Attendees

SRC

- Joe Muldoon - Vice-President, Environment
- Ian Wilson - Manager, Environmental Remediation
- Chris Reid - Project Manager, Gunnar Site
- Skye Ketilson - Project Manager, Gunnar Site
- Mark Calette - Senior Advisor, Community and Aboriginal Engagement
- Alexey Klyashtorin - Senior Environmental Scientist
- Erin Adrian - Project Coordinator
- Garricks Elechi - Project Coordinator
- Vanessa Crawford - Administrative Assistant
- Tara Stratton - Executive Coordinator

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC)

- Karina Lange - Advisor, Aboriginal Consultation
- Adam Levine - Senior Project Officer
- Nicole Frigault - Environmental Assessment Officer

Athabasca Basin Community members

- Leonard Hardlotte - Prince Albert Grand Council
- Councillor Willie John Laurent - Fond du Lac First Nation
- Kevin Mercredi - Fond du Lac First Nation
- Councillor George McDonald - Fond du Lac First Nation
- Louis Mercredi - Fond du Lac First Nation
- Councillor Ambroise Sandypoint - Black Lake First Nation
- Councillor John Toutsaint - Black Lake First Nation
- Victor Echodh - Black Lake First Nation
- Emil Hansen - Hatchet Lake First Nation
- Paul Denechezhe - Hatchet Lake First Nation
- George St. Pierre - Hatchet Lake First Nation
- Glenda Mercredi - Hatchet Lake First Nation
- Peter Gazandlare - Hatchet Lake First Nation
- Jack Flett - Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation
- Wayne McNeil - Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation
- Allen Augier - Métis Nation-Saskatchewan, Uranium City
- Curtis Fiss - Métis Nation-Saskatchewan, Stony Rapids

Other:

- Ann Coxworth - Saskatchewan Environmental Society
- Peter Prebble - Saskatchewan Environmental Society
- George Bihun - Saskatchewan Environment
- Trevor Podiama - SRK Consulting
- Mark Liskowich - SRK Consulting

Agenda

1. **Morning Session (9 a.m. - 12 p.m.)**
    a. Opening Prayer
    b. Introductions, objectives and agenda
    c. Frequently Asked Questions
    d. SRC Presentation
2. **Lunch Break (12 p.m. - 1 p.m.)**
3. **Afternoon Session (1 p.m. - 5 p.m.)**
    a. Presentation by SRC's Engineering Consultants (O'Kane, SRK)
    b. Presentation by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and updates from the Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment
    c. Meeting wrap-up and next steps
    d. Closing prayer

Discussion:

Q. Was the bidding process for a primary contractor sent out through Sask Tenders?
A. Anything over a certain dollar figure has to go out to the public. We can put targets and milestones to make sure local people will be used. We plan on using our lessons learned from the Lorado project, labour involved, entrepreneurial involvement and other resources from the communities, as well as training initiatives. We have partnered with agencies to accomplish this, one being Prince Albert Grand Council (PAGC). We are also developing a community monitoring program to train local people.

You can download the information from the Sask Tenders website. Mark Calette has also sent the information to all of the Athabasca Basin communities.

Q. Fond du Lac hasn't heard about any training. We need more communication to know what is going on.
A. Information hasn't been rolled out yet as we are working closely with PAGC to determine what are the training needs for this stage of the project. We will provide information to the communities when training plans are finalized.

Q. If we have another mild winter, will there be an issue with the stability of the ice road?
A. We hire local people to build the ice roads. We also follow the regulations set out by Saskatchewan Ministry of Highways. If we can't build the road due to a mild winter, we will use a barge if needed.

Q. Why did the Gunnar mine shut down? Was it mined out?
A. Yes, it was mined out.

Q. The design you presented, is it a final design?
A. Yes, we have been tasked to take this to the final level.

It also has to go through public approval, as well as a CNSC commission hearing. The commission has the final say.

Q. What are you planning on doing with the frozen slurry that contains arsenic, which is currently in the ice (permafrost)? When we were drilling the slurry ponds, it brought up a layer of frozen slurry 15 feet down. SRC's rep was excited about it, so they ordered in a special container and shipped it to the lab for testing. What are you doing to protect the land if global warming causes the slurry to melt?
A. We plan on constructing a cover for the tailings that will be up to 7 feet thick. This will act as a very good insulator. If it were to thaw, it would happen over a very long time and the toxicity of it would not impact the environment. The concentration would not cause any health concerns.

Climate change is a big concern in the north and throughout the country. CNSC faces a challenge with a number of our licenses in the north for this very reason. As a regulator, we ask that they try to incorporate climate change into their designs. If global change does happen quicker than expected, CNSC and SRC will have to change their plans. We will continue to monitor and maintain these areas, we won't just walk away.

Q. There is not a plan to put waste rock into the pit. Do you have any thoughts on this? Where did the rocks come from? They should be put right back where they came from. If we have a rainy season, the pit could leach. What if the levels of Lake Athabasca lower? There is concern about arsenic levels.
A. The arsenic levels are not that significant, it is the uranium levels that we are worried about. Backfilling the pit isn't as simple as bulldozing waste rock into the pit. If you are going to back fill the pit, we would have to use a barge or a conveyor belt. There would be higher safety risks to the people doing the work. The benefits do not outweigh the safety risks.

Q. Is the pit at a higher level than Lake Athabasca?
A. Yes

Q. Our elders have really pushed and let their voices be heard. They have indicated they would like the waste rock material to go back into the ground where it came from. Maybe we should look at milling the waste rock. You should look at who lives here, we aren't leaving.
A. We are looking at the safety of the workers and community members. Whatever is done will be feasible and safe for the people working on the site. Safety has to be taken into account.

CNSC has looked into the options. We do not look at costs as our mandate, we only look at health and safety. Half of the community wants it in the pit and the other half do not want it in the pit. We have heard very mixed opinions.

Q. If you removed the water from the pit and treated it, would you anticipate you would drive down the ramp and put debris/equipment into the pit?
A. No.

Q. Is water treatment considered for the pit? If the water gets treated, what is the end result? What would a water treatment plant cost?
A. Is has been considered and still is being considered. If the water goes through a water treatment plant, it would eventually go into Lake Athabasca. A water treatment plant could be between $10-20

million dollars. We have looked at all options (partially filling, completely filling, etc.) and those scenarios are not the best solutions. The uranium concentration going into the lake would be lower (better) than Saskatchewan water quality drinking levels if we were to proceed with water treatment.

Q. We haven't talked about doing a one-time treatment of the water, pros and cons. What would that look like?
A. There is no quick treatment. We haven't look at treating the pit water at this stage of remediation, because the contaminant content in the pit water is stable right now, so there is no immediate need to treat it. If you treat the water, there will be a sludge you have to deal with. The treatment can be done, but we would have to find a place to put the sludge.

Q. You are assuming the waste rock taken out of the channel is suitable for cover. Is it clean enough to use?
A. The rock won't be part of the top cover. The rock will be covered by the borrow material.

Q. You have to take into account that the land under the channel was mined as well. Is there seepage coming in? What are you doing with the high grade you find? When you start digging, you are going to dig up a lot of garbage, it will not be easy.
A. We are expecting to find a lot of debris. As it is found, it will be incorporated into the hazardous debris or the nonhazardous debris piles.

Q. Everything comes down to money, but we are not concerned about money. We cannot live from store-bought food. We are worried about the land and water. Is it safe enough to go hunting and fishing?
A. You are right, cost is a consideration, and so is safety. We are trying to have a balanced approach. We cannot make this site pristine, but we want to make the land as natural as possible.

Q. What are we doing with Zeemel Bay? By leaving the sediments in Zeemel Bay, we are leaving the contaminants still there.
A. Yes, you are right there is no plan to do anything with the sediment in Zeemel bay. Dredging Zeemel Bay is not a simple task. It would be very difficult to do without mobilizing contaminants. Mother Nature is doing a good job at covering the contaminants with sediments and bringing them back to their original isolated state. There will still be a fish advisory for a while. Long term, Zeemel Bay will be closely monitored.

Q. From reading the preliminary design report, I got the impression radium 226 is not being reduce. When the historical channel is restored, will all the radium coming from catchment 3 continue to go into Zeemel Bay?
A. We have numbers for all the sourced terms of radium. Uranium is the element of the most concern at this site. Our radium numbers will be reduced in Zeemel bay, but marginally.

Based on our monitoring, radium in Zeemel Bay is already meeting or very close to the Saskatchewan guidelines.

Q. What about radon gas?
A. There is no expected risks of radon gas, so no plan.

Q. We used to walk around Zeemel Bay, there were also families that stayed in that area. We are all alive and well today. If it is that dangerous, why am I still here?
A. The reason there is risk associated with Zeemel Creek and Bay is because everyone's tolerance is different. There is still a fundamental risk from eating fish out of this area. We don't recommend it at this time.