Please note, we will be sending our responses to your questions from our last meeting as soon as possible.

Mìgwech,

Margot

Margot Thompson (she/her)

Manager, Communications and Indigenous Engagement

margot.thompson@cnl.ca

519-501-1596

www.cnl.ca

Canadian Nuclear Laboratories | Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

From: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>**Sent:** December 3, 2025 1:03 PM**To:** Thompson, Margot <margot.thompson@cnl.ca>**Cc:** Lance haymond <lhaymond@kebaowek.ca>; vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; Waldman, Danielle <danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>; LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh

<haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; >ERM Stakeholder Relations <ERMStakeholder@cnl.ca>; Riopelle, Alexandra
<alexandra.riopelle@cnl.ca>; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL) <akaltenecker@aecl.ca>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>
Subject: [External] Re: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact
Assessment Act

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email

Report Suspicious

Good Afternoon Margot,

Confirming receipt of email regarding the upcoming notice of intent for Gentilly-1,

In the meantime, if we have any questions, we will be sure to reach out,

Thank you,

Justin Roy
Councillor

Director of Economic Development

Kebaowek First Nation

110 Ogima Street

Kebaowek, QC

(819) 627 3309

[Jroy@kebaowek.ca](mailto:jroy@kebaowek.ca)

www.kebaowek.ca

From: Thompson, Margot <margot.thompson@cnl.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, December 3, 2025 12:20 PM

To: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>

Cc: Lance haymond <lhaymond@kebaowek.ca>; vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; Waldman, Danielle
<danielle.waldman@cnl.ca>; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL) <afournier@aecl.ca>; MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca>;
LeBlanc, Nicole <nicole.leblanc@cnl.ca>; Chennette, Rachel <rachel.chennette@cnl.ca>; Cox, Haleigh
<haleigh.cox@cnl.ca>; >ERM Stakeholder Relations <ERMStakeholder@cnl.ca>; Riopelle, Alexandra
<alexandra.riopelle@cnl.ca>; Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL) <akaltenecker@aecl.ca>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>

Subject: Upcoming Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1 under Section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act

Good afternoon Justin,

Earlier this year CNL made an application to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) to amend the current Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (G1WF) licence, which would authorize CNL to proceed with the last phase of decommissioning activities at the G1WF. CNL's application for a licence amendment outlined plans to complete the decommissioning of the facility by dismantling all remaining buildings and structures associated with the G1WF. In addition to the licensing process, the proposed activities require a federal lands assessment in accordance with the Impact Assessment Act (IAA). Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL), the owner of the G1WF, as well as the CNSC are both responsible for making an Environmental Effects Determination under section 82 of the IAA.

The Notice of Intent will be posted on the [Canadian Impact Assessment Agency Registry](#) by December 15, 2025. This notice will remain available on the Registry for a minimum of 30 days for comments from Indigenous Peoples and the public. After that time, AECL and the CNSC must determine whether the proposed activities are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. AECL will make a section 82 determination separately and prior to the CNSC's determination.

Note, the licensing process continues in parallel to the IAA process. The CNSC is conducting a hearing in writing on CNL's application to amend the licence and licensing basis for the G1WF in July 2026. For more information, please see the CNSC's [Notice of Hearing in Writing and Participant Funding](#).

AECL and CNL are committed to continuing to engage Kebaowek First Nation throughout this process. Once the Notice of Intent is posted, we will share a direct link to the Registry posting.

Please reach out if you have any questions in advance of our meeting tomorrow.

Migwech,

Margot

Margot Thompson (she/her)
Manager, Communications and Indigenous Engagement

margot.thompson@cnl.ca

519-501-1596

www.cnl.ca



Canadian Nuclear Laboratories | Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

This email is confidential between the sender and the intended recipient specified in the message, and may contain proprietary or otherwise protected information of the intended parties. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and confirm you have deleted this message. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or reliance on this information may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited.

This email is confidential between the sender and the intended recipient specified in the message, and may contain proprietary or otherwise protected information of the intended parties. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and confirm you have deleted this message. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or reliance on this information may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited.

Waldman, Danielle

From: Waldman, Danielle
Sent: January 14, 2026 6:33 PM
To: Justin Roy; Lance haymond; rosanne van schie; Madison Fraser; Kerrie Blaise; Katharine Brack
Cc: MacKay, Mitch; LeBlanc, Nicole; Chennette, Rachel; Cox, Haleigh; Riopelle, Alexandra; Thompson, Margot; >ERM Stakeholder Relations; Fournier, Adrienne (AECL); Kaltenecker, Arpad (AECL)
Subject: Additional Information re. Gentilly-1 Decommissioning
Attachments: ◇Gentilly-1_Waste_Facility_Detailed-Decommissioning_Plan_Volume_1
 _-Program_Overview_REV_1.pdf; G-1 Responses for KFN January 14 2026.docx

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Hi Justin,

Thank you again for your note concerning the Notice of Intent for the Decommissioning of Gentilly-1. CNL is happy to provide KFN with additional information on the project and engage on further questions or information needs.

Please see attached for the G-1 decommissioning plan and below for links to various websites, which include, among others, our G-1 website as it provides a reader friendly overview of the decommissioning plan and a recorded public presentation on the plans. I have also attached responses to the questions outlined in our meeting on December 11, 2025, and updated by your note on December 19th, as requested.

G-1 Page: <https://www.cnl.ca/environmental-stewardship/gentilly-1-decommissioning-project/>
 Information on Transportation: <https://www.cnl.ca/environmental-stewardship/transportation/>
 Transportation Factsheet: <https://www.cnl.ca/wp-content/uploads/Transpo-Fact-Sheet-2025.pdf>
 IWS: <https://www.cnl.ca/wp-content/uploads/CNL-IWS.pdf>
 G-1 Public Webinar: <https://youtu.be/nf-msOj4J7Y?si=NhprvHFXA0-nfnyo>

We are also working on collating further information to share with you regarding G-1.

As discussed together, AECL's G-1 section 82 determination will be based on activities that are proposed to take place at the G-1 site near Bécancour, Quebec. We appreciate and understand that you and your team have questions and concerns about the waste planned to be stored and/or disposed at Chalk River Laboratories, located in Algonquin territory in Ontario. CNL has presented and engaged KFN on the Integrated Waste Strategy (IWS) and has proposed to further engage together at the working group level on waste acceptance and consolidation at Chalk River and how best to address concerns related to these activities.

We note your comment on the comment period, and in accordance with your discussions with AECL, confirm this has been extended to February 5, 2026, as previously communicated by AECL.

Once you and your team have had a chance to review the materials, please let us know if you have any further questions.

Danielle

Danielle Waldman
 Senior Legal Counsel, Major Projects

61-508760-041-000

Page 42 of 77

Canadian Nuclear Laboratories Ltd.

c. 613.602.0153

danielle.waldman@cnl.ca



Canadian Nuclear Laboratories | Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

Questions re. G1 Decommissioning Project

Raised by Kebaowek First Nation in a meeting held with CNL and AECL on December 11, 2025, and by email dated December 19, 2025. CNL and AECL provided initial responses to most, if not all of the questions at the meeting on December 11th, which is being recorded here.

1. Confirm the federal authority(ies) for the project.

The regulatory process includes the review under section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act (IAA) and a licensing process under the Nuclear Safety and Control Act (NSCA). Both Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL), as the owner of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (G1WF) located on federal lands, and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC), as the regulator who will make a licensing decision under the NSCA, are responsible for making an Environmental Effects Determination under section 82 of the IAA.

2. When the G1 fuel transfer occurred, was the Section 82 process for the G1 Project between CNSC and AECL in place?

CNL announced the completion of the transfer of all used nuclear fuel from the G1WF in Québec to Chalk River Laboratories (CRL) in Ontario in July 2025. The section 82 process for the decommissioning of the G1WF formally commenced with the Notice of Intent on December 15, 2025, as communicated to KFN.

3. What activities are in scope and out of scope for the Section 82 assessment? For example, transportation.

The scope of the activities being assessed are related to the Phase 3 decommissioning activities, which include, without limitation, the:

- a) Southern portion of the Turbine Building, including the tunnel to the Reactor Building and the Spent Fuel Canister Area
- b) Basement portion of the Service Building, including the Spent Resin Storage Area; and
- c) Reactor Building, including clear-out activities together with the calandria and bioshield, dome, and the containment structure.

These specifically include, without limitation, pre-requisites to completing decommissioning and demolition activities, decommissioning and demolition activities, and interim site restoration activities.

The Section 82 assessment does not consider the following:

- Decommissioning of buildings or portions of the buildings that are owned by Hydro-Québec;
- Land which is owned by Hydro-Québec and where the entire G1WF is located on;
- Buried services or process systems that are 1 m away from each building footprint perimeter;
- Buildings associated with the operation of Gentilly-2 Nuclear Generating Station;

Date: January 14, 2026

- North volume of the Turbine Building that was transferred to Hydro-Québec after being cleaned to meet the Radiological Safety Zone 1 criteria;
- Remediation/restoration of the G1WF site for the next land use (i.e., end-state land use); or
- Transportation to, and acceptance of the waste at, CRL.

4. Is there another process to consult on the movement of waste to Chalk River Laboratories from G-1?

Yes, the formal opportunity for engagement and consultation on the movement of waste to CRL from the G1WF will be at the CRL site licence renewal hearing in 2028. CNL will be sharing notice of the participant funding opportunities when they are posted.

In addition, there is an opportunity to engage, understand and work together regarding the activities that occur at the CRL site through our existing working group.

5. Would AECL/CNSC consider delaying the posting of the Notice of Intent for the G1 Project while CNL, AECL and KFN work through a process to consult and engage on Section 82 projects?

As CNL advised on December 15, 2025, AECL/CNSC posted the Notice of Intent for the G1WF project. CNL and AECL remain committed to developing a process with KFN to consult and engage on Section 82 projects and will provide KFN with a document on or before January 16, 2026 for this purpose.

6. Are CNSC and AECL communicating on the Section 82 assessment? If so, what does this look like?

Yes. CNSC and AECL have communicated to determine the process to conduct the Section 82 assessment.

a. How do two authorities, and two reviews, impact Section 82 consultation?

Each federal authority will conduct their own consultation efforts which support their respective processes.

b. What information will be relied on in each review? Will they happen together? How will the two authorities coordinate their review processes?

AECL will consider all information received during the comment period, whether by the public or pursuant to any engagement and consultation with Indigenous Nations, communities and organizations. As stated in the Notice of Intent, the processes have been coordinated as follows:

The CNSC will conduct a hearing in July 2026, based on written submissions, to consider CNL's application. The proposed activities also require a federal lands assessment in accordance with the IAA. Both AECL, as the owner of the G1WF, and the CNSC, as the lifecycle regulator, are responsible for making an Environmental Effects Determination under section 82 of the IAA. That is, as a prerequisite to the licensing decision, two federal authorities must determine whether the proposed activities are likely to cause significant

Date: January 14, 2026

adverse environmental effects. AECL will make a section 82 determination separately and prior to the CNSC's determination. The CNSC's determination will be made by the CNSC's independent Commission following the July 2026 hearing, prior to the Commission making the licensing decision.



KEBAOWEK FIRST NATION
110 OGIMA STREET
KEBAOWEK (QUEBEC)
J0Z 3R1

TEL: (819) 627-3455

FAX: (819) 627-9428

www.kebaowek.ca

February 5, 2026

CNL Communications and Indigenous Relations
 Canadian Nuclear Laboratories
 286 Plant Road
 Chalk River, Ontario K0J 1J0
 Email: communications@cnl.ca

Environmental Review Division
 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
 280 Slater St
 Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5S9
 Email: er-ee@cnsc-ccsn.gc.ca

To the federal authorities CNSC and AECL, Mr. Adam Levine and Ms. Shannon Castellarin:

**RE: Kebaowek First Nation's Comments on the Section 82 Assessment for the Proposed
 Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Project**

We write to set out some of our serious concerns with CNSC's unacceptable approach to engagement with Kebaowek First Nation regarding the Gentilly-1 project. We also intend to raise consultation and cumulative nuclear waste disposal related concerns regarding Gentilly 1 Project separately with the CNL and AECL.

This letter is in response to correspondence from the CNSC dated January 12, 2026 regarding the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (G1WF) decommissioning activities; as follow up to correspondence KFN sent to AECL and CNL on January 27, 2026 seeking the environmental effects review for the project; and to the federal authorities for this project as our submission on the "Decommissioning of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility" assessment.¹

As this project is proceeding absent clarity on timelines, roles, process and disclosure of information necessary to inform our remarks on this determination, we make the following

¹ Impact Assessment Agency of Canada Registry, "[Decommissioning of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility](#) - Notice of Intent" 15 Dec 2025.

remarks to all above noted contacts and also retain the right to provide further and more detail comment when adequate information has been disclosed such that we can weigh in the project, its effects and potential impacts to our rights and interests.

First, we have several outstanding concerns relating to the contents of correspondence to date and the assessment of the G1WF project, being undertaken pursuant to section 82 of the *Impact Assessment Act*.

Second, we wish to endorse the comments provided as part of this project's review by Dr. Ole Hendrickson and Dr. Gordon Edwards. Their insight, shared concern for the Kichi Sibi and expertise in these matters is invaluable to ensuring KFN has access to independent, subject-matter experts.

Third, we ask that our comments and correspondence to date on this file be shared to the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada Registry. Critical to building trust in participatory decision-making processes, is ensuring an accurate, update to date and public record.

Gentilly 1 Project end waste distribution falls at the deepest end of the consultation spectrum

As you know, the Gentilly 1 decommissioning project end waste distribution to Chalk River falls within our traditional territory and, more specifically, in an area where CNL and CNSC have acknowledged that Kebaowek asserts s.35 rights (including aboriginal title).

Based on the project information provided to us to date, it is clear that the Gentilly 1 Project has the potential to cause negative impacts to our s.35 rights, title and jurisdiction (directly, indirectly and cumulatively) that are *intergenerational*, *irreparable* and *profound*. Further, as the Gentilly 1 Project engages matters relating to hazardous materials in our territory and therefore engages Article 29 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples which requires Canada to obtain (as opposed to seek) our free prior and informed consent (FPIC) before advancing the Gentilly 1 Project.

Accordingly, we reiterate that the Gentilly 1 Project triggers a duty to consult Kebaowek directly at the deepest end of the consultation and, based on Canada's adoption of UNDRIP, this includes a requirement to obtain Kebaowek's consent.

The importance of CNL and AECL acknowledging the depth of consultation required for the Project cannot be overstated. First, consultation that proceeds on an erroneous assessment of the scope of consultation is inherently flawed. Second, the scope of consultation is what provides a roadmap for identifying elements of consultation and engagement that must be included in a consultation process. Deep consultation includes, among other things: a requirement to design a meaningful consultation process specific to the rights, interests, needs and concerns of a Nation; proactive discussions about consultation timelines and regulatory coordination; identification and development of process for dealing with information gathering to fully understand potential

impacts to rights; a respectful and robust process for the inclusion of indigenous knowledge; and, ultimately, timely and effective discussions around avoidance and accommodation of impacts and the implementation of FPIC.

CNSC's approach to engagement regarding Gentilly 1 has been inadequate

As we take stock of CNSC's engagement with us to date regarding the Gentilly 1 Project, it is clear to us that your approach to engagement with Kebaowek has been and continues to be inadequate and falls far below what is required.

This intensely disappointing conclusion has been very recently confirmed by, among other things, CNSC's imposition of arbitrary and rushed timelines for Kebaowek to comment on Section 82 materials and CNL's apparent decision to push forward with an Integrated Waste strategy Kebaowek agreement on the strategy that CNL has recently proposed to fund. CNL's approach to the review of Integrated waste strategy materials could exacerbate structural imbalances in the Section 82 environmental assessment process that, in our experience, undermine the fairness of the environmental assessment process, lead to the minimization of our indigenous knowledge and perspectives, and frustrate meaningful consultation around Gentilly 1 waste disposal at Chalk River.

In the table below, we provide some specific examples of deficiencies we are observing regarding CNSC's engagement with Kebaowek on the Gentilly 1 Project so that CNSC can work with us to identify the necessary commitments to resolve them. While there are many problems outlined below, the takeaway is simple: notwithstanding the need for deep consultation regarding a project that has the potential to accumulate more nuclear waste at Chalk River that severely affects our way of life for many generations, we have yet to see the hallmarks of meaningful engagement and responsiveness.

Engagement Deficiency	Explanation
Ongoing lack of a meaningful Section 82 process framework to carry out the duty to consult, including clarity on the relationship between Section 82 and consultation	We continue to see a real disconnect between CNSC's approach to the Section 82 environmental assessment process the UNDA, the UNDRIP and its engagement with us. This has, unfortunately, created uncertainty around key elements of consultation, such as how/when information gaps will be addressed, how/when our information will be incorporated into decision making, and how/when our concerns will be addressed prior to a decision on the Gentilly 1 Project. We are very concerned that CNSC, rather than work with us to develop a coordinated, efficient and meaningful consultation framework process, continues to advance an engagement process that is ad hoc, reactive and, ultimately, prejudices Kebaowek's ability to participate.

Failure to appropriately consider existing cumulative effects	To date, the consultation process for the Gentilly 1 Project has failed to appropriately consider existing and foreseeable cumulative effects when evaluating impacts to our s.35 rights. The lack of clarity around how cumulative effects will be considered undermines our ability to be adequately informed in the consultation process. But most critically, the failure to appropriately consider cumulative effects prevents meaningful discussions about critical conversations around avoidance, alternatives, and accommodation that are part of deep consultation. This, in turn, is likely to interfere with the ability of CNSC, and Canada more broadly, to ensure that its decision-making for the Gentilly 1 Project upholds the honour of the Crown. The failure to manage cumulative effects on the treaty rights of Indigenous peoples is unconstitutional.
Failure to appropriately consider foreseeable projects	The Gentilly 1 Project does not exist in isolation. The nature and scope of the impacts it may have on our s.35 rights (including the potential mitigation and accommodation measures required to protect our rights) is closely related to other activities at Chalk River on our territory. That is why it is so troubling that it remains unclear how CNSC will take steps to assess the relationship between Gentilly 1 and other proposed project activities in our territory, including CNL's proposed NSDF activities, and how Gentilly 1 waste activities may contribute to or interact with the impacts of the NSDF Project. This is a required part of the consultation process, but one that has been frustrated by the Integrated Waste Strategy.
Rushed and arbitrary timeline for KFN engagement on the Gentilly 1	CNSC's recent imposition of arbitrary and rushed timelines for comments on Gentilly 1 Section 82 materials is emblematic of the larger problems we are experiencing with CNSC's unwillingness to create meaningful opportunities for us to participate in consultation. But it also creates specific and cascading consultation deficiencies such as: undermining our ability to participate in a critical part of the Section 82 process, exacerbating capacity restraints we are experiencing, further entrenching the idea that Indigenous-led studies and Indigenous knowledge are separate and less important when CNSC should be working with us to bring that information into Environmental Effects Assessment materials and, ultimately, rushing to approval of the Project when essential mitigation, accommodation and consent discussions have not taken place.
Ongoing information gaps and deficiencies	Even a preliminary scan of Gentilly 1 has confirmed that CNSC is pushing forward with the environmental assessment and

	approval process without necessary information and without gathering/providing information required to support meaningful consultation.
Failure to recognize capacity constraints	We are dismayed that CNSC appears to be imposing timelines for Kebaowek's review of Gentilly 1 materials that ignore Kebaowek's capacity constraints and, more generally, that CNSC is pushing engagement forward on the Gentilly 1 project without consideration of the many other engagement activities deadlines (RORs) that create pressures on Kebaowek's resources. While we recognize that CNSC will be providing limited capacity funding this funding alone does not address capacity constraints. What is also needed is a clearer process with timelines that support necessary engagement.
Lack of responsiveness	We continue to struggle with CNSC's lack of responsiveness to our information requests, capacity constraints and ultimately, our requests to engage on measures to address our concerns. It appears to us that CNSC has maintained an entirely closed mind regarding our concerns and perspectives.
Failure to meaningfully consider aboriginal perspectives, voices and knowledge	We continue to find our voice and perspectives to be marginalized by CNSC in the consultation and environmental assessment process for the Gentilly 1 Project.
Failure to consider implications for the UNDA Action Plan	It remains unclear to us if or how CNSC will engage with us regarding the implications of approval of Gentilly 1 Project for Canada's ability to implement the UNDA Action Plan.
Inconsistency with and failure to incorporate or engage with principles of FPIC	It remains unclear to us if or how CNSC will incorporate principles of FPIC, and Article 29 of UNDRIP, into its engagement with us.
Lack of meaningful process for incorporating IK	It remains unclear to us if or how CNSC will create meaningful space for discussing and meaningfully incorporating indigenous knowledge throughout the Section 82 process and what our knowledge will mean for addressing our concerns, including evaluating mitigation and accommodation measures.

Indeed, CNSC's recent imposition of arbitrary and rushed timelines for Kebaowek to comment on revised Gentilly 1 materials at the same time that CNL was having discussions with us about undertaking engagement on the Integrated Waste Strategy in completely different time horizons

underscores that there are real deficiencies in CNSC's engagement with us regarding Gentilly 1 that need to be resolved immediately.

Outstanding items include:

1 - Breach of Right to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)

The transport of waste from the G1WF site to the Near-Surface Disposal Facility (NSDF) poses potential adverse impacts to Kebaowek First Nation's (KFN) rights and responsibilities due the trucking of radioactive waste across KFN territory and its ultimate and permanent disposal on KFN territory.

KFN was alarmed to learn that the transport of waste from G1WF to the NSDF has already occurred, without prior notification or consultation to our Nation. According to the CNSC's recently published Regulatory Oversight Report (ROR) for CNL Sites, 88 spent fuel bundles, stored in 11 concrete silos, were transported via road from the Gentilly nuclear site in Quebec to CNL's Chalk River Site. The ROR further states:

The decision to grant CNL the approval to ship spent fuel was predicated on the fact that there would be minimal impact to the health and safety of workers, the public and the environment, as a result of these activities. CNSC staff also concluded that CNL met all of the regulatory requirements in order to ship the fuel safely.

A safety assessment of the retrieval of the spent fuel from storage at the G1WF, as well as a safety analysis of the transportation package that would be used to ship the fuel. CNL also applied for a license to transport, submitted a transport security plan, as well as obtained agreement from the IAEA to move the spent fuel from the G1WF to the CRL site.

Kebaowek is deeply concerned that it only learned of this information upon the publication of this ROR just months ago. No notice or inclusion of the CNSC's "decision to grant CNL approval to ship spent fuel" was communicated to us, nor was the decision shared. The above-noted documents, including CNL's transport licence application, were also not conveyed to us and at no point was there an opportunity presented for our engagement. While KFN has requested these documents be disclosed in full without delay, we are yet to receive any correspondence from the CNSC.

This transport of high level radioactive result is a serious breach of KFN's right to provide its FPIC prior to the storage and disposal of hazardous on our territories, as recognized by Article 29(2) of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and affirmed by the Federal Court of Canada in *Kebaowek First Nation v Canadian Nuclear Laboratories*, 2025 FC 319 at para [130](#).

UNDRIP must inform all actions taken under statute, as well as the execution of the duty to consult and accommodate. The federal *United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act*, SC 2021, c 4 (UNDA) confirms that UNDRIP applies in Canadian law and provides

the minimum standards against which state conduct must be measured. CNSC has failed to meet these standards with respect to the G1WF project, as detailed further below.

2 - Breach of Duty to Consult

The activities undertaken by CNL and licensed by the CNSC are in direct conflict with the Honour of the Crown and the duty to consult, which is triggered whenever the Crown contemplates action that may adversely impact established or asserted Aboriginal or Treaty rights. The triggering of the duty does **not** depend on unilateral determinations by Crown about whether the contemplated activities fall within the scope of a licence approval, amendment, or renewal, or on the Crown's unilateral determinations about whether there is a risk of adverse impacts to rights.

Where the Crown conducts a preliminary assessment on the potential impacts of a project to a First Nation, it must disclose this assessment and provide an opportunity for the First Nation to comment (see, *Sipekne'katik v Alton Gas Storage*, 2020 NSCC 111 at paras [123-129](#)). As stated by the Supreme Court in *Clyde River (Hamlet) v Petroleum Geo-Services Inc.*, 2017 SCC 40 at para 49, consultation is "talking together for mutual understanding," including talking with First Nations about the possible impacts to rights.

The Crown should not have permitted the transport and disposal of waste at NSDF without first notifying KFN and asking whether our Nation about perceived potential adverse impacts. This was a breach of the constitutional duty to consult and KFN's right to FPIC. Moving forward, we require the CNSC, AECL, and all proponents to adhere to KFN's *Rights & Responsibilities Assessment Law*, in accordance with the process described below.

3 - Compliance with KFN's Rights & Responsibilities Assessment Law Moving Forward

As CNL and CNSC are aware, on November 27, 2026, KFN ratified the *Rights & Responsibilities Assessment Law*. This Law applies whenever a proponent, including a Crown corporation, proposes physical activities which may result in effects on KFN territory or impacts to KFN rights and responsibilities. CNSC must comply with the Law, pursuant to the requirements in UNDRIP that states cooperate with Indigenous peoples through their own representative institutions and in accordance with their own laws, procedures, and customs before authorizing projects affecting our territory.²

The purpose of the Law is for KFN to determine whether there is a risk of adverse impacts to KFN rights and responsibilities. Pursuant to Step 1 of the Law, proponents must submit a Project Description that provides KFN with sufficient information to make a Designation Decision under Section 10 of the Law. We expect CNSC to support KFN in obtaining a project description from proponents, as the Crown maintains the substantive obligation to discharge the duty to consult but may delete procedural aspects to third parties (*Haida Nation v British Columbia*, 2004 SCC 73 at para [53](#)).

² UNDRIP, Art 32(2); see also UNDRIP, Arts 11, 12, 27.

A complete project description enables KFN to identify the potential impacts of a project and evaluate their anticipated severity, to help inform the decision about whether the project should be designated for review under the FPIC process. CNSC must allow KFN sufficient time to make this Designation Decision and should consider KFN's own determinations about the risk of potential impacts, before making any determination about the existence or scope of the duty to consult. There is a clear need for improved transparency, communication, and collaboration with KFN, to avoid further violations of our right to FPIC.

Further, CNSC must allow KFN's FPIC Process under Steps 4-13 of the Law to take its course, as this process will produce the information about KFN's laws and knowledge, as well as proposed mitigation and accommodation measures, necessary for the Crown to make a responsible and constitutionally compliant decision under the section 82 assessment. As was made clear in *Kebaowek First Nation v Canadian Nuclear Laboratories*, 2025 FC 319, the CNSC must consider UNDRIP and the FPIC standard when assessing whether its duty to consult has been met and must align its processes to reflect KFN's laws, knowledge, and processes, and work toward achieving mutual agreement.

4 – Outstanding Information Requests and Calls for Impact Assessment

KFN wishes to remind the federal authorities for this project that for many years, KFN has been calling for all decommissioning projects to undergo federal impact assessment. We stated this in 2019 as part of our comments on the *Impact Assessment Act's* draft 'Project List' regulation and more recently, when the same regulation underwent a 5-year review.³

The CNSC, by its own admission, does not evaluate socio-economic effects within its *Nuclear Safety and Control Act* licensing process, which therefore cannot be seriously construed as a robust and comprehensive review process.

As the CNSC is now among the federal authorities for this project, we again lack trust in their expertise and continue to push for an IA, recognizing there must be a credible, sustainability-based assessment of the environment, health, economic and social impacts of this decommissioning project before it proceeds. In KFN's view, this project – despite it being the first of its kind in Canada – is emblematic of the nuclear industry getting a free pass under the IAA; it is the antithesis of sound and precautionary planning.

Furthermore, we also reiterate our request for copies of any internal Environmental Review(s), Environmental Effects Review(s), or equivalent environmental assessment documents prepared (or currently relied upon) along with any additional information. This request has been made to AECL⁴ to ensure we have a clear and complete understanding of the environmental considerations being relied upon for the G1 project. To date, this information request remains outstanding.

³ KFN's [Comments on Project List Regulation](#), May 31 2019; KFN's [Comments on the Discussion Paper and 5-Year Review of the Project List Regulation](#), Sept 27, 2024

⁴ Correspondence to Danielle Waldman from Justin Roy, Jan 27, 2026.

5 - Clarifying the Role among Federal Authorities

Finally, we still require an explanation of the respective review processes of CNSC and AECL, given that both authorities will conduct a section 82 assessment. We understand that the AECL will issue its section 82 determination first, but we do not have information about how KFN may be engaged in AECL's process. We again ask that this information at the earliest opportunity.

Our attempts to engage on this and other s 82 projects, such as the Modern Combined Electrolysis and Catalytic Exchange Project, have exposed the complete lack of coordinated framework for section 82 assessments, including consultation that addresses CNSC's and the federal authorities' roles, and requirements for consultation or engagement in the review process. We need to know which entity from among CNSC, AECL, and CNL is the decision-making authority at a given time, and which entity is responsible for consultation, both constitutionally and practically through delegation.

All s 82 project assessments, including licensing reviews and authorizations that may accompany them, must include real consideration of our rights and knowledge. This requires our free, prior and informed consent ("FPIC") before decisions are made. Unfortunately, our experience shows section 82 assessments to be *ad hoc*, uncoordinated and lacking support and expertise from the Crown in undertaking consultation.

A major shift in the planning, coordinating and decision-making of section 82 assessments is needed if AECL/CNL and CNSC are to ensure a way forward that upholds our rights, which includes the duty to consult and FPIC. Since November 2021, KFN has been requesting a framework for section 82 project engagements and appended to this letter, is a chart tracking our numerous and outstanding calls for a coordinated process framework. We reiterate this is now long overdue and must be developed.

Next Steps

It is clear that CNSC's approach to engagement with Kebaowek regarding the Gentilly 1 Project fails to have essential elements we expect of a meaningful consultation process. Recent engagement challenges suggest that CNSC's approach to engagement is worsening and, rather than address our concerns, CNSC may be seeking to capitalize on them.

It is our hope that these challenges can be resolved and a meaningful engagement process developed. To that end, we request that:

1. The federal authorities confirm they will withdraw its arbitrary February 5, 2026, comment deadline;
2. The federal authorities commit to working with us to co-develop a Section 82 engagement process for the Gentilly 1 Project that responds to the concerns set out above and further commit not take further steps in the environmental assessment process until such a process has been developed to our mutual satisfaction; and

3. The federal authorities commit not to proceed with the Gentilly 1 project without obtaining our Free, Prior, and Informed Consent on waste transfer to Chalk River.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,



Justin Roy

cc:

CNSC:

Natalie Dormer – natalie.dormer@cnscccsn.gc.ca
 Adele Bissonnette – Adele.Bissonnette@cnscccsn.gc.ca
 Kirsten Sellers – kirsten.sellers@cnscccsn.gc.ca
 Erin Cotnam-Bent – erin.cotnam-bent@cnscccsn.gc.ca
 Kendra Warnock-Juteau – kendra.warnock-juteau@cnscccsn.gc.ca
 Candace Salmon, Commission Registrar – registry-greffe@cnscccsn.gc.ca
 Adam Levine, Director, Indigenous Consultation and Engagement Division
Adam.Levine@cnscccsn.gc.ca

AECL:

Adrienne Fournier – afournier@aecl.ca
 Arpad Kaltenecker – akaltenecker@aecl.ca
 Fred Dermakar – fdermarkar@aecl.ca
 Maude-Emilie Page – Mpage@aecl.ca

KFN:

Madison Fraser – [REDACTED]
 Rosanne Van Schie – [REDACTED]
 Kerrie Blaise – kerrie@blaiselegal.com

First Peoples Law:

Katharine Brack – kbrack@firstpeopleslaw.com
 Charlotte Connolly – cconnolly@firstpeopleslaw.com
 Nico McKay – nmckay@firstpeopleslaw.com



KEBAOWEK FIRST NATION
110 OGIMA STREET
KEBAOWEK (QUEBEC)
J0Z 3R1

TEL: (819) 627-3455

FAX: (819) 627-9428

www.kebaowek.ca

May 14, 2026

Minister of Natural Resources Canada
The Honourable Tim Hodgson
HonTim.Hodgson@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca

Minster of Environment and Climate Change
The Honourable Julie Dabrusin
ministre-minister@ec.gc.ca

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
President and CEO Pierre Tremblay
Pierre.Tremblay@cnsccsn.gc.ca

Canadian Nuclear Laboratories
President and CEO Dennis Carr
dennis.carr@cnl.ca

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited
President and CEO Fred Dermarkar
dermarkar@aecl.ca

Impact Assessment Agency of Canada
Compliance Promotion and Enforcement Unit
enforcement-applicationdelaloi@iaac-aeic.gc.ca

Dear Ministers Hodgson and Dabrusin; Presidents Tremblay, Carr, Dermarkar; and the IAAC
Compliance Unit:

**Re: Demand for respect for KFN's right to be consulted and FPIC obtained prior to the
transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste on our traditional territories**

Kebaowek First Nation (KFN) writes to bring an urgent issue to your attention regarding

breaches of KFN's right to provide free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) prior to the storage and disposal of hazardous on our territories, as recognized by Article 29(2) of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and affirmed by the Federal Court of Canada in *Kebaowek First Nation v Canadian Nuclear Laboratories*.¹

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) permitted Canadian Nuclear Laboratories (CNL) to transport of 88 spent fuel bundles stored in 11 concrete silos via road from the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (G1WF) nuclear site in Quebec to the Chalk River Site in July of last year. According to a report published by the CNSC in December 2025, CNL applied and obtained a license to transport from the CNSC, submitted a transport security plan, and obtained agreement from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to move the spent fuel from the G1WF site to Chalk River.² In its report, the CNSC commented it approved the transportation licence on the basis that there would be “minimal impact to the health and safety of workers, the public and the environment, as a result of these activities.”³

Breach of the Duty to Consult and Right to FPIC

KFN was not consulted on the transport of this waste. KFN was not notified or informed about the transport of waste from the G1WF site to the Chalk River site, despite a clear triggering of the duty to consult: the Crown approved a licence for the transport of waste⁴ to Chalk River where it would be stored and disposed of—an activity which poses the risk of potential adverse impacts to KFN's territory. Our Nation had already made the Crown aware that we expect to be consulted prior to the storage and disposal of hazardous waste on our territory, in accordance with Article 29(2) of UNDRIP and as endorsed in the Federal Court's decision less than 5 months prior to the Crown's authorization allowing the transport of waste to the Chalk River site. During this time, we were also meeting regularly with the CNSC and CNL, making the omission to properly consult us even more egregious.

CNSC ignored our requests and proceeded with the transfer. The lack of notification and consultation regarding the transport of waste from G1WF to Chalk River is extremely concerning considering CNL's plans to transport more radioactive waste from other sites across the country, including the Whiteshell and Port Hope facilities, for ultimate storage and disposal at the Chalk River site. KFN is concerned that the Crown will continue to keep our First Nation in the dark as waste accumulates in our territory, contrary to the Crown's constitutional obligations and UNDRIP.

¹ *Kebaowek First Nation v Canadian Nuclear Laboratories*, 2025 FC 319 at para 130 [*Kebaowek*].

² CNSC, [Regulatory Oversight Report for CNL Sites: 2024](#) (Dec 1, 2025)

³ *Ibid*, p 83

⁴ See, *Packing and Transport of Nuclear Substances Regulations*, 2015 (SOR/2015-145), sections 6 and 7, online: [Packaging and Transport of Nuclear Substances Regulations, 2015](#)

KFN has since communicated its concerns about the past transport and storage of waste at Chalk River without notification and sought information disclosures to better understand the ongoing activities at the GW1F site, including any environmental reviews, licence applications, and safety assessments.⁵ The CNSC has not provided any documents or additional information. Our knowledge of the proposed decommissioning activities is limited to the one-page Notice of Intent posted to the IAAC Registry.⁶

In response to our requests, the CNSC has taken the position that the duty to consult is not triggered because the transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste from other nuclear facilities is already covered by existing licences bases for the G1WF and Chalk River sites,⁷ and, therefore, there is not “Crown conduct” contemplated. This position is legally incorrect: the Crown issued an authorization for the transport of waste from G1WF to Chalk River site, and the ongoing accumulation of hazardous waste on KFN territory without our knowledge and consent poses the potential for adverse impacts. Our understanding is that intermediate and high-level radioactive waste will be stored in concrete vaults until a deep geological repository is built, and low-level radioactive waste will be deposited into the proposed Near-Surface Disposal Facility, which may directly impact on water sources and waterways. Unfortunately, the CNSC has rationalized the lack of consultation on the basis that the spent fuel from G1WF was already transferred to CRL.⁸ *Post hoc* justifications cannot cure a breach of the duty to consult or FPIC.

The CNSC has unilaterally determined that our concerns “do not fall directly in scope of the G1WF decommissioning activities that are being proposed for this licence amendment.”⁹ The CNSC’s attempt to foreclose consultation on the narrow basis of licencing scopes disregards the multiplicity of past and ongoing breaches of our right to FPIC, and the critical importance of assessing and monitoring the cumulative effects of Crown authorized activities in the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future.¹⁰ As stated in our letter dated February 5, 2026, all activities related to the transfer, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste on our traditional territories have the potential to adversely impact our section 35 rights. We view all projects which lead to the storage and disposal of hazardous waste on KFN territory as interconnected,

⁵ KFN to CNSC, “RE: Kebaowek First Nation’s comments on the Section 82 Assessment for the Proposed Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Project” (February, 5, 2026); KFN to CNSC, “Federal Assessment under the *Impact Assessment Act* for Gentilly-1” (October 15, 2025); CNSC to KFN “CNSC Staff Response to the Kebaowek First Nation Inquiries on the Section 82 Assessment for the Proposed Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Activities” (January 12, 2026)

⁶ See, <https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/documents/p90092/164173E.pdf>

⁷ CNSC to KFN, “RE: CNSC Staff Response to the Kebaowek First Nation Inquiries on the Section 82 Assessment for the Proposed Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Activities” (12 January 2026); CNSC to KFN, “Subject: CNSC Staff Response to the Kebaowek First Nation’s Comments on the Section 82 Assessment for the Proposed Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Project” (10 April 2026) [April 10, 2026 CNSC letter].

⁸ April 10, 2026 CNSC letter

⁹ April 10, 2026 CNSC letter

¹⁰ KFN, *Rights & Responsibilities Assessment Law* at sections 10.3(e), 16.1(b)(vii), 19.3; *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, SC 2012, c 19, sections 4(1)(i), 19(1)(a); and *Impact Assessment Act*, 2019, SC 2019, c 28, sections 6(2), 22(1)(a)(ii).

and expect to be consulted on all activities which engage Article 29(2) of UNDRIP.

As the Federal Court made clear, CNSC must consider UNDRIP when assessing whether the duty to consult and the FPIC standard have been both triggered and adequately fulfilled,¹¹ and must align its processes to reflect KFN's laws, knowledge, and processes with the aim of finding mutual agreement.¹²

The CNSC's failure to consider Indigenous perspectives and consult with KFN prior to approving a licence permitting the transport of radioactive waste to our territory has resulted in ongoing and unremedied constitutional, statutory, and regulatory violations.

To reiterate, Article 29(2) of UNDRIP provides that states shall ensure that "no storage or disposal of hazardous materials shall take place in the lands or territories of indigenous peoples without their free, prior, and informed consent." The CNSC continues to allow the licensee to carry out the transport and storage of radioactive waste at the Chalk River site without having first ensured that Crown obligations are being fulfilled. CNSC's conduct falls well below the standard required by the Honour of the Crown. We are extremely concerned that the CNSC's pattern of non-disclosure and indifference to our concerns will persist, as more hazardous nuclear waste is transferred to, stored, and disposed of on our traditional territories without our knowledge or consent.

Enforcement and a Halt of Activities at the Gentilly-1 Nuclear Site is Required

In July of 2025, KFN became aware of CNL's request to seek a licence amendment for the G1WF licence. As we communicated to the CNSC at that time, "KFN was not provided direct notice ... by the CNSC, despite our regular meetings and request for notice of any project triggering section 82 of the Impact Assessment Act."¹³

On December 3, 2025, CNL notified KFN of CNL's application to amend the existing G1WF licence to authorize CNL to proceed with the last phase of decommissioning activities, including the dismantling of all remaining structures and components, as well as the management, packaging and safe storage of resulting radioactive waste. KFN only later learned that the Crown had already issued a licence approving the transport of radioactive waste to the Chalk River site for storage, without any notification or consultation with KFN.

The CNSC's decision to issue a licence for the transport and storage of waste at the Chalk River site without notification to KFN breaches the Honour of the Crown and the duty to consult and

¹¹ *Kebaowek* at para 112.

¹² *Ibid* at para 133.

¹³ Email KFN to CNSC, "202507-00010: Gentilly-1 license Amendment" (July 8, 2025)

Article 29(2) of UNDRIP.

The CNSC's actions also directly conflict with section 82 of the *IAA*, which states a project on federal lands cannot be carried out, *in whole or part*, before an authority makes a determination on the likelihood of significant adverse environment effects:

82 An authority must not carry out a project on federal lands, exercise any power or perform any duty or function conferred on it under any Act of Parliament other than this Act that could permit a project to be carried out, in whole or in part, on federal lands or provide financial assistance to any person for the purpose of enabling that project to be carried out, in whole or in part, on federal lands, unless

(a) the authority determines that the carrying out of the project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects (emphasis added)

A section 82 assessment should have occurred prior to the transport of spent fuel rods from the G1WF to the Chalk River. Instead, CNSC circumvented the application of the *IAA* and issued a transport licence based on its unilateral determination that there would be “minimal impact to the health and safety of workers, the public and the environment, as a result of these activities.”¹⁴

Section 40 of the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act* further that requires that the CNSC hold a public hearing occur prior to the issuance of a licence:

40(5) The Commission shall, subject to any by-laws made under section 15 and any regulations made under section 44, hold a public hearing with respect to

(a) the proposed exercise by the Commission, or by a panel established under section 22, of the power under subsection 24(2) to issue, renew, suspend, amend, revoke or replace a licence

A public hearing should have occurred prior to the transport of spent fuel rods from G1WF to Chalk River and issuance of the transport licence¹⁵ to ensure a robust assessment about the potential adverse effects stemming from the decommissioning activities at G1WF, including the potential adverse effects to our section 35 rights, considering UNDRIP and the FPIC standard.

A hearing in writing on the remaining G1WF decommissioning activities is expected to occur in July 2026.¹⁶ CNL is also seeking a determination of significant environmental effects in keeping with sections 82 and 84 of the *Impact Assessment Act (IAA)*.¹⁷ Given the continued lack of

¹⁴ CNSC, Regulatory Oversight Report for CNL Sites: 2024

¹⁵ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2015-145/section-6.html>

¹⁶ Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, [Participant Funding for Canadian Nuclear Laboratories' Application to Amend the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence](#) (2025)

¹⁷ Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, [Decommissioning of the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility](#), Project No 90092

adequate response from the CNSC and the seriousness of these concerns, we request your immediate cooperation and assistance in calling on the CNSC to:

1. Immediately suspend any ongoing or proposed activities related to the G1WF site pending proper engagement and consultation with KFN, in keeping with section 82 of the *Impact Assessment Act*, the Honour of the Crown and section 35 of the *Constitution*; and
2. Demonstrate its willingness to take steps to immediately remedy the above-noted breaches by:
 - a. fulfilling KFN's outstanding information requests, detailed below;
 - b. working collaboratively with KFN to co-develop a Section 82 engagement process under the *IAA*; and
 - c. refraining from issuing any authorizations or making any Crown decisions until a mutually agreeable process is established and consultation is completed; and
3. Commit to not proceed with the decommissioning of the G1WF site without obtaining KFN's FPIC, including with respect to any transfer, storage, and disposal of waste at the Chalk River site.

Outstanding Information and Document Requests

Without any information or documentary disclosure about the G1WF decommissioning project, we cannot accept the CNSC's assertions that our rights and interests will be unaffected given the "scope of the current G1WF licence amendment application" and "the localized nature of potential impacts from the proposed decommissioning activities at the G1WF."¹⁸ Information sharing is a prerequisite for satisfying the duty to consult and seeking our FPIC.

The following document requests remain outstanding:

- copies of any internal Environmental Review(s), Environmental Effects Review(s), or equivalent environmental assessment documents prepared (or currently relied upon), along with any additional information to support the section 82 assessment on federal lands; and
- CNL's licence to transport application, safety analysis of the transportation package,

(2025)

¹⁸ Correspondence from Adam Levine, CNSC dated April 10, 2026; As communicated to the CNSC in our letter dated February 5, 2026, "where the Crown conducts a preliminary assessment on the potential impacts of a project to a First Nation, it must disclose this assessment and provide an opportunity for the First Nation to comment (see, *Sipekne'katik v Alton Gas Storage*, 2020 NSCC 111 at paras [123-129](#)). As stated by the Supreme Court in *Clyde River (Hamlet) v Petroleum Geo-Services Inc.*, 2017 SCC 40 at para 49, consultation is 'talking together for mutual understanding,' including talking with First Nations about the possible impacts to rights."

transport security plan, and agreement obtained from the IAEA to move the spent fuel from the G1WF site to the Chalk River site.

KFN cannot verify whether the CNSC's assessment is justifiable without the disclosure of the above noted documents.

To-date, the CNSC's approach to engagement with our Nation regarding the GWIF Project falls well short of meaningful consultation. Recent correspondence and statements from the CNSC demonstrates the approach to engagement is worsening rather than addressing our concerns. KFN is extremely concerned about the CNSC's flagrant disregard of its obligation to uphold the Honour of the Crown, its lack of transparency and accountability, and its nonconformity with its statutory obligations and licensing regulations.¹⁹

Conclusion

We hold a profound duty to act as stewards of *Anishinaabeg Algonquin Aki* (lands), our sacred sites, and our inherent relationships based on traditional laws. Yet, we have been denied the opportunity to fulfill this responsibility. KFN firmly maintains that the Crown should not have permitted the GWIF transport, storage, and disposal of waste at the Chalk River site without first notifying KFN, engaging in consultation, and asking whether our Nation believes there is the potential for adverse impacts to our rights. The failure to notify KFN about the transport of nuclear waste from the G1WF site for storage at the Chalk River site is a serious breach of:

- KFN's right to provide its FPIC prior to the storage and disposal of hazardous on our territories, as recognized by Article 29(2) of UNDRIP and affirmed by:
 - the United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, SC 2021, c 4, which confirms UNDRIP applies in Canadian law and provides the minimum standards against which state conduct must be measured;
 - Sections 9 and 24(4) of the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*, which direct the CNSC to ensure conformity with international obligations to which Canada has agreed;
 - the Federal Court of Canada's decision in *Kebaowek First Nation v Canadian Nuclear Laboratories*, 2025 FC 319.
- KFN's *Rights & Responsibilities Assessment Law*, ratified on November 27, 2026; and
- the duty to consult and accommodate under section 35 of the *Constitution*.

The CNSC must align its licensing decisions with Section 35 of the *Constitution* and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which mandates Free,

¹⁹ Despite our request that our comments and correspondence to date on this file be shared to the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada Registry, such disclosure – which is critical to building trust in participatory decision-making processes, is ensuring an accurate, update to date and public record – remains outstanding.

Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) before hazardous materials can be moved through or stored on our traditional unceded lands. Further the CNSC and all proponents must adhere to KFN's *Rights & Responsibilities Assessment Law*, as set out in a letter dated February 5, 2026.²⁰

We request a meeting with your offices to discuss these critical issues and the Crown's obligations in a context where hazardous radioactive waste is being transported, stored, and disposed of on KFN's territories on an ongoing basis.

Sincerely,



Chief Lance Haymond
Kebaowek First Nation

CC:

CNSC: C. Moses, A. Levine, N. Dormer, A. Bissonnette, K. Sellers, E. Cotnam-Bent, K. Warnock-Juteau

AECL: A. Fournier, M. Page

KFN: J. Roy, M. Fraser, R. Van Schie, K. Blaise, K. Brack, N. McKay, C. Connolly

²⁰ See, KFN, *Rights & Responsibilities Assessment Law* (2025), <https://kebaowek.ca/wp/r/>



June 23, 2026

Chief Lance Haymond
Kebaowek First Nation
110 Ogima Street
Kebaowek, Quebec
J0Z 3R1
lhaymond@kebaowek.ca

Re: Demand for respect for KFN's right to be consulted and FPIC obtained prior to the transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste on our traditional territories

Dear Chief Haymond:

Thank you for your letter of May 14th, 2026, sharing your concerns regarding the proposed Gentilly-1 Waste Facility (G1WF) decommissioning activities and related regulatory review process.

As noted in the CNSC staff correspondence to Kebaowek First Nation (KFN) dated January 12th and April 10th, 2026, the scope of Canadian Nuclear Laboratories' (CNL) licence amendment application—and the associated federal lands assessment in accordance with the *Impact Assessment Act*—focuses on the Commission's decision on whether to authorize an amendment to the G1WF licensing basis so that CNL may progress into the active decommissioning phase of their decommissioning strategy, which would involve the dismantling of structures at the G1WF site. Consequently, we have consulted and engaged with Indigenous Nations and communities that may be impacted by or who have expressed interest in this amendment application and authorization, and we remain open to further consultation and engagement with potentially impacted and interested Indigenous Nations and communities.

On May 5th, 2026, CNSC staff notified KFN that the relevant Commission Member Documents for this hearing had been posted on the [CNSC Registry webpage](#).



These include CNSC staff's Environmental Effects Evaluation Form, CNL's G1WF Licence Amendment Application, Environmental Protection Measures for Decommissioning and Demolition (formerly titled Environmental Effects Review Report), and other materials submitted by CNSC staff and CNL regarding CNL's licence amendment application for the G1WF. We remain available to answer questions regarding these documents.

KFN has also requested the following documents:

- CNL's licence to transport application;
- Safety analysis of the transportation package;
- Transport security plan, and
- Agreement obtained from the IAEA to move the spent fuel from the G1WF site to the Chalk River site

These documents fall outside the scope of CNL's licence amendment application and have not been posted to the CNSC's website for this particular licence application. CNSC staff will be providing KFN, through separate correspondence, the letter indicating that the IAEA and the CNSC are satisfied with the Summary of Activities and Safeguards Measures, as well as the transport licence that was issued, and the certificate for the package used during transportation. The remaining documents are CNL owned documents and should be requested directly from CNL.

The CNSC remains open to receiving any additional G1WF specific concerns, perspectives, information, or Indigenous Knowledge relevant to the licence amendment application and the associated federal lands assessment in accordance with the *Impact Assessment Act*. We encourage KFN to share any further submissions with CNSC staff and the Commission through the interventions process, as appropriate.

We would also be pleased to meet with KFN outside the context of the G1WF licence amendment to discuss and learn more about KFN's concerns related to the transport of nuclear substances should that be of interest.

Canadian Nuclear
Safety CommissionCommission canadienne
de sûreté nucléaire

Page 3

If this is of interest to KFN, please contact Natalie Dormer by email at Natalie.Dormer@cnsccsn.gc.ca.

Yours sincerely,

2026-06-23

X

Signed by: Moses, Colin

Colin Moses

Vice-President, Regulatory Affairs Branch and Chief Communications Officer
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5S9

c.c./c.c.: **CNSC:** Adam Levine, Adèle Bissonnette, Natalie Dormer, Nana Kwamena, Mark McLaughlin, Kendra Warnock-Juteau, Kirsten Sellers, Erin Cotnam-Bent
KFN: Roy, Justin: jroy@kebaowek.ca
McLaren, Kacie: kmclaren@kebaowek.ca
Van Schie, Rosanne: [REDACTED]
Blaise, Kerrie: kerrie@blaiselegal.com
Brack, Katherine: kbrack@firstpeopleslaw.com
McKay, Nico: nmckay@firstpeopleslaw.com
Connolly, Charlotte: cconnolly@firstpeopleslaw.com
LaRocque, Erin: elarocque@firstpeopleslaw.com

Canadian Nuclear
Safety CommissionCommission canadienne
de sûreté nucléaire

Page 4

Reference:

Response Letter from CNSC to First Nation Inquiries on the Section 82
Assessment for the Proposed Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Decommissioning Activities
January 12, 2026 [2026-01-12 - Letter - CNSC to KFN -
Response to KFN Inquiries on s 82 Assessment for G1WF -January 2026.pdf](#)

CNSC Staff Response to Kebaowek First Nation's Comments on the
Section 82 Assessment for the Proposed Gentilly-1 Waste Facility
Decommissioning Project, April 10, 2026 [2026-04-10 CNSC Response to KFN Letter on
S.82 Comments.pdf](#)

Incoming Letter from Kebaowek First Nation: Demand for respect for KFN's right to be
consulted and FPIC obtained prior to the transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous
waste on our traditional territories Letter May 14, 2026 [2026.05.14 - Letter from KFN re
G1WF Decommissioning Project.pdf](#)

Waldman, Danielle

From: Sellers, Kirsten (CNSC/CCSN) <kirsten.sellers@cnscccsn.gc.ca>
Sent: July 3, 2026 2:31 PM
To: Lance haymond; Roy, Justin; Kacie McLaren; Madison Fraser; rosanne van schie; Kerrie Blaise
Cc: Levine, Adam (CNSC/CCSN); Bissonnette, Adèle (CNSC/CCSN); Cotnam-Bent, Erin (CNSC/CCSN); Dormer, Natalie (CNSC/CCSN); Gordon, Joanne (CNSC/CCSN)
Subject: Documents related to G1WF Spent Fuel Retrieval and Transfer
Attachments: E-DOCS-#7371884-v1-CNSC_to_CNL-Finalization_of_the_Safeguards_Approach_for_the_G1WF_Spent_Fuel_Retrieval_and_Transfer_Project_September_2024.pdf; E-DOCS-#7323606-v2-Approved_TL-S-15193-48_00_2025.PDF; E-DOCS-#7313958-v3A-Approved_Certificate_CDN_2098_B(U)F-96_Rev_2_NAC_Optimus_H_EN.PDF

Hi Justin and team,

We received a request from KFN, in Chief Haymond's May 14th letter addressed to various federal ministers and CNSC President Tremblay, for the following documents:

- CNL's licence to transport application;
- Safety analysis of the transportation package;
- Transport security plan, and
- Agreement obtained from the IAEA to move the spent fuel from the G1WF site to the Chalk River site.

The first three documents on this list are CNL documents and we recommend you submit this request directly to CNL.

As per the letter Colin sent to Chief Haymond on June 23rd, I am pleased to provide the following documents related to G1WF Spent Fuel Retrieval and Transfer:

- the letter indicating that the IAEA and the CNSC are satisfied with the Summary of Activities and Safeguards Measures
- the transport licence that was issued, and
- the certificate for the package used during transportation.

Please find these three documents attached.

Have a great weekend!

Kirsten

Kirsten Sellers
(she/her/elle)

Senior Policy Officer, Indigenous Consultation and Engagement Division
 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
Kirsten.Sellers@cnscccsn.gc.ca / Cell: 343-575-4581

Agente principale des politiques, Division de la consultation et de la mobilisation des Autochtones

Waldman, Danielle

From: Kerrie Blaise <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>
Sent: July 31, 2026 10:27 AM
To: MacKay, Mitch
Cc: Justin Roy; Levine, Adam (CNSC/CCSN; Bissonnette, Adèle (CNSC/CCSN; Cotnam-Bent, Erin (CNSC/CCSN; Dormer, Natalie (CNSC/CCSN; Gordon, Joanne (CNSC/CCSN; kirsten.sellers@cnscccsn.gc.ca; Lance haymond; Kacie McLaren; madison.fraser96; vanschies3; Charlotte Connolly; Katharine Brack; Waldman, Danielle; Chennette, Rachel; LeBlanc, Nicole; Cox, Haleigh; Shorter, Katie; Riopelle, Alexandra
Subject: [External] Re: Documents related to G1WF Spent Fuel Retrieval and Transfer

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good morning Mitch,

Confirming receipt of your email and confirmation of CNL's response that the documents will not be released.

To clarify, the information request seeking disclosure of these documents was included in KFN's submissions on the CNL Regulatory Oversight Report dated January 28, 2026, that came to CNL's attention. Follow-up correspondence and submissions have since repeated this request.

Thank you for the response and wishing you all a safe long weekend,

Kerrie

On Wed, Jul 29, 2026 at 4:20 PM MacKay, Mitch <mitch.mackay@cnl.ca> wrote:

OFFICIAL USE ONLY / À USAGE EXCLUSIF

Good afternoon, Justin,

The CNSC has forwarded us the below request. CNL had only received this request through the initial letter, which was not clear to whom the request was going to as only our CEO was on the email. I would recommend KFN work directly with me and my team for such requests.

The SAR (proprietary 3rd party information) and Transport Security Plan (security protected information) are both confidential and cannot be released. All pertinent details from our license to transport application is reproduced

in the CNSC transport licence and the certificate for the package that CNSC has already shared. CNL would be happy to bring a subject matter expert to a monthly meeting with KFN to talk about the safety, packaging, and transport of used nuclear fuel. Please let us know and we will begin to schedule.

Further to this CNL has also delivered a presentation to KFN regarding CNL's emergency preparedness planning in February 2026.

Additionally, we have some great resources on our website that explains the program.

This [page](#) and [factsheet](#).

Thanks,

Mitch

From: Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>

Sent: July 6, 2026 8:22 AM

To: Sellers, Kirsten (CNSC/CCSN) <kirsten.sellers@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Lance haymond <lhaymond@kebaowek.ca>; Kacie McLaren <kmclaren@kebaowek.ca>; madison.fraser96 <[REDACTED]>; vanschie3 <[REDACTED]>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>; Charlotte Connolly <cconnolly@firstpeopleslaw.com>; Katharine Brack <kbrack@firstpeopleslaw.com>

Cc: Levine, Adam (CNSC/CCSN) <Adam.Levine@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Bissonnette, Adèle (CNSC/CCSN) <Adele.Bissonnette@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Cotnam-Bent, Erin (CNSC/CCSN) <erin.cotnam-bent@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Dormer, Natalie (CNSC/CCSN) <natalie.dormer@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Gordon, Joanne (CNSC/CCSN) <joanne.gordon@cnscccsn.gc.ca>

Subject: Re: Documents related to G1WF Spent Fuel Retrieval and Transfer

EXTERNAL EMAIL – USE CAUTION / COURRIEL EXTERNE – FAITES PREUVE DE PRUDENCE

Good Morning Kirsten,

Hope you had a great weekend,

Confirming receipt of our below email and the shared attachments,

As for the files we requested that you stated were CNL documents,

That is part of the issue we are having, we have requested from CNL, more than once and over quiet sometime now, for these documents and we still have not received them,

KFN is wondering if the CNSC can help with this,

Thank you,

Justin Roy

Councillor

Director of Economic Development

Kebaowek First Nation

110 Ogima Street

Kebaowek, QC

(819) 627 3309

Jroy@kebaowek.ca

www.kebaowek.ca

From: Sellers, Kirsten (CNSC/CCSN) <kirsten.sellers@cnsccsn.gc.ca>

Sent: Friday, July 3, 2026 2:30 PM

To: Lance haymond <lhaymond@kebaowek.ca>; Justin Roy <jroy@kebaowek.ca>; Kacie McLaren <kmclaren@kebaowek.ca>; madison.fraser96 <[REDACTED]>; vanschies3 <[REDACTED]>; kerrie <kerrie@blaiselegal.com>

Cc: Levine, Adam (CNSC/CCSN) <Adam.Levine@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Bissonnette, Adèle (CNSC/CCSN) <Adele.Bissonnette@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Cotnam-Bent, Erin (CNSC/CCSN) <erin.cotnam-bent@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Dormer, Natalie (CNSC/CCSN) <natalie.dormer@cnscccsn.gc.ca>; Gordon, Joanne (CNSC/CCSN) <joanne.gordon@cnscccsn.gc.ca>

Subject: Documents related to G1WF Spent Fuel Retrieval and Transfer

Hi Justin and team,

We received a request from KFN, in Chief Haymond's May 14th letter addressed to various federal ministers and CNSC President Tremblay, for the following documents:

- CNL's licence to transport application;
- Safety analysis of the transportation package;
- Transport security plan, and
- Agreement obtained from the IAEA to move the spent fuel from the G1WF site to the Chalk River site.

The first three documents on this list are CNL documents and we recommend you submit this request directly to CNL.

As per the letter Colin sent to Chief Haymond on June 23rd, I am pleased to provide the following documents related to G1WF Spent Fuel Retrieval and Transfer:

- the letter indicating that the IAEA and the CNSC are satisfied with the Summary of Activities and Safeguards Measures
- the transport licence that was issued, and
- the certificate for the package used during transportation.

Please find these three documents attached.

61-508760-041-000

Page 74 of 77

Have a great weekend!

Kirsten

Kirsten Sellers

(she/her/elle)

Senior Policy Officer, Indigenous Consultation and Engagement Division

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Kirsten.Sellers@cnsccsn.gc.ca / Cell: 343-575-4581

Agente principale des politiques, Division de la consultation et de la mobilisation des Autochtones

Commission Canadienne de sûreté nucléaire

Kirsten.Sellers@cnsccsn.gc.ca / Tél. cell. : 343-575-4581

This email is confidential between the sender and the intended recipient specified in the message, and may contain proprietary or otherwise protected information of the intended parties. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and confirm you have deleted this message. Any unauthorized review, disclosure, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or reliance on this information may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited.

--

Kerrie Blaise, MSc, JD

[Blaise Law](#)

Tel: 705 978 4034

DISCLAIMER:

Confidentiality Note: This message may be subject to solicitor-client privilege. If you have received this message in error, please let me know by reply email, and delete your copy. Thank you.



61-508760-041-90

KEBAOWEK FIRST NATION
110 OGIMA STREET
KEBAOWEK (QUEBEC)
J0Z 3R1

TEL: (819) 627-3455

FAX: (819) 627-9428

www.kebaowek.ca

Colin Moses

August 6, 2026

Vice-President, Regulatory Affairs, and Chief Communications Officer
 Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
Colin.Moses@cnsc-ccsn.gc.ca

**Re: Response to June 23 and July 3, 2026 correspondence regarding the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility
 Licensing Proceeding**

Dear Mr. Moses,

Kebaowek First Nation (KFN) writes in response to your letter of June 23, 2026 and Ms. Kirsten Sellers' correspondence of July 3, 2026, enclosing additional documents relating to the transport of spent fuel from the Gentilly-1 Waste Facility ("G-1").

From the outset, we wish to reiterate our ongoing request that the Commission postpone the G-1 licence amendment hearing until such a time that the informational and consultation gaps are remedied and Kebaowek is provided a meaningful opportunity to engage in the process, including with respect to the assessment of the project's potential impacts to our rights in accordance with our own laws. It is not our preference nor preferred approach to engage with the matters raised in your correspondence and that of CNSC Staff by way of letter correspondence, as these matters are precisely those KFN has been seeking to resolve as part of the licensing process with the Commission.

At present, KFN has no certainty as to when the written hearing record may close or when the Commission may render its decision, despite the significant procedural, Constitutional, and disclosure issues that remain outstanding.

1 – Licence Hearing and Meeting Invite

In response to your invitation for a meeting, Kebaowek remains willing to meet with CNSC Staff. However, no justification has been provided as to why this meeting shall occur "outside the context of the G1WF licence amendment" when matters directly affecting that licensing matter, as raised by KFN, remain outstanding. Discussions with CNSC staff are not a substitute for dialogue with those ultimately responsible for determining this matter and we again request the opportunity to address the Commission, via an oral hearing for this matter.

Additionally, we do not wish to engage in a debate through correspondence regarding what CNSC Staff consider to be "within scope" or "outside the scope" for this proceeding, when these remain live

Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction
61-508760-041-000 Page 76 of 77
matters that we have included in our intervention before the Commission. For instance, your June 23,
2026 correspondence asserts that transportation-related matters and associated documentation fall
“outside the scope” of the current licensing proceeding.

KFN has already addressed this issue at length in our written intervention to the Commission and we respectfully direct you to review these remarks. In our submissions, we set out why the transportation, storage, and ultimate disposition of the spent nuclear fuel are integral components of the overall project before the Commission; why these activities engage Kebaowek's section 35 rights, Indigenous laws, and right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent; and why the associated information is necessary to permit meaningful participation and procedural fairness.

Rather than revisit these arguments through this correspondence, our position remains unchanged as articulated in our G-1 written intervention.

2 – Information Requests and Additional Requests

KFN wishes to address the CNSC's correspondence of July 3, 2026 regarding KFN's request for documents and CNSC Staff's suggestion that we seek CNL's licence to transport application, safety analysis of the transportation package, and transport security plan from CNL directly.

These documents have already been requested directly from CNL and on July 29, 2026, we were provided confirmation that they would not be disclosed, namely due to being security-sensitive or proprietary. As CNL confirmed in denying our request for disclosure:

The SAR (proprietary 3rd party information) and Transport Security Plan (security protected information) are both confidential and cannot be released.¹

As these documents are already in the possession of the CNSC – by virtue of being submitted by CNL, reviewed by CNSC staff, and relied upon by the Commission in issuing the transport licence – we again request their prompt disclosure. The CNSC ought to ensure the most just and expeditious means of providing information rather than requiring Kebaowek to pursue an unsuccessful parallel request with the proponent. Ensuring dissemination of information also flows from the mandate of the Commission, as set out in the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*.

The documents provided by the CNSC in the July 3, 2026 also give rise to additional requests for information which KFN now seeks:

1. The October 10, 2024 CNSC correspondence confirms that the International Atomic Energy Agency ("IAEA") and the CNSC were satisfied with the Summary of Activities and Safeguards Measures, identified as e-Doc 7371989. As that document is expressly relied upon in the CNSC's correspondence, KFN requests that e-Doc 7371989 also be disclosed; and
2. The transport licence provided only makes reference to a licence number and not the name of the licensee who held the authorization to transport high level radioactive waste and spent fuel

¹ Correspondence from CNL, Mitch MacKay, “Documents related to G1WF Spent Fuel Retrieval and Transfer,” to KFN dated 3 July 2026.

Supplemental Commission Member Document: Additional Information for Consideration in respect of the
Gentilly-1 Waste Facility Licence Amendment pursuant to the Procedural Direction
61-508760-041-000
to Chalk River. KFN requests the name as to whom licence holder number TL-S-15193
48.00/2025 represents.

Page 77 of 77

In closing, we request that this letter; your correspondence of June 23, 2026, Ms. Sellers' correspondence of July 3, 2026; and any subsequent correspondence regarding these matters, be included in the hearing record for the G-1 matter.

Kebaowek remains committed to engaging in good faith. We continue to call on the Commission to postpone the hearing until the informational and consultation gaps identified in our submissions have been remedied and meaningful dialogue and compliance with our law and protocol, has occurred.

Sincerely,



Chief Lance Haymond
Kebaowek First Nation

cc: Natalie Dormer, natalie.dormer@cnscccsn.gc.ca
CNSC Registrar, registry-greffe@cnscccsn.gc.ca