



CMD 26-M13.48

Date: 2026-05-15

**Written Submission from
Nicholas Lato**

**Mémoire de
Nicholas Lato**

In the matter of the

À l'égard de la

**Mid-term update from BWXT Nuclear
Energy Canada Inc. on licensed activities
at its Toronto and Peterborough facilities**

**Mise à jour de mi-parcours sur les
activités autorisées de BWXT Nuclear
Energy Canada Inc. à ses installations de
Toronto et de Peterborough**

Commission Meeting

Réunion de la Commission

May 2026

Mai 2026

From: Nick Lato
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2026 12:36 PM
To: Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN)
Cc: Written intervention
Subject:

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

Nicholas Lato

Across the street from a school is an inappropriate place to build a new nuclear processing factory.

Everyone acknowledges that there would be no way that a factory that applied for zoning next to a school would be approved. The only reason that BWXT is permitted to build a new facility at the location is that it is grandfathered in from GE having a former factory there.

This may adhere to the letter of the law, but is against the spirit of the law. For this reason the CNSC should deny/revoke the licence for BWXT to move their pelleting operation to Toronto.

After the current license was granted by CNSC, it came with the caveat that BWXT needed to perform better community outreach and communication with the affected populations.

BWXT came to my son's school, Prince of Wales, for a presentation and Q and A.

They cited multiple times that the uranium emissions from the Toronto pelleting operation were "zero".

I challenged them on that figure, saying they're certainly not zero, that they may be rounding to zero, or have crude measurement techniques, but there were definite non-zero uranium emissions associated with the pelleting operation.

They acknowledged that I was correct, that there were uranium emissions associated with the pelleting operation. Then they went back to stating that there were zero emissions, seemingly forgetting that one minute ago they acknowledged that there were indeed emissions.

If BWXT wants to communicate with the public, they need to do so truthfully and not round the figures to a level where they can say it's "zero" when it's not.

I looked into BWXT's annual report for the Toronto location.

It shows that the 24 hour high release limit is 50 times the upper limit of background uranium levels, measured between 25 and 100 metres from the site.

This in and of itself seems unacceptable to expose school children to.

For the average for the year, the figure they cite is 0.000 micrograms per cubic metre. I asked them why they are only measuring to 3 decimal places when background uranium is cited as ranging from 0.000025-0.0001 micrograms per cubic meter.

They replied that the measuring techniques they use are more crude than the more advanced analytical methods used to calculate background radiation, such as coupled plasma mass spectrometry.

So their figure of 0.000 could theoretically be 4.9 times the upper limit of background radiation if the rounded to get the figure of 0.000, or it could be 9.9 times the upper background limit if their measuring techniques resulted in an effective truncation to achieve their figure.

Either way, stating that the emissions are zero because their measurement methods aren't sophisticated enough to measure in the range that a parent of a child at the school may find meaningful is deceitful.

I suspect that BWXT has been using this "zero" figure in many of their communications.

Dave Smith, our local MPP, when discussing the upcoming GE demolition, was lamenting that a factory could never be built next to a school in current times.

I pointed out that BWXT is potentially planning on doing exactly that. To which he replied that it would be safer for the neighbourhood to move the pelleting operations to the GE site, that making the pellets in Peterborough would be safer for the residents than delivering them on trucks.

I can only assume that BWXT has been telling him as well that the pelleting operation has zero emissions.

Other than for CNSC to revoke the license for pelleting operations to move to Peterborough, I have 2 requests.

1. BWXT refrain from stating that the pelleting operation has "zero" emissions, when it clearly has non-zero emissions
2. That robust air monitoring be established at the Peterborough site

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

Nick Lato

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)