

SRB TECHNOLOGIES (CANADA) INC.

320-140 Boundary Road

Pembroke, Ontario, Canada, K8A 6W5

Tel.: (613) 732-0055 Fax: (613) 732-0056

E-Mail: sales@betalight.com Web: www.betalight.com

FULL REPORT

Activation of Contingency Plan - September 25, 2015

Author:

Jamie MacDonald
Manager of Health Physics & Regulatory Affairs

Accepted:

Stephane Levesque, President

Accepted:

Ross Fitzpatrick, Vice-President

Date Submitted: October 9, 2015

Submitted To: J. Campbell, Project Officer - CNSC

SRBT Full Report

Activation of Contingency Plan - September 25, 2015

NOTE:

This report is intended to fulfill the requirements associated with Clause 29 (2) of the General Nuclear Safety and Control Regulations (GNSCR), in relation to the event of the activation of the fire response contingency plan at SRBT on September 25, 2015.

(a) The date, time and location of becoming aware of the situation.

SRBT became aware of the situation at 0845h on September 25, 2015 at the facility premises.

(b) A description of the situation and the circumstances.

An approved third party maintenance professional was performing maintenance on our air compressor, located in the compressor room at the northeast corner of the facility. During this maintenance, an oil hose became disconnected from a pressurized section of the compressor, ejecting a fine mist of oil into the room. This was quickly corrected by the maintenance contractor; however, the small amount of oil mist emitted was detected by the smoke detector in the room, setting off our fire alarm.

All staff evacuated the building as expected, while the Pembroke Fire Department responded to the alarm within minutes, confirming that there was no hazard of any kind to workers, the facility, the public nor the environment. The fire department response and unscheduled evacuation of staff was deemed to be an event that constituted the implementation of a contingency plan in accordance with the licence, as described in GNSCR (29) (1) (d).

(c) The probable cause of the situation.

The contingency plan implementation was caused by the unexpected release of suspended oil droplets near a detection head of our fire safety system.

(d) The effects on the environment, the health and safety of persons and the maintenance of security that resulted from the situation.

There were no effects on the environment, the health and safety of persons and the maintenance of security as a result of this event.

(e) The effective dose and equivalent dose of radiation received by any person as a result of the situation.

No effective or equivalent dose of radiation was received by any person as a result of this event.

(f) The actions that the licensee has taken or proposes to take with respect to the situation.

The root cause of the contingency plan being implemented is determined to be the conduct of a maintenance activity which inadvertently generated airborne particles that tripped the fire alarm system.

The maintenance provider was debriefed on the event once it was determined that the alarm was false, and was caused by the maintenance.

This event represents the first false alarm of this nature at SRBT; at this time, there are no other specific actions proposed to be taken with respect to the situation.

Should a trend in such false alarms be identified, more specific actions may be taken to address these situations.

Jamie MacDonald

Manager of Health Physics and Regulatory Affairs

Date