

NUCLEAR FAILURE WITHIN BORDERS



Darlington NOT compliant with Building Code Rule 4.1.3.6. Vibration

'...The Darlington Power Plant and others are not designed to accommodate highly penetrating Radio Frequency (RF) Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) that will electromagnetically induce the building. It will cause high speed vibrations billions of times per measurable second 86,400 times per day and the peer reviewed science is called electricity...'

~ Professor Curtis Bennett

Response to:

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission On Granting Ontario Power Generation
13 Year License For Darlington Nuclear Power Plant



"...The Darlington Power Plant and others are not designed to accommodate highly penetrating RF Electromagnetic Fields that will electromagnetically induce the building. It will cause high speed vibrations billions of times per measurable second 86,400 times per day and the peer reviewed science is called electricity...."

~ Adjunct Professor Curtis Bennett

<http://www.stayonthetruth.com/cnsc-2015-10-21-curtis-bennett-ref-2015-h-04.php>

"Darlington Nuclear Generating Station panorama2" by Oðinn - Own workThis image was created with Hugin. Licensed under CC BY-SA 2.5 ca via Commons - https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Darlington_Nuclear_Generating_Station_panorama2.jpg#/media/File:Darlington_Nuclear_Generating_Station_panorama2.jpg
© Dianne Knight, 'StayOnTheTruth', 2015

<http://www.stayonthetruth.com/cnsc-2015-10-21-curtis-bennett-ref-2015-h-04.php>

'...There are 13,000 dams in the U.S. and 440 Nuclear Power Plants in the world. Radio Frequency (RF) Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) blanketing these areas will cause accelerated erosion, undermine designs and 5G RF EMFs will contribute to infrastructure failures....'



<http://www.stayonthetruth.com/pilots-pediatricians-wi-fi-inducing-electrical-cur.php>

**Response to:
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission On Granting Ontario Power Generation
13 Year License For Darlington Nuclear Power Plant**

Re: My submission – Public Hearing Ref. 2015-H-04.
From: Curtis Bennett
Date: Wed, Oct 21, 2015 at 9:46 AM Pacific Time
Re: My submission - Public Hearing Ref. 2015-H-04.
"Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN)"

Louise Levert,

The commission's response to my submission is reckless, negligent and undermines their mandate on safety. The commission's response is an administrative response dismissive of applicable codes and standards.

Your response says there is an "absence of specific argumentation"?

Building Code Rule 4.1.3.6.(Vibration) is very specific to every building in the country. Compliance with building code is a requirement with new and existing buildings. The Building Code reference is separate of the adverse health effects that are lectured for education credits required for ongoing medical licensing and applicable across Canada as well as the United States.

The Darlington Power Plant and others are not designed to accommodate highly penetrating RF Electromagnetic Fields that will electromagnetically induce the building. It will cause high speed vibrations billions of times per measurable second 86,400 times per day and the peer reviewed science is called electricity.

I spoke with Marc Leblanc and he made ridiculous comments that I wasn't specific to Darlington in my submission as well as that FortisBC information was irrelevant. The reference number is specific to Darlington and the mention of other Nuclear Power Plants is specific to the real dangers. I would not be doing my job and have liability if I didn't include it.

The reference to FortisBC is because the link includes transcripts and evidence of the BC Government in legal hearings with the experts under oath. There is no higher legal precedent for the commission to see. While FortisBC dismissed the dangers of the RF EMFs saying people were safe 20 cm away from a smart meter, they left out the smart grid required to communicate with smart meters. FortisBC Engineer Mark Warren admitted under direct cross examination by me that would cover 17,000 sq. kms to communicate with the meters. That admission puts several cities, buildings, infrastructure and ecosystems inside man made microwave ovens. There is ZERO margin of error and Ontario is covering large geographical areas as well which can adversely affect buildings and infrastructure.

The submission also contains the reality the BC Legislature allowed BC Hydro to bypass **ALL** regulatory process to install smart meters. The CNSC can understand the ramifications if there was a deregulation of Nuclear Power Plants and industries did what they wanted. It would be catastrophic.

While I understand this might be administratively and politically inconvenient, applicable governments in Canada and Ontario will have to account for not sharing with the CNSC that the RF EMFs were illegal as applied.

My qualified opinions are not singular, engineers with errors and omission's insurance were not informed or consulted. Professional Engineers would NOT allow the electromagnetic induction of their buildings, they aren't designed for it.
The commission can verify that with engineers and Building Inspection Department specific to the Darlington Nuclear Power Plant's location.

The commission has to amend their agenda to incorporate this information subject to any challenges but it can NOT be dismissed. It isn't definable as sustainable under the Auditor General Act.

As per Marc Leblanc's direction, this is our response to the commission and we are available for presenting by Skype or whatever teleconferencing the commission has arranged for the hearings.
Sincerely,

Curtis Bennett
Chief Science Officer
Interprovincial Journeyman Electrician(Red Seal)
Building Engineering Technologist
Adjunct Professor for Accredited Medical Education For CME Credits
Thermal Radiation Consultant for 35 Years
thermoguy.com
info@thermoguy.com
Ph: 604-239-2694

Copyright © 2015 Thermoguy. All rights reserved.

From: Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN) <cnc.interventions-interventions.ccsn@canada.ca>
Date: Wed, Oct 14, 2015 at 12:12 PM
Subject: RE: My submission - Public Hearing Ref. 2015-H-04.
To: Curtis Bennett <info@thermoguy.com>
Cc: "Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN)" <cnc.interventions-interventions.ccsn@canada.ca>

Dear Mr. Bennett,

We refer to your request to participate at the Darlington hearing on November 2-5, 2015. This is to inform you that, pursuant to Rule 19 of the CNSC Rules of Procedure, the Commission will not permit you to participate as an intervenor in the hearing on the basis that the Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Field focus of your submission and the absence of specific argumentation in your submission of the impact of Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Field to the Darlington facility do not demonstrate a sufficient interest in the matter being heard, and that such information is not likely to be useful to the Commission in assisting it in coming to a decision.

Please communicate with Mr. Marc Leblanc, Commission Secretary, at 613-995-6506 if you require additional information.

Regards,

Louise Levert

Senior Tribunal Officer, Secretariat Division
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission / Government of Canada
tel: 613-996-9063, 1-800-668-5284

Department of Justice Canada
Rule 19 - Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
Rules of Procedure (SOR/2000-211)

Presentation

19. (1) Where a request to intervene at a public hearing is filed with the Commission in accordance with subrules (2) and (3), the Commission, subject to these Rules, may permit the following persons to participate as intervenors at the hearing in the manner and to the extent that the Commission considers will enable it to determine the matter before it in a fair, informal and expeditious manner:

(a) a person who has an interest in the matter being heard; or

(b) a person who has expertise in the matter or information that may be useful to the Commission in coming to a decision.

(2) Where the notice of public hearing given under this Part indicates one hearing day, the request to intervene must be filed with the Commission by the filing date specified in the notice.

(3) Where the notice of public hearing given under this Part indicates two hearing days, the request to intervene must be filed with the Commission at least 30 days before the second hearing day.

(4) The request to intervene shall include

(a) the name, address and telephone and facsimile numbers of the requester;

(b) where the requester intends to be represented by counsel or an agent, the name, address and telephone and facsimile numbers of the counsel or agent;

(c) a description of how the requester meets at least one of the conditions for intervening set out in subrule (1) and;

(d) a statement setting out whether the requester wishes to intervene by way of written submission only or by way of written submission and oral presentation, and a copy of the information and submission.

(5) Where a public hearing comprises two hearing days, any written submission and oral presentation of a person permitted to intervene at the public hearing shall be considered by the Commission on the second hearing day.

<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/sor-2000-211/page-6.html#docCont>

Source: Rule 19 - Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Rules of Procedure (SOR/2000-211)

From: Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN) <cncs.interventions-interventions.ccsn@canada.ca>
Date: Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 11:20 AM
Subject: RE: My submission - Public Hearing Ref. 2015-H-04.
To: Curtis Bennett <info@thermoguy.com>
Cc: "Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN)"

Dear Mr. Bennett,

We have received on October 21, 2015 your revised submission for the public hearing regarding the proposed renewal of the Darlington nuclear facility. After review, the Commission has decided to accept your written submission and to add it to the record for the hearing. However, the Commission will not permit you to make an oral presentation at the hearing, as per its discretion under Rule 21 of the CNSC Rules of Procedure. Your submission will be referred to as CMD 15-H8.161.

Please communicate with Mr. Marc Leblanc, Commission Secretary, at 613-995-6506 if you require additional information.

Regards,

Louise Levert

Senior Tribunal Officer, Secretariat Division
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission / Government of Canada
tel: 613-996-9063, 1-800-668-5284

**Department of Justice Canada
Rule 21 - Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
Rules of Procedure (SOR/2000-211)**

Presentation of Information and Submissions

21. (1) During a public hearing, the Commission, subject to these Rules, may permit each participant to present information and submissions on the subject-matter orally or in writing, and may permit participants to question one another and any witnesses, and to respond to any submissions, in any manner and sequence that will enable the Commission to determine the matter before it in a fair, informal and expeditious manner.

(2) A person who makes an oral presentation at a public hearing must have complied with the documentary filing requirements of rule 18 or 19, as the case may be.

(3) A person who has filed documentary material with the Commission under rule 18 may, no later than seven days before the start of the public hearing, file documentary material to the extent necessary to supplement or amend the material originally filed.

SOR/2007-208, s. 32.

<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/sor-2000-211/page-7.html#docCont>

Source: Rule 21 - Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Rules of Procedure (SOR/2000-211)

From: Curtis Bennett
Date: Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 7:16 AM
Subject: My submission and the CNSC reference # CMD 15-H8.161.
To: "Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN)" <cns.interventions-interventions.ccsn@canada.ca>

Att: Marc Leblanc

re: Oral Presentation or Questions as Per Submission

Good Morning Marc,

I want to thank you for the work being done on this very important topic and the commission accepting my written submission CMD 15-H8.161.

Under Rule 21 of the CNSC Rules of Procedure, the commission does have the discretion to allow an oral presentation. I spoke with Louise Levert briefly yesterday and she spoke of avenues where questions can be asked pertaining to my submission. This email is to ask the commission to use their discretion and allow important questions to be asked. EMF interaction with buildings, infrastructure and including Darlington Nuclear Power Plant is technically complex. EMFs are an electrical interaction first requiring a qualified electrical interpretation before they interact with building construction.

I am one of the provincial and federal governments as well as Industry Canada's certified electricians specific to the utilization of the electrical energy OPG distributes. My Interprovincial Red Seal as a Journeyman Electrician is recognized across Canada. My Building Engineering Technology Diploma is specific to regulation, Building Code compliance as well as the energy use by building development.

100% of our work is without lobby and is specific to energy objectives as well as safety. We spent 1000s of hours of objective investigation including providing expert witness at the request of Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee and as Registered Intervener in FortisBC's application for wireless smart meters.

There are real avenues for OPG to eliminate billions of watts per hour of wasted electrical energy off the grid immediately without expenditure on their part. There was a Nuclear Power Plant in Nebraska where flooding affected the facility and our submission is specific to that as well.

It is critically important to your objective and mandate that I be asked tough questions from any professionals to substantiate the real danger. Once again there is nothing personal in my submission. Electrical and engineering is all science within existing codes. I would be negligent if I did not report to the commission as I am here and in my qualified capacity.

Sincerely,

Curtis Bennett
Chief Science Officer
Interprovincial Journeyman Electrician(Red Seal)
Building Engineering Technologist
Adjunct Professor for Accredited Medical Education For CME Credits
Thermal Radiation Consultant for 35 Years
www.thermoguy.com
info@ thermoguy.com
Ph: 604-239-2694

Copyright © 2015 Thermoguy. All rights reserved.

Revised Agenda with Written Submission from Curtis Bennett

NOTE: Written submissions will be considered throughout the 4 hearing days.

- 17 -		CMD 15-H11.A	
•	Written submission from Trixie Deveau	15-H8.153	• Mémoire de Trixie Deveau
•	Written submission from several individuals (letter writing campaigns)	15-H8.154	• Mémoire de plusieurs individus (campagnes de lettres)
•	Written submission from Christine Koenig	15-H8.159	• Mémoire de Christine Koenig
•	Written submission from Curtis Bennett	15-H8.161	• Mémoire de Curtis Bennett
FINAL ROUNDS OF QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS		DERNIÈRE PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS DES MEMBRES DE LA COMMISSION	
4.	CLOSING	4.	CLÔTURE

Source: Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) UPDATED 2015-10-22 PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA Document Dates: November 2 to 5, 2015