



File / dossier : 6.01.07

Date: 2017-12-11

Edocs: 5414424

Oral presentation

**Submission from
Rick Bradshaw**

In the Matter of the

Canadian Nuclear Laboratories

Application for the renewal of the Nuclear
Research and Test Establishment Operating
Licence for the Chalk River Laboratories

Commission Public Hearing

January 23-25, 2018

Exposé oral

**Mémoire de
Rick Bradshaw**

À l'égard des

Les Laboratoires Nucléaires Canadiens

Demande de renouvellement du permis
d'exploitation d'établissement de recherche
et d'essais nucléaires pour les Laboratoires
de Chalk River

Audience publique de la Commission

23-25 janvier 2018

December 11, 2017

Rick Bradshaw

Pembroke, On. Sheenboro PQ.

Ms. Louise Levert
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

CNSC submission in opposition to Chalk River Nuclear Labs licence extension

Dear Ms. Levert,

I strongly object to a licence extension beyond five years for CNL's operation in Chalk River. What is the point of an extension that exceeds the limits of the existing contract, particularly when the Environmental Impact Statement has yet to be approved and there is no approved plan or clearly defined government policy direction for the handling of the radioactive waste, which seems to be their main purpose. There has yet to be proper public consultation for the project and certainly no public acceptance.

I strongly object to the changes being made that reduce the reporting requirements of the licensee as well as the reduction to the safety standards. You are leaving too much to the discretion of the licensee, a group that has yet to demonstrate competence at any level according to many current employees at the Chalk River site. One of the main opposition points to the planned radioactive waste dump is the potential for contaminating the Ottawa River which is the source of drinking water for millions of people. This new licence would limit the requirement to test and report water quality on the CNL Chalk River site as just one example of further relaxing of environmental standards. How do the reduction in reporting and the gutting of the safety requirements affect the eventual approval of the EIS? Have you simply lowered the bar?

I object to the role that the CNSC itself plays in this process as a supposed 'arms length' organization when in fact recent history has proved that this is not the case. It appears that when a potential licensee can't meet the necessary requirements, you find a way to make it work, as you appear to be doing in this case. How do you justify relaxing the requirements? Why are you making it easier for an organization that has partners that have been proven to have questionable ethics? And how is the public to have confidence in the process if it appears to be rigged to favour the licensee from the start? How can the CNSC, touted by government as an independent body, be trusted when the CNSC and AECL, who awarded the contract to CNL, answer to the same Federal Department and report to the same Federal Minister?

I don't believe this passes the smell test.

I will be at the January hearings in Pembroke and wish to make an oral presentation.

Regards,

Rick Bradshaw