

**Canadian Nuclear
Safety Commission**

**Commission canadienne de
sûreté nucléaire**

Public hearing

Audience publique

Cameco Corporation:
Application for a Licence to
Allow Operation of a Uranium
Mine at the Cigar Lake Project

Cameco Corporation :
Demande visant un permis
d'exploitation d'une mine d'uranium
pour le Projet de Cigar Lake

April 3rd, 2013

Le 3 avril 2013

Hilton Garden Inn
90 22nd Street East
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Hilton Garden Inn,
90, 22e rue Est
Saskatoon (Saskatchewan)

Commission Members present

Commissaires présents

Dr. Michael Binder
Dr. Moyra McDill
Mr. Dan Tolgyesi
Dr. Ronald Barriault
Ms. Rumina Velshi

M. Michael Binder
Mme Moyra McDill
M. Dan Tolgyesi
M. Ronald Barriault
Mme Rumina Velshi

Secretary:

Secrétaire:

Ms. Kelly McGee

Mme Kelly McGee

General Counsel :

Conseillère générale:

Ms. Lisa Thiele

Mme Lisa Thiele

Cameco Corporation:
Application for a Licence to
Allow Operation of a Uranium
Mine at the Cigar Lake Project

MS. MCGEE: Thank you. This is a One-Day Public Hearing. The Notice of Public Hearing 2013-H-01 was published on December 18th, 2012.

The public was invited to participate either by oral presentation or written submission.

March 4th was the deadline set for filing by intervenors. The Commission received 11 requests for intervention.

March 27th, 2013 was the deadline for filing of supplementary information. I note that presentations have been filed by CNSC staff, Cameco Corporation and intervenors.

Participant funding was available to intervenors to prepare for and participate in the hearing. The Commission received five applications for funding.

The Funding Review Committee, independent of the Commission, reviewed the applications. Funding was provided to four applicants as per a decision issued on February 11th, 2013.

All the documents presented today are available at the reception, either on CDs or in paper format, as well as the Commission Members' biographies.

To begin, we will first hear the presentations by Cameco Corporation and CNSC staff and go through a first round of questions from the Commission Members.

We have in attendance today, available for questions, representatives from the Ministry of Labour.

After the first round of questions, we're going to hear from intervenors who have requested to speak. Commission Members will have the opportunity to ask questions after each presentation.

The public hearing related to the Beaverlodge decommissioned mine and mill will begin at 6:00 p.m. this evening.

Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so let's start the Cigar Lake hearing by calling oral presentation from Cameco Corporation, as outlined in CMD 13-H5.1 and 5.1A.

I understand that Mr. Mooney will make this presentation.

Mr. Mooney, the floor is yours.

**Oral presentation by
Cameco Corporation**

MR. GODDARD: Good morning. Actually, President Binder, I will make the presentation on behalf of Cameco, and I say good morning to everyone.

For the record, my name is Grant Goddard. I am Cameco's Vice President of Saskatchewan Mining North and in this role, I have responsibility for the Rabbit Lake Operation, for the Cigar Lake Project soon to become the Cigar Lake Operation.

On behalf of Cameco, I wish to express my appreciation to the Commission Members and the Commission Secretariat for scheduling this important relicensing hearing in Saskatoon.

I also welcome CNSC staff from Ottawa, joining their colleagues from their Saskatoon office for this hearing.

I'd like to introduce the others at the table with me. On my right is Steve Lowen, General Manager, Cigar Lake Project, and on my farther right is Liam Mooney, Cameco's Vice President, Safety, Health, Environment, Quality and Regulatory Relations.

The commissioning and start-up of Cigar Lake, later this year, will certainly be the culmination

of a tremendous engineering, project management and team effort by Cameco preparing to mine uranium from an ore body that contains some of the highest grades ever discovered.

Our stakeholders have watched patiently as Cameco's Cigar Lake team has risen to the challenge of overcoming the obstacles nature has placed in our path.

Step by step we have taken a methodical approach to gain more knowledge, assess risks and then make our plans to safely advance the work. This is the process we call assurance of success.

Cigar Lake is important to Cameco and our joint venture partners and it will also be an important overall contributor to future global uranium supply. This supply is needed to generate clean electricity in a world where all predictions point to an ever-increasing world electrical demand as millions more people seek to improve the quality of their lives.

Cigar Lake uranium represents a considerable percentage of the new uranium needed for the world's reactors now that secondary sources of fuel are expected to become more limited in the next few years.

As the licensee, the Commission and CNSC staff deals with Cameco as the operator of Cigar Lake. Behind the scenes, our international joint venture

partners provide another set of eyes, contributing their experience and expertise where applicable, as our plans evolve and we work to complete construction and move into operations.

Our largest joint venture partner, AREVA Resources Canada, is engaged in a parallel process to prepare their McClean Lake Operation to mill Cigar Lake ore.

What really speaks to us is the confidence all of our joint venture partners have shown in Cameco and the Cigar Lake management team as a qualified operator. They have always supported our commitment to Cameco's values and safety and the environment while achieving project success.

In Saskatchewan, northern residents have counted on the uranium mining industry for many years to provide ongoing jobs and business opportunities. Northern workers have been a big part of the recovery, remediation and construction phase at Cigar Lake. We expect residents of Saskatchewan's north to benefit from new permanent jobs as Cigar Lake moves into its initial mining and ramp up phase and onto long-term operations.

As Canada's largest industrial employer of Aboriginal people, Cameco takes pride in our programs that prepare people for jobs in our industry, and also takes

pride in the encouragement and training we provide people to advance in their careers.

During the past few years, CNSC staff and Commission members have heard Cigar Lake management speak often about assurance of success. This approach has guided mine recovery, remediation and the current construction phase, ensuring that we have been and continue to keep people safe and the environment protected.

Assurance of success was built in to all of our program documents and in the highly structured processes within our readiness reviews as we prepared to re-enter the mine after we successfully de-watered it. Assurance of success helped to support the ongoing effort to build and maintain a strong safety culture at Cigar Lake which continues to this very day.

It has been about 13 years since Cameco received our initial operating licence from McArthur River, the world's first high grade mine. From that time until now, Cameco systems and programs have been refined consistent with a process of continuous improvement. Our safety, health, environment and quality specialists at Cigar Lake have benefited from Cameco's accumulated corporate knowledge as we begin to begin operations at what will be the world's second high grade mine.

To further expand on how Cigar Lake is preparing to become an operating mine while safely managing a major industrial construction project, I will turn this presentation over to Steve Lowen, general manager from Cigar Lake.

But first, I'd like to offer a little bit of background on Steve. During his 16 years at Cameco, Steve has had extensive managerial involvement in a number of Cameco assets and operations. Prior to his appointment as general manager at Cigar Lake in 2010, Steve spent 2007 and 2008 overseeing the creation of a new corporate standard for Cameco's Corrective Action Process. This standard is now in place at Cigar Lake and all of our operations in Cameco. The improvement of our Corporate Corrective Action Process demonstrates how Cameco applies what we have learned to improve the way we manage our operations.

In my time as general manager at Cigar Lake, I benefited greatly from Steve's leadership and thoughtful insight, particularly in the areas of governance and his focus on systems and process.

Steve?

MR. LOWEN: Thank you, Grant.

For the record, my name is Steve Lowen.

As Grant noted, this effort is being

watched by external observers in the nuclear industry. Cigar Lake's progress to an operating mine is also of great internal interest and focus at Cameco.

For the past 29 months, it has been my privilege, as general manager of Cigar Lake, to lead a team dedicated to successfully completing the project and transitioning to operations. My focus, as general manager, is to make sure our people are prepared for the start of operations and while -- and achieving our goal of safe, clean and reliable production. My job is to oversee all aspects of Cigar Lake site work, including operational readiness, while working with the team that is constructing the finished project.

Getting a new mine ready for operations is not a turnkey process where people only get to operate the equipment when construction is complete. A good example of how we are getting ready is the work we are doing in our Jet Boring System, or JBS.

Jet boring is a mining method that uses high-pressured jets of water to turn solid ore into a manageable slurry. The JBS is the heart of our mining process which is part of the fully integrated ore processing system. Construction of individual ore circuits within that larger system is ongoing. In the meantime, the JBS operator team has been busy with hands-

on learning.

Working closely with the Austrian manufacturer, they first assembled the machine in a Saskatoon shop, inspected and tested it, then disassembled it again, delivered it underground to the mine, then reassembled it and prepared it for first use.

Now, as part of our comprehensive test program, the JBS team has been busy the past few months using the JBS in a development tunnel to drill in waste. This drilling is a part of our JBS mining procedure and is an early test of our mining method. As a result, we are confident our equipment and our people will be well prepared when they begin mining later this year.

Another example of assurance of success is how we approach mine development. Having the best available geological information before proceeding is one key to managing our risks. To get such information, we draw upon the extensive cross discipline expertise within Cameco, and also draw on the knowledge of world-leading experts in ground support.

In this context, assurance of success means we gather data ahead of new development to select the appropriate ground support. With that knowledge, we will have the ground support measures planned and the materials at hand ready for prompt installation.

Aboveground freezing is part of our technical answer to the ground conditions we face. This demonstrates our defense in-depth approach to managing our risks. A great success at Cigar Lake these past three years has been our program to drill and install freeze pipes from the surface. It has not only been a technical success but it is also a business success within our broader social responsibility mandate.

Team Drilling, a northern owned and operated company, has been responsible for executing this program. There are many northern workers on this project gaining experience in precision drilling techniques.

The complex nature of the geologic setting of Cigar Lake ore body in the Athabasca Basin poses its challenges to the development of any mine. Despite our extensive efforts to gain knowledge and implement risk mitigation strategies, including a defensive in-depth approach, we must remain ever vigilant to the potential risk of water entering the mine. Our Water Management Plan takes this risk into account.

Assurance of success means we have installed underground pumping capacity that is twice the modelled predicted volume of water inflow. At surface, we have built the infrastructure to treat and store these volumes and then safely release through our new discharge

pipeline to Seru Bay on Waterbury Lake.

To effectively execute our Water Management Plan, we train our workers and involve them in tabletop exercises for various inflow scenarios. This sharpens the human response to a potential inflow.

The ability to treat routine amounts of mine water safely is another part of our Water Management Plan. Our environmental quota practice anticipates the type of ore that we will be processing. Within our Environmental Management Program, our water treatment plant plays a significant role in protecting the local receding environment.

Building on the experience of our other operations, we designed and built a facility to safely remove molybdenum and selenium from groundwater and/or process water. It is now ready for first ore. We predict a high success rate in removal of the contaminants of concern, and as such, we will be well under regulatory guidelines in what we release.

Another goal of our environmental programs is to minimize waste. A side benefit of the Jet Boring System is that the amount of waste rock generated is extremely low compared to other mining methods. Since this method drills a hole of 16-inches diameter, only a relatively small amount of waste rock is removed prior to

reaching each ore cavity.

A clear advantage of jet boring is in its design to provide radiation protection. Jet boring, integrated with our ore processing infrastructure, forms a closed circuit system which minimizes worker exposure to the ore. There are many design features, including thickness of steel and concrete shielding, that provide effective protection for process operators and those doing maintenance. Work procedures in accordance with our radiation code of practise will also ensure that exposures are kept to a minimum.

During the current licence period involving mine remediation and construction, radiation exposures have been, as expected, very low.

Nevertheless, our Radiation Protection Program and the Radiation Code of Practice are both fully implemented. This means our people are used to routinely applying the level of care that will be required once we begin operations in ore.

During the current licence period, Cigar Lake has been both a mine in development and a construction project with a tremendous level of activity both on surface and underground. Despite the heightened activity, we continue to foster a strong site-wide safety culture.

Our Contractor Management Program ensures companies and their supervisors are adhering to Cameco's safety standards for the protection of all workers on site. For example, no one goes underground without getting thorough training on the use of the mine self-rescuer, as seen on the right.

Now, this past winter at Cigar Lake more than 800 people have been on site most days. All of them are exposed to our safety culture. An example of the profile that safety has at Cigar Lake can be found in our morning safety meetings. We discuss minor incidents and how they could have been prevented.

Regrettably, last month we also had a loss time injury. One of our contract drillers working on the surface freeze drill pad broke his leg in the course of doing a routine task. We have worked with our contractor to analyze this incident and have already completed our corrective actions.

I am proud of our safety culture and how we work to protect our employees and those working for our contractors. Yet, as this most recent event shows, we can never get complacent and we always must look for new ways to keep our workers safe.

As we progress through commissioning this year, a systematic way of putting assurance of success

into practice is found in our comprehensive readiness reviews. Cigar Lake developed readiness reviews prior to beginning the remediation work. It proved its value there and we continue to use it through subsequent work. We will use readiness reviews to validate the entire ore processing infrastructure prior to commissioning.

As part of a methodical approach to ensuring equipment is operating properly, readiness reviews give us the opportunity to establish internal checks. Through the process we can be confident a particular circuit is ready for commissioning.

During readiness reviews we ask ourselves important questions for each required stage of commissioning, are all safety assessments and control procedures in place; are all operating procedures written, and is training completed. Only when we satisfy ourselves that we have answered these, and similar questions, will we then proceed with commissioning.

It has been my privilege to take the Cigar Lake story to our northern audience in Athabasca Basin communities, as we did last September.

Also, just this past month we brought members of the Athabasca Working Group and the Northern Saskatchewan Environmental Quality Committee to the site to update them on progress since the September meetings.

During these meetings we outlined our plans for transporting ore slurry to the McLean Lake Mill.

Our commitment to northerners is that we will take all precautions to ensure slurry trucks are highly visible to other motorists on the road. Our slurry truck operators will follow the posted provincial speed limits or lower to match road or weather conditions. This will ensure the safety of other traffic and the safety of their load.

As indicated in our written submission, our Emergency Response Plan takes into account possible transport events. We have taken delivery of an emergency response vehicle equipped with a crane capable of lifting a loaded slurry tote.

The members of our Cigar Lake emergency response team will be using this vehicle in May for a joint emergency response exercise with a team from McLean Lake. We view this upcoming emergency preparedness exercise as being part of the readiness activities at Cigar Lake.

Assurance of success continues to be the driving philosophy and approach at Cigar Lake as we complete the final stages of construction and move into commissioning. This approach keeps us focused on our values of safety and the environment.

During the past licence term we have demonstrated continuous improvement in our programs and procedures and have safely executed the extensive work undertaken in both remediation and construction.

At Cigar Lake I know we are on the right track. We have shown we are qualified to carry out licenced activities. We are seeking a 10-year licence. Our plans, programs and our procedures are in place to guide us through this licence term. We will continue to focus on keeping people safe and healthy while protecting the environment. We are ready for safe, clean and reliable production.

Thank you for your attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Before getting into questions, I'd like to hear -- I'd like to move to the presentation from the CNSC staff as outlined in CMD 13-H5. I understand that Mr. Peter Elder will make the presentation. Please proceed.

13-H5

Oral presentation by

CNSC staff

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. President, Members of the Commission. My name is Peter

Elder; I'm the Director General of the Directorate of Nuclear Cycle and Facilities Regulation.

With me at the front table today are Mr. Jean LeClair, Director of the Uranium Mines and Mills Division, and Mr. Salman Akhter, Senior Project Officer within that division who is responsible for this project. We also have a number of our CNSC licensing team with us. And as the Commission's secretary has noted, we also have representatives from the provincial regulatory partners as well.

Cameco has applied for that the Cigar Lake Uranium Mine licence be renewed to authorize mining of the uranium ore and completion of commissioning and operation of its ore processing circuits. This presentation contains CNSC staff assessment of that licensing application and Cameco's performance during the current licence term.

As well, CNSC staff are proposing to move to the standard licence format with licence condition handbook that has been previously implemented at other facilities, including AREVA's McLean Lake operation. The proposed licence and licence condition handbook provides increased clarity in regulatory expectations and ensures proper regulatory oversight and controls on the licensees operations.

Later this year, as part of applications for licence renewals that are currently being reviewed, we will be proposing the standard licence and the licence condition handbooks for the other uranium mines and mills operated by Cameco; that is McArthur River, Rabbit Lake and Key Lake.

I will now ask Mr. Salman Akhter to present CNSC staff assessment and recommendations.

MR. AKHTER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commission Members. For the record, my name is Salman Akhter. I am the Senior Project Officer responsible for managing the licensing and compliance activities associated with the regulation of Cameco Corporation's Cigar Lake project.

CNSC staff are here to recommend that the Commission renew the Cigar Lake licence to authorize transition from construction to operation, commissioning and operation of all processing circuits, mining of uranium ore and to accept the revised financial guarantee for decommissioning.

We also recommend the introduction of a new licence format accompanied by a licence condition handbook.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you speak closer to the mic please?

MR. AKHTER: I will begin my presentation by providing an overview and a brief history of the Cigar Lake project. This will be followed by the current status and some key improvements made to the project.

A summary of Cameco's performance during the current licence term will be provided. The three key safety and control areas of radiation protection, convention, health and safety and environmental protection will be discussed. Finally, CNSC staff conclusions will be provided.

This map shows the location of the Cigar Lake project in northern Saskatchewan.

Cigar Lake is located approximately 650 kilometres north of Saskatoon and 450 kilometres north of Laronge. The closest communities are the northern settlement of Wollaston Lake and the Hatchet Lake First Nation; both are located about 80 kilometres to the east by air.

The Rabbit Lake, McArthur River and Key Lake facilities are the closest Cameco operations in the area.

Areva's McClean Lake operation is located approximately 70 kilometres northeast of the site and this is where the Cigar Lake ore will be milled.

This slide shows an overview of the

facility looking north. The actual Cigar Lake is located to the west of the project site. Seru Bay is shown on the top right of the slide. The existing surface facilities shown include the main camp on the left side and Waste rock stockpiles on the right side of the picture.

The Freeze Plant, the slurry load out and shafts one and two are shown in the middle, while mine water treatment plant, slime ponds and monitoring ponds are shown on the lower side of the picture.

After completing an environmental assessment, a construction licence was first issued in 2004 for a three-year term. Following inflow events in 2006, the Commission granted a two-year amended licence in 2007 authorizing Cameco to conduct remediation activities.

The current licence was renewed on January 1, 2010 for an additional four-year term that authorized the completion of remediation and construction activities.

In response to the inflow events, the CNSC required Cameco to develop project remediation plans as summarized in this slide.

At the time of the licencing in 2009, Cameco had already completed phase one remediation activities which mainly included plugging the source of inflow from surface. Mine dewatering, re-entry inspection and securing the underground was completed as part of

phases two and three.

Mine rehabilitation, restoration of permanent surfaces and low risk underground development were also completed as part of phase four.

Cameco has also completed Shaft number two sinking which provides a second means of regress from the mine.

The picture on the top right shows the mine after it was dewatered. Mud and debris was removed. The bottom picture shows the area after clean up with ventilation and electrical system being restored.

CNSC staff reviewed and approved the mine dewatering and project remediation plans.

Phase five mine development and construction of ore processing facilities is progressing well. The main components of the ore processing facilities are jet boring system, run of mine ore storage and reclaim, grinding and clarification, water clarification and recycle, ore slurry hoisting from underground to surface, and slurry load out building on surface.

The function and operation of the underground ore processing facilities is similar to those at the McArthur River operation of which Cameco has had more than 12 years of operating experience.

The image on the right shows the high pressure pump room underground being constructed for the jet boring system.

CNSC staff reviewed the plans and designs to verify that the risks are effectively managed and controlled.

A brief summary of the significant improvements made to the project are: Cameco has conducted a series of geoscientific investigations which resulted in a better understanding of the geological and hydrogeological characteristics of the project.

Corrective action plan and rImplementation plan led to revision and development of new management programs and procedures to assure better planning, assessment and execution of all activities.

Cameco has developed and submitted to the CNSC staff an acceptable revised mine plan based on the results of the geoscientific studies to ensure a safe design and operation of the mine. Water management strategy was revised to ensure safe access to the mine in case of inflow. This has been achieved by ensuring sufficient pumping storage treatment and release capacity.

The ore grinding facilities underground are being constructed as shown in the picture on the right. CNSC staff verified through multiple inspections that

Cameco is taking appropriate measures to protect the health and safety of workers and the environment.

Now I will discuss the increase in the discharge capacity in the next slide, effluent drainage.

Following an environmental assessment, the Commission approved construction of Seru Bay pipelines for the Cigar Lake Water Inflow Management Project in 2011. This has allowed an increase in the discharge capacity and moved the effluent release point from its current location on the Aline Creek drainage system directly to Seru Bay.

These new pipelines will prevent erosion concerns within the Aline Creek system in the event of a large volume non-routine inflow. This image shows both existing effluent drainage through the Aline Creek system shown in white and the newly constructed Seru Bay pipelines shown in yellow.

During the review period CNSC staff conducted ten compliance inspections including focus inspections on the subject areas of geotechnical, training, radiation protection, environment and waste management.

CNSC staff also reviewed Cameco's performance and compliance through desktop reviews including the review of monthly, quarterly and annual reports, the review of reportable incidents and events

such as spills, worker injuries or dangerous occurrences, the review of licensees' applications for new projects and activities and meetings with joint regulatory group comprised of CNSC staff, the Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety and the Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment and with Cameco on compliance and licensing issues.

The picture shows CNSC staff inspecting a self rescuer cache which contains breathing equipment used by miners underground in the event of smoke and fire.

Cameco has updated and implemented their programs for the 14 safety and control areas to meet operational requirements.

During the current licence term, CNSC staff rated all safety and control areas as satisfactory except for conventional health and safety, which was rated as fully satisfactory.

There were no exceedances of action levels. Radiation doses remain low and well below the regulatory limits. The final treated effluent met discharge limits.

There were two last time incidents during the current licence period which I will explain later in my presentation under Conventional Health and Safety SCA.

This photo shows a radiation detector which measures radon in the work areas. When the light is green

it means that workers can continue work normally. If the light becomes amber, workers are required to investigate and take appropriate corrective measures to bring the light back to green. When the light turns red, workers are to evacuate the work area immediately. These lights can be found in most work areas underground and workers are trained to know what to do when the light changes colour.

I will now present further details for the three core safety and control areas of radiation protection, conventional health and safety and environmental protection.

This graph illustrates the annual effective radiation doses to workers from 2007 to 2011. The average worker dose and the maximum individual dose are shown. As indicated by the red line, the effective radiation dose to workers continues to be well below the annual regulatory limit of 50 millisieverts per area.

CNSC staff are of the opinion that radiation exposures are being adequately controlled and monitored. CNSC staff verified through a focus compliance inspection that Cameco has implemented a protection-ready radiation protection program.

In 2010 Cameco Cigar Lake Project was awarded the John T. Ryan Special Award Certificate shown

on the right by the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. The award was for its excellence in safety performance in safe mining at the Canadian Metal Mine Development Project.

Cameco reported two lost-time incidents during the current licence period.

In August 2011, an underground employee was struck by a falling object. And recently, on March 10th 2013, another employee broke his lower left leg while pulling a large pipe wrench. The licensee followed established protocol and informed its regulators in a timely manner, and is continuing the accident investigation and assessment for the recent event.

CNSC staff review all events with the Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety to confirm appropriate actions are taken. Considering the large number of workers during peak construction activities, maximum of 800 per day, CNSC staff noted that Cameco has effectively managed workplace safety hazards and continued to maintain a strong safety culture and performance. As a result, CNSC staff rated conventional health and safety SCA fully satisfactory.

Please note that on page 27 of CMD 13-H5, in the paragraph after the table for number of lost-time incidents, the year 2011 is identified. The correct year

is 2010.

The annual mean concentrations and associated licence limits for the final treated effluent are shown here. As seen on this slide, releases have been consistently very low and below the relevant licence limits. During operation of the mine, effluent limits are expected to rise but continue to remain below regulatory limits. As the project progresses to commissioning and operation, CNSC staff will continue to monitor, evaluate, and verify environmental compliance.

Please note that the limit for TSS provided in Table 3.9.1 on page 29 of CMD 13-H5 was in error. The corrected limit is 15 milligram per litre and not 1.5 milligram per litre.

Cameco has an effective monitoring and control system for spill prevention. Every new worker at the project has to complete a spill prevention and response training course within 90 days of starting work.

During the current licence term there were five minor reportable spills. Cameco's spill response was satisfactory. All spills were promptly cleaned up leaving no residual environmental impacts, and corrective actions were applied to prevent recurrence. CNSC staff reviewed Cameco's spill notifications and follow-up reports and verified the corrective measures implemented during

inspections.

During the licence term, CNSC staff participated in over 12 public events relating to Cameco's operations, including Cigar Lake. During these meetings CNSC staff provided information to the public on the CNSC's mandate and provided interactive radiation protection demonstrations.

In addition to regular public events like annual community tours, meetings with the Northern Saskatchewan Environmental Quality Committee and Athabasca working groups, CNSC staff also participated in community meetings hosted by Cameco from September 18 to 20, 2012 in Uranium City, Fond du Lac First Nation, Black Lake First Nation, Stony Rapids, Wollaston Post, and Hatchet Lake First Nation.

These meetings were held to inform the communities about Cameco's request for licence renewal. In addition to these outreach activities the CNSC provided funding through the participant funding program to the public and Aboriginal groups interested in reviewing and commenting on the licence application submitted by Cameco.

CMD numbers 13-H5.2, 7, 10 and 11 are from the recipient's of this funding program. CNSC staff have verified that Cameco has conducted outreach activities throughout northern Saskatchewan.

Radiation risks at the Cigar Lake mine site remain very low during the current licence term because the project is still in the construction phase. Cameco's submission assessment of radiation doses to workers was reviewed by CNSC staff and found acceptable. During operation, Cameco has estimated that the average and maximum dose could increase to two millisievert per year and 11 millisievert per year. These estimated doses remain below the radiation limits for nuclear energy workers of 50 millisievert per year and 100 millisievert over five years.

A direct reading dosimeter is shown on the right. These are worn by workers underground and provide a real-time gamma dose reading. The workers are trained to report to their supervisor if their direct reading dosimeter is above 0.05 millisievert in a day.

While on inspections, CNSC staff also checked workers DRD badges. During commissioning and early operation, CNSC staff will conduct inspections to verify that radiation doses to workers remain within estimated ranges.

Cameco has planned to commission the equipment with progressively increasing grades of ore to allow for the verification of the safety and control systems related to radiation protection. As the ore grade

is increased, additional radiation monitoring will be carried out to verify that the radiation levels and worker doses are within an expected range of values.

Necessary corrective and preventive actions will be implemented as needed to verify that radiation doses to workers are as low as reasonably achievable. A worker is shown in the picture collecting gamma radiation measurement underground.

CNSC staff will continue to monitor Cameco's performance in maintaining radiation doses to as low as reasonably achievable.

As requested by CNSC staff, Cameco has developed a four-stage commissioning plan. Stage 1 is to verify that facilities have been built to the specifications. In Stage 2 equipment checks will be conducted, including running pumps and motors. Stage 3 is initial start-up with water ensuring that systems are working together following with waste rock, and, finally, with increasing grades of ore. Stage 4 commissioning will focus on proving the design and identifying any limitations during normal operation. The picture shows Jet Boring systems set up underground for initial testing.

CNSC staff have reviewed and approved the commissioning plan. As captured in the draft Licence Condition Handbook, Cameco must demonstrate that Stage 1

to 4 commissioning is complete and ore processing circuits are operating safely and as per design. CNSC staff will continue to inspect and review commissioning activities and reports.

Due to high-grade uranium content, Cameco has selected a non-entry mining method known as Jet Boring system. Mass freezing of the ore body is required before mining. Freezing is conducted from surface and underground to prevent water inflow, provide ground stability and minimize radon release into the mine.

High-pressure pumps are used for jetting cavities in the ore. Ore is contained as slurry within pipes and tanks minimizing radiation exposures to personnel. Currently, commissioning of the JBS is progressing well. CNSC staff have reviewed and approved the JBS commissioning plan.

Cameco has proposed a financial guarantee of \$49.2 million. This includes all current facilities as well as any planned facilities to 2018. There are five reasons listed on the slide, but the primary reason for the cost increase is the addition of new infrastructure.

CNSC staff conclude that the revised decommissioning plan and cost estimate is acceptable and meets regulatory requirements.

I will now turn the presentation back to

Mr. Elder.

MR. ELDER: Thank you.

Before concluding I'd like to say a few words on the licence term.

As Cameco has mentioned they have applied for a 10-year licence term and CNSC staff have assessed Cameco's requests in accordance with our current practices in terms of licence term.

So what we looked at in terms of this one is making sure that Cameco has effective corporate-level management systems in place, and we believe this is the case, and they have been successfully used in the operating mine.

Cameco also has shown a consistent and good history of compliance during the licence term, not only at this site but at all their sites.

The proposed licence term is also consistent with other facilities where there is a defined operating plan, i.e. that for the next 10 years they plan to operate the current known ore body.

CNSC staff has strengthened the licensing compliance program with the introduction of the Licence Condition Handbook. As well, as has been mentioned, CNSC staff have established outreach program in Northern Saskatchewan that is based on on-going dialogue with the

communities and is not -- and is largely independent of licensing activities, and these will continue in the future regardless of the licence term.

CNSC will continue to present annual compliance report to the Commission on the performance of the uranium mines that -- and these performance reports allow opportunity for public intervention during the meetings when they are presented, as well as in current practice CNSC staff will report any significant event and the issues to the Commission on a timely basis.

In conclusion, we believe that all measures are in place to ensure that continued public involvement and robust compliance over a 10-year term.

Overall, CNCS staff inspection program has confirmed Cameco's satisfactory performance during the remediation and construction, and we have noted a strong safety culture at the site.

CNSC staff reviews have shown Cameco has the necessary programs in place to proceed to operation and we have the necessary compliance program to verify those at the key points.

That concludes our presentation. We are now available to respond to questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. What I propose to do, Commissioners, is that we go through one round of

two questions per member, and then open the floor for intervenors, and then we'll conclude with another round of questioning.

I also have been informed that we have a representative here from the Ministry of Labour. I understand that Mr. Crocker is here; also available for answering some questions.

So why don't we start with Ms. Velshi.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you, Mr. President. A couple of quick questions then and I'll start with Cameco.

Can you elaborate on the experience with the jet boring system globally and how well it has performed, and are there any key teething problems that you may be anticipating?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I'll ask Mr. Lowen to provide you a little bit of detail on our most recent testing, which has been successful.

I would also say that jet boring system is a mining method that is not used elsewhere but will be used at Cigar Lake. We have had experience going right up too where Cameco undertook tests on the jet boring system followed in the year 2000, more extensive testing underground as well as

including jetting of ore and waste.

So the jet boring system is something we've been familiar with for a number of years, and even through the period of mine recovery, the remediation, we had people assigned to the jet boring system assuring that our continued understanding of that system and its development prepared us fully for the implementation of that system as we started to in preliminary testing.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

To add to Mr. Goddard's comments, our testing that we had done earlier in the decade was on the industrial scale. We actually had drilled out four cavities in waste and four in ore and, indeed, produced a bit of ore, about 766 tonnes from that particular test.

Recently, of course, we have been using the jet boring system in a more controlled fashion in terms of starting the test design in waste rock, the drilling; we have had a number of holes drilled. There are no cavities jetted yet, but a number of holes drilled just to get used to operating parameters and familiarization of the operators with the machine again as we approach mining.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you. So what you're saying is through all the testing you've done in the commissioning stage you'll really think you'll have ironed out all the kinks and it should be operating fairly

smoothly then?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

With respect to the JBS, we also have experience with the adoption of technology within Cameco to mining and the very successful adoption. Raise bore mining was new to Cameco and it was adopted as a mining method in McArthur River and very successfully employed over the last decade.

Certainly we were able to make adjustments during the ramp-up period to fine-tune that machine, but it was always focussed on the protection of people in terms of safety and the environment, and we would expect the same experience with the JBS.

Good groundwork, as Mr. Lowen as described, as we move into commissioning and start-up. Again, we will bring all of our experiences to bear in terms of focussing an assurance of safety of people and the environment.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you. And a quick question for staff.

Cameco has mentioned its staged or gated approach to commissioning in that at the end of each stage reports will be submitted to staff for review. Is that submission for review or do you have to approve before

they can proceed to the next stage?

MR. LECLAIR: Jean LeClair, for the record.

At the end of each stage there is a status review report only to be submitted and reviewed by CNSC staff. In addition to that, CNSC staff will continue to do on-site inspections. There's ongoing dialogue going with Cameco throughout the entire commissioning phase, so we can go out not only read reports but also independently verify the activities that are going on at the site, do interviews, review the activities that are going on. And if we identify any issues or if we have any concerns, we'll be having them address them at that time.

It's also worth mentioning that we're fortunate that under our Act we have the powers as well to even issue orders and stop it if we felt that there is a - - we had identified serious concerns. From a safety and environmental point-of-view we could issue orders if necessary.

It is worth mentioning, however, we have noticed that with Cigar Lake they've been very responsive to being very proactive and addressing issues before they become more serious.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just piggy-backing on this question. Are all those reports made public? I'm trying

to understand when such reports, background, safety achievement and all those, when are they becoming public?

MR. LECLAIR: There's several reports that we receive throughout the year -- monthly reports, quarterly reports, yearly reports, these status reports. All reports that we do receive, of course, are available to the public on request. We do make them available, and our main vehicle right now for providing the information is things like the annual report, the annual compliance report, that we're providing to the Commission that provides the overview of the entire operation. But certainly any community or any stakeholders that are interested in reviewing any of those reports, they can be made available if requested.

THE CHAIRMAN: So Cameco doesn't automatically post them? I'm just trying to understand which reports get posted.

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

Cameco does post broader reports that provide overview of the Cigar Lake operation as well as all of its other business units. For example, our technical report that was posted in, I believe, 2011, but in terms of the working-level documents that would be held at sites, those are not normally posted on the web.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess my first question is to Cameco.

And your discharge is into Seru Lake -- or Seru Bay rather -- of Waterbury Lake. Why are you discharging into the lake directly? Is there a reason for this?

And I guess the next question is, how do you monitor what is being discharged into the lake?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I'll ask Mr. Lowen as well as Mr. Mooney to provide detail in the two areas to your question.

I would say overall that the Waterbury Lake, or Seru Bay discharge, is part of our comprehensive water management system that we put in place, CNSC staff also described, over the past number of years, is a further level of defence in our risk mitigation against water inflow, and it provides the provision, certainly, to be able to handle any water that may, despite all of our measures, be encountered and allow us to deal with remediation of any water inflow, however small or large, at the site.

But in terms of the actual water and its

distribution into Seru Bay, I'd ask Mr. Lowen to speak to that and perhaps Mr. Mooney in terms of the details around our environmental monitoring.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

The history of the direct discharge into Seru Bay was the result of our look again at our water management plan following the 2006 and 2008 events and was the subject of an extensive environmental assessment.

And what we found at the time was at our current release point, or at least the previous release point into the Aline Creek system, would not be able to withstand a non-routine release of mine water should we have another inflow, and thus the Seru Bay discharge point was the response to that particular evaluation of our risk.

With that, of course, in the environmental assessment plan that we did, we also identified our monitoring in various places in the lake, we do sampling, we have specified areas which are being actually monitored and viewed by the Saskatchewan Ministry of the Environment and we have an extensive monitoring program for those areas for the lake.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Is it because of diluting effect of the lake that you went there, or is there another reason other than the fact that you've got

more, I guess, water to dilute, whatever you're putting into the lake?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

The amount of discharge would not fundamentally be any different than what we have planned throughout the years. However, the monitoring probably more reflects the point of discharge into the lake rather than any additional dilution from what we've planned in history.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So the monitoring is done in the lake itself rather than at the effluent pipe I guess?

MR. MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney, for the record.

There are monitors before the water is discharged, and during the operation of the Cigar Lake project there will be batch release. So there's an additional control of the routine discharges to Seru Bay.

Going back to your question on the change from Aline Creek to Seru Bay, Aline Creek, as you could see from the staff slide that was shown to you, shows the -- ultimately reports into Seru Bay and Waterbury Lake, and so this is just an attempt to minimize the potential for any physical effects to that drainage system in a non-routine circumstance.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

CNSC, do you care to comment really on is this an accepted practice of going and dumping underwater and into a lake?

MR. ELDER: I'll ask Mike Rinker in a second to give you some details on the monitoring and on the overall approach. But I think Cameco said the key points on -- said this is treated effluent.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay.

MR. ELDER: So it's treated on a batch scale and confirmed that it meets the release limits before it is released.

The change in release point is actually related to after the mine inflow events they were asked to do what's the maximum quantity of water that you would ever have to deal with. So they actually had to resize their treatment system to deal with large quantities of water to make sure that they could treat it.

And then the concern was if you were then, even on a batch scale, releasing larger quantities of water more frequently, you may be causing physical damage to a small creek system, and that's where they looked at alternatives to the release point. So it's not to get better dilution it's actually the controls are before you release it and they must make sure they meet those

controls.

And I'll ask Mike to give you some details on that.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thanks.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker, for the record.

So I guess you understood that the change was to avoid erosion in Aline Creek with the high water flow.

But your question really related to concentrations and whether that's an acceptable practice. One of the concerns that we did have in the 2004 environmental assessment was when you put water through Aline Creek and then ultimately to Seru Bay, is you're looking at the Aline Creek system like a canary, if you see effects in Aline Creek you might have an opportunity to stop it in Seru Bay.

We don't really consider that as best modern practice because we don't want a piece of the environment to be a canary we want the whole thing to be protected.

So the environmental footprint in Seru Bay has not changed by directly putting the pipeline to Seru Bay because the risk -- the environmental footprint in Seru Bay is the same; the water would flow through Aline Creek leading to releases to Seru Bay, or the water would

flow through the pipe leading to releases to Seru Bay. So the environmental footprint in Seru Bay has not been altered but Aline Creek has been protected.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Next question is to CNSC. The Joint Review Group meets how often?

MR. AKHTER: Salman Akhter, for the record.

The JRG group, Joint Regulatory Group, meets quarterly to review the performance of the licensee, and also they provide us the updates on the health and safety record and any major submission coming.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay. So the CNSC reviews the minutes from this group. I know they're part of the group. But do they also have minutes -- records of the meetings?

MR. AKHTER: The record is the presentations which Cameco provides to the Joint Regulatory Group, this is part of the record.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

That's all for now, Mr. Chairman. I've got a bunch of other questions for later on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, to piggyback, remind me again who are the members of the Joint Review Group, and particularly I want to know if NRCAN and Eldor are members of this group or not.

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record.

Just to clarify, I think that would be relevant for Beaverlodge. This is ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, this is -- sorry, right, Cigar Lake.

MR. ELDER: Yeah, but we will give you the members of this group.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not the same membership?

MR. AKHTER: The members of the Joint Regulatory Group of Saskatchewan, Minister of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety, and the Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment and CNSC staff.

MR. LeCLAIR: So if I can perhaps just supplement to give a bit of a framing around why. So the environment representatives are also doing their own independent verifications and inspections of the site, so with the Ministry of Environment.

And Labour Relations and Workplace Safety, you mentioned earlier, we have Mr. Neil Crocker, who is available to answer any questions if you have them, who is responsible for workplace safety. So this is the conventional safety, safety of mining, inspection of mines.

So it's also worth mentioning, we do on

occasion try to organize joint inspections where we will jointly inspect the mines with both provincial and federal. Now each respecting our own responsibilities and our own duties but trying to work together in harmony to verify activities.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: If I may, Mr. Chairman. On your Slide 10 you say as the compliant verification activity the Joint Regulatory Group but you're saying that applies to Beaverlodge and not to ---

MR. LeCLAIR: Just to clarify, there's -- Mr. Binder had mentioned a few names, Can Eldor, for instance, NRCAN ---

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Yes.

MR. LeCLAIR: --- are much more relevant in the context of Beaverlodge because Can Eldor is the owner of the Beaverlodge site, while for Cigar Lake really Cameco is the owner/operator of the site, and in that situation it's more consistent with all the operating mines where we have environment representatives from the province, and labour, conventional safety representatives from the province.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So just three groups? And does CNSC participate also?

MR. LeCLAIR: Yeah, that's correct.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay.

MR. LeCLAIR: So the Joint Regulatory Group is ourselves, from a federal perspective, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, and the Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment and the Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety, three parties.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you. It's nice to be here again.

My questions relate to starting on page 29 of the staff document. You may recall in 2009 I think it was we had a lot of discussions on molybdenum. And Cameco mentioned today in its presentation molybdenum treatment, but there is no reporting of molybdenum in Table 3.9.1, and that was my first question.

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record.

So what we have presented in 2.9 was what was being monitored under the current licence. And these are based on federal standards that are set by environment Canada, or provincial ones. In the case of molybdenum there is no number for either federally or provincially. So what we have done in the Licence Constitution Handbook is put in action level which is what is reported in on the

slide on Slide 14.

So it is being monitored and we are working with the other federal partners and province to come up with what a particular number would be for a national standard. But in interim we are using internal control, like the action levels in internal controls within Cameco to make sure it is monitored and controlled. And we also look at their internal controls to make sure the system is operating as designed. If it operated in design you will not get anywhere near these limits.

MEMBER McDILL: One hopes.

MR. ELDER: Yeah.

MEMBER McDILL: Does Cameco want to comment? It was just I did find it in Addendum D; I was just puzzled as to why it was here with a double asterisk or an action level.

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I'd ask Mr. Mooney to speak in detail, in terms of response.

Cameco has the experience, as said, at McArthur River for over a decade and certainly for several decades at our Rabbit Lake operations and Key Lake operations, all operating in northern Saskatchewan as we look to Cigar Lake's construction and development of its

water treatment facilities. And so we've been able to build on the learnings and the successes and implement in our continuous learning approach to arrive at the solutions we have in place today, which, as Mr. Lowen has stated, are prepared for us to move into mining of ore.

Perhaps Mr. Mooney can provide a little more detail.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, actually, for the record.

Our design of our water treatment plant does follow our learnings at McArthur River and we've designed a two-stage water treatment plant to remove molybdenum and other contaminants. Our pre-treatment area is actually designed specifically for that and we've had the practice at that at our other sites. And we certainly continue to expect to be below regulatory limits on the release of molybdenum from that methodology.

MEMBER MCDILL: Thank you. My second question on that ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I interrupt again on this one?

Okay, so if memory serves we had a long debate about whether there are accepted regulatory limits for selenium and molybdenum. Do we now agree -- I'm looking at staff -- what they should be? And will the

operators be able to meet them?

MR. ELDER: So Peter; I'll ask Mike Rinker to give the update on where we are in terms of we've had a discussion appear out on effluent limits and I'll get Mike to give an update on -- especially those two parameters.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker, for the record.

I guess if the question was about if we are aware of a number that we could apply nationally that would provide a safe level? I would say we are not there yet. We are working with Environment Canada, who is the process of considering revisions to the Metal Mine Effluent Regulations, but they have not yet proposed a number that could be used as a regulatory number.

What we have done, and we've heard much debate, is setting limits on a facility basis. So Key Lake, nickel used to be the main driver, and then it was selenium with molybdenum. At McClean Lake arsenic is the important constituent, and at Cigar Lake molybdenum is the important constituent. So we have spent a lot of time and effort determining what is a safe level. I think about eight or nine years ago the Commission did make some decisions that led to Cameco putting in a molybdenum removal facility. But it was based on site-specific considerations.

THE CHAIRMAN: So when the proposed Cigar

Lake getting back online, they will meet our requirement, CNSC requirement?

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker.

Yes, and because molybdenum poses a risk to mammals and muskrats and minks and moose and not as much to fish, having the effluent going straight to Seru Bay where there is much less habitat compared to Aline Creek, we see that the risk to the environment is less when they are operating their molybdenum treatment plant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Dr. McDill?

MR. ELDER: Just one note that I want to add on that one. We had done, in turn at our review, as saying in the draft handbook we had noted that Cameco does have limits and has sampling and controls on molybdenum. They are in their Environmental Code of Practice. When we revise the handbook or finalize the handbook we will make sure those are very visible in the handbook as well.

MEMBER McDILL: That was my question because right now it's only in Addendum D, it's not in the Licence Conditions Handbook and that----

MR. ELDER: Right, and we had noticed that over -- and we will make sure it's very visible in the final version.

MEMBER McDILL: Okay. So I can pull all

the stickies out.

On page 29 at the very bottom, could someone correct the units for me? We have mine water approximately .08 to .1 cubic metre litres. What is that?

MR. AKHTER: Salman Akhter, for the record. It's cubic metres, not litres.

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can pick it up in the next round.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Tolgyesi.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Merci, Mr. President.

My first question is to Cameco. Do you do any ore sampling and analysis onsite?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

As actually part of our surface freeze drilling programme we are drilling right through the ore body as we are installing brine pipes. And as part of that we are doing extensive geological review of the core sample to not only get information about the ore but the surrounding geology.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: I'm asking that because I would like to know how -- you know, it's a high grade ore that's what you have. And the question was that how do you handle that while sampling when analyzing, because it is a high grade uranium.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

Our radiation protection programmes and our monitoring systems are full in force for the geological team that is doing that analysis in the core shots. And we use radiation monitoring devices on their person to measure their exposures.

We also monitor individuals, their exposure through their week in accordance with good practice and make sure their work practices are keeping them safe.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: I have two short little ones, Mr. President, please.

When you are talking jet boring, it's very high pressures. I don't know how much is that, I suppose it's quite high pressure of the water jets. Is this water with high pressure pumped through high-pressure pipes from a central high-pressure room? Or it is located on a course next to the GPS driller?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

Part of our mine design is to actually have a separate high-pressure pump room which is separate from the jet boring production areas.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: That means you have a very high-pressure pipes going through the mine which needs a certain kind of special care because if you hit them or they broke, et cetera, it could be a quite severe

consequence.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

There is high-pressure pipes that do go from the high-pressure pump room to the jet boring area. And, yes indeed, all pipeline obviously follows high-pressure guidelines and regulations. But it is also we make sure it's an area where travel is restricted and watched, and that type of thing is watched out for, from a safety point of view.

MR. GODDARD: If I could perhaps add -- Grant Goddard, for the record.

One of the great strides Cigar Lake has also made is the introduction of our operational reliability, and I know from visiting the site quite frequently that our reliability program would be applied to an area like the high-pressure pumping system and piping so that we would be taking -- ensuring that we're monitoring and measuring pipe performance and so on so that we always have an advanced view as to the condition and state of the equipment. So our advanced reliability programs would also be implemented there.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: And the last one is you use number 2 shaft as a main intake and exhaust at the same time, because it's split? That's what you are saying in your presentation on page 23. That:

"A portion of the number 2 shaft has been used as fresh air, intake, and the balance of the shaft diameter is used to exhaust mine air." (As read)

That means in same shaft, air is going down, is getting -- going up also?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

Shaft two's design has within it a separate -- a compartment wall that runs right up the centre of the shaft that provides that ability to split so we can have fresh air coming in and also be exhausting air on -- in the same shaft. And we have the ability to keep that air going underground.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: And I am asking that because I don't see anywhere, nor in a level plans, nor in the description, you don't have emergency exit from a mine. You know, usually in the mines that have emergency exit, whereas in a fresh air, could be a raise, also in a shaft also there are ladders and the people could escape in the case something happens and they should walk out. But I don't see that in these plans nor in your description on page 23, Shaft number 2 infrastructure.

You mentioned that there is compressed air pipes, electrical conducts, processed water piping, slurry

pipes, but there is no emergency exit.

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

Cameco and Cigar Lake, like we have in our other operations that involve underground work, has multiple layers of defense to provide for the protection and safety of workers as well as the environment. In the case of Cigar Lake, we have underground, both on our 480 level and our 500, so those are the two primary levels that we operate on; mine refuge stations, where in the case of an emergency, workers would go to the refuge station and would have fresh air supply and so on. They would wait until the emergency was declared over or mine rescue personnel that are fully trained would come down to take them to safety.

But in addition, we also have the ability, with both shaft 1 and shaft 2, to have multiple egress points from the mine. The shafts both can carry -- shaft 2 in the future will be able to as well with its, what we refer to as a cage or an elevator, will also be able to carry workers up and down. They can today because we're in construction and we can use that shaft to, in an emergency, to allow egress. In addition, there are ladder ways installed in the shaft, and we also have the ability to place an emergency hoist over top of those shafts. So

we have several layers of defense.

Our primary plan though is not to use the shafts for egress, it's actually to use the mine refuge stations, which are outfitted, as we said, to provide for the provision for workers when they're underground.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Maybe this is a good time to hear from the representative from Minister of Labour about their view about the construction and the readiness to move to the next phase.

Is Mr. Crocker ---

MR. CROCKER: Neil Crocker, for the record.

I'm the chief inspector of mines for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan Labour -- well we're not labour anymore, we're workplace -- we're Labour Relations and Workplace Safety, our third name change, I believe, -- we're very pleased with Cameco's performance at Cigar Lake. We're very pleased that they operate at or below the provincial average for accident frequency.

We recently changed in Saskatchewan and we don't look at loss time accident or frequency very much anymore. We look at a total recordable incident rate. It's a much more better reflection of what's actually going on in the mines.

The mines have gotten so safe in Saskatchewan that our loss time injury rate is well below 1 percent, and so we look at all the incidents that go on right now, Cameco is doing very well on that basis also. So we're extremely pleased with Cameco's performance, not only in Cigar Lake but at their other mines.

And I would add a little bit about the egress from the mine dam, that a little while ago I was talking to the contractors in number 2 shaft, because they had a very extensive method of -- double method of removing people in the event of an emergency. So they -- and I was telling them, well, you guys are way beyond our regulations, and they are. So they actually have backups to their backups for getting people out of the mine.

So yes, we're very pleased with Cameco.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody want to ask an additional question while we got the Minister of Labour here?

Go ahead.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Is there a special training or measures, because a mine rescue is a mine rescue from mine to mine, but in this case is a high-level radiation ore? Do you have any special training and special equipment for these type of mines?

MR. CROCKER: Well, if it's a radiation

question I'm probably not the right guy to ask. I'm a mining guy, not a radiation guy.

But on a radiation basis, my inspectors also monitor and audit. We also have an inspector that comes for our -- from our radiation unit that audits what's going on in the mines. We don't leave it entirely to the CNSC, we sort of work in conjunction on that. We have a guy that goes on a regular basis to all the mines every year just to audit what's going on.

And yes, everybody has to be trained. We also -- when supervisors and people like that come to us, they have to pass a radiation exam also from us, and we won't let them pass the exam unless they can demonstrate that they have training. Even if they pass our exam, we say it's not good enough. They still have to have Cameco's training on radiation.

So everybody gets trained, and you can ask other people that are a lot more knowledgeable than I am in the radiation field dam, because I'm a mining guy and that's something that you can't see, touch, but we have --

-

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure it's tough.

MR. CROCKER: Yeah. We haven't had any complaints. We haven't had -- you know, had -- our guys who are doing the audits are very pleased with what's

going on in a radiation basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff, you wanted to add on the radiation aspect?

MR. LeCLAIR: Yes, I can speak that.

Jean LeClair, for the record.

So to touch on your question. So when we're talking about second means of egress, usually it's through fresh air, so there's no risk of exposure. The main issues we're dealing with on emergency egress for the mine would be associated with radon; radon gas is what the concern would be. In fact, the refuge stations are there and are available also to deal in the event if the radon concentrations were to be elevated. We tend to look at refuge stations for smoke, carbon monoxide, the normal things that we would see associated with conventional mining.

In the case of uranium mining, we're looking at radon, radon gas or the other, is the contaminant, the radiological contaminant really concerned about. But it's the same rule, right, we want to go through egress through fresh air rather than through exhaust air, so we're not exposing people to exhaust fumes to some of these other contaminants.

So their ventilation programs, their refuge stations are actually all built in to consider the

conventional hazards, airborne hazards that we would need to address, and we supplement that with those associated with primarily radon, (inaudible) radon gas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Just briefly.

With traditional occupational safety, how closely do you work with the CNSC staff?

MR. CROCKER: It's an overlapping function. Probably the only time we crossed paths in a lot of areas. The only time we really, I would say, intimately work together is when we're looking at things of basic joint concern and that would be something like the new SO₂ plant that got built and in there, I know that our inspectors did a lot of talking back and forth when that plant was getting ready for construction.

So as required, our inspectors get together. As a routine basis, no, they don't.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: They don't.

MR. CROCKER: But as required, they do.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay, so CNSC, are you satisfied with the level of, I guess, cross-cultural exposure with the Provincial Occupational and Safety?

MR. LeCLAIR: Jean LeClair, for the record.

It's interesting you asked questions because, in fact, I was -- I was talking to Neil about two

weeks ago, in fact, saying this is an area where I'd like to strengthen our -- our working relationship.

In Saskatchewan, there's -- there's always been a certain amount of tension; provincial and federal jurisdictional issues have always been a bit more of a challenge. However, that being said, it doesn't mean there aren't opportunities for us to work together.

I -- I should mention also that when there are events that occur, particularly in the area of conventional safety, it's quite clear that the province has people who are competent inspectors who have expertise. They hire people who are mine engineers who have extensive expertise in conventional safety.

So when investigating events, we will work with the province and even defer to the provincial inspectors, allow them to do their reviews and their own independent verifications of the events to determine what they feel is necessary to deal with that. We monitor it and watch it and if we're satisfied with what's going on, we will just allow them to take the lead. If we're not, we obviously have the -- the power and the authority to act as necessary.

But we do recognize that there's a whole set of mining regulations that are provincial regulations that have been developed that are specifically to deal

with mining and whether that's a gold mine or a nickel mine or a uranium mine, there's some very important things that need to be there. So we recognize that -- that expertise that they bring to the table and -- and like I mentioned, I'm always looking for opportunities to further improve ---

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Work together, yeah.

MR. LeCLAIR: --- how we can work together.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Cameco, are you satisfied with the relationship between the provincial and federal with regards to traditional occupational and safety, and do you find it's a hindrance or is it a positive experience, a positive working relationship?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

In answering your question, first and foremost, I'd say that at Cameco we're guided by our own internal, corporate policies and programs that -- that help us assure ourselves we're meeting the standards that we expect and that are -- are handed down fundamentally from our Board.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So you have a third level is what you're saying.

MR. GODDARD: Well, that is true. We ---

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Yes.

MR. GODDARD: We obviously expect that both provincial and federal regulators are performing their duties. In doing so, we also find that we can tap into other learnings and advice that they may bring. So at this point, we find it -- they're fulfilling their regulatory responsibilities and providing support as necessary.

But first and foremost for us, it's -- we have a duty and an obligation to our employees and contractors that work for us and our focus is there on any incident whether it's in traditional safety or otherwise. We are focused on assuring that we can best understand what occurred, put in place the corrective actions to assure that to the best of our ability, this does not occur again.

We in turn, then, of course, would report that information through to provincial and federal regulatory authorities and look for their reviews and -- and perhaps suggestions as well. We're continuously looking to learn to assure ourselves that we provide protection and safety for people and the environment.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. I think it's time for us now to take a 15-

minute break. That will get us back here to ten twenty-five. Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 10:09 a.m.

L'audience est suspendue à 10h09

--- Upon resuming at 10:32 a.m.

L'audience est reprise à 10h32

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're going to move now to the interventions and I'd like to remind the intervenors that first we've read all the written material that was given to us in great details and we've got questions about that.

On top of that, we've allocated 10 minutes for each intervenor to present their sense of their presentation or anything else they would like to add and so that everybody will have a chance to be heard here.

So the first oral presentation is by the Kineepik Métis Local Inc. as outlined in CMD 13-H5.8 and I understand that Mr. Natomagan will be making the presentation.

Sir, please proceed.

13-H5.2

Oral presentation by the

Kineepik Métis Local Inc. (#9)

MR. NATOMAGAN: Good morning. Good morning, Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen.

For the record, my name is Vince Natomagan, Executive Director of Kineepik Métis Local of Pinehouse. I am a 43-year-old Métis who grew up on the trap line with my adopted father Simian, adopted mother Ernestine, grandmother Helen and grandfather Leon. I have lived and worked in my hometown for all of my life. I am married to a wonderful Métis woman and we have wonderfully vibrant children with great potential.

I would like to take this time to extend my congratulations to you, Mr. Binder, on your recent reappointment as President of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. This signals to us that this uranium regulator is strong, vibrant and -- and is with highest integrity and we put our faith in CNSC to protect the Canadian public including our precious, life-sustaining traditional lands.

On behalf of the constitutionally-recognized, rights-bearing Métis community of Pinehouse, I am here to put forward full support of Cameco's 10-year licence application for the Cigar Lake Mining Operation as per our written intervention submission.

The Métis community of Pinehouse is situated 480 kilometres north of Saskatoon. Eighty (80) percent of our 1,450 population is of Métis ancestry with direct ties to the historical Métis community that existed before effective European control. Our traditional lands and adjacent areas are rich with exploitable natural resources and abundant wildlife that -- that continue to sustain us to this day.

For the last 200 years, our community living has gradually shifted from the nomadic way of life along the Churchill River to the current location of Pinehouse, permanently settled on in the 1920s. Throughout our history, outsiders have had profound influence on our cultural way of life, but we're not here to talk about past wrongs and so forth; rather, I want to highlight the resiliency of survival and sheer determination of our community, the desire to live within a modern economy while trying to preserve our identity and culture.

When you walk into our community hall, you will immediately see our vision statement on the wall that reads:

"Pinehouse is a holistic, healthy, self-sustaining community. We will continue to work in unity to reclaim

our community through positive values and indigenous identity."

About six years ago, we had the audacity to dream up this vision statement. Little did we know how hard the task of rebuilding our community would be.

The first and most important thing we needed to do was come to terms with the sickness of assimilation and start to heal the wounds of broken individuals and divided families.

In order to move in any forward direction, we needed to just do it and use the tools that were at our immediate disposal. This meant utilizing our very own people and methodologies to commence family and individual healing.

We also recognized that we would not throw away any individual, regardless of age, education, or background. Through strong and visionary leadership, we started down the path of healing. We combined the home-grown recovery lake project with a circle of courage concept of mastery, independence, generosity, and belonging as our guiding principles to realizing incremental results as per our vision statement.

Relying on small community fundraising efforts to improve our social conditions wasn't going to cut it. What we needed was a steady revenue stream that

would invest some dollars in social programming and basic community infrastructure, like the hockey arena.

On the morning of May 17th, 2007 we took the bold step of sending six community members to Cameco's Key Lake mine site in the hopes of securing some labour work. Cameco personnel must have wondered who these six individuals were with paintbrushes and hammers in hand. Through constant lobbying and thousands of kilometres to Cameco corporate office and the Key Lake mine site, we started to slowly gather momentum.

About three years ago we realized that we would not reach our dream of being an independent northern community by painting handrails or hammering nails. We needed to professionalize our economic arm, Pinehouse Business North. With the help of Westcap Management from the bridge programme, we have been able to grow our company by adding capacity, making better business decisions, and investing in joint venture partnerships. We are proud to say that in 2012 our economic arm, Pinehouse Business North LP, realized retained earnings of \$3.75 million.

Generally speaking it has been a positive experience working for Cameco corporate and the mine sites. There have been substantial effort by mine site personnel to come to a full understanding of what a

northern contractor is and the skill set that could be brought forward if given the chance.

Although it is challenging at times, the mine sites are starting to give northerners a fair shake are contracting opportunities. As rights holders we have a constitutional and inherent responsibility to protect our traditional land and adjacent areas for this is what sustains us. We will continue to rely on the land for generations to come. Our language and culture might be challenged at times but we will always depend on the land for sustenance.

Through rigorous and redundant environmental legislation, we believe Cameco is doing its part in protecting the environment for our children and grandchildren. Through its internal administrative controls, we believe Cameco meets or exceeds these regulatory expectations. It is because of this fact that the Métis community of Pinehouse signed a historic collaboration agreement with Cameco Corporation on December 12, 2012. We knew that this obligatory agreement simply formalized what was already in place; a vibrant and vigorous relationship with Cameco at the corporate mine site and community level.

This collaboration agreement now sets out a protocol process of active and formalized community

engagement by way of a five-member environmental committee to address any environmental considerations within our traditional lands; formalizing the trust fund agreement with a legal trustee; and forming a six-member joint implementation committee to ensure effective implementation of all the pillars of the CA. This historic agreement now gives us a sense of assurance in terms of economic revenue streams to effectively start to alleviate our social ills and to start adequately addressing our infrastructure deficits.

We are a very determined bunch in Pinehouse. We have learned to get up each morning with pride on our faces knowing that the day ahead holds promise; a day that is better than yesterday. Although we appreciate outside feedback sometimes, we will listen to our own voices and our own hearts. We will do it our way.

A small bit of anecdotal evidence might be the fact that the Métis community of Pinehouse was named Northern Saskatchewan Community of the year in 2012 at the Northern Justice Symposium. The local RCMP also notified our reclaiming our community group that Pinehouse had the lowest crime rate in 2011/2012 as compared to other Northern Communities. We also have some positive feedback from Social Services that client numbers are steadily decreasing. This is surely good news.

In closing, we believe that Cameco Corporation desires a win/win scenario with Northern Communities provided that there is homework and due diligence. We believe that Cameco can continue to provide clean energy to the world while being mindful of its regulatory and social obligations.

In the spirit of collaboration and mutual benefit, we fully support Cameco Corporations 10-year licence application for the Cigar Lake mining operation.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, and thank you for showing confidence in this Commission.

Okay, the floor is open. Who would like to start?

Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In your presentation you mentioned something about medicine wheel. So pardon my ignorance, what is a medicine wheel as a traditional method of healing?

MR. NATOMAGAN: Medicine Wheel, according to my understanding, is using a holistic approach of treating, essentially, the person instead of the illness or diagnosis. Treating the person, as indigenous people did for hundreds of years in millennia; that's essentially

what it is.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay. Thank you very much, that's good.

My next question is that, if I understand correctly, is that you formed a waste management company?

MR. NATOMAGAN: That's part of the CA.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay.

MR. NATOMAGAN: Waste Management, considering this day and age and what Pinehouse is currently involved in we have to not take that lightly. It might be taken out of context by certain members of society. Under the collaboration agreement, waste management as we understand it, and so does Cameco, is recycling tires or shredding pallets at the mine sites, or recycling plastics and tin cans. That's the understanding of what waste management is to us under the CA.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay. Nothing to do with uranium or radiation?

MR. NATOMAGAN: Nothing at all.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay.

MR. NATOMAGAN: If we did we would fall under -- if we -- our guys, under the economic arm working at the mine sites, we would have to fall under Cameco's Radiation Protection Programme, just like any other contractor.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairmen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Velshi.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you, Mr. President.

So you have presented a very hopeful and rosy picture of the relationship with Cameco and what the future may hold. SO what percentage of your community is employed by Cameco either, you know, as labour there or with their businesses that you provide?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I do believe Cameco employs about 80-plus employees directly, as direct employees from our community. And our contractor, Pinehouse Business North, in a given year probably employs up to, I would say, 100 people off and on depending on the nature of the work we have. And then we have another privately owned contractor called Snake Lake Construction who probably employs another 50, and I don't know who else is involved in transportation or whatever. But a very significant portion of our community relies on Cameco. I would say, generally speaking, probably 20 to \$30 million flows into our community because of Cameco. So hopefully that answers the question. I can't give you a percentage, I don't have any stats; sorry.

MEMBER VELSHI: No, that's good enough.

In your written submission right at the end

on page 22 -- and if you don't have it in front of you I'll just read out the sentence. You said your:

"...review provided little insight into the cultural impacts on the community of Pinehouse resulting from loss of use of traditional territory."

And then you questioned whether the 1997 Environmental Impact Statement considered cultural impacts to the community of Pinehouse.

Maybe I'll ask Cameco to comment on that, on cultural impacts and whether your EIS had looked at that. Certainly from your submission it seems like on all fronts it's been extremely positive. But were there any specific objectives you had set and how well are you reaching those?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I'm going to ask Liam Mooney to provide a response on that specific question, I would say that Cameco has been working with northerners and making a contribution in Northern Saskatchewan for over 25 years and it's Canada's largest industrial employer of Aboriginal people. We've been proud of the ongoing relationship in Northern Saskatchewan, and continue to look forward to the future.

There are approximately 1,700 people from the north in Saskatchewan that are employed at our operations, either as employees or contractors today. So success in the past and looking forward to continue to work together as we build a successful future.

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record.

I think it's important to start the discussion around how many environmental assessments have involved the Cigar Lake Project. We have the 97 Joint Panel proceedings under the auspices of Earth Co., we also had a 2001 assessment, a 2004 assessment, and then a 2011 assessment, and as we've proceeded through those environmental assessments and -- the environmental assessment framework federally has become more defined, there's been more broad-based look at traditional and Aboriginal knowledge in gathering those.

So there has been an evolution in relation to assessing the potential impact of our activities, and taking those into account in coming to the conclusions that the effects are acceptable.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you. I'll ask you one last question.

So if you take this forum as an opportunity, there was an additional thing you'd like Cameco to do to help with the development of your

community. Is there anything else?

MR. NATOMAGAN: There is nothing else, in my opinion, that Cameco can do for us. Within the scope of what they can do, they have done what they can. At a certain point, it's up to the Northern community -- and I can only speak for Pinehouse. We don't ask somebody to hold our hand, we never have. We've never looked outside the window to blame everybody else for our social ills. Our leader, Mike, is very strong and adamant to say, "Look in the mirror, take stock of what we are." And if we know -- and as for my submission, my oral submission; if we know how to hammer nails and paint handrails for Cameco, let's start there. But we have to start somewhere.

When 50 population of your local population is under 19 years of age and forestry is gone, trapping -- you know, the anti-fur people made sure that we had no livelihood on trapping -- what else do you go on? So Cameco can only do so much.

So right now, in my opinion, closing with this one, we're having robust conversations with Cameco on what effective implementation of the collaboration agreement really means. To make sure we, Pinehouse, reminds Cameco that it's a collaborative process; it's a partnership.

So right now I have to give Cameco complete

credit, especially the CSR group. We're fully engaged in active conversations, and I can only wish that other Northern communities could do the same because, I'm sorry, but what else do we have? And Cameco has done an excellent job, in my opinion. Without seeming like I'm blowing smoke, I'm just stating a fact.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you. My compliments to both of you for -- you know, for making this work so well.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I piggyback on this? I enjoyed reading this and I saw this picture of, I guess, the signatories to the agreement.

MR. NATOMAGAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So I assume every community has now seen this, and I've got two questions.

First of all, are they all going to knock on Cameco's door now and say, "We want the same deal"? By the way, the terms of the deal are described here pretty well as a function of production, and I'm just curious if all the Northern communities knock on Cameco, you know, and Areva, how's it going to be -- can you handle it, particularly since I also hear there's a lot of skill shortages and you're always looking for new recruits, so maybe it's a win/win on both sides for the long term?

Let me start with Cameco. Maybe -- how are you going to handle all those communities?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I think win/win is exactly the right kind of terminology to use, and Mr. Natomagan's passionate presentation underpins the relationship that Cameco has had, not only with Pinehouse but with other communities. The collaboration agreements are really a means of formalizing something that has been going on for 25 years, as I've noted.

The strength of our organization, as you see in that Opportunity North Magazine, Mr. Gitzel is on the cover and our CSR group, our mining operations, for example, Cigar Lake led by Steve Lowen, all of the different components of our business are active and engaged in communicating and working with the communities in the North to see that win/win solution.

In terms of our path forward, yes, there's one collaboration agreement formally signed; there will be more, and we are active in discussions with the communities to put those in place.

Skill shortage is something that's affecting industries in Canada, if not across the globe these days, and Cameco is no different. And we look to

continue to grow the skills of individuals in the North so that they can be active participants, not only in potential opportunities at Cameco but as they grow their own skills and capabilities to reach out beyond Cameco.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, you know, the agreement you just signed, at least in the press was reported as very controversial, there was some members of the community that did not agree. So what is the perception right now? Is the whole community behind you, and are there other communities going to follow your leadership?

MR. NATOMAGAN: We make sure the community is fully engaged by way of quarterly public meetings. There is no excuse for not knowing anything, and the community meetings are very well attended. The last one we had before the signing, about two days before the signing, there was about 280 people in our little tiny community hall. That is a lot. And I'm not exaggerating when I say once the terms and conditions were fully disclosed by our major, we were given a standing ovation as leaders.

Unfortunately, in the real world, as you know, Mr. Binder, we can't satisfy all members of the community, any community. There might be a small French group -- and they have their merits in some of their discussions, but these particular people that we want to

really address here are not necessarily long-life members of our community.

And I probably should apologize before using this word but, in my opinion, they are transient members of our community, they're not Aboriginal members of our community. They came in there years ago, we're trying to enlighten them to help us rather than tear things down that we're trying to build up; we're trying to engage with them to help us out but they try, and if they want -- don't want to come onside, we have municipal elections and we just had one last October. Even though the CA signing was clearly imminent and it was in the air, it's very telling that 80 percent of the local population re-elected the same mayor and the same councillors. Now, that says something. That's says the leadership is strong, visionary, it's vibrant, and when 80 percent of your community members elect you in, something's got to be going right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you. A quick question.

You reported that 50 percent of your population is under 19. What's the distribution under 19? Are 50 percent of those under 10? And how do you engage

the youth in the community who will be the next workers.

MR. NATOMAGAN: That is a \$64 million question.

Thank goodness for strong leadership. We've had to think holistically on everything that we do. For instance, to answer your question in a roundabout way and to the earlier point of Cameco, we have to engage the health delivery people; we have to engage the local school, the high school, the elementary; we also have to engage post-secondary institutions, such as Northlands College, Gabriel Dumont Institute, all the way to Northtip, North Pak; and we also have to engage Cameco as one of the pillars under workforce development. We're currently putting a Skills Matrix Data Plan in our community to effectively gage, "Okay, how many of our youth are under 15? How many are employable? How many of them know how to read and write?"

Unfortunately, the reality is we lack capacity in a lot of ways, but according to our mayor, Mike, that doesn't give us an excuse to just sit on our hands. So we are using a holistic approach and making sure our mayor, Mike and our president, make sure all members of the community and the parties like Cameco and the educational institutions all come together and try and solve this problem.

I don't know the demographics, but when 50 percent of a community, probably generally speaking like other north communities, are under 19, there's a lot of work. As Calvin Helene said, a lot of baby boomers are about to retire. Where is the social net coming from? Who is going to get cut when, you know, the governments have to address all the baby boomers? It's probably, unfortunately, the less privileged in society.

And Pinehouse has -- that global statement has bearing for us, meaning, unfortunately, a certain percentage of our community still relies on welfare dollars, and that's what we're trying so hard to get away from. So when that day comes, the baby boomers are retiring and the money has to flow the right way, that Pinehouse is healthy, alive and vibrant, and that's all you can ask of us.

So I don't have any absolute demographics, we're not that detailed thinking yet. But to answer your question, we're trying to bring all the parties together and give our -- all our collective heads a shake and saying, okay, how are we doing to do this. We have a vision statement, as I said, and we have a CA, how do we make it all work? And I'll tell you right now it's very tiring, but -- some of us don't sleep, we just keep working in a little tiny community called Pinehouse.

MEMBER MCDILL: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tolgyesi?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Merci, Monsieur
President.

Just to compliment what you are saying, that traditionally or should I say usually the content of agreement between natives and the mining companies were not public. You do, as Mr. President said, you do something that's new.

Do you think that the communities, native communities will follow this approach, which means that all these contracts eventually -- content of the contracts will be public?

MR. NATOMAGAN: They should be.

We for three years, close to three years, negotiated with Cameco. With the lawyers and CSR and everybody else, we negotiated for three solid years. We have always maintained to Cameco this needs to be public.

It's not in our collective health if we signed a secretive agreement just for because you don't want to know the neighbouring community just in case you're negotiating a (inaudible) with them and negotiating with them. Frankly, that doesn't really matter to us. That's -- if you're negotiating with other terms and conditions, that's fine. But we at the community level

have never had a closed door policy to anything.

So that's why on this day of the signing it was public. As a matter of fact, the whole 63 pages, I think it is, of the collaboration is on our web site, and pinehouaselake.ca. Anybody in the world could read that. We have never operated under a premise that we're going to sign a confidentiality clause here and there. And as for those certain people that say there's a gag order, there's no gag order.

So I hope that answers your question, but we really encourage Cameco to be like us and keep an open door policy, because after all it's a win/win situation. Why wouldn't society as a whole encourage a northern community like Pinehouse, a determined northern community like Pinehouse that has a little bit of grey matter between its ears that could effectively negotiate on its own, thank you very much, and that's what we've done.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: And my last is do you as a Pinehouse business owner doing some specific trainings to expand your contract opportunities by new contracts or by new expertise to develop new expertise?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I'm not sure what the question is, but I'll -- we have a joint venture partnerships with our economic development arm, namely people like Nuna Logistics, Dowland. And within those

partnership contracts we make sure people like the Nuna people, you know, don't just -- let's just not have a -- and my language to them is this is not a brown skin game. We're going to have terms and conditions of the partnership agreements that say you will employ X number of people and on the job as well. And by the way, we're going to enroll 12 people at this trades course and we fully expect out of those 12, 50 percent you will hire, or else we're not signing.

So we're very determined to make sure our joint venture partnerships are very enlightened, that if they want to come onboard with Pinehouse they better really come onboard. We're not interested in brown skin games here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Any other questions?

I've got one -- two questions, two quick questions.

First of all, in your submission you mentioned something called Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. What is this?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I don't know much of that. I wasn't directly involved in the restructuring of Pinehouse Business North.

As you saw from my title, I'm the executive

director of Kineepik Métis Local, so I am too busy trying to engage with the Crown, if you will, on pertinent matters. But that question could be effectively answered if people within Westcap Management, whose offices are here in Saskatoon, could be asked that question.

But I think in my opinion, knowing what I know of that project, is a systematic way of approaching governance and protocols of restructuring small economic development entities in Aboriginal communities, effectively splitting politics and business. That's the essence of splitting politics and business, because a politician is not a good businessman, as we all know, or maybe sometimes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There'll be no comment on that one.

(Laughter/Rires)

Staff, anybody came across that, or anybody is aware of that? It's in their submission as Exhibit D. So there is -- anyhow, if nobody -- maybe we'll just pursue it a bit later on.

My last question is a bit an unfair question. Are you aware of some of the debates that's ongoing know with the Cree Nation in Quebec adamantly against ---

MR. NATOMAGAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- uranium mining? And it always fascinated me about the different perspective between northern Saskatchewan and northern Quebec. How do you explain this diametrically different approach and views about uranium mining?

MR. NATOMAGAN: Generally speaking, I think uranium mining or the introduction of that is a foregone conclusion in northern Saskatchewan. They were here since the mid-seventies. So generally speaking, a lot of northerners have gone through the working with the mine sites. A lot of northerners to this day see the rigorous management -- radiation management board, environmental protection or the safety, all those things. As a matter of fact, a lot of us, including myself, every time I go visit the mine sites I have to go through some kind of an orientation thing.

So I hope that answers that question where Cameco and AREVA have been a part of northern Saskatchewan in a lot of ways since the mid-seventies as opposed to northern Quebec. I don't know much of northern Quebec's and that company Strato. I think they're basically at the stage of a hello, how are you, my name is so and so in northern Quebec, so maybe that's why.

And maybe it's because of media. In my

opinion, the nuclear industry has been painted with a lot of strokes a lot of different kind of colours. Instead of black and white, there's a lot of in between. So maybe if -- being presumptuous here -- northern Quebec's community leaders can maybe just take the time and look at information for its own merits, rather than maybe opening up the newspaper and then making some kind of comment. It's not fair, even on the other, we're talking about nuclear waste, and oh, we're not going to oppose anything without knowing the information. I think that's called ignorance.

I'm not trying to paint the nice people in Quebec that, but I'm just making a fundamental statement here. If you're not prepared -- if you're prepared to say yes or no to something, you better be prepared to know the information. If not, don't waste anybody's time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you. You may be invited to testify somewhere and ---
--- (Laughter/Rires)

MR. NATOMAGAN: Well, actually, speaking of baby boomers, Mr. Binder, if you ever retire, I'm around guys.
--- (Laughter/Rires)

THE CHAIRMAN: It'll be an open competition.

--- (Laughter/Rires)

THE CHAIRMAN: Any final word to us?

MR. NATOMAGAN: No, other than just to reiterate and again thank you, all commission members, for doing your job effectively. I follow you guys, not religiously, of course, but I follow you guys, and you have a very hard task. And we all know that the world needs energy in all its different forms, and you guys just happen to be in the crosshairs of certain members of society, that's fine. We'll all do our song and dance, but at the end of the day the world needs energy and we're going to have to find it somehow. And Pinehouse just wants to be an active player within that and that may be - - you know, if some people can't handle that, well, that's their prerogative, not ours.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. NATOMAGAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presentation is by the Northern Saskatchewan Environmental Quality Committee as outlined in CMD H5.3, and I understand that Mr. Augier will make the presentation. I'm not sure I pronounced it right, but welcome.

13-H5.3

**Oral presentation by
the Northern Saskatchewan
Environmental Quality Committee**

MR. AUGIER: Close enough. It's Augier, it's French.

THE CHAIRMAN: Augier, okay.

MR. AUGIER: Good morning, Commission.

My name's Allen Augier. I'm fifth generation Athabaskan Métis; very proud of my ancestral background.

Of course, I was born and raised in Uranium City, lived there, actually, 95 percent of my life. Of course, growing up in a mining community, when you finish high school that's where you go to work, and of course I know the processing since I was 16. Also employed with Cameco with -- at that time when I was employed at Rabbit Lake it was Gulf Minerals.

And I have to admit that Cameco does a great job in training its people and the knowledge that we've gained since -- I remember starting at El Dorado Nuclear; it was built in the fifties, and the advances in technology has really gone -- the recovery is 90 percent. The recovery is great, and also the reclamation now that we have, the money that they have to do after the mining

is done, which we don't have in Uranium City, and it's a big issue, it's a big eyesore. And, actually, I get a lot of friends that come from overseas and they just can't believe what they see.

But further ado, I'll continue on.

I am Athabaskan Northern Saskatchewan Environmental Quality Community Representative, and live in Uranium City, Saskatchewan, near where the Cigar Lake mine is located. As you are aware, that the North Saskatchewan EQC is a Saskatchewan Provincial Government advisory committee, presenting some 34 impact communities in Northern Saskatchewan. These communities and their representatives have given northerners an effective community voice on the uranium industry for the last 17 years. The representatives have come from multiple municipalities and First Nations alike, and the individual includes people of First Nations, Dene, Cree, Métis, and non-Aboriginal.

Over the years we have followed development of the Cigar Lake Project closely. We have visited the sites numerous times and are quite familiar with the specific projects, such as the Cigar Lake Water Management Project. In fact, we like to think of ourselves as civilian community experts, not only on Cigar Lake, but on uranium mining in general in northern Saskatchewan.

Our activities are known to many stakeholders throughout the correspondence, direct reports to communities, our published annual report, our reliable media coverage in northern Saskatchewan, and leading business organizations -- magazines, sorry -- and the North Saskatchewan EQC 2010/2011 report to communities have been provided to this Commission.

The North Saskatchewan EQC has been involved in many excellent workshops and tours of Cigar Lake over the years, and these tours I go on. So being a processing operator is kind of in my blood. So at times I kind of look back if we have other people that are on the committee and I've worked with, and we kind of look back at the old days of how things are now compared to when we first started, and we know what we see.

So we can see vast improvements. We can see there's back-up systems without asking questions. So to me that really that kind of brings me back to the old days. It's part of my -- it was part of my bread and butter.

We are satisfied with the environmental performance for this site, and certainly recognize the economic importance of the mine and the attending mill of the ore or McClean Lake to northern Saskatchewan.

In our June 23rd, 2011 public hearing

intervention, we recommended that Cameco establish a monitoring program at the outlet of Waterbury Lake treatment effluent from McArthur River, eventually travelling to Waterbury Lake, and that the permanent stakeholders worked on our replacement for the provincial communitive (sic) effort monitoring program.

We felt that the CME program or its replacement do -- are very important with new mines coming on-stream and new mines being proposed; example, Millennium Midwest.

We are greatly encouraged to report that the province has found a replacement for the earlier CEM programme called Eastern Athabasca Regional Monitoring Programme, EARMP. Under the Provincial Boreal Forest Watershed Initiative, this programme has included a sampling site at the outlet of Waterbury Lake, something we specifically asked for in June 2011 hearing.

Our only recommendation for the details with Cameco's report for the 10-year lease, we recognize that a 10-year licence seems to be the norm now. However, Cigar Lake has not yet been operating and will be using a new Jet Bore method to obtain the ore. Also, there has been two major water influences at this site. We would prefer a five-year or eight-year licence.

If a 10-year licence is granted,

consideration should be given to a mid-term public hearing, not a mid-term public meeting. The public hearing gives much more opportunities to public involvement.

In conclusion, the Northern Saskatchewan EQC supports the Cigar Lake licence renewal, with our recommendation for a five- to eight-year licence, and looks forward to our continual learning with Cameco and Cigar Lake site.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

It's open. Mr. Tolgyesi?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: You were talking about five- or eight-year licence. What do you think it will change from 10 years to eight years?

MR. AUGIER: I think because it's a new processing in Jet Boring. We have to look at the consumption of water, that's my main goal is the water consumption. We're using Jet Boring, which is a high pressure, and how much water are we going to use.

So it's going to increase your outflow. So it's a new process so we kind of want to look at this and go from there. So it's a new process, I think, more or less, so I'm not familiar with Jet Boring. So, you know, I like to be cautious in this field, not to jump too far

ahead of our standard.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Yeah. But you know what I'm saying, that -- if you say when is production supposed to start at Cigar Lake?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

We expect to be moving into commissioning and start up through this summer period, with package pounds actually in the fourth quarter of this year.

MEMBER TOGLYESI: So why if you say two years or three years, I mean, it's one thing. You are saying from 10 to eight they should gain experience because they will start this summer, or maybe next spring, really speeding production, you know? And so I just ask, what's the difference between 10 and eight years?

MR. AUGIER: I'll let my colleague answer that.

MR. KELLY: Warren Kelly, for the record; I'm the EQC Manager.

I think the essence of this recommendation is Cigar Lake is moving from a construction licence to an operational licence. In the past, all the construction licences in northern Saskatchewan have been for five years; we've moved to 10-year licences for existing mills. If a 10-year licence is given this would be the first time

in the history that a 10-year licence is given to a new mine, and we feel that because of the Jet Boring it's a new technology, it's been well worked out and so on, but it's a new technology to be used. And also there's been two inflows, and because of the history, operational licences have always been five years for a new mine starting up. We feel that it's much more prudent to give it a five-year licence, the five- to eight-year licence.

The other part of the recommendation is if you did go to a 10-year licence, we'd rather see a midterm public hearing that allows for public intervention, rather than a public meeting where the public can't intervene. So that's the essence of that recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: So if you were provided with some means of having a public input sometime in the middle period, you would be content?

MR. KELLY: Well, I think, as CNSC staff will point out, there's always provision, sort of, for -- for public discussion and so on, but we're concerned about having, sort of, a more official opportunity that -- that a public hearing presents. Like, we're -- we're always talking with Cameco. We're always talking with CNSC staff, but a public hearing is obviously much more official.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I'm missing something. Most of the risk or apprehension is going from construction to operation; that's going to happen in the first year, so if there's anything that doesn't work, you will immediately know about this. So I thought that if you really were worried about those area, you would ask for a 1-year licence or extension and then -- and then 10 years; you know what I'm saying?

So you see what the first year of operation experience brings rather than 8 years which I don't think is much different than 10. I'm missing something.

MR. KELLY: Warren Kelly.

I don't think it's reasonable to ask for a 1-or-2-year licence. You know, Cameco will hardly be away from here and they'll have to come back again and these -- these hearings are very expensive for the proponent, so I think, you know, historically, a 5-year licence is -- is much more reasonable. But you know, that's our opinion and it's based on historical -- you know, the granting of licences to the other sites in Northern Saskatchewan in the past.

THE CHAIRMAN: But what is being recommended, I think, is a 10-year licence with annual reports. The annual reports could have public -- in fact, the MPP in the nuclear power presentation and annual

report, there is a public input and depending on which phase and what concern are it can be a full public hearing.

MR. KELLY: Warren Kelly, for the record.

I don't think public involvement in these 1-year annual reports has really been defined. It -- it's I don't think defined in writing anywhere. It's just that we'd like something more -- more official, more prudent.

As I -- as I said, historically, the operating licence for the other sites, in my knowledge, has always been 5 years. We have -- CNSC has never granted a 10-year licence to a new uranium mine coming on stream. If -- if I'm wrong, I stand to be corrected.

THE CHAIRMAN: But there's a whole new licensing process with licensing -- with licence condition handbook and an annual report. But why -- staff, maybe you -- if it's not clear, it's -- obviously the message is not being articulated.

MR. ELDER: Okay, I'll start and see if anybody else wants to add. Peter Elder, for the record.

Admittedly, maybe we -- we need to do in our outreach a little more explanation around the annual report that we started in -- you know, for our 2011 report. For that report that was presented last fall, we

did allow public intervention on the report for the first time and our intention would be to continue to do that on an annual basis.

And certainly, when we look at, you know, not prejudging what will happen later this year, but certainly if we get most of the -- the mine licences under longer licences, I think that, you know, the Commission would have to consider, at some point, holding one of their meetings to discuss that report outside of Ottawa. It's possible to come to Saskatoon sometime in that 10-year period as well.

But there is -- definitely, we are now allowing written interventions on those annual reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jammal?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

Thank you, Mr. President. Just to compliment Mr. Elder's answer, the CNSC licence reform of the CNSC is taking into consideration the verification criteria and clarity for the public and the proponent on what the expectations of the CNSC is and what it will be.

A couple of things I would like to mention is the -- I commend the intervenor on the request for a 5-year versus 10-year, but we have to recognize the fact that the new changes in the licensing process provide a yearly input.

You mentioned public hearing. Public meeting is just as equivalent or as official as a public hearing, especially on the input of the public.

You mentioned that the report is a synthesis report. It's -- potentially, it's a summary, but the public intervention is not limited to the report itself, so you can submit your intervention on the basis of what you know. And that's where the public meeting or the public hearing, from the public engagement, are fully equal.

And the licensing term is not a compliance tool. As Mr. Elder mentioned, the yearly review -- the yearly report of the industry, uranium industry, will allow the public intervention and the report will be regulatory in nature. So in 30 seconds, you've got the licence, the licence condition handbook and the annual report will be discussing the performance, the outcome of the regulatory oversight to include regulatory changes with respect to the LCH.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Dr. McDill.

MEMBER McDILL: Often when we have a - a licence, it goes through a transition as this one will as the jet boring comes on stream and everything is set up and becomes running. We have a hold point and this -- there's no -- there's no suggestion of a hold point in

this licence.

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record.

What we are it's analogous to a hold point in terms of the phase commissioning, so -- and why we didn't call it a hold point, in fact, is it's a continuous process that Cameco is proposing, so they don't plan to stop and do inspections. They actually do inspections as they're running on their system, so we put in analogy of the hold point and say, "You've got to give us this report and allow time to review it in conjunction with our inspections to allow us to make sure that you're okay before you go further in your continuous process".

So we are, you know, the -- we've used different terminology because it's not a physical stop, but is -- is exactly analysis of having all of the verification as you go gradually going from water to waste rock to low-grade ore to high-grade ore.

MR. LeCLAIR: If I could just add to that because I think part of what needs to be added here to perhaps help with the understanding and I think I'll ask Cameco to elaborate a little bit more.

But in -- in the start up of operations, it's not so much a start-stop or turning on of a switch, if I can use that as an -- as an analogy. The smooth transition, because it's a process, it moves gradually

from one to the other and start-stops are not things that you necessarily want to do. You want to allow that continuous flow.

In fact, that was one of the driving forces for coming for an early renewal rather than waiting until the end of December was there was a concern that they wanted -- make sure that they were not in a position where they had done all their commissioning, which is already authorized under the current licence, and come to a point where they'd have to stop and wait for a licence hearing to then allow to move into full operations.

But perhaps I can ask Cameco if they can elaborate a little bit more because this was a fairly important part of the discussions even with regards to when we were holding this -- going through the licence renewal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, please.

MR. GODDARD: Thank you. Grant Goddard, for the record.

Perhaps Mr. Lowen will also want to provide a little more detail, but perhaps several points to make in response to the intervenor and to CNSC's comments.

Overall, Cameco believes we have demonstrated during the mine recovery, the remediation and the construction that Cameco has the necessary programs in

place and we've demonstrated solid performance in the execution of those programs to warrant a 10-year licence term. This should provide confidence to the Commission that Cameco is fully qualified to carry out the licensed activity of uranium mining throughout the 10-year period.

I appreciated CNSC's presentation and it reminded me, as well, as I said, I had Steve's former or my former role was Steve's as GM.

The -- the very intensive remediation planning that took place over the past number of years, taking us through phase 1 right up to mine development and construction today in phase 5. The intensive effort put into assessing risk and assuring that we had all of the proper steps in place before we went ahead and executed that work which we did safely.

I -- I now see our approach to commissioning to be very, very similar. It is a very rigorous, methodical approach to commissioning and start up of the operation, takes into account full assessment of the risk. It ensures that we have the equipment, systems, the procedures, programs, the trained operators in place and it will be carried out with the same rigor that we carried out our mine remediation and recovery.

So as we move forward with that, we can provide assurance that: 1) we will be successful and 2)

any issues we encounter, we will always counter those and tackle them in the way we have in the past, and ensure the success of the operation will focus on the safety of our people and managing the environment, and it's really about having a safe clear reliable operation as an end result.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we've got enough on this, unless somebody -- last quick question, please, on 10.

MEMBER McDILL: This is back to EQC. If this phase commissioning, which isn't a hold point as we normally have, is this something that reports become available, you'll be in a position to gain some comfort or express some concerns through the phasing?

MR. KELLY: Warren Kelly.

I just want to add that we'll certainly respect the decision of the Commission and also our involvement with Cameco and Cigar Lake has been excellent, excellent discussion, and also with the CNSC staff. So, I mean, it's been excellent discussion, certainly if a 10-year licence is done I have the assurance of success. I've seen things change at Cigar Lake and I'm sure the commissioning and start-up is going to be excellent.

So yes we'll certainly be continuing to discuss it and to go up to Cigar Lake and to talk to the CNSC staff.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Tolgyesi, we interrupted you. C'est fini?

Ms. Velshi.

MEMBER VELSHI: So I do want to pursue this a little further, this duration of licensing. And so there were a few factors that were raised here. One is that the annual reporting does allow public intervention but that's written and there isn't an oral presentation, and I wondered if that would be perceived to be undermining the level of public engagement. There was a recommendation that at some frequency we actually have those annual meetings; the meetings where we do the annual report review within the community. And again I'd like to get your opinion on that and from staff to see whether they've got any feedback on that.

But the bigger question I had was; what's so magical about 10 years? So once you've got your licence and the Licence Condition Handbook and these annual reports and they reach a level of maturity, do you envision going to perhaps a 20-year licence. I mean, you articulated very well why a 10-year licence but what's so magical about 10 years? And perhaps I'd like some insight into that.

So I'll start off with the intervenor first on do you see a difference between a written versus a

written and an oral presentation, and would having these meetings at some frequency within the community meet the need to be able to participate fully?

MR. KELLY: Warren Kelly, for the record.

I think with different legislative changes and so on, you know, CNSC staff is still a work in progress of how they're going to allow sort of for more public discussion and so on. And I could be mistaken but the public meetings; like, there's a public meeting coming up on Gunnar and it's my understanding at public meetings, public can attend the meetings but they can't say anything. Now, I don't know if you have public meetings where public can say something; maybe I'm confused here but I was always under the understanding that CNSC public meeting, public can attend but they can't say anything.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's up to the Commission to decide when public meeting is purely a meeting amongst ourselves or a meeting with intervention. Or it could be a full-blown meeting with oral presentation.

MR. KELLY: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it's up to the Commission to determine, depending on the subject and the file.

MR. KELLY: Yeah, I guess the essence of sort of our intervention is that we just think the public

hearing is more official, is what we're used to. I don't think there's anything about the 10-year licence it's just that industry has moved 10 years. It literally costs a proponent millions of dollars, you know, to prepare and come to sessions like this. So I think that's why the industry has gone to 10 years. Again, just going back it's just that we think with going from a construction licence to an operating licence for a mine that's had two inflows, and using Jet Boring, a new method that maybe it's a little more prudent to offer a lower licence of five years.

But as I said, we've had excellent discussions. We go up to Cigar Lake every year, CNSC staff is always there. I'm sure there'll be lots of opportunity for discussion and as we've talked about different hold points and so on. But as I say I just returned to -- it would be the first time in history that you've granted a 10-year licence to a new uranium mine starting up in northern Saskatchewan, and I think that takes a little bit of thinking.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you.

Staff, do you want to comment about 10 years and what do you see the future evolving to?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jammal?

MR. JAMMAL: It's Ramzi Jammal, for the

record; Executive Vice-President.

Ms. Velshi asked the question about what is the significance of the licensing term. As the regulatory oversight matured at the CNSC and as the old timer under the AECB and the CNSC, the CNSC used to issue indeterminate licences for certain Class 2 nuclear facilities for undetermined period. And at the time our computers could not put "undetermined," we used to put 30 years as a time limit.

So this is where the evolution of the licensing structure has taken place from the CNSC itself. For the record, the licensing term is a Commission decision; we make recommendations based on our maturity of the regulatory oversight, number one. Number two is the establishment of the licensing reform, the public input, the compliance activity. We had the discussion of hold points and verification points; they're both equal with respect to the regulatory oversight.

And, again, the licensing term is not the compliance tool. With the change, the Proponent or the intervenor is talking about public hearing because the classic structure, for the longest time, was the public engagement during the hearing. But has been proven, the Commission meeting can have a public meeting as the Commission decides on the intervention. So it's a change

of culture but it's not a blind change, it's based on the maturity of the licensing process at the CNSC.

MR. MOONEY: Sorry, could I -- It's Liam Mooney, for the record for Cameco.

I'd like to add that as the Applicant who's seeking the 10-year licence we feel, given the strong environmental and safety performance at Cigar Lake, there is a good track record there to establish that. And I think another point that we saw earlier today when we had Mr. Crocker from the Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety, there is additional oversight to our operations provincially from both the Ministry of Environment as well as Labour Relations.

And it goes again to the point that Mr. Jammal made along the lines of what we're talking about is we still have an obligation to comply with our licence and all of the legal and regulatory requirements. So that the term of the licence we are happy to have 10 year; we would be happy to see a longer licence term, but the 10 year we are happy to start with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In your presentation you mention monitoring a Waterbury Lake, and I guess you are asking for closer monitoring. Is it because you have concern over the

contamination of Waterbury Lake?

MR. AUGIER: For the record yes. We're also considering the communities downstream from us, from the mine which we are a part of it. And also it's a great concern of water for us because it's -- the water is very important to us because we do live in, and fish and hunt and gather as the Métis and Dene, and so on. If they do have a monitoring system so if there is a problem they can catch it before it gets too out of hand. So it's kind of a safety precaution we're kind of asking for.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay. As a follow-up, is there any fish that you cannot eat out of your lakes now because of contamination?

MR. AUGIER: Yes. Actually, in the Beaverlodge region right now we have a limited fish advisory to eat so many fish because of selenium. This is, of course, the Beaverlodge which I have come from. And there is one other lake, which is Martin Lake, we do not eat fish out of there. But we do have fishing there we just catch and release because of selenium. And that's kind of a thing that happened. So this is a big mistake that happened years ago and we don't want this to happen again.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay.

MR. AUGIER: So, you know, we want

precautions. It's very important because once the mines are gone, we're going to still be there. My family -- well, my relatives, ancestors they'll all be there. I know because Uranium City is close; I'm still there.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: To date, have you been satisfied with Cameco's monitoring of the environment?

MR. AUGIER: Yes, actually I am quite adamant that the monitoring system is at full throttle, so to speak, and they're updated. And we do request certain monitoring and also environmental studies that they do.

So, you know, I'm really fine with that, and it's just how we have a new mine starting up. So it's not only my concern it's also other communities within our region.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Have you found the public health system useful in helping you and assisting you with monitoring?

MR. AUGIER: Yes, by far, yeah. It's a very useful tool. It's also a good educational tool for the people that are not familiar with the mining. Of course, I'm familiar with it because I started working in the mines since I was 16. And we have older people who are not familiar with it so them to come to give presentation on it, so it gives them some idea of what's happening and to put their fears aside, it's not all bad.

And in the end, we've got to look at it this way, we do need work in our region, and the city life is not good. I tried the city life and there's no place like home in the north. And it's difficult for people that live in the north the small communities to come to big communities because it's a big shock.

And what I'm saying is yeah we would like to see that more because it's a safety precaution. Also the other communities within my region have that concern also.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just to piggyback on that, I understand that there is a regional medical health studies of northern Saskatchewan that's being done periodically and shows that the health of the communities is good or is better than anybody else in Saskatchewan. Am I -- I don't know if somebody can remind me, when was the last such study been done and was it released?

In fact, I was hoping that the regional medical officer would have been here to talk about that.

MR. LeCLAIR: Jean LeClair, for the record.

The regional medical officer will be present later on today. He was going to be here for I believe the Beaverlodge part of the hearings.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we can ask a general question then.

MR. LeCLAIR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. KELLY: Warren Kelly.

Just another report that you may not be aware of, but the community vitality monitoring partnership process, which has government people, Cameco and AREVA, we've just finished a report on the socioeconomic effects of uranium mining in northern Saskatchewan. And Jean LeClair can certainly provide you a copy of that.

But that's an examination of the socioeconomic effects of uranium mining in northern Saskatchewan over the last -- well it's sort of what we call the modern era of uranium mining in the last 20 or 30 years, and it's an excellent report that you might want to take a look at.

THE CHAIRMAN: Give me the 10-second clip. What's the bottom line?

MR. KELLY: Well, the bottom line is that uranium mining has been very important to northern Saskatchewan. It's helped the people in the communities a lot. But you might be aware of some reports; there's still a lot to do in terms of housing and different things

like that, but the uranium mining industry has been very, very positive for northern Saskatchewan.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we have a copy of this?

MR. LeCLAIR: Yes, we have a copy of the report.

Just to give a synopsis as well. Some of the on-going -- you heard from one of the previous interventions, 50 percent of the population was under 19. What that means is there's a boom in population growth in northern Saskatchewan, and some of the things that are mentioned in the community vitality report is there's so much growth in the population -- in the young population. While there's been tremendous employment and major growth in the employment in northern Saskatchewan coming from the northern mines, it still doesn't make up for the rapid growth in population and there's still some social issues that continue to be a challenge in northern Saskatchewan.

However, I'd rather leave that perhaps to Dr. Irvine to speak to it because he certainly can speak to it much, much better than I can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER McDILL: Mr. Elder wanted to say something a little while ago.

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record.

I'm not sure that we answered Mrs. Velshi's

question about why 10 years. And our view has been internationally 10 years of some sort of formal review actually makes sense. If you go to a much longer period than that, standards can change and you get the possibility that the facility will be well away from modern standards.

So internationally, even if you -- regardless of the length of the licence, you should actually do about every 10 years a check about how the facility is comparing against good practice, internationally as well.

MEMBER VELSHI: I'm sorry; is this something that the annual review would not do?

MR. ELDER: The annual review would not do it in terms of -- I'll give you an example, from the power reactors is much more of a periodic where you do a comprehensive review. And one of the things more in the mining side is that you look at -- you know, you have long period environmental monitoring programs, five to 10 years, and you need to look at those and say well what's that telling you about the operation of the facility and should I be changing my risk assumptions around that operation.

So we're looking in terms of annual reviews don't capture everything. Occasionally you need to look

at the cumulative and internationally about 10 years is where people are settling.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions?

Okay, thank you. Anything else you -- final words you want to say to us?

MR. AUGIER: Yes, I have great faith in what you guys are doing. And I do follow you like the former person before me, but not religiously, but -- and congratulations to your extended term. And it's a pleasure meeting you all and hearing what you had to say. Have a great day. Cheers.

MR. KELLY: And I just have one comment. You asked about the difference between northern Saskatchewan and northern Quebec. I think it's because uranium mining has been going on for 50 or 60 years. It was a little different, you know, back in the old days. There was a lot of mistrust and so on. But because of the operation of Cameco and AREVA and the communities and so on we've built up a great deal of trust and relationship, and basically that's, you know, over the period of time, and both Cameco and AREVA are very good corporate citizens.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

The next presentation is by the Greater

Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce as outlined in CMD H5.4. I understand that Mr. Smith Windsor will make the presentation. Please proceed.

13-H5.4

**Oral presentation by the
Greater Saskatoon
Chamber of Commerce**

MR. WINDSOR: Yes, thank you very much. My name is Kent-Smith Windsor. I'm the Executive Director of the Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce.

Our membership is now approaching 1,900 businesses. In aggregate they would employ in excess of 60,000 people in Saskatoon and region.

There is a significant portion of our membership base both in terms of the direct business side in consulting, support and engineering that have benefited from economic activity under the oversight of your committee or commission.

We are speaking in support of this project, and you will note that we didn't have a very extensive written submission.

I thought it would be useful to pull us back to a project that we were able to participate in some

years ago in 2004 where we were able to, for the very first time, get the technical committee from the International Atomic Energy Agency to attend one of their technical sessions on mine safety standards and environmental stewardship in Saskatoon for the very first time.

Our Chamber was involved in hosting the visitors from around the world. And I personally had an opportunity to attend their trip to northern Saskatchewan and participate in their activities, to some extent, in and around Saskatoon.

And it is very safe to say that when the visitors from around the world that have similar responsibilities towards the staff team that your Commission deals with were able to be in northern Saskatchewan and see the activities that were going on at that time, they were in awe. They were simply the best in the world.

That was further buttressed by a more recent report from the International Nuclear -- International Atomic Energy Agency where it annotated in 2010 the best practices in environmental management of uranium mining, and it identified a series of projects that were regarded as being the best practices in the world.

Four out of six of the examples that were used were from northern Saskatchewan; they were under the auspices of this applicant, Cameco or AREVA. And so in our observations, from the people around that were able to attend, not only were they thoroughly impressed with the oversight that your commission offers, but the genuine commitment on behalf of the industry, in this case Cameco, to bring both the attitude and aptitude to continuously improve their operations.

I think you would have heard a little bit earlier from some of the intervenors as to the progress that we have seen in terms of further engagement with northerners, which was of particular note to a number of the visitors over and above the technical expertise and prowess that was demonstrated in their visit. They were very taken with the extent to which aboriginal engagement and northerner engagement had occurred within the employment fabric of the mining operations.

And we've heard further progress in that area. The commitment to best practice, the commitment to continuous improvement, and the commitment to bring the best available technology under the oversight of your commission, gives us full comfort that this license should be approved. You know, I think as Canadians we have a little bit of a difficulty understanding when we're the

best.

I happened to be listening the radio in one of our traffic jams yesterday -- and we do have traffic jams now, and they are substantially as a result of economic success of projects like the projects that's being proposed -- but it was from Tim Horton's, and they were sorry that we were the best at hockey. They were sorry that they had the best coffee; and if people from other parts of the world didn't get the joke, they were sorry.

My point being is, is that when we are the best and we have an aptitude to bring the best to the table with sincerity that's demonstrated through their involvement with northern communities, the proficiency of your staff team, your rigour as you analyze this, and the obvious integrity that had been applied on behalf of Cameco and others in the industry, we're fully comfortable that this should -- license should be offered by your commission. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Questions?

So let me ask you as -- what's the role of the Chamber of Commerce to -- or is there a role in the Chamber of Commerce to inform the world on some -- such technologies?

I assume that the JBS is a Canadian invented technology? I don't know if it is or not, but if it is, are you helping Cameco marketing this internationally?

MR. SMITH-WINDSOR: Yes, I can say we do our little part.

I much liked the comments that were asked about how we could see more progress in terms of economic success of the peoples of northern Saskatchewan. These are one projects at a time kind of work. It does require persistent, consistent and significant effort. Cameco has been a great supporter of some of the projects that we've undertaken to reach out to the world to tell the story of proficiency in this market, not exclusively relating to uranium expertise but of many others.

Most recently, we were involved in a project that had support from the industry relating to hosting a group called the Pacific Northwest Economic Region, which is made up of both administrative teams from various states in the northern part of the United States and western Canada, along with elected officials and businesspeople in the region. Cameco was able to host some people to be able to see that their mining operations in northern Saskatchewan as part of that project.

So we were able to touch some pretty

significant influencers in the region, and what continues to not surprise us but continue to cement our resolve on the importance of reaching out is the extent to which the prowess that is exhibited here in the uranium industry and others is simply unknown in the United States. And we can take a more classic Canadian example of blaming our customer for their ignorance, or we can say we've got a job to do to tell that story, and Cameco has certainly helped us to do that.

We continue as a Chamber to do that outreach. We have very regular visitors coming from all over the world to attend and participate in projects. We are under the microscope of the world. I've probably been dealing with five to eight delegations from China alone a week for the last year and a half. Not all totally interested, solely interested in uranium activity, but they are certainly interested in the activity and why Saskatchewan has amazing stories to tell, and certainly the prowess of the industry here is one of those amazing stories.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

--- (A short pause/Courte pause)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

The next presentation is by the Fond du Lac

First Nation as outlined in CMD H5.10 and 5.10A. And I understand that Mr. Froess and Mr. McDonald will make the presentation. Please proceed.

13-H5.10 / 13-H5.10A

Oral presentation by the

Fond du Lac

Denesuline First Nation

MR. McDONALD: For the record, Darryl McDonald, CEO for the Fond du Lac First Nation. Just a bit of background: I'm Dene from the Fond du Lac First Nation, part of the Treaty 8 adhesion, grew up and raised by trappers and fisher parents, grandparents. We're about a fourth generation experience exposure to uranium industry mining, as well, a product of residential school systems. Grew up in the community partially, went off educated outside the community, came back just over -- under five years ago, and now working for the community.

And part of my work at this capacity as CEO is the -- working with the First Nation community on substantial hearings such as this, that we take whatever opportunity we can with the limited resources, and human resources, and financial resources. So we're very glad that we're here, that this is our second hearing that

we've presented.

And now I'll pass the mic to Ryan. Thank you.

MR. FROESS: Hello, my name is Ryan Froess.

I'm a aquaticologist with Canada North Environmental Services here in Saskatoon. I will be presenting today on behalf of the Fond du Lac First Nation concerning the renewal of Cameco's uranium mine construction license for Cigar Lake Project.

I would first like to welcome Darryl for being here today. Unfortunately, Chief Earl Lidguerre, who was supposed to be here as well, was delayed up north due to weather, so he'll be joining us this afternoon for the Beaverlodge hearings.

I'm just going to start by giving a bit of a background on the Fond du Lac First Nation.

Founded over 150 years ago, Fond du Lac is one of the oldest and most remote communities in Saskatchewan, the band members of -- primarily of Dene, Cree, Métis descent. The band currently maintains a total registered membership of 1,842 members and manages and administers their own programs for education and health as well as economic and social development.

The Fond du Lac community is located on the on the north side of the Fond du Lac River in the

Athabasca Basin of northern Saskatchewan. The band has a total reserve land base of over 36,000 hectares, and today approximately 1,000 members live on the reserve.

Access to and from the community is by seasonal road in the winter months and via boat from Stony Rapids, which is accessible by Highway 905 during the open-water months. Two airline companies also provide year-round access to and from the community with daily flights.

The Cigar Lake Project is located within Treaty 10 which covers the northern and north-eastern parts of Saskatchewan. The Fond du Lac First Nation is located within Treaty 8, which was signed in 1899. The signing of the Treaty 8 was spurred by the mining development in Northern Canada in the late 1800s. The Treaty protects the Band's right to live off the land, including hunting, fishing, and trapping throughout the traditional territories pursuant to Treaty 8.

Governments have the right -- have the duty to consult with Aboriginal peoples whenever they are contemplating actions and may potentially infringe upon these treaty rights.

Cameco is requesting the renewal of a uranium mining construction licence for Cigar Lake Project for the period of 10 years. The licence period will allow

Cameco to complete the final stage of commissioning at the facility, transition it to operations, and to commence shipping uranium ore slurry from the Cigar Lake Project to (inaudible) McClean Lake operation.

The Band supports the renewal of Cameco's licence for Cigar Lake Project for a period of 10 years. However, they have some concerns they would like to call attention to you today.

The Band's primary concern is in terms of operational change at the Cigar Lake Project is regarding transportation safety. The Band is concerned with the hauling of uranium ore slurry and the acid-generating waste rock from the Cigar Lake to McClean Lake site.

The ore haul route between the two mine sites includes a stretch of 10-kilometres stretch of Highway 905. Highway 905 is a public road and is the Band's only roadway to southern Saskatchewan and is frequently used by community members. A higher volume of mine traffic may increase the potential for traffic accidents and fatalities.

So this map just shows an area of primary concern for the Fond du Lac First Nation. This stretch of road, this 10-kilometre stretch of road is used by the residents of Fond du Lac and other northern communities as a public Highway 905 year-round access to southern

Saskatchewan and back up north.

Fond du Lac Band members have also continued to express an interest in protecting the environment and having implemented industrial development in northern Saskatchewan. The Band is concerned with the potential environmental issues that may result from increased mine traffic between Cigar Lake and McClean Lake operations.

Environmental concerns may potentially include: Spills and other accidents from increased haul-truck traffic; dust emissions from increased mine traffic; and the cleanliness of vehicles travelling between Cigar Lake and McClean Lake after the loading and dumping of uranium ore slurry and acid-generating waste rock.

Cameco also has a comprehensive public information programme. However, there still appears to be mixed messages amongst community members and the lack of detail in the type of information communicated. The Band would like to emphasize the need for clear and direct communication between Cameco and the community members regarding safety and environmental concerns due to the increased haul truck traffic on Highway 905.

In addition, other environmental issues that may occur at the Cigar Lake Project including spills, waste management issues, and engineering challenges need

to be clearly communicated to the Fond du Lac Band.

Finally, the Band would like to note that any information translated into Dene should be peer-reviewed before being distributed throughout the community.

In summary, the Fond du Lac First Nation supports the renewal of Cameco's licence to operate Cigar Lake Project. However, the Fond du Lac First Nation would like to highlight the need for further consultation to ensure the safety of Cameco's plans to use Highway 905 for hauling uranium ore and waste rock. In addition, the Band would also like to emphasize the need for clear and direct communication between Cameco and the Fond du Lac First Nation moving forward.

In closing, the Fond du Lac First Nation would like to thank the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission for the opportunity to participate in the hearing today.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Okay. Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess it begs the question really how can your concerns with transportation be addressed? What would you see as a solution compared to what's been going

on with the preparation for the transport of the ore slurry?

MR. McDONALD: For the record, Darryl McDonald.

One of the main concerns is the narrow roads and there's continuing traffic day and night from community members, like our vehicles, usually half-ton trucks, and those roads are windy and narrow and there's some highway maintenance, I guess, at some points where there's provincial road access or near uranium mining sites that there's some rural clearing. But the concern is the narrowness of the road and there are other overlapping access like (inaudible) companies. There have been fatalities there already and concerns have been voiced and -- so one solution would be the widening of the roads.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay. Pardon my ignorance but is the road gravelled or paved or ---

MR. McDONALD: Gravel.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Gravel road. Okay.

I guess, Cameco, it begs the question really, how many trucks per day do you envisage being on the road in excess of what's going on now?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I'm actually going to ask Steve Lowen to provide not only the answer to that, which I believe is about eight to ten in full production, but just a little bit more detail on the precautions to be taken and our approach to assuring safety.

The entire road haul, as the presentation clearly showed, is a total of about 80 kilometres from Cigar Lake mine site to AREVA's facilities at McClean Lake, and the portion that is being discussed the concern is the 10 kilometres that lie between the two sites.

Whether it's the 10 kilometres or it's the entire 80, Cameco is focused on assuring the safety of people and protection of the environment throughout the entire stretch, and has undergone comprehensive risk assessment, assessments of all activities involved in the slurry haul, as well as later waste hauling.

And for that reason, I think it is worth asking Mr. Lowen to provide a little bit more detail because there's been a lot of work done in this area.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record. Thank you very much.

The focus on safety of our ore slurry loading, haulage has actually been a very strong focus. As Mr. Goddard pointed out, at the start of operations we will be transporting roughly about six to eight trucks per

day with some days no transport at all. At full production, that will ramp up to roughly about 10 trucks per day of slurry haulage between Cigar Lake and McClean Lake.

I would say that we are very experienced in hauling slurry totes. We do exactly the same thing from McArthur River to Key Lake, and have many years of experience on doing that as well. But for the portion of the 10-kilometre road where there is a provincial highway, we are also making sure that we're putting in safety procedures such as high visibility on the trucks themselves, reflective lights, reflective markings, flashing lights; making sure that trucks are reporting regularly; travelling at posted speeds or lower if conditions warrant; and using the professional drivers that we are using up north for all of our transport, whether it's through just normal delivery of normal mine goods and ore slurry transport.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Velshi?

MEMBER VELSHI: Do you share the intervenor's concern about the narrowness and the windiness of the road, and perhaps as an opportunity of widening the roads, down the road?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

The intervenors are correct that Highway 905 is a narrower road than what we have put in place for the access between Cigar Lake and the turnoff to 905, and from 905 to McClean Lake.

However, the 905 is maintained by the provincial government and they put the -- they maintain the road on their own -- on their terms.

In an emergency, we obviously do -- if we have snowstorms or whatever, we do make sure that the road is kept clear and we can put people out onto that to make sure that that highway, that stretch, is kept safe, but that is a provincial government responsibility.

MEMBER VELSHI: There are other concerns raised by the intervenor around communications.

But before I get to the communications there was actually one here that caught my eye about the cleanliness of vehicles. Is that because of a track record or you know why did you single that out as an issue that you had?

MR. McDONALD: Well it's going from one mine site and proper procedure, from what I understand when I used to work at the mining company, was wash down in a wash bay when a vehicle leaves. So in this circumstance, the vehicle is leaving a mine site and going

on a public road without washing or clear down and then going to a different site.

MEMBER VELSHI: So is washing down part of your standard procedure?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen for the record.

Washing down and scanning the vehicles are both part of our procedures before we would send a vehicle on the road.

MEMBER VELSHI: So comment on the communication concerns that have been raised whether it was around the clarity or the completeness of communication or the translation request?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney for the record.

I want to start off by saying that we have a very robust and long history of consultation and engagement in Northern Saskatchewan with respect to our operations there. We are seen as best in class and leaders in that regard. With respect to the consultation in relation to Cigar Lake, the Ore slurry transportation as an example was the subject of discussion with the communities in the Athabasca.

In September last year, there was also further follow up in early March with a site tour of Cigar Lake for representatives from some of those communities. So there has been good deal in that regard. We, as part

of our compliments of staff, have a representative, a community liaison officer actually stationed in Fond du Lac.

All of that being said, we take -- part of the reason we got to where we are in our consultation and engagement efforts is because we take feedback very seriously. So we've heard the intervention and we'll be exploring that both with Fond du Lac and our corporate social responsibility group.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you, and can you comment on translation to Dene to be peer reviewed?

MR. MOONEY: Sure, Liam Mooney again for the record.

Cameco takes the matter of communicating clearly again very seriously. And in that respect we try to have regard for the various Cree and Dene dialects that are in play in Northern Saskatchewan and making sure that things are reviewed before they are disseminated, whether that's posting on our website, whether that's put out into the community in relation to those community activities; we also try to have translators present. And give them coles notes, synopsis of the presentation in advance of the presentation so they are prepared and can discuss that as the presentations are provided to the communities.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tolgyesi? Still on traffic, I'm trying to get an understanding. You said that full production; it will be 10 vehicles a day as a maximum. What's the existing traffic in terms of vehicle per day, and maybe we heard that there were some traffic accidents. What's the accident rate? I'm just trying to get a feel for the actual volumes going on right now.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen for the record.

I do not know about the overall accident rate on highway 905. I do not have any recollection of any accidents involving Cigar Lake vehicles right now, or collisions with other sites, just very specifically for our site. However, at the current time, the amount of traffic that's coming to the site is roughly about 10 trucks. And these are normal transport trucks delivering construction materials to the site. So what we would be seeing would be roughly on the same order in volume as what we're seeing right now. Of course construction is going to tail off and then it will be replaced by Slurry transport. So the significance difference is roughly about the same as what we're seeing right now. And you know, certainly, we take seriously all safety of truck traffic on the road in between us and Mclean Lake and wherever we are sending materials to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Saskatchewan government

thinking about improvement or they don't believe it's right now required?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney for the record.

I think that we have worked with the province. We share the concerns of communities about having good safe roads in Northern Saskatchewan. We use them, our contractors use them so it's in everyone's interest to have safe roads. Our experience with the government of Saskatchewan has been positive about communications, about road conditions and working with them to improve those as required.

THE CHAIRMAN: And your professional drivers, are they locally engaged? Are they people from the communities?

MR. MOONEY: A lot of our truck traffic is from NRT, Northern Resource Trucking, which is a Northern Saskatchewan Owned company. And there is a good deal of representation of residents of Saskatchewan's north in their work force.

THE CHAIRMAN: And my last question is to staff. The intervener, I guess, argues that the information on spills and things like this could be better? I know that you have been working on improving the information requirements. So is that now manifest itself or is it all practice?

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder for the record.

I think for Cameco, in terms of spills that are reportable to province in this of any spill, they are available on Cameco's website. I think they are obviously with these communities. We have experienced that you can't rely only on the websites; that you have to work with the communities to figure out what works with that particular community in terms of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you think in the future it will get better because of 99?

MR. ELDER: Well in terms of the public information, it's not, you know, and Cameco's been doing quite a good job on this one. It's only based on making available one way it's talking to the communities and continuing to refine the information to make sure you're meeting the community's needs. So imbedded in the requirements, in our standard which is 99.3, is that ongoing dialogue with the communities. So that's one of the things that we monitor when we are talking to the communities, is making sure that there is that on-going dialogue about the information the licensees are providing.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the last thing on just by way if they interveners know if any Dene translators that are available, we would be very much interested to

find out. I tell you we've been trying to find Dene translator for this hearing and we also for La Range coming up. Very difficult, so if you know somebody who is available all the time whenever we need them, please let us know, send us a name.

MR. McDONALD: For the record just some further comments on the peer review. I'm not promoting myself, but I do speak Denesuline and I did translations before and transcriptions. But there are other individuals out there; Allen Adam is one of them. But that's where some other peer review is where I question. The translations like, say Selenium, there is no Dene scientific word for Selenium. So how do you describe and engage community members to understand scientific background information such as that? That's a prime example. Other areas of engineering processes and procedures. So those types of comments that are in the peer review. That's why I'm saying there needs to be more peer review. Individuals from the Denesuline Communities to look at before prior to presenting an official document of Cameco or AREVA. So that's my greatest concern, is when communities welcome companies and you have the presentations being done which hasn't been peer reviewed. And from my understanding, where I'm bilingual in Denesuline, for me as an educated person as well and

individuals such as an elder trying to explain to them and then the information that's presented by Cameco or AREVA doesn't jive with me when it's transcribed and translated. And knowing the difference and this is where I always question CNSC or Cameco or AREVA, but the focus of those communities are not really Q's and A's. Because like you said, we've been experienced with the companies and after a while, that we have generations that come to the meetings. So you have the old elders who are more the sovereigntist who have that position of indigenous rights; part of their treaty and that teaching. And then you have the baby boomers, and then you have individuals like myself were either educated or have limited education and work experience, and then you have the youth who were promoting more education and it was sort of in limbo there with regard to how they view the operations and the overall whatever it is, outreach, community consultations or whatever buzz word that is out there now; outreach is what I hear now. Prior to that it was open analysis, so stressing that point, we need more Denesuline peer review in the documents are being presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Tolgyesi, do you have another question?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Yes, a short one for Cameco.

The intervenors are talking about this waste truck hauling from Cigar Lake to McClean. It's something which is continuous. It will continue or something which is just temporary because when you are talking about ten trucks a day, I think it will be a little bit more if you want the waste material plus slurry.

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

The waste truck, excuse me, waste rock haul that is referred to is something that is not going on at this point in time but it's plan for the future is part of our ultimate decommissioning where we'll place waste rock into one of the abandoned pits, thereby making more efficient environmental usage of the land. So it's not today but it's something for the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Anything else? Okay, last word to you. Anything else you would like to share with us?

MR. McDONALD: No, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The next presentation is by the Canadian Nuclear Association, as outlined in CMD H5.5, and I understand Mrs. Kleb will make the presentation. Please proceed.

13-H5.5

Oral presentation by

Heather Kleb

MRS. KLEB: Good morning, President Binder, Commission members and members of the public.

My name is Heather Kleb and I am the interim president and CEO of the Canadian Nuclear Association and I am here today to speak to you on behalf of the 60,000 Canadians whose livelihoods are supported directly or indirectly by our industry. These men and women explore for and mine uranium, generate electricity and advance medicine through live-saving diagnostics and therapies.

Our members work and live in communities across Canada where they maintain a deep commitment to the safety of their workplace and the protection of the environment. That is why I am here today supporting Cameco's applications for the renewal of the Cigar Lake and Beaverlodge licences because they affect not only our livelihoods but the communities where we live and work.

During my presentation, I will focus on two main themes. First, the numerous socioeconomic benefits that Cameco's operations bring to Canadians, and second,

Cameco's commitment to the protection of health, safety and the environment as they provide these benefits.

The development of Saskatchewan's uranium resources brings clear socioeconomic benefits, not just to the local communities but to the vendors and contractors across Saskatchewan and beyond its borders.

Cameco is the leading industrial employer of Aboriginal people in Saskatchewan, providing high paying, secure jobs in northern communities. The uranium mining industry employs some 5000 Canadians and pays them roughly 500 million in wages and benefits.

In 2010 uranium exports from Canada totalled \$753 million. The uranium mining industry also contributes directly to government revenues so uranium exports in 2010 yielded taxes and oil fees for the province worth nearly \$150 million.

In reviewing the written submissions from the other intervenors we saw broad recognition of the significant role that Cameco and the Cigar Lake mine play in Saskatchewan's economic health. However, your decision does not rest on these benefits alone. The health and safety of every nuclear industry worker and the protection of the environment where they live and work are also very important.

Development can only occur in a workplace

that does the utmost to protect the health and safety of the people who work there. The health and safety of the people undertaking activities at the Cigar Lake and Beaverlodge facilities is a priority for Cameco. Cameco is committed to the safe, clean and reliable operation of all of its facilities and is continuously improving its safety performance.

The effectiveness of Cameco's health and safety programs and procedures is evident in Cigar Lake's record of lost-time injuries. Only one lost-time injury occurred between 2010 and 2012 even though their work hours increased from 1.3 to 2.3 million over this period. Further, there have been no lost-time injuries at Beaverlodge in the current licence term.

In fact, in 2010 the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum awarded Cameco the prestigious John T. Ryan National Safety Trophy for having one reportable injury over 700,000 working hours at McArthur River in 2009 and also a special certificate for reporting only one injury in a similar timeframe at Cigar Lake.

Over the years Cameco has helped maintained Canada's strong safety track record. Canada has a track record of over 50 years of occupational and public health and safety. We are a safety leader in the industry

worldwide. Even so, we strive to continually improve.

When it comes to safety, we are never complacent. Cameco values safety and like all of our members strives to improve even further.

Cameco also holds environmental protection as a core value. We can see this in how well Cameco has integrated the mitigation of environmental risks into the design and operation of the Cigar Lake mine. Protecting the environment is not an afterthought, it's at the centre of Cameco's business.

We also see this core value in the responsible environmental stewardship demonstrated at the decommissioned Beaverlodge properties. Cameco continues to demonstrate responsible environmental management many years after these facilities have been decommissioned. Since forming in 1988, Cameco has managed these properties to ensure the health and safety of their workers, the public and the environment.

Canada's uranium mining industry is in fact recognized as the best performing mining sector relative to the metal mining effluent regulations under the *Fisheries Act*.

Cameco is also specifically recognized by the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada with an Environmental and Social Responsibility Award.

By maintaining its commitment to the high standards of environmental stewardship, Cameco continues to demonstrate our industry's responsible management over the full life cycle of our activities.

While reading the submissions provided by other intervenors, it was satisfying to see the recognition of Cameco's strong track record in protecting the environment. Some of the community groups that wrote in to support the project also questioned how Cigar Lake could affect the environment, and we ask these questions too.

That's why I draw your attention to the effectiveness of the infrastructure and programs that Cameco has put in place to protect the environment. We believe that Cameco has demonstrated, both through the information they provided to the Commission and through its historic track record, that it is qualified to carry -
- qualified to responsibly carry out the required activities at the Cigar Lake and Beaverlodge facilities.

The question before you in this hearing is specific to the relicensing of Cigar Lake and the decommissioned Beaverlodge facilities. As you approach this decision, I hope to have helped renew your confidence that the companies who are safely managing nuclear projects today will continue to do so in the future and

long after commercial operations are complete.

Before I wrap up, let me leave you with a thought or two about how your decision could affect Canada's future. Around the world today there are 64 new nuclear reactors under construction in 14 different countries; most of these are in China. The ability of Canadians to access this market is likely to go out now that Canada and China have signed a memorandum of understanding on energy cooperation.

We foresee hundreds of new jobs and billions of dollars in new investment for Canada. To realize these benefits, we will need to build new mines and mills and extract more uranium. That work will happen in communities just like the ones that made submissions to the Commission. We support their call to develop a northern community that is healthy, vibrant and prosperous.

The CNA supports Cameco's applications. They will provide social and economic benefits to Saskatchewan, and this will be accomplished while maintaining the highest standards of workplace safety and world-class environmental standards.

In summary, Canada enjoys a natural wealth in uranium that contributes to economic growth locally and across Canada. Cameco has demonstrated that it is

qualified to safely carry out the activities sought in its application and has made adequate provisions for the protection of the environment. The Canadian Nuclear Association therefore recommends that the Commission approve Cameco's application to renew the Cigar Lake and Beaverlodge licenses.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today, and I'd be pleased to answer any questions that you may have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Okay, questions? No. Monsieur Tolgyesi?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: What's the role of Canadian Nuclear Association?

MS. KLEB: Heather Kleb, for the record.

The mandate of the Canadian Nuclear Association is to promote the acceptance of nuclear - Canadian nuclear technologies and to create a positive, public, political and regulatory environment in Canada and abroad.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Do you have a specific public targeted or it's broad in general?

MS. KLEB: Our primary focus -- Heather Kleb, for the record.

Our primary focus is the Canadian public. Our members are -- we have over 100 member companies that

are located right across Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody? Ms. Velshi?

So just to build on that line of questioning, so you have any your role in duty to consult?

MS. KLEB: Heather Kleb, for the record.

I wouldn't say that the Canadian Nuclear Association has a role in the duty to consult. Our members are obviously very active in consulting local Aboriginal communities throughout the environmental assessment process and in the course of doing business. My understanding is that the duty to consult rests primarily with the federal government.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I was thinking about, you know, at least as an association you can share good management practices. So if Cameco is doing such a good job in northern Saskatchewan, wouldn't it be something that would be useful other parts of the country, such -- which the Association can be a conduit? It's a question; I don't know the answer to that.

MS. KLEB: Heather Kleb, for the record.

Actually, that is one of the benefits of membership with the Canadian Nuclear Association. When we express an opinion on a regulatory development or a public policy issue, it's built on the opinions of our members. So we are constantly grouping and regrouping to address a

whole range of issues, and those networks are established, and the learning's are shared, whether it's in the regulatory, or environmental compliance realm, or a public policy, or a political realm. They are constantly sharing information and experiences.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm just coming back to the theme that there's such differences between different parts of the country from moratorium against uranium in B.C., and Quebec is now playing with this, and Saskatchewan just the opposite. So I just don't know whether you think that the Association has any role in explaining and educating, sharing information.

MS. KLEB: Heather Kleb, for the record.

I absolutely do believe that we have a role. We have a few members in Quebec, but whether we visit local communities, say Aboriginal communities to provide education or informational support, it's -- to date it's been on an invitation only basis. So if our members invite us into discussions with Aboriginal communities then we'll certainly comply.

If an Aboriginal community were to approach us and request our presence, in terms of an education or information capacity, we would certainly comply, but it's -- typically, it's -- there has to be an invitation, because the relationship between our member companies and

their local Aboriginal communities are more important than our relationship, the CNA's relationship with those communities. But we're certainly willing if we're invited.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Yes, to what extent, because you have large companies like Cameco, you know, they are well staffed, they have experience, they have all these departments, you know, those small junior companies who are looking for, searching, exploring, and they don't have the staff and they don't have experience. So what's the role, how do you transfer or how do you help the knowledge, which is from -- in Quebec or in AREVA, and to transfer to these junior companies? Because they could do things, which eventually are not good, negative, because they don't know how to do that. So how do you see your role there?

MS. KLEB: Heather Kleb, for the record.

We have many -- a whole range of events that allow our members to network and share views, ranging from our annual conference, to workshops on specific topics, to working groups who are focusing on a specific issue and taskforces. And just at a recent event, I saw AREVA basically sitting beside Strateco. So we do provide those opportunities for them.

MR. MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney, for the

record.

And I was going to weigh-in previously with relation to this, and for both the Quebec circumstances and when we were negotiating an agreement in Australia, there was a concerted effort by Cameco to bring those communities into northern Saskatchewan to see the successes that we've had there, and for those communities to talk without us in the room at times on what the challenges were, how they got to where they were, and why they are so accepting of those benefits.

So there has been efforts by the -- in addition to what Heather outlined, but there has been efforts by industry directly in that regard.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

MS. KLEB: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it's a good time to break for lunch, and we'll reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 12:34 p.m./L'audience est suspendue à 12h34

--- Upon resuming at 1:33 p.m./L'audience est reprise à 13h33

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presentation is by the Prince Albert Grand Council as outlined in CMD 13-H5.11. I understand that Mr. Hardlotte will make the

presentation. Sir, please proceed.

13-H5.11

**Oral presentation by the
Prince Albert Grand Council**

MR. HARDLOTTE: Good afternoon to Dr. Binder, and the Commission. Ladies and gentlemen, (speaking in native).

I just want to start off by introducing who's here from the Prince Albert Grand Council.

To my right, I have Dene Vice Chief Joseph Tsannie, and to my left I have Mr. Ron Beatty, and back here I have Robin McLeod that works for the Woodland Cree. He's from the Lac La Ronge Indian Band, as well as Wollaston Lake Elder Emil Hansen, and Southend Ranger Lake Woodland Cree Youth, Adam Jobb.

The Prince Albert Grand Council is made up of 12 First Nations that are divided into four sectors; the eastern sector, which includes Red Earth, Shoal Lake, and Cumberland House; the Plains and Dakota, which include James Smith, Sturgeon Lake, and the Wahpeton Dakota Nation. In the north, we have the Woodland Cree Lac La Ronge Indian Band as well as Peter Ballantyne Cree Nation, as well as Montreal Lake Cree Nation. In the far north,

we have three Dene Nations of Fond du Lac, as well Black Lake, and Hatchet Lake, which is at Wollaston Lake.

In 2011, there was 36,336 members from the First Nations of the Prince Albert Grand Council in 27 communities that covers one-third of Saskatchewan in territory. We do have the two largest bands in Saskatchewan, the Lac La Ronge Indian Band that has over 9,000 band members, and Peter Ballantyne Cree Nation, which also has over 9,000 band members.

This afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, we'd like to discuss both issues of Cigar Lake and Beaverlodge at the same time.

And the Chiefs have asked me to state at the beginning that no one is to misconstrue this as the duty to consult and accommodate, first of all, which is important. And I know that many people that even if they meet with one of our First Nation members from different companies, call that a duty to consult and accommodate, even if that person jumps up and down and says no to any process.

And the other issue is that the First Nations at the Prince Albert Grand Council want it stated that they are not opposed to industry but industry in a responsible and sustainable and maintainable manner, maintainable meaning we want to maintain what is there, as

close as we can.

With that, I'll turn the microphone over to Vice-Chief Joseph Tsannie.

CHIEF TSANNIE: (Speaking in native language)

I just want to say I had to speak my language. I know we talked about that on translating equipment. I posted on Facebook that this hearing is broadcast web so people back home, the far north. I'm originally from Hatchet Lake, Vice-Chief of the Prince Albert Grand Counsel.

Some of the concerns were some of the Elders don't know how to use the computer and technology; there's no translation in Dene how can they understand what's happening to our land and our territory.

We do have some recommendations for the hearings -- for future hearings. We could probably show them at the community level for our people where there's going to be translations, and we do have some people that can translate in both languages.

I just want to say thanks for inviting us and giving us this opportunity to hear some of the concerns.

The Dene people of the Athabasca are the true owners of the land. We never give licences out to

any industry. We should be the ones that should be issuing the licences. I think we have to make that clear. If we want to be true partnerships we've got to accommodate both parties. We should have members because it is affecting our land. We should have members on the Commission that are from our people. We should have Elders asking some of the questions as well.

Those are some of my recommendations.

If we need to move forward working together we need to start working together and building those relationships with government, the province and the First Nations and the true owners of this land.

Like my partner said, we're not against development but we need to be part of it. We need to be -- we need to feel included in those decision makings right from the beginning.

So with that, I don't want to take any more time here, just thanking you for the opportunity. And I'll hand the mic over to Leonard Hardlotte. Thank you.

MR. HARDLOTTE: Thank you, Chief.

We do have documentation here that we had a preparation meeting for the hearings on March 13th in Prince Albert where we brought Dene Elders, trappers, hunters and fishers to Prince Albert, and we also brought youth from the far north as well as the Woodland Cree

sector, and everybody had a chance to talk and then to reiterate what they had said.

And then we had our northern Saskatchewan Trappers Association Convention 2013 on the 14th and 15th where many more Elders, trappers, hunters and fishers discussed issues surrounding the north, and a lot of the discussion was around the nuclear industry right from line cutting right to nuclear waste management and everything in between.

We also have a -- we've audio and videotaped the three days and we broke down the video to a half hour presentation, and we have that available if you call the Prince Albert Grand Council and request that, at a price of course.

And many of the Elders had similar concerns, and some of those concerns were also mentioned through the presentation of Fond du Lac, and we shall have our Elder speak on some of those issues that's here at the table with us. But at this time I'm going to turn the microphone over to Ron Beatty.

MR. BEATTY: Good afternoon. The Prince Albert Grand Council thanks the Participant Funding Program for allowing us to be able to come to today's hearing and to be able to discuss some of our concerns and some of our comments to the Commission. Without this

funding -- you know, this is the first time that we've been able to participate. It's only the second PFP that's been issued, the first one in Saskatchewan, so we were able to get the first too.

From our point of view, you know, we've got a population of 36,000 people occupying a quarter of the northeast part of the province, and we don't go to each community to figure out how they feel on nuclear issues. So we're glad that we're able to get a little bit of money here to be able to come here today.

We've looked at Beaverlodge mine and mill that occurred in the '50s and ran for 30 years, about eight kilometres to the east of Uranium City, and it ran from 1952 to 1982. And during that time it produced 4.8 million tonnes of waste rock.

And there's been many studies with waste rock in the Cigar Lake project and with the Midwest Lake project that are coming up, and there's been concern of the potential for acid mine generation with the sulphite and the sulphates that are occurring within the rock.

There's so much concern involved that they're going to do two campaigns of waste rock disposal from the Cigar Lake site. I know we were talking about transportation this morning but we didn't address the issue of the two campaigns that would occur within the

short life of that Cigar Lake mine, the 15-year lifespan.

This waste rock has the potential of lowering the ph, of creating acid and affecting the organisms in our waterways where we've always used these for all our country foods. We live off the land. So this is a concern raised by the PAGC that we've got 4.8 million tonnes of waste rock at the Beaverlodge mine site.

Once the rock has been mined from underground and put through a milling process, in the life of that 30-year span there was 10 million tonnes of mill tailings produced. Six million tonnes of this was deposited into the waste management facility. The waste management facility are three lakes. The three lakes are Mine Water Lake, Foukes Lake and Marie Lake.

Currently, radioactive radium 226, with a half-life of 1,509 years. It's part of that mill tailings in the lakes. In addition to the radium-226, there's total dissolved solids that are elevated with the mill tailings that are in the current three lakes: Marie, Minewater, Fookes Lake. There is no way that these will ever decrease. These will always be a problem. They are a problem today; they will be a problem for our children because we are not addressing it. Cameco has the mandate to look after that. The money comes from Canada Eldor.

Perhaps Cameco's not the proper operator.

Perhaps we need someone to clean up the site or to isolate the mine and mill waste. Isolate it or clean it up because it's continuing today and it'll persist for time immemorial.

There are groups monitoring it, an Athabasca working group. Takes some nice pretty pictures of people fishing on Lake Athabasca, which is downstream, but in between there there's Greer Lake and between that is -- prior to Greer Lake is Beaverlodge Lake. And that's where all the waste continues to go and it's downstream, and the monitoring, you're not going to find anything in Lake Athabasca. That's Canada's third-largest lake; it's a large volume of water. There is a very small amount of monitoring occurring.

Radon is not a concern. It's monitored for though, good for the public image. But they're not monitoring at the source, they're monitoring away downstream. So if the monitoring is also questionable, all the mining projects that are occurring, they got Jet Boring system, raise-bore technique, all state-of-the-art technologies that are occurring in the mining end. But in the waste management portion, there's no new, emergent technologies are used: No satellite imagery, no satellite-linked automated networks; no (inaudible) chip biomarkers; no sensor-based integrated samplers.

It's all -- monitoring may occur a few times a year, of water samples. It's not in the peak periods when there's high water level, low water level, the snow-melt period, ice jams. There's no -- it's been -- the way it's been taken care of is just routine monitoring and maintenance, that's it. So another 10-year licence is all you'll find, is more routine monitoring and maintenance.

To transfer this over to an institutional control programme that would be looked after by the Saskatchewan government is preliminary because we've got tonnes of radioactive material in the lakes, so how can Cameco hand it over now to the province and leave out the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission?

I'd like to switch to Cigar Lake. The Cigar Lake mine is going to run for 15 years. It was discovered in 1981. They spent a lot of money on it. Went through a few floods; I've heard two, I thought there was three floods. There's -- again, the 10-year licence is going to be 67 percent of the total life of the mine. If that occurs, a question would be the participant funding program, so maybe the next time we'll see is 10 years' time?

And also there are other companies besides AREVA and Cameco that are involved in the nuclear

industry. And Rio Tinto will try the Russell Lake project between Key Lake and McArthur, and also at Midwest Lake. They have the Roughrider deposit, which would be the highest grade deposit in the world.

A 10-year licence is not -- it's going to be pretty tough for them to get a licence. When you see numerous operating mines and mills in the area, the public is not going to be keen on letting another mining company start up. So by having a 10-year licence, you're going to -- you're keeping them out as well.

The final two concerns is with the Seru Bay discharge. Prince Albert Grant Council were -- unfortunately was not involved in the Seru Bay study that took the discharge away from Aline Lake, or from the Aline Creek into Aline Lake then into Seru Bay. If you have a quick look at the satellite image, try Google Maps, look at the mine site and have a look at the brown area. That's vegetation that's not growing in the Aline Creek system.

One of the CNSC members called it a canary; they don't want to kill the canary, but the canary has been wounded. Now, if you're not killing the canary out in the Aline Lake, you're doing the same thing to Seru Bay. Discharging it straight out into Seru Bay with no natural filtration of a creek, muskeg; that used to be the

way to do it was it.

Now, finally, the cumulative effects is a concern of the Grand Council. We have Rabbit Lake Mine -- at Eagle Point, Rabbit Lake Mill, McArthur River which is currently producing the highest grade ore and has also had a flood of water which is -- you know, that's another flood in a similar area, were all around the Athabasca Sand Basin area. And we've got the Key Lake mill.

Joining those projects in the future will be Midwest. At points north, near points north, Rio Tinto Roughrider Project. There's Russell Lake's Rio Tinto project between Key Lake and McArthur, and there's Cameco's Millenium Project. All these will impact the existing water system. All of them drain down through -- from Key Lake to McDonald -- Horsefly Lake, McDonald Lake into David Creek down to Russell, Geeky River, flowing up to Wollaston Lake, branching off from there. Part of it -- 70 percent going to Cochrane River and down to the south end. The other 30 percent joining the other flows from Cigar Lake, McClean Lake, Rabbit Lake. So those projects are all going to impact the water and if you're not going to look for it properly, you're not going to find it, any damage.

I think that's about it right now, that I've -- I'd like to bring to your attention. I did -- I

have provided all that material in our submission.

Thank you very much.

MR. HARDLOTTE: Thank you very much, Ron.

I'll go to our youth from South End Reindeer Lake, Adam Jobb.

MR. JOBB: My name is Adam Jobb. I'm representing the youth of northern Saskatchewan, more specifically, Prince Albert Grand Council.

I was born in northern Saskatchewan and raised at South End Reindeer Lake. For time immemorial, we have inhabited the area that is known now as northern Saskatchewan.

We have sustained and continue to sustain ourselves from the land. This was made possible by maintaining respect for Mother Nature by only taking what was needed for survival, nothing less and nothing more.

The environment in its entirety continues to be a fundamental aspect of our livelihood. We are active users of the land. We hunt, we fish, we are active gatherers. We hold the land very close to our hearts. We eat the animals, we eat the fish, we gather the plants for the medicine, we pick the berries and other food plants that are found on the land. And, I guess, one of the big concerns from that aspect is the environment, like keeping it safe.

I have a young family myself. I have a young son whom has just turned five years old and he is following my footsteps. I took him hunting this past fall. He was able to enjoy and experience the land the way I did when I was his age when my father took me out.

Okay. Fortunately, the area that we are in hasn't have -- hasn't had as much activity as for exploration and mining, so we, in that part of our territory, we are able to enjoy it the way it has been enjoyed. The trees continue to grow, the plants and animals continue to be healthy, and so, what my son's seen and what I've seen is the same thing that my father has seen, that my grandfather has seen, that my great-grandfather has seen. And it has sustained us ever since we have been here and we want it to sustain us for as long as we are here.

We need or we are going to pass these customs on. The life span of the mines -- Cigar Lake, for example -- is 15 years. We're going to be here long after that 15 years. What is going to be put in place? How are we going to be able to say that our land is going to be safe for us? How do we know that industry, uranium mining in particular, is not going to destroy us?

In First Nations culture, we are living right now, not for us but for our future generations, and

we look as far as seven generations. That's our responsibility right now: the next seven generations. And that continues on and it's passed on. So, what we do now is going to affect what's going to happen in the future and we do not want to compromise that.

Thank you.

MR. HARDLOTTE: Thank you, Adam.

We'll go to our Elder from Wollaston Lake, Emil Hansen.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much. My name is Emil Hansen. I'm with the Hatchet Lake Band in Wollaston Lake.

I grew up in Wollaston Lake where all the uranium mines are. I was born in Pinehouse, Saskatchewan, when we moved up there to do some commercial fishing and that was back in '57, before any mines were up there.

Since then, they started mining uranium. I have seen the destruction of trap lines and not only one company, there's 30 companies out there right now. They're all diamond drilling, cutting lines all over the country. May be there's a couple of trappers that are getting compensated for that because they a mine right in their trapping, but the rest don't get nothing even though their trap lines are being destroyed by line cutting, diamond drilling, prospecting, you name it. And it's all

over the Northern Wollaston Lake there right into Manitoba and there's a lot of exploration going on and the trappers are not happy because their trap lines are getting destroyed and they're getting nothing for it.

The fishermen, the commercial fishermen, we hardly have any left. Our young people are all going to work now and not learning how to commercial fish, so we're losing a lot of our young people to the mines.

But, what's going to happen when the mines are shut down? When everything is gone and the resources are taken out and they shut down the mines and -- how are they going to survive if they don't know how to fish, they don't know how to trap, you know? A lot of them, they don't even have a training centre up north, you know, to train our people, our young people, in how to do -- how to get a job at the mine. They don't have a training centre. They have to come down south here to learn so they can get a job at the mine site and, you know, that's something that the mining companies should have thought about: to put a training centre up there already affected the communities are, so they can train these young people and if they want them to work at the mine, train them. Train them right, you know. That's the safety of it.

You know, it seems a lot of -- a lot of our older people, the Elders, that don't read and write, you

know, but they see all this stuff going on and they don't know these high technologies that people talk about, you know. They say "well, the water is safe and the area is clean, the environment, you know, we're watching it", but people don't understand all this. They give us a bunch of readings, you know, and who knows? They don't understand that, you know. Maybe they understand what's a dollar and what's five cents and nobody don't understand what's 6% of this and that, and the water --

They're worried. They're always worried because they don't know. They hear that uranium is dangerous, the most dangerous ore they can take out of the land and they're always worried. What happens if it gets into the rivers and the lakes? What happens if the animals are getting sick from eating the plants? Lots of animals live in the rivers and the water flows all the way -- goes up all the way to Lake Athabasca or Wollaston, and then it goes south, back to Reindeer Lake to the south and back to the Churchill River; that's where the water turns around. One river goes north and one comes and turns around coming back south and back to the Churchill River.

So, all these communities in between are all connected to the water system. So, what happens if something ever gets into the lake, the water? It's going to drift all the way up north and all the way back down

south again.

What guarantee do we have? What guarantee can they give us? I don't think they're going to ever guarantee anything to the people that they'll be safe even if something happens, if something leaks into the lake.

We've got a mine right in Wollaston Lake that's under water. What would happen if it ever caves in? What happens if they get a crack and then the water starts flowing into the mine underground?

There's a lot of things that people are worried about today and there's -- we all will be worried until the mining is gone and then they're back to their normal life as it used to be: nice and quiet. Today, they can't even trap because there's so much noise, you know. When you're trapping, you don't want no noise, you know. You scare the animals away. Today, they can't even trap because there are diamond drillers going all over, the drillers going all over and roads being built through the bush bulldozing their trap lands so they can build the road to take the drills in there.

It's not quiet anymore and it's not like before. They don't even have to use their Skidoos because there are roads open, they just use the trucks.

Anyway, it's all I want to say for the people: the Elders of the North are really worried about

this. You know, giving them a 10-year license, they haven't produced anything yet at Cigar Lake but they're getting a 10-year license. When you're a trapper, if you don't produce in two years, you don't get your license, you know. You lose it and somebody else uses it. Same with a commercial fisherman. Every year you have to buy your license to commercial fish.

And here they're given them a ten year license and they haven't produced an ounce of ore yet from that mine. So I don't see why they're given a ten-year license. You can give them a -- maybe a five-year license and they can review it to see if they're producing anything. It's been there for a long time and they haven't produced nothing, and they're still -- and now they're applying for a ten-year license, I don't think so. Thank you.

MR. HARDLOTTE: Thank you to our Elder Emil Hansen.

Just in summary, to the Panel and to the ladies and gentlemen that are here, we have the concerns from different trappers and hunters and traditional cultural land users, written down and on video and audio, and many of them echo the same concerns.

And the issue of the licensing was questionable right from the beginning when we had our

preparation meeting. And when we discussed this with the trappers, and the Prince Albert Grand Council is suggesting that there is a three year license for the Cigar Lake project, followed by an application for a five year license to see where Cameco goes with this project and what happens to the environment, the sustainability of the environment, and see who gets employed at this sites directly by Cameco or the subcontractors. Because we know in the Prince Albert Grand Council that number is not high from northern Saskatchewan for our First Nations people, and that's a concern of the leadership from the Prince Albert Grand Council.

The Prince Albert Grand Council is concerned about the environment and the natural resources in our ancestral and in maintaining that, and they are also concerned about the treaty issues surrounding our ancestral lands.

We are not partners in the sense of real partnership with any of the mining companies; we don't own big shares. We have a partnership in transportation with Northern Resource Trucking. We have a partnership in catering and raw crushing and other small jobs. We deal in hundreds of thousands of dollars in business but not the millions and the billions that are taken out from our ancestral lands, and we need to be a part of that.

In this Province of Saskatchewan, the First Nations are not a part of revenue sharing or royalties. All the southern communities and rural municipalities have revenue sharing, but not First Nations, where a lot of these minerals are taken out of in our ancestral lands. What are we left with at the end of the day? If we don't have it now, we'll never have it.

We get zero percent of royalties and revenue but we get 100 percent of the garbage; that is what one of the elders said. And one of the trappers from the area where there's a lot of exploration and the uranium mining stated, we were here long before the uranium mines and we'll be here long after. It's what we're left with that concerns me.

So with that the statement by Cameco with their assurance of success, the First Nations can assure there will be no success without First Nations involvement. (Speaking native).

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I would like to -- you raise many, many issues, and maybe we'll open up the discussion here for any questioning. Who wants to go? Dr. McDill.

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

Let me begin by asking a question. You presented both for Cigar Lake and Beaverlodge. You --

that was a comfortable thing for you to do? There was no -- that was your wish to do so?

Yes, thank you.

MR. HARDLOTTE: To answer that question, we were asked if we wanted to do ---

MEMBER MCDILL: Yes.

MR. HARDLOTTE: --- that, go through that process that way, and in dealing with Beaverlodge decommissioning and the Cigar Lake project, one would run into the next with our concerns. So at the beginning we had decided to go with the original agenda, but upon discussion we thought because they would overlap within our concerns that we would do both.

MEMBER MCDILL: Thank you.

I just wanted to make sure that that was a comfortable decision for you.

I -- the next question may be more difficult. You said at the outset that you believe that the First Nations should be granting the license. If you were granting the license, what would your position be?

MR. TSANNIE: I guess it comes from as two owners of the land. If I were to come into your home, in your backyard, start digging up your backyard and, you know, start putting a swimming pool or a little hut behind your house without talking to you, it's about partnership.

It's about building relationships with the First Nations.

This is our home. This is what we depend on. Long after uranium mining is gone, we're still going to be there. It's about building that partnership and relationship with the most -- with the impact to communities in the north. That's our home. We can't be taking -- we can't be stealing, that's what it is. We never gave up our right. We agreed to share the land.

So the people need to be included. We're having a meeting here in Saskatoon. There is only a handful of Dene people that are from -- ask them the question. Go into the communities in the Athabasca, would you give us the license to start tearing up the land. I can't speak for the people. Everybody has their own minds.

MEMBER McDILL: Is there anybody else in the group who would like to add to that?

MR. BEATTY: Yes.

The chief is making a point that when the treaties were signed we agreed to share this land so the newcomers would survive, to share the land to the depth of a plough, as it states in the treaties, and that the Indian's way of life would not be altered in any way or manner.

Of course, we know that's not true, and it

was very smart for the Government of Canada to get the Queen to sign away the United Kingdom's responsibility over Canada. And before that, for Canada to divide this country into territories and provinces, then to take the responsibility through such legislation as the Northern - the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement in 1930 and give the natural resources to the provinces and the territories when it was not theirs to give.

Those treaties have been broken many times. Now, the federal government and the provincial government are giving out licenses and there is no real duty to consult or accommodate with our First Nations people come to northern Saskatchewan communities. Even if there's one person that goes to that hall or talks to that person, they translate that as that duty to consult. Institutions and companies have done that to our northern people. That is why the Chief was making a point; we should be giving out the licences. We know that's not going to happen.

There was a comment earlier that there has always been tension between the Canadian government and the Government of Saskatchewan, and that they should work on that relationship to make it better and that it's getting better. Well, how about First Nations government? How about the First Nations people; the indigenous people of this land that you're taking all the wealth out of?

(inaudible)

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you -- look, there are certain issues that this panel, this Commission, cannot deal with, as sympathetic as we may be. But you keep referencing a few times about the duty to consult. Well, the Commission developed a whole protocol of what we thought was acceptable process for duty to consult and maybe I can ask our own people to just, very quickly, describe what is the process and you tell me what is wrong with it or what is missing in it because I'm missing something and maybe staff can tell us about what is your view of when a duty to consult is being exercised properly.

MS. MANN: Good afternoon. This is Kimberly Mann, for the record.

At the CNSC, as an agent of the Crown, prior to making a decision that may have an adverse impact on the Aboriginal or Treaty rights, we do realize we do have a duty to consult with potentially impacted communities. That could include a range of activities from our first letter of notification to meetings with the community to, if adverse impacts on practising of those protected rights are identified, of having those discussions of accommodation.

We do also take into account all the

activities that various proponents do do, so that the community meetings, the information they're sharing with the communities, the feedback they're coming back with, the mitigation that they're proposing, our various experts within the CNSC review that to consider if the proposed project is having an adverse impact on the environment. We do feel we go to the communities, ask for their input on those findings to identify any adverse impacts or any infringement on communities' ability to practise their rights.

And so there is a various -- various process and these hearings are also part of the process that communities can come forward and not just tell the staff but to tell our Commission members, and our Participant Funding Programme is also there to assist communities in this whole process.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the process, as we understand it, is within our own mandate. So what -- and I assume that that was done for the Cigar Lake and the Beaverlodge licence application process; is that correct?

MS. MANN: Yes. Kimberly Mann, for the record.

In conjunction, staff did travel with Cameco on various community meetings, participation in the environmental quality meetings, letters were sent, and we

had not heard -- we had heard various concerns about the projects like you've heard today, we felt that they were addressed through our reviews, but we had not heard specific infringements upon the practising of any other rights for either of those projects.

MR. HARDLOTTE: Thank you very much for that explanation.

There's a -- for the direct issue of did you do consult and accommodate, there's very few people that are with us here today that have been a part of those, and in the future the Chief suggests that all levels of First Nations be invited, whether it's from the hunters, trappers, fishers and gatherers, to First Nations leadership at those communities, and First Nations leadership at the Prince Albert Grand Council, and other tribal councils, and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, so that that information can be shared properly amongst everybody and that it's discussed properly at the meetings in Prince Albert Grand Council so that everybody is aware and everybody knows what's going on, not a handful of people, and not to be diluted by other discussions at the same time but just those issues where we are a part of the decision-making process.

And that's another question that I was asked by First Nations leadership when we came here, like,

are you just there to rubberstamp the process and they'll give them the 10-year licence regardless of what you say? And my answer was, they're going to do this hearing anyways. We need to be there to voice our opinion and to hear what the others and what the Commission has to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we believe that's very important for you to be here and to share with us your thoughts about what's working, what's not working. And, in fact, still on -- we're continuously told that Cameco, in fact, these communities are -- they've extolled the virtue of their discussion between Cameco and the community. But you are not very happy with the discussions, so maybe I'm going to ask Cameco.

You heard, I think, some criticism about the process itself of consultation and accommodation. Maybe you can comment about your view, about what you've done with the Council?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record.

I think it's important to sort of walk through this suite of tools we do use to engage in northern Saskatchewan, as was discussed earlier today. We do have a website and there's a good deal of pointing in conversations to the website for some of the documents that we use.

The Northern Saskatchewan Environmental

Quality Committee, the EQC that we heard from earlier today, has representatives from more than 30 committees from northern Saskatchewan that is administered by the province. The Northern Mines Monitoring Secretariat manages and facilitates the meetings of the EQC.

We also have the Athabaskan Working Group which is a group of representatives of six of the Athabasca First Nations, including Fond de Lac and Hatchet Lake and those -- there is a monitoring program associated with that as, well as ongoing meetings on a quarterly basis, as well as site tours.

We also look at our consultation process and, as I said earlier today, we do look for opportunities to improve that, and one of those opportunities that our corporate social responsibility group organized was a Leadership Round Table for northern Saskatchewan which really was asking the question, "How would you like to be consulted?"

And a good deal of our engagement, our efforts to discuss our project activities, our ongoing activities with northern Saskatchewan, was shaped around feedback that we had from that Northern Leadership Round Table.

We also have heard, on the communications piece, how we can be clear. There's animation videos that

we prepare to sort of walk through what exactly our mines are doing, to give them a very physical sense to things.

We also, because of our numerous visits to northern Saskatchewan, we have a good deal of information on what are the frequently asked questions. And so we developed fact sheets in that regard and we circulate those at the meetings that we have in northern Saskatchewan, as well as try to get them onto our website for broader distribution.

So there is a -- there's not just one way that we try to engage in northern Saskatchewan. It's a multi-faceted, well thought out, and comprehensive programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you meet -- it seems to me that the Grand Council represents a pretty important segment of, you know, the whole northern population. Have you met with them and discussed the various portfolios?

MR. MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney again, for the record.

I'm going to apologize. Garry Merasty, our Vice-President of Corporate Social Responsibility, was going to be here with us today; he could not be.

I can say that we have engaged with communities that are in the vicinity of our operations, and a lot of the members of the PAGC that were listed

earlier are in those group of communities that we engage directly with, whether it be the leadership, whether it be the appointed EQC rep, whether it be the AWG representative.

So I can't say positively on the PAGC. I can say with respect to those communities that are impacted by -- that have potential to be impacted by our operations that we do engage with those.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Maybe I can redirect that question. Have any of you here today spoken to people at Cameco? Have any of you who are sitting in front of us today -- maybe I'll say sitting with us today -- spoken to Cameco?

MR. BEATTY: Yeah, we speak to Cameco. I speak to Gary, some Darwin Roy (phonetic) from -- but because I know them personally but we don't -- haven't sat down. I've been in leadership since October. Met with them in Vancouver once with Gary and them. But there has been some contact. But we talk about duty to consult and accommodate. I think that's what we were kind of talking about and kind of drifted off.

MEMBER McDILL: Let me rephrase the question. In terms of consultation, the duty to consult, at what level have those conversations occurred?

MR. BEATTY: With me, nothing, zero. It's new to me with the relicensing and the 10-year Beaverlodge, but then again, I'm newly elected since October, so this was my first opportunity to be part of this.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're familiar with the Pinehouse deal that they just cut? What do you think about that?

MR. BEATTY: Like it's an opportunity. At least the community is getting something out of it. I've been living on the reserve in Hatchet Lake. I used to be on council in Hatchet Lake. I used to work with youth and the kids. We used to be lucky if we can get \$5,000 from the mining companies.

Cost to fly nine kids across to points north \$900 one-way to fly. If you want to take a hockey team, sports team down the cost is so high.

But now I know there's other opportunities. We want to attract more businesses in our communities. We're trying to build a road in our community and we're having a hard time building that road. But anything -- any opportunities in partnerships with the companies I think the community would be open to something like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MEMBER McDILL: One more if I might, Mr.

Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MEMBER McDILL: With respect to websites and that sort of thing, I think it's fair to say that my elders have some trouble with that also. But have you -- have the youth, for example, who may be more savvy with that sort of thing, have you invited the Elders in to see these animations so that they can understand perhaps a little better what is being proposed?

I understand the concern of the Elders. If you don't have a name for uranium or a name for selenium you can hardly say well in Latin it comes from. But this is something that I think the youth could have a very strong role in helping some of the Elders have a more -- yeah, a share it, a more visual understanding of what's happening.

MR. BEATTY: No, we're getting -- I know the community gets the cell phone services now from the mining company because they have a tower at Rabbit Lake. Not all the communities have cell service still. We're still isolated communities.

And technology is very important. A lot of the young people are using technology nowadays, like the iPad, iPhones, but that transition -- you know, we put stuff on, we expect -- we can't expect the Elders to look

at the website and animation. We're visual people. They need to touch, and feel and smell things. That's how they learn.

But that transition -- if there's an opportunity to have that transition from the young and teach the old and both vice versa, the traditional, I think that would be awesome.

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just I guess a few basic questions I'd like to start off with, if that's okay, and one of them deals with Beaverlodge, for example, and I'm wondering if you are happy with the progress -- obviously not as happy as you could be -- in trying to clean up the area of Beaverlodge, and is it really happening, is it really -- and are you part of the on-going discussions, if you want, or monitoring of the clean-up?

I guess it's a variety of questions but perhaps you can answer that.

MR. BEATTY: Yeah, Ron Beatty.

The process -- the clean-up occurred in 1983 to 1985, a two-year clean-up of mostly building structures and a few tonnes of material removed from the surrounding area around the tailings pipes and stuff. But

other than that it's routine monitoring and its continually and slowly removing some of those responsibilities from the CNSC towards Sask Environment, but there is no clean-up, no.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So what I'm hearing is that there's been no clean-up over the last 10 to 15 years really?

MR. BEATTY: That's right. And it's going to continue that way in the next licence period. It's just routine monitoring.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: And are you part of the monitoring of the clean-up? Is the community involved?

MR. BEATTY: The Prince Albert Grand Council's involvement is the Participant Funding Program that we just received.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay.

MR. BEATTY: That's our involvement.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: And the Participant Funding Program is from CNSC not from Cameco?

MR. BEATTY: That's right.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

My next question is to CNSC. The Saskatchewan service water quality objective, how do they compare with the -- I guess with the natural objectives for surface watering?

MR. ELDER: I'll ask Mike Rinker to answer the question.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker, for the record. Could I clarify? How do you mean how do they ---

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Well, you know, what's going to happen is that they're looking for approval to release untreated water that meet discharge guidelines Saskatchewan surface water quality objective. Is that acceptable to the CNSC, the levels of contamination, if there is, in surface water?

MR. RINKER: And this is for Beaverlodge?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Yes, for Beaverlodge. That's correct, yes.

MR. RINKER: So the objective is a level below which we would know that the environment is protected, above which you would have to do an assessment to see are the species which that objective was set present and are they at risk.

So they're appropriate values -- the Saskatchewan surface water quality objectives are appropriate values for what we would ---

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So they're acceptable to CNSC is what you're saying?

MR. RINKER: Yes, they are acceptable, yes.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you. The next question really is that in terms of contamination of the Beaverlodge again area, how much of the area is not fit for food consumption?

And I know there's been some monitoring done and testing of fish and animals in the area, but are there any areas that you would certainly not, I guess, gather food, or hunt, or fish in that area?

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record.

There is a fish advisory -- provincial fish advisory on one of the lakes at Beaverlodge. So it's a consumption advisory, do not consume more than this amount.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: And is it for the Beaverlodge Lake or just for an area of the Beaverlodge Lake?

And the reason why I'm asking that is because just a few days ago I was looking on the internet for fishing lodges, Beaverlodge fishing lodge, and if anybody's got a few thousand bucks to spend they can go spend four days fishing up there, apparently, and there's no mention at all that this area may or may not be contaminated if you do spend the money to go fish there. And I'm wondering really if we're aware of that and if

they are aware of that in terms of contamination.

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record.

Yes, it is on Beaverlodge Lake, and there are -- you know, when we get to the presentation, there are posted signs around the lake about the warning. Again, it's a consumption -- it's not a zero consumption warning it's a do not eat more than a certain amount a week.

DR. BARRIAULT: Okay. And have you noticed any decrease in these numbers from public health or are they maintained the same or are they increasing?

MR. BEATTY: Beaverlodge Lake is four lakes down from the original tailings site. So we got Minnewater Lake, Marie Lake, Fookes Lake.

DR. BARRIAULT: Okay.

MR. BEATTY: Muskeg into Greer Lake then into Beaverlodge Lake. So it's still -- it's going to continue to persist.

DR. BARRIAULT: I understand that. Yeah. In terms of commercial fishing operation, is there any commercial fishing operations on that area of the lake?

MR. ELDER: Not in that area.

DR. BARRIAULT: Thank you. In terms of, I guess, and just to reiterate Dr. McDill, duty to consult, obviously, there's a lot of room for improvement. Are

there any committees that you can be involved with to be part of that communication package, if you want?

MR. HARDLOTTE: Yes, we have a lands and resources department within the Prince Albert Grand Council that should be notified on all the issues. And so that we can work with our First Nations. And I know that a lot of companies and institutions go to individual people and sometimes individual First Nations and try and deal with them and say that they've consulted. And what they do includes everybody, all our First Nations in northern Saskatchewan.

DR. BARRIAULT: So even though they're not part of the group, if you want, just by virtue of the fact that they've been consulted, it's assumed that they've consulted everybody?

MR. HARDLOTTE: Absolutely.

DR. BARRIAULT: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Chair.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you, Mr. President. A couple of questions for Cameco. A number of times today, you have said, you know, you're continuously improving and listening to what your stakeholders have had to say.

So the intervener we've just heard from now has presented a picture quite different from some of the

earlier interveners we've heard today. I don't know how much of this is a surprise to you, but I wanted to get a sense of your reaction to it and what are you planning on doing about this?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record. We do consult with the dually elected representatives of the First Nations and their representatives that they put forward for consultation, that's part of the program.

The relationship between those First Nations and PAGC, that becomes a bit more complicated then, but we do feel quite strongly that we are talking to the right people. If we need to be talking to potentially a broader circle in relation to that, that's something we would take away.

MEMBER VELSHI: I think what you've heard, and I think I heard that, that they believe you need to speak to a wider group of people than you probably have. So maybe something for you to investigate.

My second one is ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, just a clarification. Is the Grand Council not an elected body of the communities?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record. We -- when I say the elected representatives of the community, I mean the band council and elected band

members, not necessarily the PAGC. There's a difference there, if you will. And PAGC, by all means, is dually elected representatives, but there's two different levels to the conversation.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it seems to me you should hedge your bet and you consult with all. That would be my advice, let's put it this way.

Sorry, Ms. Velshi.

DR. McDILL: We have -- an Elder would like to speak to that. I just saw a hand.

MR. McLEOD: Thanks for the -- I'm not an Elder. For the record, my name is Robin McLeod, I work for the Prince Albert Grand Council. To answer the question that this guy was trying to answer on our behalf, the Grand Council works for the First Nations, it's not the other way around. The First Nations don't work for us, we work for them.

The only role we have, duty to consult and accommodate, is to facilitate meetings. That's our only role. We cannot answer to the duty to consult at the PAGC level unless we're mandated by the First Nation -- the actual First Nation that requires duty to consult. If they mandate us to facilitate and also to answer questions, then we will do so. But any given day, we are not -- we cannot answer questions on duty to consult, we

have to pass it on to the actual affected First Nation.

And the duty to consult doesn't end in leadership, it doesn't end with the chief, it doesn't end with the chief and council, it still has to go to the grassroots level. Usually, it goes to the land users; the land users that are affected within the area, which is likely a trapper, commercial fisherman. And then it goes back to chief and council and then it goes back to you.

So there's -- there has to be a process there that Cameco has to respect or any other industry. There are many times, you'll come to chief and council and they cannot provide you with an immediate answer. So you have to respect that because they want to be sure they answer it properly. And in some cases, you have to go back to the grassroots people to get the proper answer. So Cameco has to respect that. That's duty to consult.

And I heard somebody saying letter writing, that's not duty to consult. Maybe it's a first step to say we need to talk with you on the duty to consult and set up a meeting. That's all you can do in letter writing. You can't say: "We're going to go into this territory, we're just letting you know." I've seen so many letters like that from industry. They don't get the permission, they just tell the First Nation, say: "We're going to go here."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that information.

Ms. Velshi.

MR. MOONEY: Sorry, it's Liam Mooney, again, for the record. On engagement with the PAGC, there has been engagement specific to Cigar with a PAG [sic] representative and notifying others within the PAGC. So there has been efforts with respect to consultation. It's not that there's been nothing with no attempt in that regard with PAGC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Velshi.

MEMBER VELSHI: Okay. So I'm just going to shift gears to something else that the chief had -- sorry, the Elder had mentioned earlier. Which was about what happens once the mine closes and the young folks who have been attracted to the mine have not learned the life skills of hunting and fishing.

In your experience over the decades in the mining business in northern Saskatchewan, is this a fairly mobile population? So they've learned some great skills, technical skills and do they move to a different mine? Is this capacity mobile?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record. I wouldn't speak to -- have that sort of information readily at hand. I would speak to some of the successes

that we've had with some of the contracts -- the contracting parties that we've worked with who have enjoyed success.

The one example immediately at hand was the teen drilling experience at Cigar Lake, where they had good, hands-on learning doing some of the surface drilling at Cigar Lake and then took diamond drilling opportunities elsewhere, not specific to Cameco, not specific to uranium exploration necessarily.

So there's that example. There's also examples of other contractors that we've worked with who have enjoyed success in northern Saskatchewan and have started to take those skills into southern Saskatchewan and sometimes into northern Alberta. So there is a degree of portability there, an ability to take those skills other than working at only northern Saskatchewan opportunities.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you. Did you want to comment on that?

MR. HARDLOTTE: Yes, thank you. And concerning that, the successes -- I'm not sure what successes he's talking about, but I know there's quite a few indigenous people or Aboriginal people that work at the mines from southern Saskatchewan and other areas, not necessarily from northern Saskatchewan.

And I know that I've helped to run training programs for heavy equipment operators and we've had to hire most of those people through First Nations companies because when they go to the mines, they get jobbed out a lot. And then what happens then is you give someone such a hard time that they quit. And the comment that we've heard many times is that those people can't last, they're quitters, but sometimes when they're getting jobbed out it's very hard to stay.

And I know a few of the folks that have gone to the oil sands and most of them are not from northern Saskatchewan.

So that's what I have to say about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Monsieur Tolgyesi?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Merci. You know, I hear and I understand what your concerns are. You were naming the language translation, trappers not too happy with exploration, and mining, and noise. There's no training, no First Nation involvement. You were talking about five-year licence. First Nations, there is no revenue sharing. Licensing should be done by First Nations. First Nations should be part of decision.

For some issues we are not the appropriate forum here, that's for sure, because we should do what the

law and the regulator is giving us a frame.

For some others it is the forum for you to be involved, and I will say exactly like this hearing, this is the way we would like to hear what those stakeholders are there -- what they're concerns are.

Now, after what I was hearing, my understanding is that you are not too happy with present relations with Cameco, at least -- I should say, at least not too happy. And I believe this is a subject number one, the most important to work because you are neighbours, you are working -- you are living and working next as neighbours.

So what I would like to hear is that are you -- specifically on the Cigar Lake project, are you against or in favour of this project and if in favour with what conditions?

CHIEF TSANNIE: Like we said earlier, we're not against development, but we want to be part of the decision making. We want to be included. We do have a long way to go, building relationships. We do have a long way to go with jobs. Racism in the companies or at the mine sites, there's still lots of that happening.

I have a brother that was working there. He got let go just about a week ago.

Lots of jobs -- we still need lots of jobs

in our communities. A lot of young people are still living off the welfare. Why is that?

You know, we -- I went to Germany; I went to a nuclear power plant and they get their uranium from my backyard, you know. I don't know. Some things aren't right still. We need to fill those gaps and start building those relationships.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I jump -- just for clarification again, on the employment, what would be the local engage percentage, let's say, in Cigar Lake?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

Out of the 250 or a little bit more employees that we have on site, as Cameco employees, 134 of them are residents of Saskatchewan's north, which is our way of measuring the employment from the local communities there.

And we have many more employees from our communities through are contractors who are on the site. These are people who provide mining services, camp services as well.

So we have a fair number of employees at the north -- from Saskatchewan's north.

THE CHAIRMAN: So they would come -- so you haven't got kind of a ballpark figure what would come from this community that are in front of you, from the

intervenor's community?

MR. MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney, for the record.

I don't have a ballpark from the communities that are members of the PAGC. Broader than the Cigar Lake story, on Cameco's numbers for northern Saskatchewan we have in our direct employment over 750 residents of Saskatchewan's north, and in our contract there's a count for just slightly over 1,000.

So roughly we have 50 percent of our employees and our contractors employees in northern Saskatchewan that are residents of Saskatchewan's north.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view on these numbers?

CHIEF TSANNIE: Can you define residents of Saskatchewan's north?

MR. HARDLOTTE: Just to talk about that too. One of the Elders told me when you go there -- when they say northern residents make sure -- because a lot of people are bringing siblings and friends from southern Saskatchewan, and they show them the process of getting an address in La Ronge or another community and they become northern residents, and that goes on a percentage of what the northern companies hire as a northern resident.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, in your view, how many

Aboriginal actually are employed?

MR. HANSEN: Emil Hanson, Elder of Hatchet Lake Band.

When we first met with the mining company discovered on Rabbit Lake, the agreement that they had made with the Athabasca region communities -- the Athabasca region, that's the communities that are affected by the mining and the Wollaston Lake, that's supposed to be 50 percent of the people from the Athabasca region. That was the agreement.

Today we don't think there's 50 percent of our people from the Athabasca region working there. There mostly is southerners, or eastern people, or western. They come from all over. And these are former employees of Cameco in the other countries and they bring them to the Athabasca region and I don't think they have 50 percent of the Athabasca people working in those mines, and that was the agreement that was made with the government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Cameco, do you want to react to that?

MR. MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney, for the record.

I can't dig much deeper into the numbers that I have. Those are the numbers that we've pulled from

our employees. And I've taken them on good faith for what they are, and they are in line with the commitments that are made under our service lease agreements with the Province of Saskatchewan.

And I can say that the efforts of Cameco are to bring those numbers up. We'd like to see them higher than that. And efforts to look at different means of doing that creatively have been a focus point for Gary Merasty and his team over the last few years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Monsieur Tolgyesi?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: I have a last. It's kind of technical. Was there any simulation done on the long-term impact, the discharge to Seru Bay? Because, you know, there are concerns about the impact. And do you do some simulation and what the results are?

MR. MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney, for the record.

Yes, there was an environmental risk assessment done in support of the environmental assessment for the new discharge point in Seru Bay as opposed to the previous one at Aline Creek. Ultimately that supported the conclusion in the environmental assessment that there were no significant adverse effects -- potential significant adverse effects associated with that changing discharge.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: You have something to add to that?

MR. RINKER: Perhaps not much to add, other than to confirm it was an environmental assessment that was completed in 2011, reviewed by the CNSC and deemed to be acceptable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well let me piggyback on that one.

Somewhere in, I don't remember if it's Beaverlodge, or in Cigar Lake, or in Gunnar, there was a commitment to do the whole Northern Saskatchewan water flow kind of a study. Where is that and when is it going to start and who is in charge? Is it Saskatchewan Research Council?

MR. ELDER: Just -- Peter Elder, for the record.

There is a provincial program that is looking at a wide area of monitoring around where the mine sites are. So it's -- there was a current -- there was a program that has run for a number of years. Every province has recently just restarted a second phase of that program. So it's -- it is in operation now.

THE CHAIRMAN: And when can we see some results out of this?

MR. ELDER: We'll have to get back to you

exactly on the results. Most of these types of programs do about a five-year cycle before you actually see results.

THE CHAIRMAN: At any rate, can you, between now and tomorrow or something, try to find out the reference so we can keep track?

MR. MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney again for the record.

I would add to that the Eastern Athabasca Regional Monitoring Program that's being run out of the provincial oil watershed initiative does have a country foods component as part of that study and it looked at the health of the country foods in the area that -- and it's -- that information was that the berries, the meat and the fish and water were safe to drink in that regard.

So there's both the water monitoring but also a country foods component to address any concerns in relation to the consumption of the food and water in that area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you. My question is back to the intervenors again.

Now that you have spoken to us, I hope you will stay tomorrow and if there are questions that you have that we can at least get them into the system.

So will you stay tomorrow?

Yes? Some of you?

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, anybody else has any other questions?

Well, you heard that the discussion -- you have the last word.

MR. HARDLOTTE: I'll give the last word to the Chief but before we do that the hunters and trappers and our traditional cultural land users do not have access to the internet and a lot of these people live out on the land and they only come out at certain times; one of them being Christmas of course and the other is the spring break where they come and sell their furs after the winter season and that's the time we had our Northern Saskatchewan Trappers Association Convention, at that time. But that time, they get their grub steak again and they go back for spring trapping and they don't usually come back until the end of April or the middle of May to sell their furs again before the trapping season ends.

And most of those people are then the commercial fishermen and guides at the outfitter camps in Northern Saskatchewan until the fall trapping season again where they leave in October and don't come back to the communities until December. So those are the times that

we try to meet and discuss the issues with these individuals.

Other than that, they've said like -- some of the elders that came to the trappers' convention said "You guys come out. Come and see what's happening to our land and the 45-gallon drums and the garbage that's being left on our trap lines by the drillers and the other exploration that's being done on our lands." And what's it going to look like after the mine starts? And what's it going to look like after they leave? Those are their concerns. And again it's not always easy to communicate with these people because of their isolation and the work that they do on their trap lines.

And let me state that a previous speaker had said that trapping was dead. Three years ago, the number of trappers in Northern Saskatchewan was less than 1,100. Those were the licences that were issued. In the last three years, the Asian market has opened up to the wild furs in Northern Saskatchewan and Northern Canada.

And for the first time in its 40 year history, Robertson's trading post sold 100 percent of their furs last year. Because the Asian markets, mainly China, and Japan, Korea and Taiwan buy any kind of wild fur that's healthy, that they use for garments.

And we know that they have millions of

people that they need to clothe over there. And the only natural clothing that the creator gave us was that fur and they're not opposed to that, say like Green Peace or PETA that killed the European and the American and Canadian markets for the wearing of fur. The prices have never been better for wild fur than they are right now. And if you look at the North American fur auction site for the December sales, they broke all kinds of records.

As of our trappers convention March 14th and 15th there was almost 3,000 registered trappers in Northern Saskatchewan now. And that number is coming up because everybody is learning of the prices of the fur. And we encourage them to be out there because they need to occupy our ancestral lands and a lot of them never had that opportunity when trapping was taken away.

Because they went out there, they needed snowmobiles now; they need gasoline and other equipment which they couldn't pay for when there was absolutely no price for any of the animals.

Also the First Nations including Meadow Lake Tribal Council and the Prince Albert Grand Council were involved in a research project called the Indigenous People's Health Research Centre which ran out of the First Nation's University of Canada in partnership with University of Toronto, University of Saskatchewan and

University of Regina.

One of the people that did a research project on cancer and diabetes and the consumption of country foods in Northern Saskatchewan was Dr. Rose Roberts. Dr. Rose Roberts did a presentation at the Northern Saskatchewan Trappers Association Convention and she defined, in her research project, the consumption of moose meat, caribou meat, the fish, the beaver, muskrats, the migrating water fowl to Northern Saskatchewan and as it pertains to industry, specifically gold and uranium mining in Northern Saskatchewan. And she documented that in a book that's available from her.

She is on her way back from Australia where she did a presentation on this project in the past week. And referring to that, there was already a country foods study done in Northern Saskatchewan around Uranium City but more upriver than downstream to where our people live.

And our people want to be involved in the more specific and extensive country food study that would include the moose, the caribou, the beaver, the muskrats, the fish, the water fowl and especially the ground quality, the air quality and the water quality at ground zero, 10 kilometres away, 100 kilometres away, 200 kilometres away, or down river, right to the Churchill River and how it affects the water and the animals.

We want to participate in the next session of hearings but with more involvement from our First Nations communities. We did what we could with the money that we had for this hearing and the time that we had but there needs to be more involvement from our First Nations communities, our elders, our youth, as well as our leadership.

And on that I just want to say, a lot of the leadership had called and apologized because the Prince Albert Band Council had a tough Easter weekend where they buried the mother of Gary Merasty at Pelican Arrows.

And I would say that's why Gary Merasty is not here with us today.

He's in bereavement, as well as another Elder from the Lac La Ronge Indian Band and the former Chief and a present councillor that they buried a couple of days ago in Black Lake, and also my brother that had a construction company and a fly-in fishing lodge whom we buried on Monday.

So it's been a rather busy weekend for our leadership, and they apologize that they couldn't be here.

But we want to discuss the next round of hearings and we want to discuss a proposal on a country foods study that would include the Prince Albert Grand

Council, our institution, the First Nations University of Canada, and a partnership with either University of Saskatchewan or University of Regina and have those academics work with our traditional and cultural land users in their ancestral lands in a more comprehensive country food study that's multi-year and ongoing, not just for two years or five years.

And who would buy into that? And who really wants to hear that?

That is for our people's sake, so that they know what they are consuming.

And with the expansion of uranium mines and the expansion of the industry in Northern Saskatchewan, it becomes more important.

In the participation of these hearings, we'd like to be able to get funding to broadcast specifically in Dene and Cree to our First Nations communities in the halls, as well as if school is in session at that time, not the whole day, but an hour in the morning and an hour in the afternoon to the schools in Northern Saskatchewan so that our youth know what's going on and they get a chance to voice their opinion at a later date on what's being said at these hearings.

And I just want to go back to one issue that the trappers had brought up at the Northern

Saskatchewan Trappers Association Convention, and that's the issue of our highways in Northern Saskatchewan, specifically the highway from La Ronge all the way to Black Lake and Fond-du-Lac, and the lack of a highway to Wollaston Lake.

The further north you go, the narrower the road gets. It seems to get more windy as you go north, and there's a lot of tractor-trailer traffic and it's mainly our partnership with Trimac, Northern Resource Trucking, where we have very few drivers driving also professionally from the Dene and Woodland Cree communities. But the condition of those highways is appalling.

The crowning of those roads is very poor. The width of those roads is not sufficient.

For the money that's taken out through natural resources from Northern Saskatchewan, we feel that the Government of Canada and the Province of Saskatchewan, in partnership with the companies -- and hopefully we're partners in those companies in the future -- can fix those roads so there's less cost to First Nations and vehicles and less cost in lives for accidents for our people in Northern Saskatchewan.

With that, I'd like to thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to present our concerns to

you.

And I know that Dr. Binder had stated that there's some issues that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission cannot deal with, but we wanted to voice the opinion of the people that was stated to us, and we know that some of these issues you cannot deal with, but we want the governments and the people to hear those concerns.

With that, I'll let Chief Dasani finish.

CHIEF TSANNIE: Thank you.

Just in closing, I just want to thank you again for the opportunity to present here. I want to thank my colleagues and the Elder, Emil Hansen, the youth, Adam Jobb.

I think a lot has been said already. I just thank you for the opportunity. Looking forward to working with you and building those relationships. Looking forward to working with Cameco in the next couple of years.

Just with that, I think there are some concerns with the translation with the Elders and making sure that information is shared properly with our people back home, because we have our people -- I had posted some stuff on Facebook just so they know what's going on, and they said, "Why are they meeting down in Saskatoon? This

is our home. They're destroying our land here." But I think we need to communicate and make sure that we include them because it's their home.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know that the next meeting is in La Ronge in September?

CHIEF TSANNIE: That's still six hours south from -- we still don't have a road, so it depends. We might have to build a road first, wait until we have a road.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. It was very useful. Thank you.

Okay. The next presentation is by AREVA Resources Canada as outlined in CMD 13-H5.6 and 5.6A, and I understand that Mr. Corman will make his presentation. Please proceed.

13-H5.6/13-H5.6A

Oral presentation by

AREVA Resources Canada

MR. CORMAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, and members of the Commission. I am Jim Corman, Vice-President of Operations and Projects of AREVA Resources Canada. I am here today to speak on behalf of the three minority partners of the Cigar Lake Joint Venture in

support of Cameco's request for a renewal of the CNSC licence for the Cigar Lake Project for a 10-year term.

Also in attendance today are Mr. Hirai, President of Idemitsu Canada Resources Ltd. and Mr. Fujinami, President and CEO of TEPCO Resources Inc.

In my presentation, I will briefly describe the Cigar Lake Joint Venture and provide the details for supporting the licence for the Cigar Lake Project.

The Cigar Lake Project is a joint venture among Cameco Corporation, AREVA Resources Canada, Idemitsu Canada Resources and TEPCO Resources.

As you can see on the ownership percentages outlined in this slide, the minority partners of the Cigar Lake Joint Venture have a significant interest in the Cigar Lake Project, collectively totalling just under 50 percent.

As partners in this project, we have a strong vested interest in seeing that the Cigar Lake Project operates in a safe and environmentally sound manner.

I will now briefly introduce each of the minority companies, starting with AREVA. AREVA Resources is a fully-owned subsidiary of the AREVA Group, which provides solutions for energy generators for both nuclear and renewable energy. The AREVA Group has close to 47,000

employees worldwide with a presence in 100 countries.

AREVA's uranium exploration and mining activity is focused primarily in Saskatchewan and Nunavut.

AREVA currently operates the McLean Lake Mill, where we will process all of the Cigar Lake ore.

McLean Lake commenced operation in 1995 and holds a current CNSC licence expiring in 2017.

Next year, AREVA Resources Canada will be proud to celebrate its 50th year of operating in Canada.

Our next minority partner is Idemitsu Canada Resources, which is a subsidiary of Idemitsu Kosan, a company headquartered in Tokyo, Japan, which was founded in 1911 and currently employs about 8,200 people.

Idemitsu is a diverse company with a focus on energy, primarily in oil, coal and, of course, in uranium with its share in the Cigar Lake Project.

Our third minority partner, TEPCO Resources, is a subsidiary of TEPCO, Tokyo Electric Power Company, with its head office located in Tokyo, Japan. TEPCO has close to 40,000 employees. TEPCO is the largest electric utility in Japan and the fourth largest electric utility in the world, with a generating capacity of more than 63,000 megawatts.

TEPCO's aim is to have a well-balanced power generation environment that includes different types

of power generation methods, including nuclear, thermal and renewable energy sources.

The Cigar Lake Project, discovered in 1981 is the second largest high-grade uranium deposit in the world. Construction of the project began in 2005 and collectively we have invested more than \$2 billion on its development with significant expenditures remaining to be spent.

The Cigar Lake Project has been through several environmental assessments and multiple CNSC licensing reviews, leading to this request to commence production in 2013.

Significant efforts have been undertaken by Cameco to ensure that the public and Aboriginal groups have been informed of the project and substantial measures have been taken to ensure the socioeconomic benefits of the Cigar Lake Project are shared with the residents of Saskatchewan's north and that employment and other opportunities have been afforded to Aboriginal groups and communities of Northern Saskatchewan.

Lastly, but no less importantly, it is our strong view that Cameco has met and will continue to meet the requirements to protect the health and safety of persons and the environment.

As partners in the Cigar Lake Project we

are pleased that throughout the significant reclamation and construction activities to date, and ongoing at the Cigar Lake site, that Cameco has maintained a strong safety record and has consistently demonstrated excellent leadership commitment to ensuring the safety of those persons working at the mine site.

As minority partners, we have been part of the Cigar Lake Project for over two decades. In recent years, we have increased our involvement in the project through the Management Committee, the Steering Committee, technical committees, secondments and third-party reviews.

As major international corporations, we operate the high standards in our own right as part of the broader nuclear energy industry. We are fully aware of the attributes necessary to be a safe and reliable operator in the context of the nuclear energy sector.

With that background, our review and oversight of how Cameco is managing our investment provides us with confidence in Cameco as the operator of our joint venture.

In conclusion, we submit that Cameco is qualified to operate the licensed facility and has the appropriate measures in place to ensure the protection of the environment and workers during the operation of the mine and that all measures are now in place to allow the

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission to grant the 10-year licence for the operation of the Cigar Lake Project.

Thank you for your attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Questions?

Ms. Velshi.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you, Mr. President.

As minority partners in this venture, what do you see as being the key risks to this project?

MR. CORMAN: The key risks of the project are the challenges that Mother Nature has thrown at the team in terms of accessing into the ore body.

The Cigar Lake Team has done an amazing job in working through those challenges, mitigating those risks and moving safely and diligently through bringing the asset to the point where we can put it into production.

Groundwater inflows, obviously, have a long history at Cigar Lake and the measures that have been implemented at Cigar in terms of management of water from underground pumping, freezing systems, treatment systems and discharge now position ourselves such that the safety of the mine is secure.

MEMBER VELSHI: So what you're saying is with the mitigation measures in place, the residual risk you see to be fairly minor then?

MR. CORMAN: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER MCDILL: Within the minority partners, is there any experience with a 10-year licence of this nature, heading from such a construction through to the other end of full production?

MR. CORMAN: With our operations at McLean Lake, we started under the AECB regulatory regime. So certainly at that time, when we initiated our operations, licensing terms were of a much shorter duration.

We're very supporting of the direction that the Commission has gone with longer licensing terms and the opportunity on an annual basis to present the projects and status updates to the Commission and to the public. We see this as a very positive step forward.

Our current licence term at McLean Lake is eight years, expiring in 2017.

MEMBER MCDILL: But that eight-year licence was for an existing producing line, right?

MR. CORMAN: That's correct.

MEMBER MCDILL: I'm getting a hand waving so I'm going to go to staff and find out what precisely this means.

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder for the record.

I think what's happening in that eight-year

period actually at McLean Lake, I believe when they had their eight-year licence, they had five or six major events, and some they didn't predict of going back in in terms of bringing new -- potentially bringing new pits online, doing -- you know, McLean Lake is the receiver of the high-grade ore from Cigar Lake. Well, it's going to go through. It's actually commissioning to high-grade ore under this eight-year licence.

So while it was built and operating before, it had never actually gone through its intended purpose and be fully operational. So it's very similar to Cigar Lake in terms of developments there. They proved their processes, but they haven't actually -- you know, both of them will go through their full production mode in the next year or so.

MEMBER McDILL: So this suggestion of a 10-year licence is not as unprecedented perhaps as it sounds?

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder for the record.

There are a number of 10-year licences. In fact, our first ones which are for the Slowpokes, you'll see going with ---

MEMBER McDILL: Excluding ---

MR. ELDER: Excluding. No, I'm just saying personal, but if you'd asked the rest of the partners, I would refer you back to one of the petitioned funding

interventions on the Blind River relicence renewal from last year that actually looked at licence length because we were proposing, at that time, a 10-year licence for Blind River, and North Watch had actually done a study comparing a 10-year licence to international practice, and that study actually said 10 years is at the low end internationally.

MEMBER McDILL: Blind River, though, is not a mine.

MR. ELDER: I understand. It was a general study of nature of that one. So I'm just saying that this is not unusual in terms of where we've gone, and we don't see that there are any major -- you know, the technology has been proven to this point and all the controls are in place to make sure that if there are issues, we will know about it and you will know about it very quickly regardless of the length of the licence.

MR. MOONEY: Commissioner McDill, it's Liam Mooney for the record.

On that, I think another point related, we've already had a construction licence going into an operating licence.

Looking at the mining regime more broadly and leaving outside the nuclear regime, you see no shortage of similar resource development opportunities

where it's for the life -- the projected life -- of the facility.

If you're going to change something, there's an environmental assessment and those sorts of thing, but the 10-year licence, I would submit to you, is unique when you look at the reserves and resources. This is what the projected life of the facility is and there's an approval in relation to it.

So I appreciate that the 10-year licence on the nuclear scale is a little bit light, but I also point to some of the other sister mining operations and what they have for licences.

MEMBER MCDILL: Did you have a follow-up?

MR. ELDER: Two points on that one, I think, that remind me of the same thing. I said if this was any other type of mine, you get approval from an environmental assessment to construct, operate and decommission all at once.

Obviously, we're not suggesting that. We still think there's value to periodically reviewing things.

The other one is from a risk perspective in a mine, there isn't a big change in risk going from construction to operation. In fact, in this one I think you could argue the bigger risk was in construction than

going into operation. You're adding a different risk. There's certainly change in the radiation protection risk, but the overall risk of the facility is not changing that rapidly, changing fundamentally, and any mine is an ongoing construction project.

MEMBER MCDILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: But nevertheless, we've heard now from a few intervenors, rightly or wrongly, that they have some angst about a 10-year licence.

So let me ask you: is there a way to allay some of this fear or concern in the first year or the second year of the annual report to be a bit more forthcoming or dealing with some of those concerns, and maybe the first year have the public annual report.

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder for the record.

One of the things that -- some ideas we looked at, you know, I think one of the things we recognized we need to do better on our routine outreach into these communities, which happens a number of times a year, is to do -- is to remind everybody that we're going to do these -- we're doing these annual reports and that that's an opportunity to intervene.

And you know we meet with the -- the environmental stewardship -- the Environment Quality Councils on a routine basis. It's to walk them through

what the reporting will going on and how they can put their concerns and bring them to the Commission.

And yes, we can look at -- like we've done, you know, as -- as the reports -- the annual reports go forward, you can have special emphasis on one project versus another depending on what's happening on those projects. We already did that, I think, a bit last year when we focused on one facility that the Commission had not seen for a number of years.

So there are lots of opportunities to do that, but we've recognized what we need to do also is to let the communities know when their opportunities are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thanks.

Dr. McDill.

Dr. Velshi. Ms. Velshi.

MEMBER VELSHI: It's a question for AREVA. In the different types of involvement, you mentioned secondment was one of the ways you're involved in the project. Can you elaborate on that and what the purpose of the secondment is? Is it to augment the capability that exists or -- and in what areas?

MR. CORMAN: Yes, thank you for the -- for the questions. Jim Corman, for the record.

We've had opportunities to -- to place secondees into the -- into the project team on the Cigar

Lake Project during the -- during the construction phase and -- and also gearing up now into -- towards operations. So we've had teams -- secondees involved with the surface freeze drilling. We've had experience -- it -- it's been an opportunity where we've had experienced people with certain aspects of the work that was being done at Cigar Lake and an opportunity for us to share our experiences and -- and insight with the Cameco teams for the betterment of the -- the project.

So we've been involved with the surface freeze drilling aspects. We've been involved with the jet boring system as well. We have a similar kind of mining system that we've been testing at McClean Lake for a number of years, so we've got operating history and experience with that kind of high-pressure water cutting and have been able to share that with the Cameco team. We've been involved, in the past, with some water management assessments and studies on the Idemitsu side. I actually was involved with that aspect of things. And currently -- we currently have an individual involved in the -- the mine operations, mine development side of things, so has good operating experience from an operating mine at McClean Lake and is able to take those strengths and skills and help compliment the Cigar Lake team that's in place.

It's been a -- it's been a great opportunity. It's a bit of a win-win. We're able to -- to help the Cigar Lake Project and in doing so we help -- help ourselves as -- as partners of the project, but also get some extra experience for our own people as well.

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: So I'm going to ask you about some corporate secrets. Is TEPCO going to remain a partner? Is Japan going to stay in the nuclear business? What's your view?

MR. CORMAN: Certainly I can't -- I can't speak for the Japanese government or people, but certainly the -- the government in Japan right now seems supportive of -- of moving forward with nuclear reactors. I think two reactors have been restarted, so hopefully they continue on that path.

THE CHAIRMAN: So -- so they have no intention to date or they didn't announce any intention of getting out of this?

MR. CORMAN: TEPCO has announced that they're going to continue to be a strong partner with us through the development and into operations on Cigar Lake. We look forward to their continued contributions to the project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, anybody. Thank you.

Ah, staff.

MR. LeCLAIR: Mr. President, Jean LeClair, for the record.

I just want to add a little bit about the - the opportunities for participation, engagement and touch a bit upon some of the things that we've been doing to be much more involved in some of the outreach activities.

You heard earlier about participation in Northern tours where CNSC staff will go with the mining companies to various communities -- several of the communities to participate in the outreach activities that are going on. When I took this job a couple of years ago, I identified opportunities for us to be much more active. I find that we were fairly passive in those meetings, that we need to be far more active.

You heard from the Environment Quality Committee a little while earlier. If you actually look at their annual report, you'll actually see my photo in -- in their annual report where we were going out and giving a radiation demonstration to help people better understand radiation from a -- a touch and feel point of view. We heard about -- people are very visual, so use of an instrument -- a radiation instrument and rock samples and an actual yellowcake sample to help people better

understand and hear it directly from -- from us as the regulator, as the independent body, as the agent that is not there for profit, is not interested in whether they produce or not, but rather that health, safety, environment are protected.

There's always opportunities for improvement. We're looking at that. I have one -- my staff member, in fact, has been working on our communication strategy. So I just want to add that there's not only the opportunities through the hearing processes and the meetings to engage all the stakeholders, those communities and the aboriginal people, we also do that as part of our -- of our tours, part of our visits to the communities and we're looking at ways to further improve that. So when we look at the 10-year licence term, we're going to continue to go in those communities every year.

So not only are we coming in front of the Commission on a yearly basis and telling you what's going on at those mines, we're also going in the communities that are closest to those mine sites to meet with people and -- and listen to their concerns and share with them what -- what we're observing. And we'll continue to work with -- with those communities and the leadership within those communities to look for opportunities for us to --

to get better and get that information out.

So I just want to provide that -- that little bit of a context, as well, for your consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I did see -- I didn't see your picture on this edition, but I saw a lot of names of CNSC staff, actual officers, and I saw the advertising for -- for this hearing. So yeah, I think a lot of improvement, but I'm not sure who actually gets this. So communication with a -- with the local communities is still a challenge. I don't know how many people actually read this, but it's a -- it's a good first step.

Which reminds me, we didn't ask AREVA about your outreach; I know it's a bit off topic, but presumably you are facing the same kind of challenges that Cameco is on all your outreach to the various communities. Is there anything that you do differently or better or?

MR. CORMAN: I can't say that it's better at this hearing, but almost certainly -- certainly we do lots of ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You will get the opportunity.

MR. CORMAN: A lot of our outreach activities are done collaboratively with -- with Cameco. The -- the magazine that you are holding actually had a

picture, as well, of a -- of our Vice President of CSR.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. CORMAN: So we are involved with the collaborative agreements. They're being discussed and signed with the Northern communities as well.

We -- we work very closely with Cameco. We're -- we're partners with Cameco on -- on the Cigar Lake Project, but also on other projects within Saskatchewan, so we work together very closely on our outreach programs.

We tour through the North, often together, talking to the community members. We often go by ourselves if we have specific site project communications that need to be discussed, but in general, our -- our outreach programs are -- are quite similar.

THE CHAIRMAN: I -- I forgot to ask this before, but were AREVA and Cameco participated in the last trappers and hunters convention. I think it was in March. Did you -- both companies were there?

I know CNSC was there. CNSC made a presentation and had a booth, so I'm just curious if you guys were there.

MR. CORMAN: I -- I can't speak for AREVA. It's possible that someone from our corporate social responsibility was at that meeting, but I'm not aware of

it.

MR. MOONEY: I don't believe so. I'm sorry; it's Liam Mooney, for the record.

I don't believe so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MOONEY: I -- it's Liam Mooney, again, for the record.

I've been corrected that we had representation there particular to ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's good. Thank you all for this.

Staff.

MR. ELDER: Sorry, Peter Elder.

I promised something on the monitoring program that's run by the Saskatchewan Government, actually in cooperation with Cameco and AREVA is called the Eastern Athabasca Regional Monitoring Program. They actually have a web site and they have annual reports that are available on that web site.

So I'll get the secretary the name -- the actual web site. And they do monitor -- it's not just water quality, but they also do Country Foods as well, and around the First Nations communities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I -- we just seemed to remember there was a new study.

MR. ELDER: It's a new study starting in 2011, but there first -- the report for the first year was just recently posted on the web site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that right?

MR. ELDER: Yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, that'll be interesting to see.

Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

I think we'll take now about ten minutes.

Let's get back at ten to four.

--- Upon recessing at 3:38 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 13h38

--- Upon resuming at 3:55 p.m./

L'audience est reprise à 13h55

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presentation is by Mr. Natomagan of Sydon Consulting Inc. as outlined at CMD H5.7. The floor is yours.

13-H5.7

Oral presentation by

Clarence Natomagan

Sydon Consulting Inc.

MR. CLARENCE NATOMAGAN: All right.

Thank you very much for having me here

today.

The last time I was in front of the Commission was in Mistissini, Quebec. That was an interesting hearing. Hopefully, I believe today is going to be a bit easier than the time I had over there, but first off, my -- for the record, my name is Clarence Natomagan.

I am originally from Pinehouse Lake, Saskatchewan. The closest mine there is Key Lake. I am First Nations. I've had one foot in mainstream society since I was about 19 years old. I've had my other foot in traditional culture for my entire life.

I have two children, 13 years old and 11 years old, and both of them grew up part of their lives here. They were born in Saskatoon. We now live in Prince Albert and we still carry on traditional activities just like everybody else from up north. I take my kids to Pinehouse. I take them near the Key Lake Mine to go do our hunting. I've travelled the road -- the old road that led from Key Lake to McArthur to Fox Lake Road, we've hunted there. I still fish and I still hunt near Prince Albert. So I've lived on both sides of, you know, the society in terms of mainstream and traditional activities.

A bit about myself. My academic background includes health and safety for the University of Alberta.

I have two certificates in radiation environmental protection from Northlands College and also the Pacific Radiation Institute. I spent 23 years in the uranium industry. Cameco has been a fundamental component of my education. I have worked in uranium production, I have worked in the health and safety field in the uranium industry, and finally, held a position for a little over two years as superintendent of environmental protection and licensing and compliance at the McArthur River operation.

I spent nine years with the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission as project officer of various facilities, which included the successful licensing and decommissioning of the Cluff Lake mine. I have intimate knowledge of the protocols, requirements and obligations each of these organizations adhere to. I know and believe in the public involvement Cameco commits to and adheres to and during my time with Cameco I spent immense time addressing regulatory commitments made through the process -- through this very process to ensure that Cameco remained in compliance, as well a lot of their other officers.

I am a strong believer of the legislative powers of the CNSC and a believer of the authority the CNSC staff has. I've enforced CNSC legislation. I've

also been on the receiving side of those regulatory and licensing requirements.

There really isn't anything a licensee can do without CNSC knowledge or approval that would significantly impact the health and safety of persons in the environment. Time and again, Cameco has made licensing commitments. It then becomes the responsibility of both the CNSC and Cameco to ensure those commitments are carried through to completion. CNSC staff and the Commission, through their license condition, continue to have the authority to ensure that any licensee remains in compliance with this license program to ensure people in the environment are protected from adverse impacts.

The CNSC has the authority to impose additional obligations should monitoring show there is change in health and safety or environmental conditions. Cameco continues to show that its working personnel, the public, and the environment continues to be protected.

The socioeconomic benefits to the people of Saskatchewan is immense, and although I realize that this is not a licensing consideration, it has to be said that many of us will continue to benefit. My hometown benefits, its members benefit, as was stated by Vince Natomagan during his presentation.

The Cigar Lake operation has had its

challenges with groundwater associated with its primarily sandstone geology, but they have come a long way in getting the mine back on track. My experiments with -- my experience with Cameco's management systems, both as an officer with the CNSC and with Cameco, has shown me that those systems are robust. The license program are consistent from site to site.

I'm just going to turn to a few points here. I've been allowed to present two of my interventions, that being Beaverlodge and Cigar Lake.

For the Beaverlodge site, I've carried out inspections in the areas described in Cameco's application, along with various other agencies, including the Ministry of Environment and Environment Canada. I also recognize that the area has limitations for remedial work. I support the option to redirect Zora Creek to prevent further leaching and migration of contaminants from waste rock piles. Even though Canada Eldor Inc. owns the site, it is Cameco who will be the operator.

The Beaverlodge region is in, in my opinion, a state of recovery from past practices that are no longer acceptable today. To commit to carryout regulatory obligations or expectations that are extravagant would only serve to harm the recovery environment. The local knowledge and input into the

remedial options has been accepted by Cameco. It is incumbent upon regulatory agencies to accept it also.

The Beaverlodge site is in the recovery for the very long term. To bring the operator to the table every few years is neither effective or efficient as it will not add value-added information nor bring about better mechanisms of addressing remedial options.

It is with this knowledge that I support the application for the issuance of a ten-year license to the Cigar Lake operations and the Beaverlodge operation. It is my opinion that a ten-year license will afford the proponent to continue to work on implementing its designs, its programs, and to effectively manage the facilities. A ten-year license will allow CNSC staff to focus on ensuring the licensee remains in compliance with its management systems through inspections, rather than spending months re-evaluating programs, systems, historical data so that we can hear the same information over and over again.

A ten-year license will likely save the companies a lot of money, but my guess is it'll also save taxpayer money by issuing a ten-year license. Cameco has, in my opinion, a proven track record on compliance to federal and provincial legislation. The CNSC has a recorded track record of ensuring its licensees maintain

compliance to its legislation.

The CNSC has historically issued shorter license terms to ensure enhanced compliance and to bring licensees back to the table to report on their performance. With that, the CNSC now has interim reporting and annual reporting requirements. Therefore, to me it only makes sense that the Commission increase the license term. This will allow all stakeholders to focus on ensuring that licensing commitments are effectively implemented and followed up on.

With that, I open the table for questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On the issue of Beaverlodge, we heard earlier that not a whole lot has happened since the 1980's. Do you support that contention that there's been very little work in decommissioning Beaverlodge since the 80's?

MR. NATOMAGAN: In terms of doing remedial work, and when I say extravagant, I'm talking about taking, you know, huge contractors there with multiple piece of equipment and starting to dig up the tailings that's already in the water, and doing really -- things that you see physically, that is changing. I know that,

you know, in the last many years, Cameco has gone out and done annual monitoring, has brought in consultants to do studies like the Country Food Studies.

Physically, not much is being done, but it is also my belief that if you go in there and start digging up everything, rearranging everything, exposing the rock and everything else, and the tailings, you're only going to expose it to further oxidation, further leaching of contaminants.

In my opinion, it's best to leave, you know, let sleeping dogs lie, because you will just -- it is my opinion that you'll just create another way of putting more contaminants into the surrounding environment.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Cameco, do you care to comment really on your involvement with the cleaning of Beaverlodge for the next 10 years and what are your objectives, I guess?

MR. LIAM MOONEY: It's Liam Mooney, for the record, and I've asked Kevin Nagy and Mike Webster to join me.

Kevin is our Director of Compliance and Licensing, responsible for our Northern operations, and Mike Webster is our Reclamation Coordinator for the Beaverlodge properties.

Before I pass it back to Kevin and/or Mike for more detail in that regard, I think a point that I wanted to start the discussion around with, that these properties were effectively decommissioned in 1985, after a two-year decommissioning activities, so that the monitoring and maintenance work that Cameco has been carrying out is with respect to decommissioned properties.

Kevin?

MR. NAGY: Thank you, Liam. For the record, my name is Kevin Nagy.

Over the past license term and in addition to our regular monitoring and maintenance activities, Cameco has undertaken a number of studies with which to support an assessment of additional remedial options that could be performed to perhaps make the licensed properties more secure, safe, and stable in the long term, and more protective of the environment.

We will be making presentations during the Beaverlodge hearing with a number of remedial actions that we have selected and we do intend to implement during the next license term. Some of these options are good engineering practice and others will have measurable and significant improvement in the local environment.

As Liam said, the sites were decommissioned in 1985. The expectation at that time was that the

natural environment would take a long time to recover. The monitoring we've done to date has borne that out and the process we went through to identify -- to identify potential remedial options has borne that out as well: that regardless of the options considered, be they small or quite grand, there was nothing meaningful that we were able to do or could do that would significantly improve the recovery time for Beaverlodge Lake.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Questions?

Let me start. You, looking at your background, you're in a pretty good position to have views about the whole sector. So, you heard some of the previous interveners. What do you think can be done better on engagement of the communities? I'm surprised that some communities are very supportive, some not so much. How do you get a little bit more consensus about this particular sector?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I'm glad you asked that, really. I had that on a separate piece of paper, in case you asked me if I needed to add something.

So, one of the things I wanted to ask was -
- not ask, but talk about or comment on, was the difficulties of the public information programs that

proponents or licensees are obligated to have as part of their licensing.

The duty to consult, I've been part of that, and you're always going to have people who are going to be unhappy. You can never satisfy everybody and we all know that. I think it's very unrealistic to expect that proponents such as Cameco, even AREVA or somebody else in front of you, to go to the grass root level, go to somebody's cabin, go talk to somebody at the dock or on the street.

We ask community members: "Vote! Vote in people, mayors and Council, chiefs and band councillors to represent us as a community, right? So, when the CNSC or Cameco sends an invite to the leadership, it is the obligation of the leadership to provide that information, to facilitate that meeting, and bring the people to the band hall, to the municipal hall, or wherever you want to collectively congregate. It is the responsibility of the leadership.

I don't believe it is the responsibility of the federal government, the province, or Cameco, to go to everybody, to expect them to go to everybody to get feedback from them. That is why we have a voting system, whether or not it's municipal or at the Aboriginal Band Council level.

THE CHAIRMAN: So -- so, as an aside, so what happened in Quebec, for example, where -- you were there, you saw the kind of mood a whole community was kind of convinced that this is really a better thing to do? How did that happen?

MR. NATOMAGAN: It's the same thing that happened in our community in the early 80's, late 70's, early 80's. You have non-governmental organizations, like Sept-Îles sans Uranium, that come into your community, with people who have very limited knowledge about radiation and the effects to the environment and to the public, and do a fear-mongering campaign. I mean, I was there. I saw the pictures; I saw the pictures at the store, the local offices; kids with tumors and big grins on their faces. I mean, everybody is going to get scared. They did that -- it was in Pinehouse, right? We got over that, but it took us 10 years. That was one catalyst for what had occurred over there, in my opinion.

The other one was: the proponent went in and, with no disrespect to the organization, but you can't bulldoze your way into a community and expect positive feedback.

Public consultation is going in and listening to the people, and taking their input, and taking it seriously. Not saying: "Hello, I'm here. I'm

going to open a mine site."

So, it's definitely two of those issues. And the third one is: lack of knowledge about the industry, about uranium and its health effects, potential health effects, and its potential effects on the environment.

So those are the three biggest issues I recognized and I spent a lot of time there back and forth and those are the things that I hear. I talk about uranium, mining, and it's hard to explain. You've got to show people, right? And that wasn't done. And that's why we had such -- such a -- I don't know, in my opinion -- negative feedback from the entire community.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Anybody? Mr. Tolgyesi?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: You were saying that there is a lack of knowledge -- you know, in the 70's here and now in Matoush -- and that there's a role and responsibility of community leaders to diffuse information.

But, how or where they should go for information? Because if you go, you know -- what is the truth? Where is the knowledge? To some extent, it's in the company. Those who are coming with those pictures and posters, they do a kind of campaign of scare, okay? On

the other side, they are saying that the company is doing a campaign, economic campaign in favour of the project.

So, I think the native leaders are also exposed. They should do something and where they should go for an advice? Who could, you know -- there is a Commission, to some extent, but scientists are there also, but, you know, each one to select where to go to make sure that it is -- the explanation is simple, you understand and you agree or you disagree. That's another thing.

But who could help these native communities, and not only native communities, because when you are talking about Matoush in Quebec, it's not just a Cree community. There are lots of people down in Montreal that are against the project. And that's why you hear lots in the newspapers, because it happens in Montreal. If it was happening just in Mistissini, the impact is lesser.

So, you know, how to help these communities to learn about it?

MR. NATOMAGAN: Well, you mentioned a couple of things there, and I'll go to the fear mongering aspect first. You know, you had Sept Iles Sans Uranium there talking to the people. You know, when somebody jumps out of your closet and scares the heck out of you, your emotional response is pretty high.

When you compare that emotional response to somebody trying to tell you the truth about the industry, your emotional response or interest to that question or that assertion is a lot weaker than somebody scaring you with, you know, hypothetical facts about the industry.

In terms of who should be teaching the communities, I mean, it's not just northern communities, northern Aboriginal communities that have a great deal of challenge in understanding the industry.

You know, you probably have 30 to 50 percent of the entire Saskatchewan population who has a hard time understanding what radiation is.

Surveys have been done in the City of Saskatoon, and there is very limited knowledge about the impacts both to people, personnel and the environment from uranium mining.

It is especially challenging for Aboriginal communities because the number of words we have to describe certain things compared to Webster's Dictionary of all the English words, I mean, I don't even think we have 5 percent of those pages to cover our language. Our language is very -- you know, like they mentioned in the other presentation from Fond du Lac, reps were very visual. Everything has to be described.

You know, you have one scientific term, and

it would probably take me two paragraphs or a story -- a half-hour story to kind of describe to an individual what that means. So it's difficult to do that.

Whose responsibility is it? In part, it's the proponent's responsibility to be able to procure the services of somebody who has some level of understanding about scientific and technical information and be able to present that in a format that's understandable to the community members, but that's still a challenge.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Some intervenors were talking that exactly what you're saying, there's no words in Dene or Cree.

So you are one of the persons who is native and you know the knowledge. So how should we proceed to make sure that we could explain? Is there some kind of note to develop new words if it's something like that?

Who do we ask to help to diffuse this information? As I said, you are one of those who knows the industry very well. I don't say you are unique, but there are very few of those who could do that.

MR. NATOMAGAN: Well, I'm certainly not here to promote my consulting company, but that's one of my jobs is to do that. They're few and far between. I've promoted myself as one of those individuals who can do that to Cree communities.

Is there an individual out there who can speak Dene and do the same? I haven't seen a person from that background. I haven't worked for the industry that long or for the regulatory agencies to be able to understand that, but I'm still of the firm belief that if I were here to translate a document, it will take me a while. I can't translate some of the discussion here on the fly. I have to know what you want to be talking about so that I can at least understand the concept of what you're trying to convey, what is your objective.

It's the same with scientific technical information that's presented in EIS, in environmental impact statements, ESAR. Any of that information is technical and people don't want to read it. It's too boring, and people don't understand it.

Those are one of my goals is to be able to produce the information in a format understandable to communities, and that's part of the reason why I was brought to Northern Quebec, was to try and be able to do that, but at that time it was already too late.

THE CHAIRMAN: To me, that was surprising. I could understand the community's suspicions of the proponent. I could see the community's suspicious of government. I didn't compute they would be suspicious of leaders of the Northern Saskatchewan community.

So that's where I couldn't understand why there was not a better relationship with Northern Quebec leaders and Northern Saskatchewan leaders to actually talk amongst themselves about what is the so-called truth about uranium mining. To me, it's still a surprise.

MR. NATOMAGAN: Well, it was a surprise to me too. I developed a relationship with a number of individuals in Mistissini and, you know, at the end of their June 5th hearings, you know, I'm comfortable to be walking down the street without the relations that I've already built.

In terms of the cross-communication or cross-relationship from Northern Quebec to here, I'm not entirely surprised. I mean, I tried to show the community that the diamond mines and the gold mines that they have there and the reagents they use to produce the product that they're going after, some of the products and tailings that come out of there -- you look at the NPRI information on Environment Canada's website -- some of the contaminants that are out there are -- you know, they're not any better and in lots of cases it's worse in terms of what's being put out in the tailings ponds, type of thing, but you can't convince them of that because uranium equals radiation, equals that fear mongering/death.

I mean, it's a harsh word, but that's what

people see. So convincing them is a huge challenge for proponents.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: There is some similarity. You are talking in Northern Quebec; you are talking about gold mines which started in the 1920s. So, you know, there was a kind of culture and you used to see the mines. So it's like when you're looking in Northern Saskatchewan, you know, you have a 40-year history or 50-year history, so the people know. Natives, they know what that is and they see and understand what the risks are.

But if you will come with something new, it will be probably different.

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney for the record.

I know it's Mr. Natomagan's intervention you're asking the questions on, but on the Dene and Cree translations, we do make an effort to have simultaneous translation for our presentations in the community and, in fact, try to get the content of those presentations to those translators in advance so some of the technical challenges we're talking about, they can try to work with Elders and find the correct word if it is a challenge.

So there is a studied way we go about having translation and respecting the different Dene and Cree dialects that we deal with from community to community.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Thank you.

MR. NATOMAGAN: Can I add one more thing?

THE CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. You have the last word.

MR. NATOMAGAN: All right.

We talk about a 10-year licence, and I am still under the belief that a 10-year licence is okay because my experience with the management systems that are captured under a licence are robust enough that Cameco can adapt the changes with exposures, with potential impacts to the environment, and it also gives the Commission and the staff the flexibility or the tools to address emerging issues.

One thing I am a bit concerned about is we talk about interim reporting or getting involved in the annual report as part of an intervention.

Right now, we have systems in place where the Commission -- the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission -- has a public funding program where interveners such as myself can come to the table, express our opinions, express our review comments of the information provided to the Commission and their staff. That's going to go -- is that going to go away?

Considering, you know, you have a 10-year period, if I'm allowed to intervene on a 2013 or 2015

annual report, which comes in several binders that are maybe three inches thick, where is the funding going to come from for communities? Where is the funding going to come from for, you know, individuals like me who want to talk about developing or emerging issues, about the proponent and their performance.

Right, so if you don't do it in shorter terms, how do we get involved? I mean, I can write letters and read, you know, 1,200 worth of documentation, but I got to work. So I do have a vested interest in the public funding program. What does that mean for communities and myself?

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff, would like to reply?

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record. I think we are looking at that program and seeing how it can be -- we can maximize the use of it. So I guess that's one of the things we're -- have to stay tuned on, is we're looking at how we can more effectively use our participant funding program. But I think we have some flexibility and we are exploring that flexibility and see how far we can go.

THE CHAIRMAN: The annual report is, can be done in many, many ways. And depending on the experience and the Commission decision, it can run all the way from a meeting to a meeting with intervention to a full public

hearing. So I think that some -- this is something that the Commission is still struggling with. But we are -- we do value public input all the time. That's the question, how often and when and where.

MR. NATOMAGAN: So how would I stay in touch to know -- to be in the know about the system? I realize CNSC staff had mentioned that we'll talk to people to go to communities, talk about the performance of the licensees during the 10-year period.

So in four years time, when I review -- when I want to look at the historical, the three-year history of the environmental performance, of the safety performance of the proponent, who's still seven years away from their renewal, how do I get involved, how does my community get involved, how does Fond-du-Lac, Beauval, any other northern community that's listed as impacted get involved in the intervention process when the funds may not be available?

So, I mean, you may not be able to answer that right now, but it would be nice if I could receive an answer at some point in time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for the intervention.

The next presentation is by the Saskatchewan Mining Association, as outlined in CMD 13-

H5.12 and 5.12A. And I understand that Ms. Schwann will make the presentation. Please proceed.

13-H5.12 / 13-H5.12A

**Oral presentation by the
Saskatchewan Mining Association**

MS. SCHWANN: Thank you very much. Good afternoon Dr. Binder and Commission members, salut. My name is Pam Schwann, I'd like to acknowledge and thank the previous presenters that presented today for the information they had.

I'm the executive director of the Saskatchewan Mining Association and I'm here to speak in support of Cameco Corporation's license application for a 10-year period for Cigar Lake.

This is a bit of an introduction to Saskatchewan Mining Association. We are an industry-funded association. Our mission statement is to represent and support a safe, responsible and growing Saskatchewan mining industry. We have over 40 members in our association that are both mining companies and exploration companies. It does include Areva and Cameco, as well as all the operating potash companies, gold companies, coal companies in Saskatchewan.

I want to talk a little bit about the record of the uranium mining industry in Saskatchewan. We've had over a 40-year period of uranium mining in the province. That's a long history of uranium production with a proven record of safe and environmentally responsible development.

Saskatchewan is a world leader in uranium production and the Athabasca basin is home to the world's highest grade uranium deposits, as showcased by the McArthur River and Cigar Lake deposits. In 2001, uranium mining in Saskatchewan provided 100 percent of all of Canada's uranium production. This represents approximately 17 percent of the world production.

I'd like to speak a little bit about the proponent and their being leaders in safety. They have -- the proponent has a proven track record in terms of safety and environmental performance in a number of areas.

If I look at the workmen's compensation statistics for Saskatchewan, underground hard rock mining that they are a part of, their time loss injury rate is lower than the time loss injury rate for all the WCB classes. So that's lower than all government workers, health workers, construction workers, manufacturing workers. And this has been decreasing since 2007.

If you look at the Saskatchewan Mining

Association injury stats as well as the labour statistics, and I believe Neil Crocker was here earlier today, we can see that Cigar Lake has received safety award -- specifically the Cigar Lake operation has received a safety award for having a competition rating of zero, which is a significant milestone for any company and it's achieved by calculating the lost time injury frequency rate plus 10 percent of severity rate. And they achieved this rating in 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012.

In terms of CNSC stats from your annual report, it indicates that personal dose records for operating mines and mills from 2006 to 2011 showed that radiation doses to workers were safe and well below the regulatory limits. The number of reportable events remain stable at the Canadian uranium mines and mills. And the effluent discharges to the environment for uranium mining did not exceed regulatory limits.

I'd also like to mention Cigar Lake again specifically in terms of their safety performance. Cigar Lake received a special award certificate recognizing their safety record with over 700,000 hours worked with one reportable loss time injury rate and zero modified work injuries in 2010. This was really quite an accomplishment.

This is also the same year that their

sister operation at McArthur River won the national John T. Ryan award. What I think that speaks to is the culture of safety that the proponent has.

In terms of the safety performance and industry leadership within the Saskatchewan Mining Association, I'd like to speak to a few points. Cameco has a long track record of being a safe and qualified operator and has demonstrated its leadership in radiation health and safety. Cameco ensures its personnel are competent and qualified to safely perform the duties, this includes radiation protection.

I'd like to speak a little bit about Cameco's role in Saskatchewan Mining Association's safety community. They are regular contributors to our safety committee meetings, which are composed of safety leaders from all the different mining operations, both site and corporate. They meet on a monthly basis. They are committed participants to providing the Saskatchewan Mining Association safety training courses for new supervisors.

An individual from Cameco led the review of our reporting of safety statistics in collaboration with the mine safety unit with the Department of Labour to ensure accuracy and consistency in reporting.

And they're also prominent members of

Saskatchewan Mining Association emergency response mine rescue competition that's held annually every year. The competition is an annual competition, but these teams train throughout the year. And on the screen, you can see them both in their fire competition on the left and an underground mine rescue scenario on the right-hand side.

In terms of public support, I wanted to speak a little bit about the general support that the mining industry has in Saskatchewan and also with -- specific to uranium.

In terms of public support, there's a strong level of support for mining and uranium in Saskatchewan, including amongst residents of northern Saskatchewan. So quite contrary to what was the experience I believe in Sept-Îles.

This support reflects the public confidence in a well-managed and well-regulated industry. In terms of a 2012 public awareness survey that was conducted by the Saskatchewan Mining Association, over 1,000 participants all across Saskatchewan were contacted, 84 percent think the mining industry in Saskatchewan is very important, 90 percent are supportive of the province's mining industry and 84 percent have a positive perception of mining as a career.

With respect to uranium specifically, a

2011 uranium mining industry poll indicated that seventy nine percent of the public support the uranium mining industry. So, I think what that reflects, is a very strong overall support for the mining industry in Saskatchewan and also for the uranium mining industry.

I'd like to speak about the -- Cameco position as a leader in terms of corporate social responsibility.

First of all, with respect to trading and employment, and specifically their work in developing a human resource capacity. The uranium mining industry in Saskatchewan is a global leader in corporate social responsibility. They were developing relationships, and we heard a lot about that, I think, this afternoon. And they were developing these relationships for the long-term. Long before the term social license to operate, or corporate social responsibility, even existed. It's a long standing way of doing business for both Cameco and AREVA, and I think you heard from Mr. Corman that it's a very close collaborative relationship between the two companies.

Cameco has taken a leadership position in working with government and education partners to create a trained labour pool in the North from which the mines and other businesses can recruit skill workers.

This partnership approach has helped deliver training, in spite of the challenges of serving a relatively small population. Close to 40,000 people over a very large geographic area. You heard the representatives from Prince Albert Grand Council talk about the North, representing one third of the province. So, a very beautiful and very large part of the province.

But they have demonstrated results. And this is a -- these statistics, actually, are from the Human Resources Development Agreements, that the province of Saskatchewan has. And, so, these are the numbers that I'll be referring to.

Three thousand seven hundred and seventy five (3,775) employees at the Northern mine sites, in 2011. Of that, forty seven percent or almost 1,800 employees were from northern Saskatchewan, with an annual payroll of \$96,000,000 injected into the northern Saskatchewan economy.

The job ranges from unskilled to skilled, with a progression over the years, from entry level through to supervisory. Admittedly, not as fast as many would like. There are lots of challenges. But, having said that, Cameco is also the number one industrial employer of aboriginal people in Canada. Certainly, something to be proud of and not that their work should

stop, but it's something that should be acknowledged.

Industry is partnering with training institutions and governments to provide training to direct jobs through initiatives such as a Northern Career Quest, a multi-party training plan as well, through different four phases, to prepare northerners for jobs directly in the mining industry. And that money has come from both industry, and it's come from the federal and provincial governments as well.

Also, in 2011, uranium mining companies awarded over \$200,000 dollarships and scholarships for northern students and \$33,000 and school awards for grade 7 to 12 in the Athabasca region alone.

Looking at the proponent's record in terms of being a leader in corporate social responsibility, with respect to business development and building business capacity. Over the 40 year history of uranium mining in northern Saskatchewan, the uranium industry has worked with communities to encourage northern business and joint ventures, to supply goods and services. That is to build the business capacity of northern Saskatchewan for the mines. But, they can also be transferred outside of the mineral resource sector and often times, right into the communities themselves.

Their role has been that of an incubator of

northern aboriginal owned businesses.

So what's the results on that? It's a number of demonstrated results. Over \$460,000,000 of goods and services were purchased from northern owned businesses in 2011.

Over \$4,000,000,000, a cumulative total in northern wages in goods and service has been purchased from northern businesses since 1991.

I'd like to mention some of the companies that were incubated, through service providing goods and services to the northern mines. They are now in the top 100 companies in Saskatchewan and more are developing. This includes: Kitsaki Management, the economic development arm of the La Ronge Indian Band, Robwel Construction, from the west side of the Athabasca basin, NRT, a subsidiary of the Kitsaki Management Development, and Athabasca Basin Development Ltd. Partnership. A very unique partnership amongst First Nations in the Athabasca region and the communities that is really developing very strong business relationships. Not just with the northern mines, but also now with the Potash mines in southern Saskatchewan, where you have individuals from the Athabasca communities, now providing security services to the south-east corner of Saskatchewan. It's really quite remarkable.

The proponents are leaders and technology, looking at developing innovation. There are unique challenges of mining uranium in the Athabasca basin, and these challenges have made Saskatchewan a centre of excellence in many aspects of mining, technology and environmental protection. And we've heard about some of the challenges.

The challenge of mining the highest grade ore bodies surrounded by clay and hosted by a water saturated sandstone. It's been mitigated through measure, including mine design, the development of a jet boring system mining method, freezing the ground in and around the surrounding ore body, and the extensive use of shielding within the ore processing infrastructure.

This photo on the screen here demonstrates one example of technological innovation utilized at Cigar Lake. Personnel, at least it's my understanding, that personnel are from Team Drilling, which is part of the joint venture with the Athabasca Basin Development Limited partnership, in northern known businesses. And this was worked that was being done, preparatory work ahead of the sinking of the number two shaft at Cigar Lake.

My concluding remarks are that Cameco has demonstrated that it is a qualified operator to operate facilities and has taken appropriate steps to mitigate the

rest that are associated with mining, one of the world's highest grade uranium deposits.

Cameco has a proven safety and environmental record. They have systems in place to effectively protect people and the environment. And they are committed to operate in the Cigar lake mining in a manner that provides them the social license to operate.

The Saskatchewan Mining Association supports Cameco's application for a 10 year license for Cigar Lake, as the operation moves from the construction and development into the mining phase.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Questions?

Ms. Velshi?

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you. The intervention from the Prince Albert Grand Council; one of the Elders had raised a concern that training centres aren't located where the mines are and workers or potential workers have to move to city for that. And I noticed in your written submission, you say quite the opposite. You actually state that "provides training opportunities at all levels and training takes place in northern communities and at the mines sites". So, I just wanted to make sure what's factually correct or -- are there concerns different then what you have actually

addressed here?

MS. SCHWANN: I think we're both correct. Mr. Hanson was speaking specifically to training sites at Hatchet Lake and Molson Lake, where he's from. There are training facilities, I believe, in Stony Rapids, but most of the training in northern Saskatchewan occurs in La Ronge, which, if you're from the Athabasca Basin, is south. It's really not part of the North. And so -- and that's just because of numbers and also when you're having people teach the courses, you need facilities and the environment that they're prepared to live and stay in. And La Ronge offers the amenities that are required for both the cohort numbers, because you don't have individuals just from one community, you have communities from all over northern Saskatchewan. And so, La Ronge is deemed really, through Northlands College, primarily and Northern Career Quest, the main training centre. There are some smaller training centres. Heavy Equipment Operators, I think, are out of Buffalo Narrows. I believe there is smaller training that takes place in the more Northern Athabasca regions, but it's not a full fledged mining centres. And I think that's the aspiration of many of the communities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Member Tolgyesi?

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Yes. Merci. When you do a training, how it's done? The person is hired by employer, like Cameco and sent for a training as a full-time employee of Cameco, or it's a provincial program or whatever program, where the young people is told, young or whoever wants to work in a mine? They are trained and eventually, could be hired by companies?

MS. SCHWANN: It's a whole spectrum, really, and Gary Morasi would be the best person to speak to this because one of the most successful programs funded by the Federal Government was the Northern Career Quest, and they just recently received some extension. Where, there's a match amongst the industry, will get together and discuss how many jobs they have specifically swapped positions and so you have training that's done for real jobs, not just bums and seats, it's training for a real job at the end.

And so there's a bit of matchmaking that goes on in terms of selecting the qualified candidate and that was through 4 different phases, I believe, it's a multi-party training plan that started I think in around 1995.

Most of the training began through Northland's College in La Ronge. But Northern Career Quest is sort of a new generation of model; it definitely

require, at least to my understanding, grade 12 graduates because you've got a large cohort in Northern Saskatchewan that aren't grade 12 graduate. You can't just leave them and not do anything to, you know, in terms of helping them be trained to work at the mine if that's what they want to do.

So they work with them to get their grade 12 and then at the grade 12 level then work beyond that to find the right employment opportunity at the mine. But the mine base also offer ongoing education opportunities whether it's through apprenticeship, all the northern apprentices at the mines are First Nations or Métis, or whether it's, you know, ongoing education to obtain grade 12. Many in there are long time mine employees working at the Northern Mine site didn't have grade 12 when they started 20 years ago. So they are offered an opportunity to get their grade 12 education through ongoing education at the mine sites and there's also ongoing distance learning opportunities, I believe most of the mine sites actually have an education coordinator right at the mine site itself.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: And with -- we were hearing the Native communities that they are ready to -- you know they have youngsters who are ready to work and they need some training. How it's done? It's -- because

it's there and so practical side of training.

If it's done all at La Ronge, they should move to La Ronge for several weeks or months and be trained or they could do a training by -- by, I don't know -- by correspondence or by I don't know, communicate by computers? And the practical side, they will have to move, because the problem I think it's with youngs and natives mainly that who will pay their room and board?

MS. SCHWANN: I can't confirm but I could get it confirmed. I believe that when -- at least there's a partial payment for students when they're in a program. I could get that confirmed for the Commission members. So, it is a huge challenge for students outside of La Ronge to come to La Ronge for, you know, three, four weeks, months at a time, often leaving young families, it's not an easy thing to do. But the realities are you cannot have a training center in every community in Northern Saskatchewan. It's not affordable. You can't get the qualified instructors that you would need.

So it may not be the perfect model but it's, you know, to the point that, I think it's 47 percent of the employees at the mine sites are First Nations or Métis people. So it's a record that, you know, I think is a good record that needs to continue to improve but it's a good record.

There's also ongoing, certainly through Northland's College some of the components of the training is actually at the different mine sites. So the students -- it's almost like a coop work term, where they would go to the mine sites and work and then go back into a classroom setting. So it's very practical hands-on training.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Is -- how Saskatchewan Mining Association is involved in the communications with the Natives? Because what we see, you could be a way to communicate to let no mining, are you doing something like this or are you involved directly or whatever or whatever for?

MS. SCHWANN: The consultation and engagement with First Nations and Métis communities and other communities of Northern Saskatchewan it's really left up to the specific companies. They know their projects best.

Up until two years ago, we did have an annual exploration forum that we hosted in Prince Albert where our member companies would talk about their exploration projects that were coming and also outline business opportunities related to that. That was suspended two years ago frankly because we saw quite a significant downturn in the number of exploration projects

that were happening.

We're trying to see if there might be another opportunity to start something like that again. Again we held that in Prince Albert because La Ronge frankly wasn't big enough. And so we paid travel allowances for people to come down and attend that and also for economic development officers from the communities to come down to Prince Albert.

But that would -- that's the -- other than -- and we also, through our Exploration Committee had developed a best-management practice in terms of engaging Northern Communities, you know, engage early, let people know what you're doing, find out who you should be speaking with, that sort of thing, that's on our website.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: So you don't meet communities in a way that it's not the mining company but as association they sit down with the community and discuss about mining, not specifically -- I don't know Cigar Lake or Key Lake or whatever, but globally about the mining?

MS. SCHWANN: No, we don't.

THE CHAIRMAN: I got two quick questions. Your slide 6, Public Support, Uranium Mining Industry of 2012; is it broken by Northern and South? Is there an original breakdown?

MS. SCHWANN: Yes there is. For the 2012, it is. And I can provide the survey for you if you would like.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I'd be interested to know. Did we -- is staff aware of this survey?

MR. LECLAIR: I heard of the survey at the Saskatchewan Mining Association's annual general meeting previously. I haven't actually seen the report itself but I did hear about it ---

THE CHAIRMAN: --- there's any difference between the North and South view of uranium mining?

MS. SCHWANN: I should clarify that uranium mining poll was done by the -- is done I believe twice a year by the companies. The 2012 SMA Public Awareness Survey does have a couple questions specifically about uranium in terms of awareness of companies and that's the one I could provide with. I can't speak on terms of provided you with a survey that CAMECO ---

THE CHAIRMAN: So uranium mining industry poll, who owns that one?

MS. SCHWANN: That would have CAMECO and Reva that sponsored that poll.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you do have the breakdown, do you?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record.

And we have the breakdown that indicates that large majority of northern residents, 77 percent; support the continuation of uranium mining in Saskatchewan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that -- so is that survey kind of available -- it's done twice a year or is it?

MR. MOONEY: It is done twice a year. We use that survey to assist us in our communication efforts and our engagements strategies.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is that normally kind of information you post?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record.

We have not historically posted that information. We had discussed that with the Commission at the last Beaverlodge Hearing and we went back and again the preference was to continue to use it in the manner that we have historically which was to help shape our communications and engagements strategies.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, I'm still missing something. Wouldn't it be to your advantage to show the vast majority of the population support the uranium mining?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record.

Yes, undeniably it's here on the public record now, I suppose there's that. And I think I will

take it back and discuss with our communications group further.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

On your slide 7, what is RSM?

MS. SCHWANN: I'm sorry. Residents Saskatchewan North, which there was reference in the presentation from Prince Albert Grand Council in terms of Residents of Saskatchewan North versus First Nations or Métis. They're not necessarily the same because you have people that aren't Métis or First Nation that live in Northern Saskatchewan but if they live there 10 years or half their life or are born there, they are considered Residents of Saskatchewan North.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that's exactly what I'm fishing for, do you have the breakdown for First Nation?

MS. SCHWANN: In terms of employment numbers?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MS. SCHWANN: It would -- it's a -- my understanding is roughly about 80 percent of ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Of First Nation?

MS. SCHWANN: --- and in terms of employment numbers?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MS. SCHWANN: It would -- my understanding

it's roughly about 80 percent of that RSN number would be First Nations or Métis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. SCHWANN: If you've been to the mine site, it's -- there -- you know, you see the First Nations and Métis employees, it's certainly not a trick. It's -- the First Nations and Métis people are employed in vast numbers at the mine site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I guess that the way -- there were no numbers.

MS. SCHWANN: Yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's always used as a northern residence and some intervenors thought that were some game being played ---

MS. SCHWANN: Yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- about the definition.

MS. SCHWANN: And I should say the reason that's used is because that's the terminology that's used in the provincial service lease agreements, is the statistics are tracked in terms of residences of Saskatchewan's north.

You had asked earlier about how many people from different communities are employed. The provincial government has that information broken down by communities because the mining companies have to report that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I've just been handed this study here that says -- this is a 2011 Northern Socioeconomic Benefit Summary, and there's a highlight here, 42 percent of the workforce of the mines is of Aboriginal heritage.

For the previous intervenor, which I see some of you out there, you may want to look at this.

Okay, anybody else?

Just again, totally out -- off topic, are you concerned that, you know, here you're in Saskatchewan, you're the Mining Association. In other provinces has moratorium on uranium mining. That's a leading question.

MS. SCHWANN: I guess it's good and it's bad. We'll take the investment in Saskatchewan.

--- (Laughter/Rires)

MS. SCHWANN: I know we do have the best training for uranium developments, but it is a concern that there are anti-development groups that get a foothold and fear monger, and we like to help out our different associations where we can across the country, but it definitely is a concern. I think the more information we can get out there about the uranium mining record the better, because I think ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Do they come for help? Do they ever come for help, some of the mining association --

provincial mining association?

MS. SCHWANN: We compare notes on successes and ways of, you know, of communicating records. So ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

I think we have two written submissions left. So let's see if we can deal with them right now, and we'll move to the first written submission is from North Saskatchewan Business Association, CMD 13-5.8.

Anybody have a question on that one? Dr. Barriault?

13-H5.8

**Written submission from
The North Saskatoon
Business Association**

MEMBER BARRIAULT: In the second paragraph of the last sentence, they're balancing business viability versus safety in the workplace, and they say well they believe they couldn't co-exist. I'm concerned about that statement, and I don't know who could answer it for me, I guess. What is that that they mean? They said if it's financially not viable after (inaudible) compromise safety? I'm not certain.

Maybe Cameco could explain that one way or the other. I know it's not your statement, but this is what they're saying on your behalf.

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I certainly wouldn't want to speak on behalf of the North Saskatchewan Business Association and interpret the meeting.

From Cameco's perspective, we drive all of our business on the basis of our core value, safety and environment, people, integrity and excellence. So for us, being excellent and having integrity is focusing on the value of safety and environment first and foremost.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you. You've answered my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

Okay, the next written submission is from Athabasca Basin Development Limited Partnership, as outlined in CMD 13-H5.9.

13-H5.9

**Written submission from the
Athabasca Basin Development
Limited Partnership**

Questions? Anybody? No questions?

Okay. Thank you.

This concludes the intervention, and I think we're now going through our, you know, the last rounds, and I would like to start with Dr. Barriault.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the presentation of page 7, Slide 14 of Cameco, CMD 13-H5, I notice in your Environmental Protection Affluent Limits that there's no mention of mercury in there. Perhaps somebody could comment, really, if it does form part of testing of affluence for heavy metals.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker, for the record.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Go ahead, yeah.

MR. RINKER: Sorry, for the record.

In general, the constituents of concern from a particular mine are first screened by what we would see in the affluent, and then you would determine which ones would pose a risk and then put limits on the ones that you had rated for that facility. And mercury releases are not an important constituent that is released on the Cigar Lake mine, so there's no limits set for that or an affluent limit.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: The limit is zero, is what you're saying? No?

MR. RINKER: No.

They're -- it is -- it's not a constituent of concern in the affluent, so it's not something that there -- we're setting a limit on. We don't set a limit on the vast suite of metals that exist. We set limits on the metals that are released from the facility.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: I'm confused, because if you look back really in the days of Northern Quebec, testing for mercury became very important because there was some mercury contamination of some of the lakes, really. I don't know if was secondary to mining or secondary to acid rain, whatever it was, but it did exist. And I guess I'm wondering why it's not part, really, of the testing. Is it too complicated? I'm sorry.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker, for the record.

Certainly, all -- when the analysis first began, all of the potential metals were looked at and what was -- what could be released from this facility, and mercury was not one of them. Mercury is released from, certainly from gold mines, from historic extraction processes, and there are areas where mercury is a very sensitive constituent in the environment because of acid rain releasing it from the mosses and so on.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: M'hm.

MR. RINKER: However, it's just -- it's not

a constituent of concern at the Cigar Lake mine.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: Merci.

This is a question to Cameco.

You had two or three inflows; two in 2006, I think, and one in 2008. Then it was a development stage, so it was no freeze or rock freeze or ground freeze ...yet at that time?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

In 2006, we had a mine inflow that resulted in the actual mine being flooded. There was a second water inflow in 2006, that was earlier, that was in shaft 2, and -- so in a different situation and not linked to the actual development that was underground at the time.

Through the 2006 period, we were already starting to, from underground, establish freezing in the ore body. So the ore body was being frozen at that point in time. The second inflow, which occurred in August of 2008, where we actually allowed the mine to refill, because we at that point in time did not have the ability to release our treated water to the volumes that were necessary while we did have the pumping installed. So that was a decision reached by Cameco to allow the mine to refill.

So those were the two instances of mine flooding or inflows, but as I said, we did have freezing actually started as part of our mine construction underground through the 2006 period, and that freezing is there today.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: And this is a \$1,000 question. Once the full ground freeze is reached, what's the probability that there will be inflow? Not necessarily a size extent of 2006 or 2008. But what's the probability do you expect? Because you are still under, you know, loaded -- water loaded structures.

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

Ground freezing is a key component of our multiple layers of defence in terms of dealing with water and the potential for water inflow. It is only one of the different mechanisms we use.

That being said, with both freeze in place, as well as our improved systems of governance, our programs, our training, the vigilance of people, and there is a constant awareness of the hazards of water inflow in our operations, that combined with our mitigation strategies to deal with inflow, says that the risk is, we believe, far lower than it has been in the past.

However, we remain ever vigilant to the

fact that there could be some water come into the mine, whether it's through a drill hole or through some other mechanism, despite the freezing. And for that reason we have put in place the very comprehensive systems and planning and the assets to allow us to address an inflow, deal with it at source, channel the water away, be able to pump it to surface, treat it appropriately and release it to the environment to allow time to address it underground.

So we have mitigated the risk but we remain ever vigilant to it.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: One other thing. Jet boring is what you push is the pipe through a hole and it's a head with a high pressure which is breaking the rock essentially is the principle. What happens if, for any reasons, that the boring part is broken, or it's plugged, or whatever, you should leave it there because you have no access?

MR. GODDARD: Grant Goddard, for the record.

I'm going to ask Mr. Lowen in a moment to provide a little bit more detail. I think it is worth talking for a moment about the jet boring process and our mitigation strategies that we have both for management of water and what we would do in a case as you describe

hypothetically.

The JBS system again is another one of our key technologies that we have worked on, as I mentioned, for a couple of decades now and have been testing underground, most recently through drilling and into waste. We are confident that that overall mining system will be successful at Cigar Lake. And part of the characteristic of it is it allows us to stand off from the high grade ore. It also minimizes the amount of waste that we'll be removing before we access the ore. And inherent in our design of that system and the actual use of it are mechanisms to deal with different situations that arise that the crews have been actually practicing.

So I'll allow Mr. Lowen to provide a little more colour on that.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

Our jet boring system through the last few years we've done a lot of engineering work and design to address some of the issues that you raise as potential scenarios. We have really improved our preventer systems. We have borrowed from things like the oil industry to look at inflatable packers and actually have installed and tested those just recently and made sure that those are all working as well.

So we have a number of different techniques

and procedures and engineering solutions in place already tested and proven that will actually help mitigate the risk there.

That, plus all the training procedures and so forth that we are giving to the jet boring system operators to help them deal with those particular eventualities, will actually make this, I'm confident, a good system to use.

MEMBER TOLGYESI: And how many jet boring systems you will have, because -- you know, when you lead the full production?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

At full production we will have four jet boring machines in use. Two of them will be in production extracting ore. One of them will be drilling and one of them will be either in maintenance or being moved. That will be essentially the ore -- the cycle that we'll be using for our four jet boring system machines and that will get us our full production.

MEMBER McDILL: My questions -- last questions are on the licence condition handbook. One of the things that caught me on page 48 was the entire section called "16 Facility Specific" followed by three words intentionally left blank. This is on page 48 of 61.

MR. ELDER: Just a minute. I need to find

the licence as well.

So what we're trying to do -- Peter Elder, for the record. Just to make sure that these follow standard format, and there is always a section to have facility specific licence conditions. So it's just -- but there aren't actually any proposed for this facility.

MEMBER MCDILL: Right.

MR. ELDER: So it's just to make sure that when we're using -- we want to be using a standard template on this one. So all of the licence condition handbooks have that section and then saying well if there's no condition -- it just makes sure that someone filling out has actually thought about it and followed the formula.

MEMBER MCDILL: I can understand that.

MR. ELDER: Okay.

MEMBER MCDILL: I guess from a reader's perspective it might be better just -- well, I might suggest that it might be good to say intentionally left blank there are no facility specific requirements.

Similarly with recommendations and guidance, because some of them are not left blank and some of them are left blank and it -- I think the Proponent has a very good idea of what that means, I'm not so certain that a member of the public looking at the licence

condition handbook, if they were so inclined to do so, would understand why an entire section called "Facility Specific" would be intentionally left blank.

MR. ELDER: I understand. And we'll look at the standard wording when we don't have anything to say to make sure that it's clearer to the public as well.

MEMBER MCDILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
That's all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Ms. Velshi?

MEMBER VELSHI: Thank you. I have a few questions around radiation protection, just to make sure that I have a clear understanding of what the hazards are. And I know there's a statement in there that says that the jet -- so this is a -- the first one is for Cameco -- that the jet boring system and mass freezing of the ore body will separate the miners from the high grade core. So where exactly does the exposure to the miners to radiation come from and when does that happen during routine conditions?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

Exposure could come from a number of different sources. Often it's through maintenance work on parts of our ore processing systems and others, but those are all particularly controlled environments where work practices will control exposures.

MEMBER VELSHI: So there is a table in the CNSC's 13-H5.1, page 31, that provides estimated annual routine doses -- annual doses, yes. Maybe this is a question better for staff. How would these estimates compare to, say, other uranium mines, given that this is a high grade ore but they have JBS, is it -- are they comparable?

MR. LeCLAIR: Jean LeClair, for the record.

Yes, it would be comparable. And when we look at Cigar Lake, the main comparison would be with McArthur River because it's also a high grade mine. One can say that even in the McArthur River mine they're also using mining techniques that minimize exposure for workers.

I think what's important when we look at this is a lot of those are being compared to conventional mines where workers could be working with drills right at, we call the face, right in front of the ore, so they're fully exposed to the ore, while with these remote mining techniques you're removing the ore, extracting it from a distance in such a way that you can minimize your exposure.

But to answer your question, they are comparable to what we would see at McArthur River.

MEMBER VELSHI: And if you were to compare

it to a mine where there is closer exposure to the face, how much higher is it? Is it like double or ---

MR. LeCLAIR: If we actually look at -- Rabbit Lake would be one of the mines which uses closer to more commercial mining techniques. You'll actually see that Rabbit Lake mine workers actually have a bit higher exposures even though the actual rates are lower than either Cigar Lake or McArthur River.

MEMBER VELSHI: Question for Cameco: there was a slide that showed a radiation detector that measures radon and, you know, the red/green/yellow one. Is there an audio signal to that as well when it hit red?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

No, there is no audio signal. It is a visual signal. The mine can be quite noisy with the fans and everything, so that one is a visual signal.

MEMBER VELSHI: Okay. And the last one. Again, these are detail questions, but just so that I understand.

There's a slide with a Direct Reading Dosimeter and I believe in your presentation you said the workers would then self-report what their dose was at the end of their shift.

But besides the DRD, do they also get issued a TLD that officially measures their dose or is it

just based on the DRD?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

We have OSLD badges, we have the personal health dosimeters which is what you're referring to as well. Those plus the Uranium and Urine Program are what we use to measure doses.

MEMBER VELSHI: And my last question is on financial guarantee for decommissioning, and question for staff on this.

So, you know, we heard briefly today on Beaverlodge that -- that those sites were decommissioned in 1985 and here we are back again remediating those sites.

So, does the estimate of financial guarantee build into it any future changes in expectations and standards?

MR. ELDER: Peter Elder, for the record.

I'll give you a general one in this case. Maybe one of my colleagues will add some details on this one.

There are two things that you build in to any financial guarantee. One is a contingency and the contingency amount will depend on how accurate or how firm you believe your plans are, but it's minimum of -- so, you know, the contingency being 15 and 30 percent. So, you do

all the detailed calculations.

For the mines, you would include a long-term monitoring program as part of your decommissioning program. And the example would be, you know, so, I guess, we've also looked at -- our real example is on Cluff Lake which actually went through decommissioning. They -- Reva has actually maintained most of their financial guarantee in place even though all the physical work known right now is done.

So, you look and say the financial guarantee -- you actually keep the financial guarantee even under a decommissioning licence for future work until you can prove that your performance is as expected.

MEMBER VELSHI: So, the short answer is: with all the contingencies installed, there is an allowance made for making changes ---

MR. ELDER: There is allowance made for -- that you may have to do additional work in the future if your performance is not what is expected, yes.

MR. LeCLAIR: If I could just add to that as well?

Financial guarantees also have to be kept up to date so their subject to review on a five-year cycle to take into account inflation and any new information you might have based on performance. So, they're regularly

kept up to date, so they're always relevant.

MEMBER VELSHI: Yes. I'm aware of that. I just wondered if there was a specific line item to say for future changes.

And I'll just make one last question in.

There's mention made that with JBS mining technique, there is less waste produced. How much less compared to the normal mining practice? Is it significantly less?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

I believe it is significantly less. There are, you know, multiple numbers of mining methods out there, of course. And with the JBS, since we're only drilling that 16-inch hole to get out the ore, that fundamentally is the amount of waste that we actually produce before we get to the ore body itself.

So it is, in my view, significantly less than traditional drilling blasts and other techniques.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

We're running up very late. So unless you've got a real ---

Go ahead. No, no, go ahead.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Once you start -- I'm sorry -- with the mining system, once you start extracting the ore, obviously you're going to have a space left

behind, with that field that was cemented, what will you do with that? What effect will that have on your freezing in your court -- temperature freezing?

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

Yes. Once the cavity is fully extracted, we backfill it with concrete and then move on to the next cavity to ensure that the concrete has actually cured.

We've done some modelling of the effect on the freezing and we're finding almost negligible effect on the freezing; it would be just at a very, very small space next to the concrete where we'd see some effect. That would not affect the overall freezing protection for the ore body.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

My turn, I guess, for a couple of quickies.

The Ministry of Environment of Saskatchewan was not here -- I'm actually surprised -- but I assume that they are okay with everything that's being done on the Environmental Program.

Staff?

MR. LeCLAIR: Yes, we work quite closely with them and they have not raised any concerns. And they have ---

THE CHAIRMAN: We asked? There's no --
they ---

MR. LeCLAIR: We are, as Mr. Akhter presented earlier, part of a Joint Regulatory Group that includes the Ministry of Environment that meets on a regular basis. And so, they've been fully involved in the process -- ongoing process with Cigar Lake.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

On Cameco, page 36, I just want to understand. This is the false alarm or the alarm on Emergency Management: "Twenty-four false alarms, seven actual incidents in 2012." Is that normal?

And staff, you can -- right behind them.

Cameco, page 36.

Yes.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

Yes, I believe the false alarms that are being referred to here are false fire alarms. We tend to have a lot of those in our camp conditions just due to dust during -- due to our furnaces setting off.

It tends to be due to the high sensitivity of our detection system, our Mine Rescue -- sorry, our Emergency Response Teams go in there and make sure that there is no underlying issue and then we call -- we stand it down.

That's basically what most of the false alarms are due to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff, is that all according to code?

Is it the new CSA?

MR. ELDER: They're following the appropriate codes on this one in terms of the -- you know, for the building codes. That said, we don't want -- we look at them but we don't -- the mine camp is not part of the licensed area. But we know they apply the same approach in the camps as they do in the rest of the facility.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean there is no -- you mean -- sorry, I did not understand the answer.

MR. ELDER: So -- sorry. Cameco said that most of these incidents have been on the camp, so where the workers live.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. ELDER: And that is actually outside the area that we licensed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Safety of -- you know -- you know my story. It was safety ---

MR. ELDER: I know, but -- but that said, they use the same -- we can confirm they use the same safety standards in the camp. And you want a fire alarm

system to be oversensitive rather than undersensitive. So, you would -- you know, false alarms, you don't want too many but we want to make sure there are alarms, in a non situation ---

THE CHAIRMAN: So, is that the same thing as residential, if it's camping?

MR. ELDER: Absolutely. So, some of these -- in Saskatchewan -- yes, they follow all the Saskatchewan normal rules on that one.

So, I guess the example would be offset if you're looking at -- inside the camp, you would want to make sure that things, before there is actual fire, they'll be going off in smoke regardless of the cause of the smoke.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

My very last one is -- I always like to hear about -- that you have actually thought about a doomsday scenario, a big earthquake, no power? How long will take the frozen ore to melt and what will happen, and what kind of mitigation you have been planned for?

MR. MOONEY: Liam Mooney, for the record.

After we received the CNSC request to look at the beyond design basis event, we attained third party experts to take a look at our facilities in northern Saskatchewan, including Cigar Lake. Cigar Lake is in a

geologically stable seismic region, so earthquakes aren't really the issue. The natural disasters that we were looking at were more in the nature of losing power to the site at -- concurrent with blizzard-like conditions and potentially having the site cut off.

So overall, they were happy with our resourcing. They were satisfied that we had adequate planning and resourcing for such an occasion and they recommended that we do a tabletop exercise to simulate that sort of event, and we did that in December, and the circumstances were what I described, a blizzard with a truck accident knocking out the bridge and power coming off at the site.

So with that, there was some learning's identified, including the limitations in relation to diesel for our backup generators and those have been actioned and will be addressed.

MR. LeCLAIR: Just to -- perhaps Cameco can supplement what I'm about to say. I believe I understood your question was how long would it take for the frozen ore to thaw? It's measured in months, if not years, so it's not something that we would have -- you would have to respond within a matter of a few days in order to address with the fact that the ground was thawing out and maybe presenting some long-term issues.

Perhaps Cameco can add a little bit to that.

MR. LOWEN: Steve Lowen, for the record.

As Mr. Goddard said a little while ago, we had done some freezing in 2006, before we had the first inflow event. And what we found is when we went -- after we did the remediation after we tried to turn on the freezing again into that area that had been now underwater for, it was a number of four or five years before we turned it on, we found that we had to drill out some of those freeze holes because there was still frozen ground there four or five years later.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

Thank you very much for your patience, and thank you for the all the intervenors. And Kelly, what's ---

MS. MCGEE: This brings this hearing to a close. With respect to this matter, I propose that the Commission confer with regard to the information they have received and then determine if further information is needed or if the Panel of the Commission is ready to proceed with a decision, and we will advise accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we are going to break for a short dinner and we will reconvene -- we are supposed to reconvene at 6:00 but we'll make it 6:15.

Okay, thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 5:28 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 17h28