

Tsui, Kathy [CEAA]

From: Smith, John [CEAA]
Sent: November 8, 2005 12:27 PM
To: Vachon, Al [CEAA]; Devin, Sarah [CEAA]
Cc: Sylvester, Peter [CEAA]
Subject: FW: Meeting with AECL

s.23

See last para: AECL coming under the Act was not an issue. Louise raised some questions in that para
I think there is a straightforward answer and I've left a message with Louise to coordinate how to proceed.

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

From: Knox, Louise [CEAA]
Sent: November 8, 2005 12:16 PM
To: Burgess, Steve [CEAA]
Cc: Smith, John [CEAA]; Robinson, David J. [CEAA]; Young, Bruce [CEAA]; Hainsworth, Cathy [CEAA]; Cameron, Darla [CEAA]; Advokaat, Eric [CEAA]; Schultz, Jeremy [CEAA]; Chan, Jim [CEAA]; Thompson, Mary Claire [CEAA]; Schafer, Paul [CEAA]
Subject: Meeting with AECL

Hello all,

Just want to summarize my meeting with Michael G. Taylor, V-P Corporate Affairs with AECL and Peter J. Allsop, Manager, Plant Performance and Processess with AECL in Mississauga.

I'll send you a copy of the "deck" but the main message was that AECL believes Ontario may, by the end of this month, announce its decision on the mix of energy generation options it prefers, and that "new nuclear" will be among these. AECL seems to want to pursue an option where OPG, as proponent, could hire AECL to construct and obtain approvals for a new nuclear facility which OPG would then operate. The new reactor would likely be proposed to be at the Darlington site, or possibly the Bruce site. AECL is trying to understand what would be involved in obtaining the EA and approvals.

Luckily, I had invited Phil Brennan from MOE who could answer to some extent their questions about whether or not a newly proposed nuclear generation facility would be subject to the EA requirements of the province (answer: no) and whether transmission lines would be subject to same (answer: yes) and the extent to which coordination is possible (answer: full extent, where both processes apply). There were questions about scope of project (I suggested they speak to potential RAs about this) about level of detail (same response) about factors which could make the EA go smoothly (I suggested they provide all the information they're asked for, quickly, and treat interested/affected members of the public with respect; I also indicated use of slightly enriched uranium in a new reactor would likely attract attention--this based on the report of the advisory committee to the Nuclear Waste Management Office).

They assume they would be into a comp study, so let me use this to confirm with Dave that they would be captured under Part VI item 19(d) if their capacity were more than 25MW (thermal), which it would be.

They talked about potential for panel--so I would like to use this to ask Bruce whether a CNSC/CEAA joint panel would be an option. Also, I had a call from Heather Jarrett this week asking about a CNSC panel as a substitution for a CEAA panel--I referred the call to Bruce and would be interested in knowing the outcome of this discussion Bruce, when you have time.

The questions about how AECL as a crown corporation would fulfill its obligations under CEAA, and what these might be, never came up. I suppose this is because they see themselves in this scenario acting under contract to the proponent which would be the prime mover. However, I think it