Project CLEANS
Summary of Public Meeting
Uranium City, SK., April 29, 2010

PRESENT:

Guests

Gabriel Staine	Fond du Lac (For Camsell)
Mathew Yooya	Fond du Lac
Marlene Powder	EQC
Pete Heide	ITnorth.ca
Marylee Larocque	Resident
Ken Mercredi	Part-time Resident
Wayne Augier	Resident
Allan Powder	Resident
Everett Charles	Resident
Harold Smith	Red Rock Energy
John Dixon	Lineor Gold Corp.
Dean Classen	Town Chair of Uranium City
Margaret Powder	Resident
Sandy Powder	Resident
Bernadette Larocque	Resident
Joanne Larocque	Resident
Doris Sapp	Resident
Vina Powder	Council Member
Mario Lhereatt	Resident
Sharon Foffwrota	Resident
Jim Foffwrota	Resident
Mark R.	Resident

Saskatchewan Environment

George Bihun	Environmental Protection Officer

Saskatchewan Research Council

Mark Simpson	Research Scientist
Jesse Merilees	Acting Project Manager
Jess Spies	Associate Scientist
Suzanne Johnston	Communications Specialist

<<Meeting started at 1:15 PM in the gymnasium at Ben McIntyre School>>

Welcome

Mark Simpson, SRC Research Scientist, welcomed everyone and gave some background on Project CLEANS. SRC has been contracted by Saskatchewan Environment (SE) to manage the remediation of Gunnar, Lorado and 36 satellite mine sites. Some of these were mines, others were just exploration targets. Satellite sites are exempt from licensing by the CNSC (Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission). SRC submits applications to SE to get permits for remediation of satellite sites. The only sites SRC is actively working on are the satellite mine sites. SRC has begun preparing the required Environmental Assessment document (EA) for Gunnar, and aims to complete it by the end of 2010 or early 2011. Mr. Simpson explained that the purpose of the meeting was to review the work that was done in 2009 on the satellite sites, and to share information about the sites that are scheduled for cleanup this summer.

Presentation #1

Mr. Simpson introduces Jess Spies, an Associate Scientist at SRC. Mr. Spies spent most of last year on the ground with the contractor working on the sites. His presentation will cover what was done last summer, he'll show some pictures, and

answer questions the community has. Mr. Spies hopes that by the end of the meeting, people will be more up-to-date with what happened last year and are aware of what is proposed for 2010.

2009 Work Season

1. Cinch/Cenex Site Work

Pre-cleanup condition (before 2009):

- Three shaft related openings, four raises, adit, 11 concrete foundations, waste rock, water tank, misc mining debris
- Three stainless steel caps were installed over shaft openings
- One water tank was dismantled

Cleanup activities included (May 2009):

- Backfilled adit with waste rock
- Backfilled two raises, one on north side and one on south side of Crackingstone River
- Third raise sealed with polyurethane foam (PUF)
- Non-hazardous material was buried onsite in the waste rock pile

Outstanding items requiring immediate attention:

- Four raises on site, three sealed, but fourth could not be backfilled properly
- Area fenced and temporary closure put in place for the winter; stainless steel cap has been fabricated for installation in early 2010

2. Nesbitt LaBine ABC Site Work

Pre-cleanup condition (before 2009):

- One shaft related opening, two adits, a raise, two concrete pads, one collapsed wooden structure, one boiler encased in asbestos insulation, moderate amount of waste rock, misc debris
- One adit addressed in 2008 and backfilled with waste rock
- Concrete/debris cleaned up

Cleanup activities included (June 2009):

- Addressed boiler issue with asbestos insulation; boiler was wrapped up and transported to a temporary special disposal area at the former Lorado mine site (fenced area SRC has permission to use)
- Installed stainless steel cap over shaft opening
- Raise sealed with PUF

Outstanding items requiring immediate attention:

- Pulled back material from entrance of second adit in 2009 and found opening was filled with ice; couldn't complete backfill; temporary jail cage installed to make site safe and to prevent any access to underground workings
- Assess in early 2010 to see if ice has melted and can backfill

3. Pitch Ore Site Work

Pre-cleanup condition (before 2009):

- Pretty clean; one of the easier sites to cleanup
- Two adits, two raises, hunting/fishing camp, moderate amount of waste rock, misc mining debris

Cleanup activities included (June 2009):

- Backfilled one adit
- All debris hauled off site to Nesbitt/Labine Eagle mine (used as debris storage area for any sites where there isn't a sufficient location to bury the debris – piled and eventually buried); cleaned up hunting/fishing camp
- Two raises, one larger than the other; sealed with PUF

Outstanding items that require immediate attention:

- Second adit located adjacent to Martin Lake (quite remote); originally blasted closed many years ago; inspect in 2010 and do some manual touchups on the blast closure to make a more secure closure

4. Nesbitt Labine Eagle Site Work

Pre-cleanup condition (2008):

- Likely largest cleanups of 2009; a lot of debris at this site
- One shaft opening, two raises, loading adit and ore storage area, pump house structure, core racks, water tank remnants, two storey concrete structure, three concrete cisterns, three concrete building foundations, misc debris (some non-mining related)

Cleanup activities included (June 2009):

- Debris disposal area for concrete, metal and non-hazardous materials; buried
- Two storey concrete structure demolished
- Raises backfilled with waste rock
- Removed material from shaft opening and found no cap was installed; safety the site by installing a gravel box over the hole; fenced area for winter time
- Ore pad had elevated gamma levels; placed sand cover over entire area to bring gamma radiation levels down; put organic material (slash) over the site to encourage natural re-vegetation

Outstanding items that require immediate attention:

- Shaft opening needs to be addressed and sealed properly; rectify in 2010 with a stainless steel cap

5. Mickey Lake Site Work

Pre-cleanup condition (2008):

- Smaller site to deal with as there wasn't a lot of cleanup required
- One adit, narrow trench, wood frame structure, small waste rock piles, misc debris

Cleanup activities included (2009):

- Backfilled adit with skid steer
- Tin shed dismantled, wood stockpiled for burning at a later date
- Small amount of debris on site was buried in trench in front of adit after adit was backfilled
- Contoured remaining waste rock to make site look more natural
- Placed organic material back on site to stimulate natural re-vegetation

No outstanding issues

6. Natural Exploration – Pat Claim Site Work:

Pre-cleanup condition (2008):

- Second largest site of summer for cleanup
- Production shaft, raise, inclined adit, five concrete building foundations, concrete cistern, inclined trench, large pile of waste rock, small amount of misc debris

Cleanup activities included (2009):

- Concrete cap on shaft was failing and in poor condition, so removed cap and backfilled entire shaft with waste rock
- Pulled all blasted material away from adit and backfilled
- Leveled waste rock pile, contoured to landscape

No outstanding issues

7. National Exploration – Keiller Work Site

Pre-cleanup condition (2008):

- One of the smallest site had to work with; adjacent to Pat claim
- Small adit with waste rock near opening, small amount of debris

Cleanup activities included (2009):

- Pulled debris out of adit (removed steel grate), backfilled with waste rock
- Cleaned up site

No outstanding issues

8. Baska Dot – Virgin Lake Work Site

Pre-cleanup condition (2008):

- Most remote site; difficult to get to
- Adit, raise, two core shacks, waste rock, misc debris

Cleanup activities included (2009):

- Adit was backfilled

- Raise sealed with PUF

No outstanding issues

9. Uranium Ridge Work Site

Cleaned up in 2008.

First year of monitoring site in 2009.

- During a scheduled inspection, SRC noticed that there was a small amount of slumping in the backfill
- Added more fill and area was fenced off as an added precaution
- Berm constructed to divert surface water away from backfill area, which will solve slumping issue

No outstanding issues.

Questions/Comments from the public

(Answers provided by SRC unless otherwise noted)

Q: Why do some sites sealed with foam have vents and others don't?

A: Mark Simpson– The vents allow for air to escape as water levels in the underground workings change. This is more of an issue in topographically low areas. Vents were not placed at sites located on the top of hills or ridges.

Q: Why isn't the foam covered?

A: The picture shown in the presentation was taken before the foam plug was covered with earth. We cover the foam plug with between half and one meter of earth material. In the case of a forest fire, that meter of earth will protect the foam from burning. The earth cover will keep fire from getting at the plug and protect it against UV Rays; sunlight can degrade the material.

Q: Is all the foam covered now?

A: Yes. It's used primarily in small openings of two meters or less and also in areas where it's very difficult to get equipment in.

Q: What about the trees? That's going to take 20 years to turn to dirt, but it looks messy really.
(Referring to areas where SRC has spread organic material to stimulate natural growth.)

A: That's a good point. It's a step towards trying to get some natural vegetation and it's better than just leaving bare grounds.

Q: Were the trees cut down or knocked down by a hoe? The contract says you're supposed to be cutting, not knocking them down. Why is Mr. Bihun allowing this? Supposed to be a cleanup, but you're making more of a mess than you're cleaning.

George Bihun – This goes for any of the forested areas of Saskatchewan - when companies go in and are allowed to make trails, these guys are doing more exploration than they should be having to do. When a skidder goes down a trail, pushes the trees and comes back out, they aren't required to mulch, so it's not going to look like a lawn. They're trying to create some organic material on rock. It's going to look like that site (referring to picture), but that's the standard that is acceptable everywhere. Give it a few years and some of the material will rot and shelter the rock. Look at access trails – when you cut trees out of the way, like at Red Rock, the Cat goes through the bush and you now have a swamp. Cutting the trees out of the way ruts up the area. Pushing these trees over and walking over them it doesn't disturb that natural vegetation – you get in, you get out. It looks rough, but you have stuff growing up right away. But when you have equipment going through there to pull it out of the way, it destroys the surface area more than clearing it out.

Q: But the contract says you're supposed to be cutting it first and here you're pushing it.

A: So there are two issues here. One is cutting trails and reopening roads to the sites. And the other is the issue of when we're cleaning up the site and we have to cut the road in, and the brush is out two to four meters; you have to get the

debris. Trees are growing out of ore carts. There are issues like how to remove debris from vegetation that's had forty years of natural growth in areas where there's debris all over the place. That's where the language of "cutting" and "brushing" to get to the road comes in. When you're actually at the site, there are issues with how do you actually get to the site or a certain piece of waste.

Guest – The other issue is marketable timber. These rules are written for all of Saskatchewan. Cut wood has value and can be recovered, but if a tree is less than ten centimeters they're not going to cut it because it creates more of a problem for tires and track when you're trying to drive on it.

Guest asking question – I have nothing against that, but stipulate on your contract what you're going to do.

George Bihun – What we do is very site specific and varies. How you put that in the contract – then communication is a big thing. What they [SRC] expect isn't always going to turn out that way.

Guest – And that's why it's hard to get a bid because we don't know.

SRC – Good point. When I do an inspection of a site, I don't have an excavator with me. I can't root around and see exactly what's there. The inspection is what the tender is based on. Things are always a bit different when you actually get on the ground and there are things that pop up like holes you didn't know about and more debris that was under vegetation. There are always surprises and we can't always specify every single item on the site. Most of these sites don't have good site plans to refer to. It's a problem in determining how the job goes forward because we don't know absolutely everything that is on the sites.

Each site is a bit different and we need to have the flexibility to determine how to handle it. Regulation is important. For example, we had to do some temporary capping at the Eagle site. Early indications were that the shaft was capped, but we pulled debris off, and it's an open hole. So now you have to change how you're going to handle this because you have to put some safety measures in place.

Q: Very common on contracting sites that the person who does the contract doesn't know all the details and you have to learn from your mistakes and get more efficient to save money in the long run.
A: We try to put as much information into it the tender as we can. Everyone uses the same spec sheet to bid, so it's fair.

Presentation #2

Mr. Spies turned the presentation over to Mr. Simpson who will discuss the proposed activities for the 2010 work season. Mr. Simpson explained that he will go over the applications that SRC has submitted. The sites where remediation work is proposed consist of the Group 3 satellite. There are a total of 36 sites identified for remediation. The sites were grouped geographically during a previous public meeting held in Uranium City (2007). The Group 3 Sites are primarily located west of Uranium City.

2010 Work Season

1. **Consolidated Beta Gamma**

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Headframe is totally collapsed over open shaft
- Assortment of waste rock, steel, pipes, drums, etc…

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Clear all benign, non-hazardous debris around shaft and site and compact into one location near or on waste rock pile and bury it in waste rock on site
- Assess condition of shaft, take measurements and determine type of cap needed
- Stockpile and burn lumber at a later date in the fall
- Backfill open adit (has some water in it) with waste rock
- Site will be surveyed for gamma radiation; procedures established by SE will be aiming to reach their acceptable targets; SRC has equipment that couples gamma reading with GPS location. This data will be used to prepare maps to show levels of radiation at each site

2. Cayzor Mine and Dump (Jean Lake)

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Concrete foundations, debris, headframe
- Shaft has been capped; won't bury it because have to see how it's holding up in future inspections

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Cleanup and do a good inspection of the shaft cap; if replacement needed then it will have to be engineered
- Break up concrete foundations
- Recontour the waste rock pile to get a natural looking landscape; it will look worse once it has been cleaned up; nature has been working on the site for 40 years, so SRC will have to disturb this natural vegetation that has happened; unfortunately site will look worse for a number of years until vegetation starts to reclaim it
- Bury benign steel and concrete debris on site in waste rock; have vegetation all over the place and there will be some damage to it when picking up debris
- Batteries will be moved to a temporary waste disposal area at the Lorado site; for special waste there are rules as to how to dispose of certain materials; all those materials which aren't hazardous will be buried on site
- Gamma survey of site

In addition, there are eight other sites along Rix Road. Four will require significant road improvements; at Leonard especially. Water has backed up due to beaver dam activity, in an area that is low to begin with. The water is maybe 40 meters across and half a meter deep. Some road improvements are needed to get equipment to four sites to continue remediation. SRC will have to clear brush to get to St. Michael.

3. Rix Athabasca Site #1

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Small adit has been backfilled, but has failed at the top
- Small amount of debris at site; typical of these mine sites

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Adit is not large, but may have to go in and backfill this again to a depth of twice the adit's height (Example: push backfill 4m into adit if the adit height is 2m)
- Will bury debris on site if there's sufficient loose material; if not, looking for other waste rock locations to bury; not looking to haul too far
- Gamma survey of site

4. Rix Athabasca Site #2

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Small site; no underground workings
- Scattered debris

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Collect debris and bury on site if there's a good location; if not, find the closest suitable location

- Gamma survey of site

5. Rix Athabasca Site #3

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Small concrete foundation; remnants of old building; waste steel

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Collect and bury debris
- Breakup concrete foundation
- Gamma survey of site

6. St. Michael Mine (Jean Lake)

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- No trail to the mine was indicated on the detailed topographic map of this area; an old geological map does show the location of the original mine
- A lot of rails and concrete are scattered over the site
- Concrete cap on shaft appears not to be in good condition

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Reopen original access trail to mine site
- Cleanup debris with same procedure as other mines – find suitable location to bury benign materials; move other waste to a temporary waste storage area
- Untreated lumber will be stockpiled for burning later
- Inspection of shaft cap; sometimes mines weren't good with making concrete shaft; put in rails as reinforcements which ends up cracking concrete more than reinforce it; may need to replace concrete cap with again concrete or stainless steel cap
- Leaning away from backfilling shafts, depending on the depth of the shaft; you can get material bridging and it's difficult to do a controlled backfill and get it packed properly
- Gamma survey of site

7. Rix Athabasca Leonard Mine

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- One adit; most of the backfill material is just waste rock piled at the door and doesn't fill the adit at all, so if it starts to slump at the top there will be access to the adit
- Concrete foundation covered with fence
- 150 ft. vertical drop on bedrock ridge; no material to backfill this; big opening; drill pieces, chicken wire, barbed wire scattered around it
- Challenging site to deal with because of large hole and difficult access to top of bedrock ridge

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Pull away waste rock from adit and place the backfill material well into the adit so that there's no possibility of it opening again
- Concrete to be broken up and buried in waste rock; some recontouring on the waste rock to be done
- Engineer cover for vertical opening; getting up to that area with equipment will be difficult
- Gamma survey of site

8. Rix Athabasca Adit #10

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Adit; not sure if it actually intersects workings of Leonard mine
- Bedrock ridge adjacent to adit appears to be unstable, possibly due to underground workings near surface

- Waste rock in front of adit opening
- Small amount of steel and a lot of regrowth of vegetation

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Strip away waste rock and refill the adit
- Pick up the steel
- Conduct gamma survey

9. Rix Athabasca Smitty Mine

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Largest site with several raise openings; need proper closures
- Concrete foundation, headframe, storage tanks
- Asbestos insulation noted on boiler pipes; OH&S has procedures and special handling methods to deal with this material

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Address the mine openings to ensure no access to underground workings
- Make surface area less unsightly by collecting all steel debris
- Concrete and steel to be buried on site in waste rock
- Hazardous material would be removed to temporary waste storage site at Lorado
- Footing at headframe and other structures has concrete to be broken down to extent possible to give the area a more natural kind of setting
- Gamma survey of site

10. Rix Athabasca Zone 62

Pre-cleanup condition (2009):

- Subsurface plans show that mine is connected underground
- Access is not very easy across the valley; quite rocky and difficult ground to work with
- Entire slope is quite unstable; appears when site was mined underground that they came quite close to the surface, destabilizing the surface; now its failing and unstable – presents a lot of challenges
- Some debris in the area

Cleanup activities planned (2010):

- Adit to be backfilled, excavate slumped material from adit opening, backfill with local waste rock
- Search mine site area for any steel debris, collect and transport to Smitty waste rock pile for burial
- Gamma survey of site

Presentation Closing

Application process has started with SE and they have reviewed a number of the applications. There are some issues with the crossing and water at the Leonard site. DFO has some concerns with putting material into the water because of the habitat. Six of the sites would be accessible without that particular portion. SRC will have discussions on the crossing as it is the only way into those sites. Mr. Simpson opens the floor to any questions.

Questions/Comments from the Public

(Answers provided by SRC unless otherwise noted)

Q: Are there any maps available for the gamma readings?

A: Yes, we do have some gamma maps. At this stage they're in draft form and we expect to complete them when the report is finalized. The complete report will be provided to regulators. They also do a site inspection to see what was proposed meets their specifications, so the yes the gamma radiation information will be in that.

Q: Will it be accessible to the public?
A: Yes, on the website. For 2010 we don't have the detailed gamma surveys yet, but there are some previous (preliminary) readings done. Gamma readings were obtained by SRC with a Ludlum scintolometer fitted with a 2" NaI detector. This instrument is more sensitive than what was used previously.

George Bihun – SRC has been asked to conduct gamma surveys of all the sites. Then we'll decide what exactly has to be done with that. Old reports are all done using an Automess instrument which puts out readings to determine worker levels. You're looking at a cut off level of 2.5. These are all low levels readings between 3 or 2.5 µSv/h; a very small number. If we can come in with better instruments that can read low level radiation we'll have a better idea where it is. Some of the rock is naturally high. Maps will be available.

SRC – Once a draft is collected, we'll have a couple thousand records of levels, and a much better distribution of measurements. Previous measurements that I've seen are limited to half a dozen readings at a site.

Q: What is considered a high rating?
George Bihun – We have to be careful when we say high. The cut off we looked at Cluff Lake was no higher than 2.5 micro sieverts per hour (µSv/h). When you work at a uranium mine, you can work at 2.5 µSv/h; based over time that's very low. We're finding them at 3 or 4, so the question is how large is the area and what's the risk. Do we have somebody stand on that site for 24 hours a day for 30 days to get the dose of the maximum level you're allowed? What is the chance of that happening if they have to stand on the side of a cliff? We need good data to look at it a little closer.

Q: What is the temporary storage area? What does "temporary" mean?
A: Right now debris is sitting in the bush and it's been there for the last 40 years. We have collected hazardous material and relocated it to our "temporary storage site". We anticipate that an engineered landfill will be required to accommodate this material at both the Gunnar and Lorado sites. We will store the small amount of special waste we are collecting at the satellite sites until a proper landfill is designed. That material will ultimately be buried in an engineered landfill to accommodate material requiring special handling.

George Bihun - Lead batteries will be shipped down south for recycling.

SRC – We'll likely have asbestos disposal at the Gunnar mine site for the asbestos sheets in the concrete panels, but we can't prejudge the environmental assessment at that site. The question of 'how long' depends on how long does it take for other sites to get decommissioned.

Q: The road out to Lorado is used a lot and we drive by the mine every day. What are the uranium levels at Lorado?
Comment from guest – Stuff they're storing is less hazardous than what's on the road.
A: The levels should be low.

George Bihun – Gamma levels on the site should be 2-3. Some of those levels you have to within certain limits, for example limits at 30 days, to meet criteria. The levels aren't too bad, but you shouldn't be out there.

Q: Before what you've just proposed, are you going to finish the work that you just did?
A: We will be doing work simultaneously. We have some feedback from SE on the inspections that we just did. We'll try to do that sooner than later; June maybe. Assuming that permits continue on with the work for 2010, we can at least start on the proposed sites as well.

Q: Do you have any guidelines for dealing with the gamma right away – say if the levels are 5-6? Or are you just doing the site survey and then sending that data in?
A: We do a pre-work survey, then if we've moved the waste rock, we do a post-work survey; what it's like before, what it's like after. If you did the survey initially and it was fine and then you moved a bunch of rock around, you would still have to do a before and after survey.

Q: Are you monitoring those sites every day to make sure you haven't hit levels that have changed the safety requirements for working at that site? If you happen to hit an area that has some high levels (like at Cigar Lake), you have to change the whole process which is highly unlikely.
A: Typically gamma levels are low. If there was still a lot of high grade material, they'd still be mining it. We have not come across any radiation levels that would prohibit us from working on a site for the short periods of time required for the remediation work.

Comment from Guest asking question – Not saying there's lots of high-grade material, but if it's something you didn't see or something they didn't find when they were mining.

Comment from another Guest – That is a health issue and that's what we're concerned about.

Break in the questions
Mark Simpson (SRC) – The focus of this presentation has been on satellite sites, but we are working on the Gunnar environmental assessment and also we now have the guidelines from CNSC for Lorado. So work will be started to prepare an environmental assessment for that site as well because it's another licensed site. Lorado is likely a concern for most people.

Q: Will you try and fast track Lorado – the one that affects us the most?
A: This community is concerned with Lorado because it's right in your backyard, and the road goes right through it. At this point, the guidelines have been finalized and we just received those last week. The Lorado remediation will require an Environmental Assessment (EA) report. The report, once completed, will go through the various regulatory bodies before a license to remediate the site is issued. As far as Gunnar is concerned, last year the EA was started at that site. Our contractor (AECOM) is compiling data collected last year for the EA and it's in the process of being written. There might be a minor amount of water sampling that needs to be done, but the bulk of the work is complete and we're hoping to see the draft document by the end of the year.

Q: Has there been any cost-benefit surveys done to see if the scrap metal has enough economic value to make it worthwhile to haul it out?
A: There was a scrap metal recycling option done for Gunnar where there's a lot of steel in one location. There was no cost-benefit associated with recycling the steel. Several options were looked at and in all cases the cost out weighted the value of recycling the steel.

Comment from Guest asking question – It would have to go to a recycling facility and whether it's hauled on a winter road or on a barge that's already going somewhere empty. Is it worth it? Doubt it.

SRC – It's been looked at and the numbers indicate no cost-benefit.

George Bihun – I suppose we'll look into it as an option when the EA comes out.

SRC – Burying all the steel we find at satellite sites - the total tonnage isn't that much. The moving costs are high and what's the best way to handle it. There are issues with possible movement of contaminants. The onsite disposal option is the most effective way to deal with that material as long as it isn't causing environmental problems.

Q: Speaking of moving contaminants off the mine sites. When Gunnar was closed in 1964, houses were moved to Uranium City – something like 25 of them.
A: Some of them went to Uranium City, some to Fort Chip. They even tried to move the hospital as I understand. Power plant material was even moved. The mining industry may have been interested in some of that and took it off site. We can't address what happened 40 years ago, but as far as material removed from the site, we asked if it's within the scope of the current contract and the houses moved from Gunnar aren't part of the contract.

Q: How do we get involved in your surveys in the communities? How do we get our people and students involved in these cleanup programs? You actually give out a contract, right? Our people aren't always in these contracts.
A: If there are qualified people here, then it would be great to have them working on the program because they have a vested interest in ensuring it's done right. In the community, there are two representatives who sit on the Project Review Committee (PRC) – Russell Powder and Dean Classen. They would be initial contacts in the community. Certainly call us to find out what's happening. We have a website where we post information. And we're certainly looking to improve community involvement in the process.

Q: I was told you were supposed to conduct community meetings and inform the communities monthly, but this is the first meeting since you started this project.
A: We can find ways to improve communication with the communities. There was no stipulation that we must report on a monthly basis. I understand you want to be informed about what's going on and we appreciate that. When you called me, I made some suggestions about ways to improve communication. As we proceed with the program, we might allocate half a day every week, through the summer where we'll have an employee available (at the town hall or similar location) to take questions if anybody wants to come in; that was a suggestion, not confirmed yet. I think that's a valuable thing we could do this summer and we might look into that.

Q: Where are AECOM and the PAGC at with the TK (Traditional Knowledge) and land use study?
A: That relationship is not quite finalized, but something will happen very soon. TK was originally scheduled for last summer, but will be starting very quickly. Also the socio-economic portion of the EA will be done. AECOM is looking to work with all the communities. We don't have any dates yet, but expect something to come out pretty soon.

Q: Why aren't you holding more meetings here?
A: The meeting we held in Stony Rapids, in March, was the first "Gunnar Options Workshop" meeting with the PRC. Dean and Russell were there. That meeting was to discuss the options for the remediation of the Gunnar mine, not the satellite sites. Gunnar is a CNSC regulated site and they indicated the impact to the community is beyond Uranium City (Black Lake, Stony Rapids, Camsell Portage, Fort Chip and some groups on Alberta's side as well). It's not just a Uranium City project. We are planning, in addition to that initial meeting, to have meetings in Uranium City, Fond du Lac, and Stony Rapids – these will be public meetings. PRC is essentially the leadership of the communities, chair persons and chiefs in the Athabasca region. That was the initial meeting we had in Stony and soon we'll move that down to the public and there will be other meetings coming up.

Comment from Guest – You should have them all in Uranium City.

SRC – We can't say that because the affected areas are close to Uranium City that everything will come to Uranium City. There's not just one group to provide information for, but the impacted (Athabasca region). There are specific communities named.

Q: What does the PRC panel board stand for?
A: Project Review Committee.

Q: Why are you allowed to bury stuff? There's supposed to be one site for cement, steel, and wood – possibly Eagle – and you were supposed to dispose of it there. Why are you burying it?
A: The application we put forward to the SE for the cleanup of all the satellite sites never indicated that all material was going to one particular site.

Q: It's all contaminated so it shouldn't be buried. What about that job you guys did out at the landfill where you took a bunch of contaminated steel, waste rock and garbage and threw it in our dump?
A: It was a small amount of material. There was municipal garbage at the Uranium Ridge mine site – washing machines, broken bottles, debris, vehicles not related to the mine. These things were being dumped there and it was used by the local people as an area to get rid of garbage. In our initial application to SE, we proposed that this municipal debris could be disposed of at the municipal landfill. We got permission from the municipal council, but there was one flaw. The day the material went to dump was a Saturday because we work whenever the weather is good. A small amount of material was dumped; domestic waste. It was picked up in the bucket of a loader that was used at the site. Yes, some material went to the landfill and SE was brought in to look at it.

Comment from Guest asking question – You didn't get consent from the dump.

SRC – Yes we did have their consent. The mistake was we didn't call the guy at the dump when they took the load. After this incident we decided not take anything to the Uranium City landfill ever again. And that's another reason why we don't want to haul stuff away from the sites because of the potential of the perception of moving contaminated materials.

Q: Since you made the mistake of taking the material to the dump - that's a mistake that won't happen again - shouldn't you give us some money to do the water testing?
A: We did a sampling immediately, a soil sample, to determine what exactly was taken there. Essentially they couldn't tell that anything was different then what was already there.

Comment from Guest asking question – Do you have that information? I'd like to see it.

SRC – Yes, we have that information for the soil test but not the water. Sampling was done the week of the incident, but there's so much stuff in there it would be hard to separate out where it all came from.

Comment from Guest asking question – That would be very good if you could give us some money to do soil testing so that people can see that maybe you are here to do the cleanup and do whatever you can to make it right.

SRC – Our concern is that with the amount of material that went into the dump was so small in the first place that a much larger situation came up out of a very small insignificant amount of material.

Q: There's a lot of garbage around the bush and lake shores, which has been put there by recreationalists and campers. I understand this is not part of your mandate, but it does show you that people do inhabit this landscape and they haven't been careful about littering. It's really offensive to see.
A: When we're doing remediation work and we're driving by a site, we'll sometimes pick up the debris and dispose of the garbage for you. It's not on the mine site, but we'll pick it up. It's a bit opportunistic because if we happen to be driving by, we'll pick it up. We're trying to get this stuff cleaned up at the site and make the site safe, so that you're not going to fall into a mine shaft. There's lots of places around, even in town, that are even worse than the mine sites we're working at.

Q: You should be cleaning up these sites when there are no leaves on the trees. Inspections on the property should be done right now too.
A: Yes, it's harder to find stuff. How much damage do you do to get to that material that's deep in the forest? Which is worse – to leave that piece of steel or hack your way through the bush? I've done inspections before the end of May and you can see a lot more before everything has leafed out. We have a small window of good visibility. Once you get in there with a tractor or hoe, you find a bunch more stuff that you didn't see visually.

Closing
Mr. Simpson thanked everyone for coming and says the SRC will continue to engage the communities to let them know what's going on with the project.

<<Meeting adjourned at 3:07 PM. >>