

**Date:** December 19<sup>th</sup> 2017

**From:** Greg Link

**To:** Candida Cianci, Environmental Assessment Specialist  
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

**By email:** cncs.ea-ee.ccsn@canada.ca

**Subject line:** Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Greg Link

**CEAA Reference number:** 80124

**Comments:**

Candida and team,

Please find my feedback attached.

It was nice meeting you in 2017 and I look forward to working with you in 2018.

Have a relaxing holiday,

Greg

Greg Link  
<Address  
Redacted>

December 18, 2017

Dear Candida and team,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proceedings.

For most of my life in Lac Du Bonnet, the Pinawa nuclear site was in the process of being decommissioned, dismantled and removed. It was brought to my attention in the spring that the AECL/CNL was applying to change their plan for the site.

My understanding of Nuclear Science was limited so I needed to educate myself. I have taken every opportunity offered – presentations, open houses, video conference, and tours – over the past seven months, to gain an understanding of the current plan and the proposed modifications to this plan. I thank all of the people that I have meet via this process. All were quality, forthright individuals whether they were representatives of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission or Canadian Nuclear Laboratories or community members of the public.

I will centre my comments to the Canadian Nuclear Safety commission on two fronts. The first category will be about the information sharing process that I observed and the second will be items that could have been shared.

I entered the discussion as an individual who didn't have a preconceived position on the proposed licensing change. My main purpose was (and still is) to determine if this change was going to have a positive or negative effect on the quality of Lac du Bonnet living.

### **Information sharing process**

My first event was the CNCS presentation in Lac Du Bonnet in May. The *CNCS 101* presentation included who the CNSC was, how nuclear substances impact our life, regulatory framework and processes. The presentation went on to detail the proposed alteration, and outlined the timeline that culminated in a hearing.

The glaring error (and I expressed this at the public gathering on that evening) was that an artist's rendering of the new proposed plan was presented in the slides, but a likeness of what the site would look like if the current plan was to continue was omitted. CNCS likes to be known as the nuclear watchdog who looks after the interests of the Canadian people. I believe that they were not acting as the neutral third party who was to explain the current license and then the proposed changes to the current license. By showing only the rendering of the proposed licensing application, I perceived that they were implying that the licensing change was a done deal.

The next event I attended was the CNL presentation in Lac du Bonnet in July. The presentation was complete and I had a chance to hear relevant questions/points from many members of the public. I forwarded several questions to the CNL team which were answered via email.

The next event was the CNL Webinar that occurred in October. The webinar was fast paced and featured a variety of presenters. During most of the event only the audio was working and the team was unable to capture the content for the public to view at a later time. There appeared to be valuable content being shared, but we will never know.

The next event was a site tour of the Pinawa site in early November. The team was prepared and competent in their explanation of the processes and participant's questions. I left the site with an understanding of the size and scope of the task ahead of CNL.

The final event I attended was the CNCS Open House at the Delta hotel in November. It was a good chance to reconnect with some of the CNCS team that I met a half a year ago. The team shared updates on the environmental study and the process that leads up to the 2018 hearing.

I am hoping that both CNCS and CNL - if given the opportunity - would have made modifications to their communications to present a more cohesive, balanced message.

### **Content that could have been shared**

Along the way I meet several passionate people who made reference to a variety of studies, events and readings. I always left conversations wondering why these documents are not readily available to the public. There were references to studies from individuals who worked for AECL (who I have finally been able to track down...and look forward to reviewing over the holidays) and references to incidents that occurred on the Pinawa site when it was operational. I found out that this information is now available to the public (Freedom of Information Act) if one does a lot of digging, but wonder why this information wasn't shared so individuals can form their own opinions. People fear the unknown and end up forming polarized views because of these rumors and unknowns.

I am thankful that there is still the opportunity to get additional information prior to the hearing but disappointed that it wasn't presented in 2017. I look forward to additional information coming to light in 2018 so that all the stakeholders can express their views of the future of the Pinawa site, knowing the history of the Pinawa site.

I did not mentioning science as others more adept than me can discuss the findings. I will continue to do personal research and reading over the next few months to fully understand the issues and look forward to the opportunity to present at the hearing.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proceedings and I look forward to your team's ongoing guidance as I prepare a presentation for the hearing.

Sincerely submitted,

<Signature Redacted>

Greg Link