

– Minutes of Meeting

Date of Meeting	November 27, 2009	Start Time	10:25 am
Project Name	Gunnar Mine Rehabilitation Project		
Location	Fond du Lac, Father Gamache Memorial School		
Regarding	Athabasca Regional Government (ARG) Conference		
Attendees	Representatives of ARG, SRC, CEAA, CNSC, Provincial Environmental Assessment Branch, and Others		

The following questions (Q) and answers (A) were recorded following SRC's presentation to the ARG representatives.

ID	Question/Discussion Item
Q1	ARG representative asked SRC to elaborate more on the Dec 10 th CNSC hearing
A1	SRC indicated that the hearing will address SRC's application for the extension of exemptions of the Lorado and Gunnar mine sites [from the requirements of the <i>Nuclear Safety and Control Act</i>]. The hearing is in Ottawa on December 10 th , at 1 pm Local Time.
Q2	Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The land has been destroyed and nobody has given a penny for this; and this has affected us ➤ Addition of schools and hospitals would help for the future ➤ Elders are not educated but they know the land and traditional values ➤ White people have overstepped us and are taking everything ➤ A lot of young people are unemployed; and we would like them to be educated and employed; training for jobs are important issues to focus on ➤ Can't blame each other ➤ Plan for them [youth] and make sure environment is safe for them
A2	N/A
Q3	Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Agree people are destroying our land; mining industries have overstepped our boundaries ➤ Grade 12 graduates are often stuck on reserves without jobs ➤ Enough is enough, need to plan for our future; water and land are our livelihood; water is a rich resource and everything depends on this ➤ In old days trappers depended on fur and now nothing like this; how to make living and put food on our tables
A3	N/A
Q4	Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Similar to above issues [translation was difficult to follow] ➤ Lots of people dying of cancer and have diabetic disease; animals that eat plants
A4	N/A
Q5	In SRC's presentation they say 'regional commitment' and 'maximizing regional economic opportunities'. If this is the case, then why did they go out of the province to get someone to do traditional studies; we have people here that are educated and could do these studies.
A5	SRC indicated that an RFP was released and TK was part of the RFP. AECOM hired Albert & Associates as a subconsultant.
Q6	ARG representative asked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Didn't you let AECOM know they have to hire locally? ➤ Did you enquire to see if traditional work could be done here?
A6	SRC indicated they let all PRC members know that they were going out for bid on this work including traditional knowledge work. ALO is invited to participate in the research.

ID	Question/Discussion Item
Q7	<p>Athabasca Land Office (ALO) has been established for over 10 years. It has produced a number of major reports around collection and management of land research.</p> <p>Question to Province – given the agreement, why has it has gone out to get somebody else? ALO has trained people that could have done this. Why not use local knowledge managed by local organizations? ARG has had proposal on table for 1 year – why hasn't the government informed SRC of this. ARG asked why the contractors were not advised of the capacity of the ALO; why is the ALO not engaged in this process of collecting traditional knowledge?</p>
A7	<p>Province (H. Klein) – does not have specific answer; she indicated she does not know the position or how the contracting was let, as she has only been with the Ministry for 4 months. Heidi is willing to look into the history.</p> <p>Province (M. Ross) – mentioned joint agreement to conduct EA is between feds and province. Provincial Ministry of Energy and Resources hired SRC to manage the process and SRC hired the contractors. M. Ross indicted he was not involved in bidding process, however.</p> <p>Province (H Klein) – in follow-up, Vice Chief question will be responded to but can't respond to what happened historically</p>
Q8	<p>Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lot of information to handle; not educated ➤ If participated ➤ Northern pike suffering from Gunnar tailings ➤ Lots of things in past; poor when live off land. Muskrat. Live off land. Small animals are not seen anymore. Caterpillars for example are not seen anymore ➤ Big machines come up from the south; destroy the land – but contractors turn around and say we don't know anything ➤ Give us schools and train them; when treaty signed why weren't they trained. We were poor ➤ Rabbits gone ➤ After mining is done they leave ➤ What are youth going to live off in the future; help people now and resolve the problems; we should work together side by side. Can't even get a processing plant to give us economic benefit ➤ Education put on back-burner; need to hire these people ➤ Have meeting with us 1-2 times per year. Test the water with us ➤ No muskrat, birds, loons, geese – who did that? Miners? Not mad at anybody here - just trying to resolve the issues ➤ Without you we are stuck too. We will still be poor – help us get out of the poverty
A8	N/A
Q9	ARG representative asked: What are things besides flora and fauna. We are still users of land. What studies done on human consumption?
A9	AECOM indicated they are sampling things that we think people want to eat – e.g., berries, and other plants. VEC list is there – if there are things that are missing let us know
Q10	ALO has this information – the information is there
A10	AECOM indicated that they want to make these connections and this additional information will be useful and we appreciate it
Q11	<p>Dalbert Augier's common law wife (Irene MacDonald) made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Dalbert has a trapper licence on Gunnar site, but cannot access them now because of the signs (contaminated site). Use of the trapline is destroyed ➤ Has never been compensated to date – will Dalbert ever be eligible for compensation ➤ Never abandoned trap line and want to pass on to children
A11	SRC indicated that they are not involved in the history with traplines, but that the province may have the answer
Q12	ARG representative indicated that the obligation is not just to government; SRC responsible to talk with communities. Proponent must dialogue with the communities.
A12a	SRC agreed and indicated that our engagement framework starts with talking with leadership on how

ID	Question/Discussion Item
	we approach this through discussion with leadership. Yes, SRC has obligation to engage.
A12b	Province (H. Klein) mentioned that Irene talked with her this morning and H. Klein then talked with EA team clarifying that it is the responsibility of EA team to collect the information and then make recommendations around compensation for the trapline. The report will come into government and government will respond to the report. We will all be looking at the EA report. EA team said they will be in touch with Irene and Dalbert to get the information
Q13	ARG representative asked if there will be actual human studies.
A13	AECOM - Not looking at direct human health indicators direction (e.g. blood and urine). What we are doing is looking at level of contaminants in food stuffs and predicting the risk to those consuming the foods.
Q14	ARG representatives indicated that they are continued users of the land, and asked "Does the study stop there?"
A14	<p>AECOM indicated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Our focus of study is health of humans, but we are answering the question differently ➢ Can apply comparison of what in soil and water and compare to known guidelines ➢ Think the easiest way to get at questions is to analyze what is in the food. We think we can answer the question without examining humans directly.
Q15	ARG representative question on TK/TLU – understanding is that AECOM is doing a treaty land youth assessment now after all the damage has been done to the land, and further stated that this should have been done prior to the operation and consulting with Athabasca residents. Why doing studies now and not before – this is kind of strange.
A15	A&A indicated that would like to incorporate use of land prior to the development as much as possible. Agree this should have been done before, but now trying to work to gather information to use the information to design a reclamation strategy to hopefully bring back activities that were there previously.
Q16	ARG representative - Damage is done, so are we being compensated for this?
A16	SRC - Can't speak to compensation, but hope to use information to rehabilitate the site. All learning together.
Q17	ARG representative indicated - regarding the answers you are giving in terms of human studies, these are not answers. You talk about pathways and think that we are not interested in this study. It seems like AECOM is worried about little things on Gunnar area but not considering consumption of food we are eating – this should be part of the studies.
A17	AECOM – we are doing a "food basket study" and looking at things being eaten in various ways and what the contaminants are in those things. Not want to give impression not looking at this.
Q18	<p>Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Work with the commercial fisherman ➢ Steel pipes and lumber – still holes – fill with cement, not grouting ➢ Study exploration companies ➢ We should teach you our culture and then you will understand this; let's work together – that is my input
A18	N/A
Q19	<p>Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative [lost some dialogue in translations]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Years later told us the water is contaminated; now it's \$28M for clean-up ➢ Whoever is responsible for water contamination they should clean it up. ➢ Test for last 15 years, but don't inform anybody; only once it has been contaminated ➢ Before giving them a licence; not going to give us royalties therefore why give you a licence ➢ We ask the questions but saying we are not the boss ➢ First time land here – how the do they know more than we do ➢ Before mining company starts mining – put money aside for compensation ➢ Need to help people out – work side by side
A19	N/A
Q20	<p>Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative [lost some dialogue in translations]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ People still fish, mine there

ID	Question/Discussion Item
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ When I look at these people – we are tough people because exposed to uranium and eating fish from fish plant – we didn't damage the land; the mining people did a lot of damage to the land ➤ Put lot of poison to wolves ➤ People live off land – eat fish and animals; birds dying; seems like going to kill people here ➤ Education ➤ This is a big issue – money – how much is available for decommissioning? We need a foundation ➤ We don't know everything, not as much as you do, we don't have money to decommission; elders give input. We want to work side by side with you. Why you came here – you know how much is available, tell us, how many people will be involved, how many people will look after the animals, lots of things hiding in the bush – fix too ➤ How many contractors hired? How much money available? How long to fix? ➤ Underground blasted – how going to fix? How much radiation exposed from Gunnar – back then no monitor or watch dogs ➤ Still preserve and consume in future ➤ Need to be educated to get hired ➤ Would be good somehow if trappers could be compensated ➤ Living off uranium ore contaminated land
A20	<p>SRC indicated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Currently there is funding - \$24M ➤ Get together with ALO and make happen – work together with Kuni Albert. ➤ SRC has made mistakes in the past / perceived issues on how contracts awarded in past. ➤ SRC wants to sit down with representatives of region. ➤ TK study has not actually started yet; want to work with you for better project in the end.
Q21	<p>ARG representative - Born at Gunnar. SRC has poor background working with the people – only can work with ALO. Do study and we can start believing. Everyone in Canada looking to get some money.</p>
Q22	<p>ARG representative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Meeting in Stony Rapids on Nuclear Waste Management Long term, it will kill water and wildlife ➤ Lots of questions not answered here – would be proper to have SRC to meet with us/trappers and address the questions ➤ Shaft - water going into water we drink; this should be checked ➤ It would be nice to say when next meeting is
A21/22	<p>SRC – We want to have a meeting with you – first week of January? Energy and Resources was supposed to be here but someone passed away and had to attend a funeral.</p>
Q23	<p>Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative [lost much dialogue in translations]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ I don't understand this and how they do it ➤ We are outnumbered; outvote us on licence? Not fair. Group in north is smaller but the issues pertain to our land. Study water and land – government meets with us ➤ Mining companies pay environmental workers - still go ahead and do what they want ➤ Presentation excellent, but in 1953, nobody watching them ➤ No royalties just small grants once in a while
A23	<p>N/A</p>
Q24	<p>Issues expressed (no question) by ARG representative [lost much dialogue in translations]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hearing same music again ➤ We don't destroy the land ➤ We don't get nothing. Everything in control of SRC ➤ Ottawa making decisions for us ➤ Housing – living in third world country here ➤ Talking and no action this far – need to get this mobilized
A24	<p>N/A</p>
Q25	<p>ARG representative asked a question of the CNSC – in the presentation under regulatory process,</p>

ID	Question/Discussion Item
	bullet 4 (slide 9) it says implement CEAA – what does that mean? Does CNSC implement CEAA now? What does this mean?
A25	CNSC indicated that CEAA is a federal act and the responsibilities fall on RAs – and the RAs are responsible. CNSC is an RA for the Gunnar project because it has to issue a licence. Under CEAA CNSC is responsible as RA for implementing the CEAA.
Q26	ARG representative - Does that mean CEAA does not determine if EA is required? CNSC makes decision on behalf of CEAA?
A26	CNSC/CEAA representatives indicated that the provincial Ministry of Environment still has a role because Gunnar is a comprehensive study. CEAA is responsible to make sure federal government is complying with the Act. The agency makes sure that CNSC will comply with the act

The following additional notes/statements (beyond the text in the slides) were made *during* the SRC presentation by the presenters:

Aaron MacDonell (SRC)

- SRC responsible for Gunnar and Lorado mine sites and other 34 satellite sites
- Site abandoned with little to no remediation except for flooding of pit
- Radon monitoring at 10 stations since 2004 by SRC (sites shown on slide map) – analyzed in summer and winter (2 times per year)
- Gamma survey completed to validate historical data – transects of 40,000+ gamma measurements
- Gamma map shows dose rates uSv/hr darker colour shows higher levels to green showing background levels
- Asbestos will be handled and disposed of appropriately
- Back then, tailings dams did not exist, tailings were dumped into the lake
- Framework developed for this project and first step is to obtain feedback on approach, then develop plan
- Maximize involvement of northern communities
- As continue with project will continue to engage communities and regulators
- Explained 1st workshop – take feedback into 2nd workshop and at that point have solid idea of what the feasible rehabilitation options are
- Presentation will be posted on the CLEANS website

Doug Bright (AECOM)

- The Mine operated for only 9 years, and scale of operations and legacy impressive
- Study on risks to humans or environment will be undertaken
- Project guidelines identify VECs and the EA will focus on VECs – provisional list may not be complete – looking for feedback on the VECs. Work on the list and perhaps expand or modify as move forward
- Waste rock also used around mill site as well as stockpiling
- Tailings piles blow around and can inhale dust that contains contaminated particles – the team is looking at this
- Data collected on plots – soils, vegetation, small mammals – looking at small mammals because will tell us risks to things eating those small mammals
- All VECs will be assessed as to how exposed to contaminants and risk to health of humans and environment, based on current site conditions

Kuni Albert (Albert & Associates)

- Sent out notification letter to communities to work with communities on direction of TK and TLU studies. Hope to work with communities on this and get down to a schedule.
- Want to sit down with communities and leadership soon on approach.