

Record of Proceedings, Including Reasons for Decision

In the Matter of

Proponent Cameco Corporation

Subject Environmental Assessment Guidelines (EA
Scoping) for the proposed construction of a
Mining Facility at the Cigar Lake Project

Date August 29, 2003

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Project Proponent: Cameco Corporation

Address/Location: 11th Street West, unit 2121, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7M 1J3

Purpose: Environmental Assessment Guidelines (EA Scoping) for the proposed construction of a mining facility at the Cigar Lake Project

Letter of intent: March 15, 2003

Date(s) of hearing: June 25, 2003

Location: Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Public Hearing Room, 280 Slater St., 14th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario

Members present: L.J. Keen, Chair
C. Barnes
J.A. Dosman
Y.M. Giroux

A.R. Graham
L. MacLachlan
J.M. McDill

Counsel: I.V. Gendron
Secretary: M.A. Leblanc
Recording Secretary: C.N. Taylor

Project Proponent Represented By	Document Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• J. Grandey, President and Chief Executive Officer• J. Jarrell, Vice-President of Environment and Safety• B. Schmitke, General Manager of the Cigar Lake Project• G. White, Senior Environmental Engineer	CMD 03-H20.1
CNSC Staff	Document Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• C. Maloney• K. Scissons• H. Humphries	CMD 03-H20
Intervenors	Document Number
See Appendix A	

Decision and Reasons:

Date of Decision: June 25, 2003

1. Introduction

Cameco Corporation (Cameco) has, in a letter to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (the “Commission” when referring to the tribunal component, and “CNSC staff” when referring to the personnel of the CNSC), stated its intent to apply for authorization to construct and operate the Cigar Lake Mining Facility, near Wollaston Lake, Saskatchewan. The proposed mine would be located on the site of the existing licensed test mine.

The Cigar Lake project was the subject of a 1997 Environmental Assessment Panel Review under the *Environmental Assessment and Review Process Guidelines Order* (EARPGO). However, the Federal Court decision of 2002 in the McClean Lake case¹ has produced uncertainty regarding the transitional provisions of the CEAA for projects previously assessed under the EARPGO. CNSC staff therefore, using an abundance of caution, and at the request of Cameco, agreed that a new environmental assessment under the CEAA will be carried out for Cigar Lake Mining Facility.

Therefore, in accordance with the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (CEAA), the CNSC will prepare and make a decision on an environmental assessment (EA) of the proposed project before the Commission makes a decision on the licence amendment application. For this environmental assessment under the CEAA, the Commission is the sole responsible authority.

In carrying out its responsibility under the CEAA, the Commission must first determine the *scope of the project* and the *scope of the assessment*.

To assist the Commission in this regard, CNSC staff, after consulting with other government departments, the public, and other stakeholders, prepared a draft *Environmental Assessment Guidelines* document (EA Guidelines), including draft statements of scope for the approval of the Commission. The EA Guidelines also contain recommendations and instructions for the structure and methods to be used in completing the environmental assessment, including for the conduct of further public and stakeholder consultations. The EA Guidelines are attached as Appendix A to CMD 03-H20.

At the start of the public hearing, CNSC staff introduced two modifications to the proposed EA Guidelines appended to CMD 03-H20. First, in the section 10, CNSC staff is proposing that the EA Screening Report be presented at a one-day hearing and not at a two-day hearing. This change would make the process consistent with that implemented by the Commission for previous EA Guidelines documents. Second, staff made a correction to the site preparation excavation licence number found in section 2, which should read USML-Excavate-Cigar.00/2004 instead of USML-Excavate-Cigar.05/2004.

¹ See *Interchurch Uranium Committee Educational Co-operative v. Atomic Energy Control Board and COGEMA Resources Inc.*, FCTD, T-1313-99, September 23, 2002. The decision is under appeal to the Federal Court of Appeal.

Issues:

In considering the EA Guidelines, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission was required to decide, pursuant to section 15(1) and 16(3) of the CEAA:

- a) the *scope of the project* for which the environmental assessment is to be conducted; and
- b) the *scope of the factors* to be taken into consideration in the conduct of the environmental assessment.

The Commission also considered whether, at this time, it would request the federal Minister of the Environment, pursuant to section 25 of the CEAA, to refer the project to a mediator or a review panel.

Public Hearing:

The Commission, in making its decision, considered information presented for a one-day public hearing held on June 25, 2003 in Ottawa, Ontario. The public hearing was conducted in accordance with the *Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Rules of Procedure*. During the public hearing, the Commission received written submissions and heard oral presentations from Cameco (CMD 03-H20.1), CNSC staff (CMD 03-H20) and intervenors (CMD 03-H20.2 to CMD 03-H20.5). See Appendix A for a detailed list of interventions.

2. Decision

Based on its consideration of the matter, as described in more details in the following sections of this *Record of Proceedings*,

the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, pursuant to sections 15 and 16 of the CEAA, approves the *Environmental Assessment (EA) Guidelines (Scope of Project & Assessment): Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Construction and Operation of the Cigar Lake Mining Facility*, as set out in Appendix A of CMD 03-H20, as amended by CNSC staff during the hearing, and as modified by the Commission below.

The Commission also decides that, at this time, it will not request the federal Minister of the Environment (pursuant to section 25 of the CEAA) to refer the project to a review panel or mediator.

The Commission makes the following changes to the draft EA Guidelines:

In section 9.2.2 (Spatial and Temporal Boundaries of the Assessment), page 9, the sentence:

“Study areas will encompass all relevant components of the environment including people, land, water, air and other aspects of the natural and human environment.” is replaced with:

“Study areas will encompass all relevant components of the environment including people, non-human biota, land, water, air and other aspects of the natural and human environment”.

In section 11.0 (Conclusion and Recommendations for Decision), page 16, the sentence:

“The Commission will make its decision on the Screening Report; then, it can proceed with licensing hearings to make its decisions on Cameco’s application for a licence to construct, and a subsequent licence to operate.” is replaced with:

“The Commission will make its decision on the Screening Report. If the Commission concludes that the project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, taking into account the appropriate mitigation measures, it may proceed with licensing hearings and decisions on Cameco’s applications for licences to construct and subsequently to operate the facility”.

3. Issues and Commission Findings

3.1 Application of the CEAA

As noted in section 1 above, CNSC staff, due to the uncertainty created by the federal court decision and subsequent appeal on the McClean Lake case, has decided, on Cameco’s request, to use an abundance of caution and conduct another environmental assessment of the project under the CEAA. In response to a question by the Commission on this decision, Cameco confirmed that it wishes to proceed with the environmental assessment under the CEAA.

The Commission considered the CNSC staff’s rationale and concurs with the decision to proceed with an environmental assessment of the proposed project under the CEAA.

3.2 Type of Environmental Assessment

CNSC staff explained that because the project is not of a type described in the CEAA *Comprehensive Study List Regulations*, a “screening” environmental assessment would be conducted, and a *Screening Report* would be prepared in accordance with subsection 18(1) of the CEAA. CNSC staff explained that it would prepare the Screening Report using the results of environmental assessment studies delegated to the proponent pursuant to subsection 17(1) of the CEAA. CNSC staff will require that those studies be carried out in accordance with the approved EA Guidelines.

3.2.1 Screening vs. Comprehensive Study

Two intervenors, Ms. Shiell and Canadian Uranium Alliance, expressed the view that the assessment should be a Comprehensive Study rather than a Screening Report. In response to this comment, the Commission sought clarification from CNSC staff as to why the assessment will be a Screening instead of a Comprehensive Study. CNSC staff explained that, because the Cigar Lake Mining Facility project will take place entirely within an existing licensed area, it is not a project of a type described in the CEEA *Comprehensive Study List Regulations*. Only projects listed in the *Comprehensive Study List Regulations* may be subjected to a Comprehensive Study.

Based on this information, the Commission is satisfied that the type of environmental assessment required under the CEEA is a screening.

3.2.2 Screening vs. Review Panel or Mediator

In response to questions from the Commission on the reasons why CNSC staff is not recommending a review panel in this case, CNSC staff stated that it considers that the effects of the project and public concerns to date can be adequately assessed in a screening assessment. In support of this, CNSC staff noted that the project was recently subjected to a full technical assessment and public review by a panel under the former *Environmental Assessment Review Process Guidelines Order* (EARPGO). While some updating of the information from that process will be required, the study team will have access to this large body of relevant information.

CNSC staff also noted that, at this time, there is no indication of any potential significant environmental effects or public concerns associated with the project which would warrant having the project referred to a review panel or mediator pursuant to section 25 of the CEEA.

In her intervention, Ms. Shiell expressed concern about the adequacy of the public consultation process conducted during the drafting of the EA Guidelines and, based on this, questioned whether the Commission has sufficient information to draw such a conclusion with respect to a referral to a review panel. The Commission considered this and, as discussed in section 3.3 below, the Commission is satisfied that the public had sufficient opportunity to comment on the draft EA Guidelines. The Commission also notes that further opportunities will be available throughout the environmental assessment process for the public to convey their concerns.

Based on these considerations, the Commission concludes that, at this early stage in the EA, there is no indication of likely significant environmental effects of the project or public concern that would warrant a request for a review panel or mediator. The Commission further notes that if, during the assessment, there is considerable uncertainty about, or evidence of significant environmental effects, or if significant public concern arise, CNSC staff will inform the Commission and recommend that the Commission request the Minister of the Environment to refer the project to a review panel or mediator as appropriate.

The Commission decides therefore that, at this time, it will not refer the project to the Minister of the Environment for referral to a review panel or mediator. The Commission requests that

CNSC staff inform the Commission of any significant issues or public concerns arising during the conduct of the environmental assessment which may justify such a referral. In that regard, CNSC staff may inform and make recommendations to the Commission by way of a Significant Development Report at any regularly scheduled Commission meeting, or directly through the Secretary of the Commission.

3.3 Consultations on the Draft EA Guidelines

This section addresses the consultations that CNSC staff conducted on the proposed draft EA Guidelines. The Commission considered the adequacy of these consultations as part of its consideration of the appropriateness of the proposed EA Guidelines, and whether the public and other stakeholders have had an adequate opportunity to become informed about the assessment to this point in the process.

3.3.1 Federal Government

CNSC staff explained that, in accordance with the CEAA *Federal Coordination Regulations*, CNSC staff has consulted on the draft EA Guidelines, and will continue to consult during the environmental assessment with the following federal departments: Health Canada; Environment Canada; Indian and Northern Affairs; Fisheries and Oceans Canada; and Natural Resources Canada. CNSC staff indicated that all comments received from the federal review of the draft EA Guidelines were incorporated in the EA Guidelines where appropriate.

3.3.2 Provincial Government

CNSC staff stated that it has confirmed with the Province of Saskatchewan that all relevant environmental assessment requirements for the project have been previously fulfilled, and that a further EA, under the Saskatchewan *Environmental Assessment Act*, is not required for the proposed project. However, Saskatchewan Environment and Saskatchewan Labour have expressed their interest in participating in the technical review of the assessment.

3.3.3 Public

To provide for public input to the draft EA Guidelines, CNSC staff reported that it established a “public registry” for the assessment in accordance with the requirements of the CEAA. The registry provides information on the project and access to all related documents. The disposition of comments received from the government is included in the CNSC staff report CMD 03-H20 Appendix B.

CNSC staff also provided details on the broader public consultation program currently being conducted by Cameco. That program covers the environmental assessment and planned future development of the project.

3.3.4 Conclusions on the Adequacy of Consultations on the Draft EA Guidelines

Based on this information, and taking into account the further opportunity for public comment provided by this public hearing on the matter, the Commission is satisfied that the public and other stakeholders have had sufficient opportunity to become informed about, and provide input on the draft EA Guidelines. The Commission is also satisfied that the public concerns expressed to date from this process do not warrant a referral of the project to the Minister of the Environment for referral to a review panel or mediator.

The Commission notes that the public will continue to be consulted during the conduct of the environmental assessment studies (refer to section 3.6.4 below), and will have another opportunity to provide comments on the results of the screening environmental assessment when the matter comes before the Commission for a decision at a future public hearing.

3.4 The Scope of the Project

3.4.1 General

“Scope” under the CEAA is expressed in two parts: the *scope of the project* (i.e., the physical works and activities proposed) and the *scope of assessment* (i.e., the scope of the factors to be considered in assessing the effects of the project). This section addresses only the issues relating to the *scope of the project*. The issues related to the *scope of assessment* are considered in section 3.5 of this *Record of Proceedings*.

CNSC staff explained how the CEAA requires the responsible authority, pursuant to section 15 of the CEAA, to systematically identify the *scope of the project*. This begins with the identification of the *principal project*; in this case, the proposed construction and operation of the Cigar Lake Mining Facility. While decommissioning is not part of the project, a preliminary decommissioning plan will also be included in the assessment. The CEAA further requires that other physical activities directly related to the principal project be considered for inclusion in the *scope of the project*.

In summary, CNSC staff recommended that the Commission identify the project as including: site excavation, ponds and stockpiles; construction of No.2 shaft, ground freezing system, and jet bore mining system; construction of on-site ore handling, transport and water recycle systems; construction of operating ventilation system; electrical control systems, and utilities and ancillaries such as compressed air, propane and fuel storage; construction of waste water treatment systems and waste rock management systems; and operation and maintenance of the mine and facilities. CNSC staff noted that the project does not include any milling of uranium ore, or any management of uranium mill tailings. Cameco intends to make arrangements to have the milling of the ore and tailings management done at another existing licensed uranium mill facility. Those arrangements will be the subject of a future environmental assessment.

In response to a question by the Commission on the purpose of No.2 shaft, Cameco stated that the shaft will provide fresh air to, and expel exhaust air from, the mine. The shaft also provides a means of egress, and to move materials in and out of the mine.

In response to a question by the Commission on the location of the camp for accommodating workers, Cameco explained that the workers will be temporarily accommodated in the construction camp but will eventually move to a permanent residence located either near the existing construction site, or on the road to the airstrip. While the Commission is satisfied that the general wording of the proposed EA Guidelines captures this, the Commission expects that further elaboration on worker accommodations and their effects on the environment will be provided in the Screening Report.

3.4.2 Accidents and Malfunctions

With reference to recent flooding at the McArthur River Mine, the Commission sought clarification on whether such an event at this mine site would be taken into account in the environmental assessment. Cameco replied that the effects of a higher than anticipated water ingress to the mine will be assessed. Cameco added that its strategies and contingencies for pumping capacity and mine water storage and treatment facilities on the surface will be updated based on a study done by its consultant (Golder Associates) on these issues.

3.4.3 Transportation

Further with respect to the transportation component of the project, the Commission sought clarification on whether the planned modifications to the road leading to the Cigar Lake Mining Facility, will be included in the *scope of the project*. CNSC staff stated that the road improvements, required primarily for off-site waste rock disposal and ore-slurry shipments, are not within the scope of the project for this EA; however, they are part of the project for the Cigar Lake waste rock disposal in the McClean Lake Mining Facility's Sue C Pit, for which a separate EA screening was conducted and a public hearing was held on June 25, 2003 to consider the EA screening report. The Commission notes that the combined effects of the two projects will be addressed, where relevant, in the assessment of cumulative effects. (see 3.5.2 Cumulative environmental effects)

3.4.4 Conclusions of the Scope of the Project

Based on the above information and considerations, the Commission accepts the CNSC staff recommendation concerning the definition of the *scope of the project* and approves the definition of the project scope as set out in section 7.0 of the draft EA Guidelines.

3.5 Scope of the Assessment

3.5.1 General

The second part of “scope” under the CEAA (the *scope of project* being the first part) is the *scope of the assessment* – otherwise described in the CEAA as the scope of the factors that will be considered in assessing the environmental effects of the project.

CNSC staff explained that the scope of a screening assessment under the CEAA must be determined by the Commission pursuant to subsection 16(3) of the CEAA, and include the factors set out in paragraphs 16(1)(a) to (d) of the CEAA. Other factors may be included under paragraph 16(1)(e) of the CEAA.

CNSC staff stated that the mandatory factors in subsection 16(1) of the CEAA are: the environmental effects of the project, including those that may be caused by malfunctions or accidents and any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects or activities; the significance of the effects identified above; comments from the public that are received in accordance with the CEAA and its regulations; and measures that are technically and economically feasible that would mitigate any significant adverse environmental effects of the project.

In addition to these factors, CNSC staff recommended that the Commission include, pursuant to paragraph 16(1)(e), the following factors: the purpose of the project; the need for, and requirements of a follow-up program in respect of the project; and the capacity of renewable resources that are likely to be significantly affected by the project to meet the needs of the present and those of the future.

In response to a question from the Commission concerning the potential effects of the sewage treatment effluent on the environment (in particular, on the muskeg area into which the effluent will be discharged), CNSC staff confirmed that the effects of the effluent of treated mine water and sewage on the muskeg fall within the above-recommended scope of the assessment. In response to a further question from the Commission on waste management, CNSC staff stated that other waste disposal issues, such as recycling, will also be addressed within the scope.

3.5.2 Cumulative Environmental Effects

With respect to the assessment of the cumulative effects of the project and other projects in the area, the Commission sought further clarification on whether the environmental effects of the proposed disposal of Cigar Lake waste rock in the McClean Lake Mining Facility Sue C pit will be considered. CNSC staff responded that the transport of ore slurry would be included in the cumulative effects in the assessment (see also 3.4.3 transportation). CNSC staff also stated that the effects of the temporary waste rock storage piles at the Cigar Lake site, including any leaching of arsenic and other contaminants through the polyethylene liners, will be included in the assessment of cumulative effects.

While the Commission is satisfied with the general wording for cumulative effects assessment used in the EA Guidelines, it is the Commission's expectation that the cumulative effects assessment will include, but will not be necessarily limited to, the effects of the project in combination with the effects of the project involving the temporary storage and future transport of waste rock from the Cigar Lake mine site, as well as the transport of ore slurry from the Cigar Lake mine site.

3.5.3 Follow-up Program

With respect to the proposed follow-up program, the Commission questioned whether there would be long-term environmental monitoring of the project. In response, CNSC staff stated that the monitoring of environmental effects will be required, and that this will be included in the recommended conditions of any future CNSC licence for the project.

The Commission notes that the EA follow-up program specified in the EA Guidelines will identify any specific environmental monitoring that is necessary to demonstrate or validate the predictions of the EA. The Commission further notes that, if the project proceeds, the follow-up program requirements will be combined with any other monitoring requirements deemed necessary by the Commission under its licensing process, and, as such, the EA follow-up program will be made a condition of the licence.

3.5.4 Conclusions on the Scope of the Assessment

Based on the above information, the Commission concludes that the scope of the assessment, as described in section 8.0 of the draft EA Guidelines, is appropriate for the purpose of the environmental assessment of the proposed Cigar Lake Mining Facility project.

3.6 Environmental Assessment Structure and Method

The draft EA Guidelines, in addition to containing statements describing the scope of the project and scope of the assessment (as addressed in the foregoing sections 3.4 and 3.5 of this *Records of Proceedings*), contain instructions relating to the structured approach and method to be used in conducting the environmental assessment. Therefore, in its consideration of the acceptability of the draft EA Guidelines document, the Commission also considered and made decisions on the recommended structure and methods for the assessment described therein.

Referring to the draft EA Guidelines, CNSC staff outlined the proposed structure and methods for completing the environmental assessment studies and Screening Report. This includes instructions for describing: the project (construction, normal operations, accidents and malfunctions, and decommissioning); the spatial and temporal boundaries of the assessment; the existing environment; the systematic identification, assessment and mitigation of environmental effects; the assessment of cumulative effects; the significance of residual effects (post-mitigation); the conduct of stakeholder consultations throughout the assessment; and the design and implementation of the follow-up program.

3.6.1 Description of Existing Environment

The Commission questioned CNSC staff as to whether there was sufficient baseline information available on the existing environmental conditions, particularly with respect to water quality. CNSC staff confirmed that sufficient baseline studies were available to adequately assess the effects of the project on the environment, including surrounding water quality.

In response to a question from the Commission on the process for selecting Valued Ecosystem Components (VECs), CNSC staff explained that VECs will be selected based on both their importance to the local residents and their importance to each of the different trophic levels in the ecosystem. CNSC staff stated that it will strive to achieve a broad representation of the VECs. CNSC staff added that they would be working in collaboration with other federal authorities to ensure that appropriate VECs are identified early in the environmental assessment process. Cameco added that the identification of the VECs will be compared with the previous assessment to ensure that consistency is maintained where appropriate.

3.6.2 Assessment of Effects Caused by the Project

Assessment of Radiation Effects on Biota:

In her intervention, Ms. Shiell expressed concern about the lack of in-situ studies on the long-term genetic effects of alpha radiation on resident biota. Ms. Shiell is of the view that such field studies of the long-term effects of high-grade uranium mining needed to be done before further uranium mine projects are considered. In response to these concerns, CNSC staff stated that the direct measurement of genetic effects from radiation in the field is not possible due to the complexities and to the inability to distinguish the effects of the mine effluent from other factors affecting biota in the environment. CNSC staff added that a considerable amount of data from controlled laboratory experimentation is available for the assessment. CNSC staff further stated that, while there is imperfect knowledge on direct effects of alpha-emitters on reproductive tissue, CNSC staff applies, in accordance with the precautionary principle, sufficient levels of conservatism and safety factors in its evaluations. CNSC staff also stated that it employs an adaptive management approach to the monitoring and regulation of projects. CNSC staff further noted that any significant genetic effects would manifest themselves in changes in species populations and reproductive success. The Commission accepts this response by CNSC staff and concludes that direct in-situ studies of the genetic effects of uranium mine effluent on biota are not required for the purpose of this environmental assessment. The Commission is satisfied that conservative projections of genetic effects based on existing laboratory experimentation and supported by indirect field measurements of population and reproductive success at similar locations, will be sufficient for this EA.

Assessment of Effects on Archaeological Resources:

From its review of the EA Guidelines, the Commission questioned how the impact of the project on the archaeological resources will be assessed. In response, Cameco explained that the proposed project would be within the boundaries of the currently licensed test mine, and that an

archaeological survey was conducted during the previous licensing process. Cameco confirmed however that further monitoring for archaeological resources during the project will be considered for the purpose of the follow-up program.

3.6.3 Spatial and Temporal Boundaries

Further with respect to the inclusion of non-human biota in the EA, the Commission questioned CNSC staff on whether the wording in section 9.2.2 of the proposed EA Guidelines (concerning spatial and temporal boundaries) should include specific reference to animals and other non-human biota. CNSC staff responded that the wording was intended to be inclusive of both humans and non-human biota. While the Commission accepts this interpretation, the Commission decided to modify this section of the EA Guidelines for greater clarity and to reflect public interest in the matter by adding specific reference to non-human biota.

3.6.4 Public Consultation During the Assessment

Cameco described the public consultation activities that will be carried out during the EA process, such as the use of various media to inform and engage individuals and interest groups and appropriate public consultation events. The Commission finds Cameco's public consultation program for the EA, as reflected in the EA Guidelines, to be acceptable. In this regard the Commission notes the importance of continued involvement of First Nations, including with respect to the use of traditional knowledge in such things as VEC identification, archaeological resource assessment and follow-up.

3.6.5 Conclusion on the Environmental Assessment Structure and Method

Based on the information presented, the Commission, with the one minor modification noted above, is satisfied with the general structure, methods, and other instructions for conducting the environmental assessment, as described in the draft EA Guidelines attached to CMD 03-H20. The Commission requests that CNSC staff closely monitor the conduct of the studies to ensure that the studies are being carried out in accordance with the EA Guidelines.

4. Conclusion

The Commission has considered the information and submissions of the project proponent and CNSC staff as presented in the material available for reference on the record, as well as the oral and written submissions of intervenors provided at the hearing.

The Commission, in making its decision pursuant to section 15 and 16 of the CEAA, approves the *Environmental Assessment Guidelines (Scope of Project and Assessment) – Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Cigar Lake Mining Facility*, as presented as Appendix A to CMD 03-H20, and as modified by CNSC staff and the Commission during the hearing, and as further modified by the Commission as follows:

The Commission makes the following changes to the EA Guidelines:

In section 9.2.2 (Spatial and Temporal Boundaries of the Assessment), page 9, the sentence:

“Study areas will encompass all relevant components of the environment including people, land, water, air and other aspects of the natural and human environment.” is replaced with;

“Study areas will encompass all relevant components of the environment including people, non-human biota, land, water, air and other aspects of the natural and human environment.”

In section 11.0 (Conclusion and Recommendations for decision), page 16, the sentence:

“The Commission will make its decision on the Screening Report; then, it can proceed with licensing hearings to make its decisions on Cameco’s application for a licence to construct, and a subsequent licence to operate.” should be replaced with:

“The Commission will make its decision on the Screening Report. If the Commission concludes that the project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, taking into account the appropriate mitigation measures, it may proceed with licensing hearings and decisions on Cameco’s applications for licences to construct and subsequently to operate the facility”.

The Commission also concludes that, at this time, it will not request the federal Minister of the Environment to refer the project to a mediator or review panel in accordance with the provisions of the CEAA.

The Commission requests CNSC staff to closely monitor the conduct of the technical assessment studies and stakeholder consultations activities and report to the Commission on any issues that could justify the Commission giving further consideration to a referral of the project to the Minister of the Environment, or for amending the scope of the project or assessment.

Marc A. Leblanc
Secretary,
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Date of decision: June 25, 2003

Date of release of Reasons for Decision: August 29, 2003

Appendix A

Intervenors	Document Number
Cogema Resources Inc., represented by B. Pollock, Vice-President of Health and Safety	CMD 03-H20.2
Canadian Uranium Alliance	CMD 03-H20.3
M. Shiell	CMD 03-H20.4 CMD 03-H20.4A
W.R. Adamson	CMD 03-H20.5