

Tsui,Kathy [CEAA]

From: Vachon,Al [CEAA]
Sent: December 22, 2005 3:16 PM
To: Tsui,Kathy [CEAA]
Subject: FW: REAC membership AECL

-----Original Message-----

From: Smith,John [CEAA]
Sent: May 16, 2005 2:32 PM
To: Chan,Jim [CEAA]
Cc: Vachon,Al [CEAA]
Subject: RE: REAC membership AECL

Thanks. This is useful - may not be the final point in a discussion, but it helps solidify and reinforce our understanding.

-----Original Message-----

From: Chan,Jim [CEAA]
Sent: May 16, 2005 2:24 PM
To: Smith,John [CEAA]
Subject: FW: REAC membership AECL

-----Original Message-----

From: Knox,Louise2 [CEAA]
Sent: May 16, 2005 1:34 PM
To: Chan,Jim [CEAA]
Subject: FW: REAC membership AECL

-Jim--this should clarify our thinking when we were deciding whether AECL should continue on REAC in Ontario. Essentially, our terms of reference call for members to be entities which have responsibility for ensuring EAs are carried out under either federal or provincial legislation and AECL was not such an entity. -----Original Message-----

From: Knox, Louise [CEAA]
Sent: April 8, 2002 5:20 PM
To: Burgess,Steve [CEAA]
Subject: FW: REAC membership

FYI, Judy's not making this easy for me, see below...

Louise.Knox@ceaa.gc.ca
Regional Director - Ontario
CEAA
(416) 952-1575

-----Original Message-----

From: Tamm, Judy
Sent: April 8, 2002 4:45 PM
To: Knox, Louise [CEAA]
Subject: RE: REAC membership

Hi, Louise,

To respond to your questions:

(1) Not really. AECL has not built a nuclear power plant in Canada - they work with the utilities, such as OPG, Bruce Energy, New Brunswick Power, Hydro Quebec. These utilities have hired/would hire AECL to provide the design of specific components of a nuclear power plant. The utility would be the project manager/owner of the plant and therefore would be responsible for its licensing. The utility would also, probably, sub-contract the construction effort. (AECL's experience is in project managing the construction of internationally-based NPPs.) It is the utility that makes the decision as to what type of power to purchase.

(2) No. Presently under the CEA Act (and, I believe, even under the proposed Bill), the classification of crown corporations to which AECL belongs, has no legal requirement to perform EAs.

Hope this assists your discussions.

Judy Tamm
Environmental Studies
AECL-Sheridan Park
2251 Speakman Drive
Mississauga, ON L5K 1B2
Tel: 905-823-9040, Ext. 4197
Fax: 905-823-0416
tammj@aecl.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Knox, Louise [CEAA]
Sent: Thursday April 04, 2002 2:22 PM
To: Tamm, Judy: AECL
Subject: REAC membership

Thanks very much for correcting my mis-understanding about AECL and power generation Judy. I'm embarrassed by my ignorance!

Before I circulate the info to the members of the fed/prov committee, maybe there are a few other questions I should ask about your business.

(1) would companies proposing to design, engineer and possibly license and construct non-nuclear power generation facilities see you as competitors?

(2) are you ever in the position of having legal responsibilities to carry out an environmental assessment?

These I think will be the key considerations for us. Glad we have talked about this and I look forward to further discussion.

Louise.Knox@ceaa.gc.ca
Regional Director - Ontario
CEAA
(416) 952-1575

Bill C-9

An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act
37th PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION
Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Location:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/LEGISINFO/index.asp?Lang=E&Chamber=C&StartList=2&EndList=200&Session=11&Type=0&Scope=1&query=3142&List=stat>

Question:

Locate mention of AECL in C-9 Committee deliberations.

Main findings in Committee minutes related to AECL:

- All federal authorities covered under the Act with no distinguishment between projects inside or outside of Canada
- 8(3) – precedence of licensing FA over Crown corporation.
- Note requesting update to standing committee every six months (Dec 11th, 2002)

Committee Minutes:

Thursday, November 7, 2002

Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, in addition to the explanations that have been made by the parliamentary secretary, I wonder if I could direct a question to staff.

It seems to be a very compelling argument that there are not two laws for different entities, and the public generally has a right to demand that this principle prevails. So if there is a compelling reason, what would it be, from a staff position, with respect to treating crown corporations differently under the Environmental Assessment Act?

I'm looking for some illustrations of urgency and relevant public interest that would be served in order to guide myself and the committee, I would think.

¿ (0935)