



**Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO)
Adaptive Phased Management (APM) Project**

South Bruce Community Liaison Committee (SBCLC) Meeting

**May 7, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.
Municipal Office, 21 Gordon Street East, Teeswater**

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Adoption of Agenda**
- 3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and Nature Thereof**
- 4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**
 - 4.1. April 1, 2015 SBCLC Regular Meeting**
- 5. Delegations**
- 6. NWMO CLC Task List Review**
- 7. Reports**
 - 7.1. NWMO Advisory Council Report – Mike Krizanc, Communications Manager (as requested at the April 1, 2015 SBCLC meeting)**
 - 7.2. Number of Visits to the SBCLC Website – Paul Austin, Relationship Manager, Southern Ontario (as requested at the April 1, 2015 SBCLC meeting)**
 - 7.3. NWMO Update – Paul Austin, Relationship Manager, Southern Ontario and Mike Krizanc, Communications Manager**
 - 7.4. Municipality Update – Leanne Martin, Clerk, Municipality of South Bruce**

8. Education

9. Communications

9.1. Dennis Eickmeier, South Bruce Resident, Outlining Concerns Regarding a Deep Geological Repository for Nuclear Waste

9.2. Brian Knox, SBCLC Member, Requesting Additional Information from NWMO Staff Regarding the Proposed DGR and the APM Project

10. New Business

10.1. Media Information Sessions for CLC Members

10.2. 2015 Meeting Schedule

11. Adjournment



**Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO)
Adaptive Phased Management (APM) Project
Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting**

Wednesday, April 1, 2015

MINUTES

The South Bruce Community Liaison Committee met on Wednesday, April 1, 2015 at 7:10 p.m. at the Teeswater Culross Community Centre, 28 Clarinda Street, Teeswater.

Members Present: Mayor Robert Buckle; Councillor Margie Bates; Councillor Mark Goetz; Jim Gowland, Chair; Doug Culbert, Vice-Chair; Brian Knox; Les Nichols; George Miller

Members Absent: Corbyn Critchfield

NWMO Staff: Paul Austin, Relationship Manager for Southern Ontario; Mike Krizanc, Communications Manager

Municipal Staff: Sharon Chambers, CAO; Leanne Martin, Clerk; Julie Ireland, CLC Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Jim Gowland called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. Members of the committee introduced themselves, as well as some members of the public in attendance. The meeting took place during an NWMO Learn More Open House.

Jim Gowland noted that this is the final CLC meeting that Sharon Chambers will attend as CAO of the Municipality of South Bruce, as she will be taking a position with the Township of North Huron in the coming weeks. He expressed his thanks on behalf of the CLC to Sharon for her work in the municipality, and her collaborative efforts with the CLC.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR:

Julie Ireland, CLC Secretary, presided over the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair (deferred from the March 5, 2015 meeting).

Julie Ireland called three times for nominations for the position of Chair of the SBCLC. The following nominations were received:

Nomination CLC-2015-4

**Moved by Les Nichols,
Seconded by Mark Goetz;**

That Jim Gowland be nominated for the position of Chair Person of the SBCLC for the 2015-2018 Council term.

Nomination CLC-2015-5

Moved by George Miller,

Seconded by Jim Gowland;

That Doug Culbert be nominated for the position of Chair Person of the SBCLC for the 2015-2018 Council term.

Julie Ireland called for any further nominations for the position of Chair Person. Seeing none, she declared nominations closed.

Each of the nominees was asked if they would like to have their name stand for the election of the Chair Person. The following were the results:

Jim Gowland – nomination stands

Doug Culbert – nomination stands

Julie Ireland advised that the voting process would be completed by members raising their hands, and that the name of each nominee would be called in the order that they were nominated. The following was the result of the voting:

Jim Gowland, for the position of CLC Chair Person: 7 votes

Doug Culbert, for the position of CLC Chair Person: 1 vote

Jim Gowland was elected Chair Person of the SBCLC for the 2015-2018 Council term.

Julie Ireland called three times for nominations for the position of Vice-Chair of the SBCLC. The following nomination was received:

NOMINATION CLC-2015-6

Moved by Jim Gowland,

Seconded by Mark Goetz;

That Doug Culbert be nominated for the position of Vice-Chair Person of the SBCLC for the 2015-2018 Council term.

As no further nominations were received, Doug Culbert was asked if he would like to allow his name to stand for the position of Vice-Chair of the SBCLC. Doug advised that he would allow his name to stand. As there were no other nominations, Doug Culbert was acclaimed to the position of Vice-Chair of the SBCLC.

Jim Gowland assumed the role of Chair Person once again. Jim expressed his thanks to the Committee members for their continuing work with regard to the APM process, and congratulated Doug Culbert on being named Vice-Chair once again.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA:**

MOTION CLC-76

Moved by Doug Culbert,

Seconded by Les Nichols;

Agenda

That the Agenda for the South Bruce Community Liaison Committee Meeting of April 1, 2015, be adopted.

Motion: Carried

4. **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND NATURE THEREOF:**

None

5. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING(S):**

5.1 **March 5, 2015 SBCLC Regular Meeting**

MOTION CLC-77

Moved by Margie Bates,

Seconded by Bob Buckle;

Minutes

That the Minutes of the South Bruce Community Liaison Committee Meeting held on March 5, 2015, be adopted as printed and circulated.

Motion: Carried

6. **NWMO TASK LIST REVIEW**

No current items – to be reviewed at the next meeting.

7. **REPORTS:**

7.1 **NWMO Update (Oral)**

Paul Austin, Relationship Manager for Southern Ontario and Mike Krizanc, Communications Manager, NWMO

Advisory Council

Mike Krizanc, Communications Manager for NWMO, provided information about the NWMO Advisory Council (AC). The AC is currently chaired by David Crombie, former Mayor of Toronto as well as a former federal cabinet minister. Membership of the AC is for a two-year term, and although there have been a few recent new appointments, most members of the AC have returned for an additional term. The provision for the AC was put in place under the *Nuclear Fuel Waste Act*, which requires the AC to observe the APM process, and to report publicly in a triennial report. To date, the AC has reported every year. The report of the AC must be released prior to April 1, and it is reported both to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the public at the same time.

Brian Knox requested additional information about the NWMO governance structure, specifically the difference between the NWMO Board of Directors and the Advisory Council, and about the resources available to the Advisory Council and its membership.

Mike Krizanc advised that the NWMO governance structure consists of a Board of Directors which is comprised of shareholders such as Ontario Power Generation, Hydro Quebec and New Brunswick Power as well as some independent members. The purpose of establishing the AC was to provide a guarantor of the public interest through a committee of completely independent and autonomous individuals to ensure that the public interest remains at the forefront of the project, rather than the interests of the nuclear industry. He noted that the role of the Board of Directors is to provide strategic leadership and direction to the NWMO, while the AC independently reviews and reports on the work undertaken with regard to the APM process. He noted that AC members do have access to resources in order to allow them to conduct their research and report their findings.

Jim Gowland asked if some of the comments, both supportive and critical of the process, could be reported to the CLC.

ACTION ITEM: Mike Krizanc was requested to report back to the next CLC meeting regarding three to four items outlined in the most recent Advisory Council report.

Mike Krizanc noted that the most recent triennial Advisory Council report was provided to the CLC members last year when it was published, and that members of the public can request a hard copy online through the NWMO website.

ACTION ITEM: Julie Ireland was requested to circulate to the members of the CLC the link to the location on the NWMO website where a copy of the Advisory Council triennial report can be requested.

Jim Gowland asked whether or not the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) is involved in the development and writing of the Advisory Council report. Mike Krizanc advised that the CNSC has an oversight and regulatory role, and that while there may be consultation or discussion between the CNSC and NWMO staff or committees, that the CNSC and NWMO do not work together in a partnership, and that such a relationship would be inappropriate due to the regulatory and oversight role afforded to the CNSC over the NWMO's final DGR application.

Open House

Paul Austin advised that the Open House had been well attended so far, with an estimated turnout of about 60 citizens. He noted that there were excellent questions and comments from members of the public with a focus on safety, health, farm land preservation and community well-being.

Brian Knox asked a question regarding the possibility of recycling used nuclear fuel. Paul Austin advised that the mandate of the NWMO is to implement Canada's plan for used nuclear fuel, and that the NWMO does not advocate for or against the possibility of reprocessing. Jim Gowland noted that there will be an opportunity to hear alternative views from outside sources in the coming months once the speakers program for the CLC commences.

Next Phase of Work

Paul Austin advised that the first phase of the preliminary assessment process, which involved mostly technical and social desktop studies, has now been completed, and several communities were screened out of the process. He noted that in this second phase of work, the same five pillars which informed the first phase of work will continue to guide the second phase of work, but he noted that field studies will also now be included.

Regarding possible locations for drilling and testing sites, Paul Austin advised that those sites will be evaluated in consultation with the CLC to determine the most appropriate sites. He noted that new maps will be available in the coming weeks, and that roads and right-of-ways will be reviewed. Sites for drilling and testing will be selected in consultation with the community, based on proposals from the CLC. Paul Austin noted that the purpose of the initial field studies will be to confirm what NWMO staff already believe to be true of the rock formations within the municipality in general, rather than to attempt to select a specific site. He noted that the site selection process for the repository is still a number of years away, and that the location of drilling and testing sites will not be an indication that those sites are being considered as potential development locations for the DGR project. The selection of locations for initial drilling and testing will have to be developed in a manner that is acceptable to the community.

CLC Speakers List and Education Program

Jim Gowland suggested that the members of the CLC provide suggestions regarding topics of interest to the committee and individuals that they would like to hear from in the upcoming speakers program. Mike Krizanc and Paul Austin suggested that two resources for determining speakers and topics could be the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, which could recommend speakers, as well as universities, at which subject specialists can be found and requested to provide information to the CLC.

ACTION ITEM: It was requested that Julie Ireland circulate an email to the members of the CLC to request topics and suggestions for speakers for the upcoming Education (Speakers) Program.

MOTION CLC-78

Moved by Les Nichols,

Seconded by Doug Culbert;

Report

That the verbal report of the NWMO to the April 1, 2015 South Bruce Community Liaison Committee meeting, be received for information.

Motion: Carried

7.2 Municipality Update (Oral)

Sharon Chambers, CAO, Municipality of South Bruce

Sharon Chambers advised that NWMO has offered to sponsor two representatives from the Municipality of South Bruce to attend the 2015 Canadian Nuclear Society conference in St. John, New Brunswick. Because Mayor Buckle cannot attend, Councillor Mark Goetz will attend on behalf of Council. Both Doug Culbert and Brian Knox expressed interest in attending on behalf of the CLC, and Sharon Chambers advised that Council suggested that Doug Culbert attend as Vice-Chair, since Jim Gowland will not be able to go. It was discussed that Brian Knox could be an alternate delegate, in the event that either Doug or Mark is unable to attend.

MOTION CLC-79

Moved by Mark Goetz,

Seconded by Bob Buckle;

Committee

That Brian Knox be appointed as an alternate delegate to the Canadian Nuclear Society conference, to be held May 31-June 3, 2015 in St. John, New Brunswick.

Motion: Carried

Learn More Briefing

Sharon Chambers noted that several members of Council, staff and the CLC attended a Learn More Briefing at Bruce Power on March 16, 2015.

Resolution Regarding New Phase of Work

A discussion took place regarding the requirement for a resolution from the Municipality to continue in the Adaptive Phased Management project. Sharon Chambers advised that a resolution for Council's consideration has not been brought forward yet, in order to allow the new members of Council an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the project. She noted that a report from the Chair of the CLC to Council will be made at the same time that the resolution is presented for consideration.

ACTION ITEM:

Leanne Martin, Clerk, Municipality of South Bruce, will contact Jim Gowland, Chair of the CLC, to discuss Council meeting dates and times in order to confirm a date for the CLC Chair's delegation to Council.

Sharon Chambers noted that some topics had been raised earlier in the meeting that did not pertain to any items on the agenda. She reminded members that if they have a question about a topic that is not listed on the agenda for the meeting, that the appropriate method to have those concerns addressed would be to request that the issue be considered on the agenda at a future meeting.

It was also noted once again that additional training for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the CLC with regard to chairing potentially contentious meetings, as well as training for addressing the media, would be beneficial.

ACTION ITEM: Municipal and NWMO staff will work to coordinate training sessions for members of the CLC with regard to effective meeting procedures and media relations.

In response to some discussion regarding the possibility of distributing a spring CLC newsletter, Paul Austin advised that NWMO will be placing inserts in local newspapers in the coming weeks, in order to provide information about the open houses for those who were unable to attend. It was agreed that a CLC newsletter would be published later in the year, possibly in the late summer or fall.

ACTION ITEM: Paul Austin was requested to provide an update on the number of visits to the CLC website at the next CLC meeting.

Mark Goetz asked if there is a set number of people that can be members of the CLC. Julie Ireland advised that in accordance with the terms of reference, there can be a total of 10 voting members: two members of Council; five resident members; up to two students; and the Mayor ex-officio. Mark asked if Sharon Chambers could be added as a resident member once she is no longer employed with the municipality, and it was discussed that an amendment could be made to the terms of reference for the committee to allow for additional members, should Council choose to make such a change.

MOTION CLC-80

Moved by Margie Bates,

Seconded by Doug Culbert;

Report

That the verbal report of the Municipality of South Bruce to the April 1, 2015 South Bruce Community Liaison Committee meeting, be received for information.

Motion: Carried

8. DELEGATIONS:

None

9. EDUCATION:

None

10. COMMUNICATIONS:

None

11. NEW BUSINESS:

None

12. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION CLC-81

Moved by Margie Bates,

Seconded by Les Nichols;

Adjournment

That we do now adjourn at 8:16 p.m., to meet again on Thursday, May 7, 2015 at 7:00 p.m., or, at the call of the Chair.

Motion: Carried

Chair

Vice-Chair

CLC Secretary

DRAFT

SBCLC Agenda – May 7, 2015 – Item 9.1

From: Dennis Eickmeier [REDACTED]
Sent: April-22-15 8:29 AM
To: Leanne Martin
Subject: From Dennis Eickmeier gravely concerned. I know that this will not be read or looked at!!

April 22, 2014

Dear Sir/Madam:

Am aware that this will not be read, or considered. I am writing this email with great concern, and it is in regard to this horrible nuclear dump that the municipality of South Bruce is so eager to accommodate. I have talked with NWMO many times, providing scientific evidence of the danger of this horrible situation. Armed with research from scientist all around the world, they just would not listen. I have spent hours talking to closed ears, and close minds, I am sure this is another instance. One only has to look at the USA and the extremely dangerous accident at there deep depository dump, which almost cost the lives of thousands. (see Waste Isolation Pilot Plant WIIP project, USA) Germany closed their underground depository, this is the Canadian prototype. Germany said it is to dangerous.). We have the Three Mile Island disaster 1976, Chernobyl disaster on April 26. 1986, we have Fukushima Nuclear Disaster (2011), Pickering radio active release in 2012. Plus to many at the Bruce that have been covered up, to even consider.

Also in Canada we have had: Here are some of the facts.

- August 1, 1983 Pickering reactor # 2 LOCA (loss of coolant accident). A pressure tube, that the fuel bundles are in, ruptured due to hydriding. All four reactors where re-tube with new materials (Zr-2.5%Nb) over ten years. Cost 1 billions dollars. Still not safe.
- November 1978 Reactor at Pinawa, Manitoba OCA loss of coolant accident. 2,739 litres of coolant oil leaked, most of it into the Winnipeg River. The repair took several weeks for workers to complete. Atomic Energy of Canada named the report "Protected". Not a threat what a story!!
- May 24, 1958 Chalk River Laboratories (CRL), Chalk River, Ontario. The NRU accident. A fuel rod caught fire and broke when removed, then dispersed **fission products** and **alpha-emitting** particles in the reactor building. (surely you know what these products are, if you are considering a disposal) The NRU suffered a major accident. A damaged uranium fuel rod caught fire and was torn in two as it was being removed from the core. The fire was extinguished, but a size-able quantity of radioactive combustion products had contaminated the interior of the reactor building and, to a lesser degree, an area of the surrounding laboratory site. The clean-up and repair took three months. NRU was operating again in August 1958. Atomic Energy Canada will not release the amount of radioactive material escaped, but the World Atomic Organization states a dangerous amount.
- 3:07 p.m. Friday, December 12, 1952, CRL Ontario, Canada, The NRX accident. Explosion occurred in the reactor core. The world's first major nuclear reactor

- accident. Yes, here in Canada it is only a matter of time until the next accident, do you want that to be the legacy of South Bruce?. Research this for yourself.
- **March 1986, Bruce Nuclear Reactor 2, Canada, LOCA loss of coolant accident. Pressure tube ruptured during pressurizing test (reactor shut down). Pressure tube holds the fuel bundles. Totally hidden from the public for years, complete cover up, yes this is your love child Bruce Power.**
 - August 2, 1992, Pickering Nuclear Reactor 1, Pickering, Canada Ontario. A Heavy water leak of **2300 trillion becquerels of radioactive tritium into Lake Ontario**, resulting in increased levels of tritium in Toronto drinking water. Recent scientific evidence now states that there is 3% tritium in all of lake Ontario, which will be a danger for 300,000 years or more.
 - December 10, 1994, Pickering Nuclear Reactor 2, Pickering, Ontario Canada. LOCA loss of coolant accident. A spill of **185 tonnes of heavy water**. The Emergency Core Cooling System was used to prevent a meltdown, this was a very close meltdown equivalent to Three Mile Island just across the lake. *Moto: Keep from the public.*
 - **June 11, 2002, Bruce Nuclear Reactor 6, Bruce B station. Bruce County Ontario, Canada. Pressure tube and calandria tube damage during a channel maintenance procedure, required replacement of the 2 tubes. Again your love child, do you really think our best interests and safety are there concern. No way, they look at us as ignorant country bumpkins, a place to do a snow job. There are more accidents not reported.**

I have spent hours talking with NWMO they have an agenda, and stick with it, in they say I am the only one opposed. Well the city of **Chicago is preparing a 40 billion dollar lawsuit against the municipality that accommodates this nightmare.** Plus the city Cleveland, Detroit, Green Peace, city of Buffalo, and the US congress. Keep in mind there are 40 million people that could die from this mis-adventure. Shake your head and think about that. This is not safe regardless of what NWMO states. It just isn't.

Just go back to your early university physics and you will quickly learn how dangerous this material is, remember the 100,000 people who died in Japan in 10 seconds, just vaporized they where the fortunate ones. Talk to the children who have cancers, deformations from Hiroshima, Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, nuclear test sites around the world. **And you want to bury this stuff in our backyard.** You know ignorance is not bliss. Wake up before it is to late.

We are now forced to sell our property and get out of the area, I can't believe that South Bruce would even consider such a thing as this.

We talked with a real estate agent and already or property value has taken a hit because of this stupidity. So, my property is worth at least 25% less, we need compensation for this loss.

SBCLC Agenda – May 7, 2015 – Item 9.1

South Bruce is so terribly backward in everything else when it comes to business, and development. Bare in mind that this material is dangerous for at least 1 millions years. I need you to issue a document to me today: --that **YOU ARE GOING TO MAN THIS SITE FOR A MILLION YEARS**. Have you ever looked at the decay cycle of Uranium? I am sure not, what about Strontium? Tritium? Cobalt? Deuterium? and all the heavy reactive heavy metals that will never be safe!!!! I am sure not.

I tried to talk to Ben Loab he ignored me, tried to contact Lisa Thompson and was made fun of, what is wrong with you people. Tried to contact your office before but have not receive a word.

No, I am not just a grumpy old college professor, I am concerned about the future. Bruce power needs to be de-commissioned before more happens. There are alternatives, Bruce Power could be fueled by bio-mass, or fuel cells very effectively and clean without this tremendous danger and cheaper by far.

When talking with them (Bruce Power) they have not even considered any other alternatives (fuels) other than nuclear. They are so narrow minded that when an spike is sticking up they would puncture both eyes with one fall. There are new technologies which out surpassed the old nuclear energy of a generation ago !!! Yes, in Spain this nuclear waste is totally recycled and reused. Germany, and the UK is moth-balling all nuclear power, why are we so stupid??? I need to know what is the caveat. Thanks for now, I know you will not read this. Suggest looking at this video <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=URpQcDZ2RGk>

Material:

World Nuclear Organiztion

USA Atomic Research

Wikipedia

Bernard L. Cohen, Sc.D.Professor at the University of Pittsburgh.

Physicians for Social Responsibility, 1111 14th St, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20005

Union Of Concerned Scientists. http://www.ucsusa.org/our-work/nuclear-power/nuclear-power-101#.VTeSu_A7fhk

Institute For Energy and Environmental Research <http://ieer.org/resource/books/insurmountable-risks-dangers-nuclear/>

Plus hundreds of more detail reports.

Dennis Eickmeier
Mildmay, Ontario.



SBCLC Agenda – May 7, 2015 – Item 9.2

Response by Brian Knox dated April 20, 2015

Thank you Julie for your inquiry on speakers. Sorry in advance for not providing a direct answer. I think the CLC may wish to consider the following:

I suggest the CLC may wish to review their mandate and I seem to have misplaced my copy and I did not seem to find it on the South Bruce or CLC website. Might you email me a copy?

It would appear to me that our mandate is to assist Council in determining if the APM for a spent fuel DGR is good fit for our community.

The CLC has spent some time on 'learning more' and we should continue to do so. I think it time to understand and engage the community.

I believe that we should gather information to respond to the question I seem to bump into frequently... 'why bother with a DGR?'. I propose some thoughts upon which we should build:

1. Our community benefits from the creation of nuclear power? Low power costs and/or local employment.
2. A criticism to continued nuclear power generation is the destiny of spent fuel. If our community benefits from nuclear power we would benefit from a spent fuel solution.
3. The DGR would overcome very apparent shortcomings in our community such as job opportunities and youth retention.
4. Naturally, other benefits should be examined.

Let's expand on these points and consider if they are similar and should combined.

Point 1 "Our community benefits from the creation of nuclear power? Low power costs and/or local employment "

- How many employees of nuclear employers such as OPG, Bruce Power, TSSA, others are in our community.
- I did a review of the Community Profile yet was unable to determine the numbers.
- What type of skill groups and age groups do the nuclear employers require and hire?
- I believe we have the costs on a variety of electrical power generation types.

Point 2 "A criticism to continued nuclear power generation is the destiny of spent fuel. If our community benefits from nuclear power we would benefit from a spent fuel solution."

- Ongoing licensing is required for current operations and naturally would be required to rehabilitate or create new units in the future.
- It seems to me that we should determine the 'nuclear' values of our community. Are they:
 1. Nuclear supportive
 2. Nuclear tolerant
 3. Nuclear adverse

SBCLC Agenda – May 7, 2015 – Item 9.2

- Once we know, we can consider if better information would move the community up the ladder of nuclear support.
- I propose we speak to the South Bruce residents who are employees or past employees of the nuclear industry. What are their positions on nuclear and the APM?

Point 3 “The DGR would overcome very apparent shortcomings in our communities such as job opportunities and youth retention”

- What type of jobs would the APM facility require?
- Would local people be trained or would hiring be from big urban areas or out of country?
- How have local nuclear employers responded to the above?

Point 4 “Naturally, other benefits should be examined”

- Spin benefits to our community such as medical professional, ??
- Secondary manufacturing for all things ‘nuclear’, possibly look done the nuclear employers account payables for possible local Nuclear manufacturing hub?
- Synergies with our current economic base?

Comments and Inquiries on the Community Profile

Pg 12/64 Table 2.4 includes utilities. Can we find out how many are nuclear employees,

Pg 18/64 Discussion of large private employers like BP and Gaylea, maybe mention of auto plants, Westcast, McGlynns, again I am wishing to know the prevalence of nuclear employees.

Pg 22/64 Is the comment on ‘the strong ties and importance of Bruce Power’ a general statement or quantifiable,

Pg 46/64 Table 3.8 indicates 3800 employees at Bruce Power. Can we get South Bruce numbers?

Pg 48/64 Table 4.1 South Bruce population has decreased 9% between 1996 and 2011.

Pg 51/64 Comment on benefitting from direct and indirect Bruce Power employment.

Pg 52/64 Table 4.6 indicates a row including utility employees. Can we find out more about nuclear?