AREVA Resources Canada Inc.:
Project-Specific Guidelines (Scope of Project and Assessment) for the Proposed Caribou Project at the McLean Lake Operation

07-H148.1
Written submission from
AREVA Resources Canada Inc.

MR. POLLOCK: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I guess the first comment I'd like to make is we appreciate very much the opportunity to have this participation take place by video conference from Saskatoon.

Our official representatives here this morning are myself, as Vice-President of Regulatory Affairs and Licensing, and to my immediate left, Mr. Jim Corman, the General Manager from McLean Lake. We also have three other of our staff here in an observer role. I'm sure that you will have opportunity to meet them in the course of formal proceedings down the road as we move forward on various projects.

We have nothing to add to the written submission. We would be pleased to respond to whatever

questions the Commission may wish to ask of us and we would appreciate the opportunity perhaps towards the end of the proceedings to comment briefly on the question of the EA and licensing process.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Pollock. And I will give you that opportunity at the latter part of the questioning period today. We will be focussing at the beginning on the subject of the guidelines themselves.

With that now, we'll turn to the CNSC staff. Again, we have the written submission from the CNSC staff. And I'll turn it over to Dr. Thompson who is responsible for this file.

Do you have any comments you wish to make Dr. Thompson?

07-H148
Written submission from
CNSC staff

DR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon, Madam President, Members of the Commission. If I may, we have some comments, opening remarks to make.

With me today are Mr. Barclay Howden, the Director General of the Directorate of Nuclear Cycle and

Facilities Regulation; Mr. Brian Torrie, the Director of the Environmental Assessment Division; Mr. Kevin Scissons, the Director of the Uranium Mines and Mill Division; Mr. Michael Rinker, the Environmental Assessment Specialist on this file, as well as CNSC specialists who are providing support on the environmental assessment.

CNSC staff is here today to present the project specific guidelines for an environmental assessment for AREVA's -- AREVA Resources Canada's proposal to mine the Caribou ore deposit at McLean Lake, to mill that ore on the JEB mill -- in the JEB mill and manage waste resulting from the proposed project.

The proposed project specific guidelines are provided in CNSC staff CMD 07-H148. The proposed project specific guidelines were prepared by Saskatchewan Environment and CNSC staff and have been reviewed by federal authorities in accordance with federal coordination process.

The proposed environmental assessment guidelines were also made available for review by the general public, by First Nations and by the Métis. The proposed project specific guidelines that are now before the Commission take into consideration comments received from those consultations.

In addition, CNSC staff has proposed a

process to be followed with respect to the Environmental Assessment Screening Report including a recommendation on whether the Environmental Assessment Screening Report should be reviewed in the context of a public hearing of the Commission.

The recommendations for decision on the environmental assessment guidelines and for the process to be followed with respect to the Environmental Assessment Screening Report are provided to the Commission pursuant to the March 23, 2005 instructions from the Commission on the environmental assessment process.

I will now describe briefly the proposed process and options for the Commission to consider. In March, 2005, CNSC staff brought forward an annual report on and recommendations for improvement to the CNSC program to fulfil our responsibilities under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.*

At this meeting, CNSC staff presented the need to better harmonize environmental protection requirements in order to reduce overlap and duplication in programs to meet the needs of various legislation.

CNSC staff explained to the Commission their intention to adopt a systems approach to environmental management that would effectively integrate the provisions of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment*

Act into licensing under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act* where it was applicable.

In the minutes of the March 2005 meeting, the Commission welcomed the systems approach to environmental management and indicated its belief that it would contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the application of both the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* and the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act* by the CNSC.

The Commission also asked staff to move expeditiously to implement the systems approach to environmental management.

Since March 2005, a number of federal government initiatives have required all federal government departments and agencies to focus on ensuring timely, predictable and effective environmental assessments. A cabinet directive on streamlining regulation also came into effect on April 1st, 2007.

The purpose of this directive is to require Federal departments and agencies to determine where approval processes can be streamlined and where resources should be focussed. There is also a recently created major project management office to which the CNSC is a signatory and that initiative is focussing on more timely regulatory reviews.

In light of these initiatives, a more systematic and integrated approach to environmental assessment is provided in CNSC staff CMD 08-H148 [sic] and CMD 07-H148.A for the Commission to consider. This integrated approach is provided as a suggested means to address the cabinet directive on streamlining of regulation and the direction given to staff by the Commission in March 2005.

CNSC staff is recommending this integrated approach with the proposed EA guidelines for the Caribou project as a pilot to test whether greater efficiency of process can be achieved while ensuring that the review remains effective.

The process as described in CMD 07-H148.A would better integrate reviews under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act with* reviews of licence applications made under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act.* To facilitate this process, AREVA would be required to separately submit technical documents in support of both processes.

CNSC staff would conduct reviews of both the environmental assessment and licensing documents and would present the findings of these reviews to the Commission at one hearing. CNSC staff is currently documenting the way CNSC conducts the EA process. Process

improvements are also being considered and documented.

Initial consultation on process improvements was made with AREVA and Cameco and consultation will continue with the CNSC NGO Regulatory Advisory Committee and the Canadian Nuclear Association before presentation to the Commission in April 2008.

The systematic and integrated approach proposed today is a part of this initiative and would reduce much of the duplication of staff efforts that occurs for some projects.

This approach is provided as an option for the Commission to consider at this time, although options to accept or reject the proposed approach are provided in CMD 07-H148. A decision on this approach will not be required until the spring of 2008 ...

(technical difficulty - transferring to French translator)

... prévus dans le document 07-H148. Une décision doit être prise quant aux lignes directrices portant sur l'évaluation environnementale de ce projet.

Le personnel n'a pas une présentation officielle cet après-midi mais nous sommes tout à fait disposés à répondre à vos questions.

LA PRÉSIDENTE: Merci beaucoup, Docteur Thompson.

J'aimerais proposer à mes collègues comme

cela est indiqué dans l'exposé du Docteur Thompson que le rôle de la Commission aujourd'hui est d'en arriver à une décision sur les lignes directrices en matière d'évaluation environnementale.

La Commission va limiter ses questions dans un premier temps à la documentation qui nous a été soumise. Ensuite, nous nous pencherons sur la question du processus qui nous a été proposé. Comme Monsieur Pollock a demandé du temps pour parler de ce processus, le Docteur Thompson en a déjà parlé. Nous y reviendrons et je vous dirai lorsque nous sommes disposés à aborder cette question.

Donc, les premières questions porteront directement sur les lignes directrices qui nous sont soumises dans le cadre de ce projet.

J'aimerais demander au Docteur Barnes de prendre la parole.

MEMBRE BARNES: Étant donné que c'est une mine dans une région où il existe déjà d'autres mines, AREVA et le personnel de la Commission ont déjà dit que la situation est déjà bien connue.

Ce qui m'a un peu inquiété c'est qu'il semblerait que dans la documentation on parle peu et voilà -- on n'a peu parlé des effets cumulatifs. Nous pensons que cela est important pour cette région.

Donc, ma question au personnel: Est-ce que les effets cumulatifs ont été suffisamment pris en compte dans les lignes directrices?

DR. THOMPSON: Je vais demander à monsieur Michael Rinker de répondre à votre question, Monsieur Thompson (sic).

MR. RINKER: Monsieur Rinker.

Dans les lignes directrices, on dit que -- la province appelle cela des considérations régionales et au fédéral on appelle les effets cumulatifs. Autrement dit, il y a une exigence d'évaluer les effets cumulatifs du projet et il y a une référence au site web où l'on retrouve des directives là-dessus.

MEMBRE BARNES: Les effets cumulatifs à plus court terme tiennent compte de la durée n'est-ce pas des activités.

Une question pour AREVA: Est-ce que vous avez dit clairement pendant combien de temps vous pensez exploiter cette mine?

M. POLLOCK: Je vais demander à Monsieur -- Bob Pollock.

J'aimerais demander à Monsieur Corman de répondre à cette question.

M. CORMAN: Jim Corman au fin du dossier.

Eh bien, l'exploitation minière telle que

définie dans la description du projet serait d'à peu près 20 mois. Les trois derniers mois seraient donc l'exploitation du minerai; 2,6 - 2,7 livres d'uranium seront acheminées à l'usine à JEB Mill pendant -- dans le courant d'une à deux années.

MEMBRE BARNES: Oui, j'avais compris le 20 mois mais je ne savais pas si cela incluait le travail de développement ou simplement l'exploitation comme telle.

Une autre question au sujet des effets cumulatifs; la question s'adresse à AREVA. C'est peut-être une surprise; ce dépôt de minerais a été découvert assez récemment en 2002 et on sait dans le domaine des mines que les nouvelles mines sont découvertes pas très loin de l'usine, mais en fait je me pose des questions.

Est-ce qu'on fait de l'exploration minière chez vous; c'est-à-dire combien d'autres gisements de minerais Caribou pourrait être trouvés, ce qui pourrait contribuer à l'aspect cumulatif?

Surtout dans cette évaluation environnementale où nous parlons de Caribou mais dans quelle mesure -- dans quelle mesure faites-vous de l'exploration et dans quelle mesure cela pourrait-il mener à la découverte de d'autres gisements de minerais comme celui de Caribou?

M. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock répond.

Eh bien, nous espérons en trouver plusieurs de ces gisements, mais à l'heure actuelle, le seul gisement que nous ayons découvert et nous avons fait de l'exploration près des sites pas seulement au Lac McLean mais ailleurs. Et avant de prendre la décision d'aller de l'avant, surtout lorsque les prix sont bas, il y a des incitatifs à faire de l'exploration près des endroits où nous avons déjà des infrastructures puisque des petits gisements à ce moment-là seraient rentables, comme c'est le cas pour le projet Caribou.

Je vais demander à Monsieur Corman de vous parler de l'échelle des activités d'exploration que nous faisons près du site.

M. CORMAN: Monsieur Corman.

Eh bien, nos activités d'exploration sont assez stables depuis les quatre ou cinq dernières années. Nous avons des programmes de forage l'été et l'hiver et nous concentrons sur le Lac McLean près de nos installations.

En 2002, nous avons eu la chance de découvrir le gisement Caribou et nous pensons qu'il y a un potentiel de d'autres gisements de la même taille sur le site. Donc, nous continuons nos recherches.

C'est très difficile. C'est comme essayer de trouver une aiguille dans une botte de foin. Donc, au

fur et à mesure que nous avons de l'information, nous découvrons des gisements. Nous avons des modèles géologiques. Nous utilisons parfois de nouveaux modèles pour refaire de l'exploration dans des régions où nous l'avons déjà faite.

Donc, nous sommes persuadés qu'il y a de nouveaux gisements. Nous ne les avons pas encore trouvés mais nous les cherchons activement.

MEMBRE BARNES: Merci beaucoup.

Madame la présidente, j'ai d'autres questions plus précises et marges aux lignes directrices. Je vais donc vous demander vos conseils.

Et sur la carte vous indiquez qu'il y a quatre ou cinq plants d'eau, des lacs ou des étangs qui vont être recouverts par les déchets rocheux, par la roche sédentaire. Vous dites que ce sont des plans d'eau très peu profonds où il n'y a pas vraiment de poissons ou d'invertébrés.

Mais de quelle profondeur d'eau parlons nous?

M. POLLOCK: Monsieur Pollock.

Eh bien, ils sont tellement peu profonds qu'ils gèlent complètement jusqu'au fond pendant l'hiver. Donc, il y a peu d'oxygène dans l'eau. Nous les avons évalués comme étant des plans d'eau sans vie aquatique et

cela a été confirmé par le Ministère des pêches et des océans. Donc, c'est-à-dire un mètre ou deux d'eau.

MEMBRE BARNES: À la page -- c'est pour AREVA.

À la page 3.6 de votre document, vous dites qu'il y aura un profil géochimique sur les échantillons et des -- vous parlez d'uranium, d'arsenic, de plomb, de nickel et de zinc.

Est-ce que le cadmium est également un élément, un problème environnemental?

M. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock répond.

Le cadmium serait dans la liste d'éléments qui a déjà été identifiée dans des évaluations précédentes. Ce n'est pas un élément qui pose un problème.

LA PRÉSIDENTE: Docteur Barnes, est-ce qu'on pourrait demander au personnel de la Commission s'ils ont des commentaires à faire là-dessus?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson.

Je vais demander à Michael Rinker de répondre à votre question, madame.

M. RINKER: Bonjour, je m'appelle Mike Rinker.

Docteur Barnes, les éléments qui sont indiqués ici constituent une liste préliminaire et pendant

l’évaluation, nous avons constaté qu’un programme de suivis serait nécessaire ici pour déterminer quels sont les éléments qui pourraient potentiellement causer des problèmes à refaire une cartographie géochimique si le projet se poursuit.

MEMBRE BARNES: Question: À la page 36, dans le premier paragraphe de cette page qui suit le tableau, votre document indique qu’il y aura ségrégation selon des techniques radiométriques et des techniques de fluorescence notamment.

Alors, pourriez-vous nous dire quel est le matériel qui sera déplacé et à quel point une analyse XRF permettra d’évaluer la nature de ce matériel en fonction du volume qui est transporté?

M. POLLOCK: Est-ce que vous voulez que nous répondions d’abord?

MEMBRE BARNES: Oui, AREVA va répondre.

M. POLLOCK: D’accord. Je vais demander à Monsieur Corman de parler des procédures sur le terrain.

M. CORMAN: Bonjour. Je m’appelle Jim Corman.

Nous avons un programme de surveillance des déchets et tous les déchets de roches doivent être évalués. Donc, nous prélevons des échantillons dans des zones significatives et de cet échantillon composé -- à

partir de cet échantillon composé plutôt, nous faisons une analyse en vertu de la technologie XRF.

Donc, ça vous donne une bonne idée pour chaque échantillon et on fait également d'autres échantillonnages en fonction des techniques radiométriques. Alors, la technique XRF est utilisée pour un échantillon composé.

MEMBRE BARNES: La question est de savoir si c'est valable sur le plan statistique relativement à la contamination potentielle de ces stériles, et peut-être que je pourrais demander au personnel de la Commission si vous estimez que cette analyse est valable.

DR. THOMPSON: Bonjour. Je m'appelle Patsy Thompson.

Je vais demander à mon collègue de répondre à cette question.

M. HOWDEN: Bonjour. Je m'appelle Barclay Howden.

Oui, de mon point de vue nous nous sommes penchés sur cette question mais pas de façon détaillée pour l'instant et à mesure que l'analyse environnementale se poursuivra, nous demanderons aux spécialistes de nous dire si c'est une méthode qui est appropriée pour identifier des métaux lourds comme l'arsenic.

MEMBRE BARNES: Dernière question.

À la page 28 de votre document se trouve un tableau organisationnel et à la page précédente, vous dites à la fin du premier paragraphe qu'il est possible que l'organisation de l'entreprise change car l'entreprise devra s'adapter aux exigences réglementaires.

Au cours de cette période vraiment que vous envisagez pour le développement de la mine, est-ce que vous prévoyez des changements organisationnels importants par rapport au tableau que vous nous avez fourni?

M. POLLOCK: Je m'appelle Bob Pollock.

Le changement qui aura lieu au cours des 24 prochains mois, eh bien, c'est le fait que moi ...

(technical difficulty - returning to the floor recording)

MEMBER BARNES: That's a person as opposed to a position. Do you see the positions in the ---

MR. POLLOCK: The position will continue with a different incumbent.

MEMBER BARNES: And the comment responds to one position, but looking at the chart as a whole, I didn't know if that statement was giving us some implication that there could be some significant organisational change expected that would apply to this work.

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock again for the record.

When I look at the charts, there will be perhaps some changes. For example, the manager of organizing effectiveness and training is normally a Saskatoon office position which was seconded to McLean Lake over the last perhaps year and a half to focus on training and development of particularly our first -- well, supervision in general and in particular our first line supervision, and also to deal with some other organizational issues.

So the expectation would be that that position is going to migrate back to Saskatoon over this time period. So that's one.

We also may have some -- they don't directly affect Caribou necessarily but we also may have some changes in our project management structure. We have a number of projects which we will be launching over this 20-month period.

So there may well be some changes or additions in the context of management of new projects, which don’t necessarily apply directly to McLean but positions that report to the Senior Vice-President and Chief Operating Officer.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Just to follow up on that, staff, do you have any concerns with regards to that statement by AREVA in organisational terms?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson.

I'll ask Mr. Barclay Howden to respond.

MR. HOWDEN: Thank you. Barclay Howden speaking.

From an organisational structure perspective, currently at the McLean Lake operation, the Quality Management Program of AREVA meets the regulatory requirements.

What we intend to do is when we review the licence application and present information to the Commission, we would comment on that particular structure and any changes to it in terms of whether we feel it still satisfies the regulatory requirements.

So at this moment, we don't have concerns but it is part of the licence review because the Class 1 Regulations require a Quality Management Program.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

I will turn to Mr. Harvey for questions.

MEMBER HARVEY: Merci, madame la présidente.

My first question is addressed to AREVA. In the figure at section 2, page -- well, it's 21. It's figure 221. It’s a very interesting figure showing all the tasks and the first one should be given to the environment. It's very exhaustive.

There is back and forth process in that and could you give us an idea of the amount of resources, mainly human resources that would be devoted to realize all those tasks?

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock, for the record.

I can comment or will comment from the perspective of the Saskatoon office. I'll ask Mr. Corman to comment from the perspective of the McLean Lake Operation.

In Saskatoon, this figure is primarily implemented through the Environment, Science and Technology Department. This department has been expanded substantially in the past year from a base of, I guess, three well-experienced senior people to approaching 10 at the moment with additional hiring in the office.

And the reason for that is two-fold; one that we have a substantial number of new projects that we see coming into the development process or at least certainly the environmental assessment of licensing process in the next several years; so that whole top part of the chart which is really focussed around the environmental assessment.

Environmental assessment provides a major planning tool and one goes around every way until one has a design with both -- with sufficient mitigation measures

in place to mitigate any potential effects and also continuously measures follow-up programs identified.

So the Saskatoon office is heavily involved in the whole top half of the chart and also involved with the bottom half because once the project starts operation, then you need to track what's going on, and if it's not on track, determine why and whether or not one needs to implement some further mitigation measures.

So the staff at the site level are instrumental in collecting the information and doing what I would call the first-level analysis and certainly the continuous improvement measures are strongly driven from the ground up, from the bottom up. It's really the only or certainly the most effective way to do it.

If it gets into effects that are greater than predicted and whether or not these require further mitigation or implementation of contingency measures, then the Saskatoon staff are going to be quite involved in that aspect as well.

So when we’re looking at a substantial additional number of projects coming down the road, we’re looking at about a dozen people in Saskatoon and it’s not their only job but certainly the core of those positions are associated with making this chart work.

I’ll ask Jim in terms of how many people we

have at the site level and I guess EHS or environment in particular.

MR. CORMAN: Jim Corman for the record.

In terms of the bottom half of that figure is the ongoing monitoring, compliance monitoring on a daily, weekly, monthly basis that our environment department on site is responsible to implement in addition to the long-term status of environment monitoring and reporting that is done to take a look at far-field potential effects from the operation.

So in terms of the number of people involved directly, our environment group is in the order of eight to 10 employees, but certainly they don't work alone. They are collecting the results. They are feeding information back to the operational people whether they're the mine or the mill operations people that are responsible for operating the plants and making corrections as need be.

So when you look at everyone, the people that are involved with this directly, the environment group, eight to 10 people, but the feedback to the operations folks extends to a significant group of people, metallurgists, operational people and maintenance people; so likely in the order of 20 different supervision folks within those two departments.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

Could the staff just give an opinion on the level of resources devoted to that project and if they -- if you are satisfied with this?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

I'll ask Barclay Howden to respond.

MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden speaking.

I'm going to ask Tom Gates, our Project Officer who is overseeing the project to comment.

MR. GATES: Tom Gates, Project Officer for McLean Lake.

At this time, McLean Lake is in compliance with their environmental monitoring. They have satisfactory staff levels. They do follow this model. We have timely reporting of any environmental incidents such as spills and we have very good communication going on.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

My second question is with regard to the -- in page 112, your -- you can read that -- Caribou represents less than 1 percent of the total uranium at the JEB site.

Could you give us a rough picture of how the small amount is important in the overall operation of the site and how it stands within that other 99 percent of

supply coming from elsewhere?

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock for the record.

First of all, I think probably the wording of the sentence would be more precise if it said 1 percent of the total uranium which would be processed at the JEB site. That's certainly the context in which it was meant.

And the wording that's used where this statement is made later on in the document, it was -- it's intended just to provide some perspective that on an incremental basis, this is quite a small project in terms of uranium production; so that, you know, the broad implication is that -- and the ore grades are similar to those which are already mined and processed at the JEB site from a broad perspective andnd perhaps similar or perhaps a little bit lower than what will come from mid-west.

So its intent is simply to provide some context that in terms of incremental effects, this is small. We don't need to modify the mill to process this ore. It's got characteristics broadly similar to some of the other ores.

The incremental effect on the amount of water which might have to be treated and discharged is clearly quite small. The incremental effect on the amount of tailings that are going to be produced over the

lifetime of the facility is quite small so that its intent is to provide some context. This is a small incremental project in terms of 40 years of operation of this facility.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

This is why you say on page 313 that you're not anticipating any issues in regards to water treatment capacity.

MR. POLLOCK: No.

MEMBER HARVEY: Is the staff -- oh, your thoughts on that -- well, just one question.

Have you had any problem with the treatment capacity during the -- well, since you're operating there?

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock for the record.

There were -- during the initial start-up phase, we had a few months where we needed to get the treatment process optimized for both radium and nickel. Since then, we have consistently been below the, not just the action level and the limits but well below those and we believe we have sufficient capacity at the -- at both the -- certainly at the JEB mill.

This is not an increase in the amount of tons of ore that are going to go through the mill, which is the prime driver, as to the amount of water that you're going to have to treat at the mill. So this is well

within the -- or the tonnage that will be going through the mill is well within what our experience has been.

At the Sue end we're looking closely at the water management there. The -- we have substantial capacity at the Sue water treatment plant. We have had some increases in some contaminants over the past year or so as we've been mining the ore at the Sue E open pit. We're now down into the area where there's ore and special waste.

I guess the worst that could happen would be that once we're finished mining Sue E, if we start to have to stockpile water that we can't treat as we produce it, we've got a large open pit which provides a very large reservoir as an ultimate contingency, but our anticipation is we'll be able to maintain treatment as we remove the water from the Caribou pit.

Other than suspended solids, the quality should be quite good for the initial stage of mining as we're going down through the clean sandstone benches.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

Coming back to the staff just to have your opinion about that point?

DR. THOMPSON: Thank you. Patsy Thompson for the record.

And Tom Gates will respond to your question

on water management capacity.

MR. GATES: I believe in the EIS they will address water balance and treatment capacity. At this time, McLean Lake has a good record of being in compliance with any operational limits on effluent levels. They have substantial operating capacity at the Sue site and their controls are in really good shape.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

My first question is further to Dr. Barnes' comments about cumulative effects. I think Mr. Pollock is aware of the Commission's concerns about this because although -- and we'll be discussing later the issues of environment assessments and timing thereof. I think one of the concerns that we always have is that this is often initiated because there are small projects, deposits and there isn't a broad EA of the site done, and so therefore, we have two effects, I would submit, from that, multiple projects, but the other is that it does immediately, I think, trigger concerns of the issue of cumulative effects on areas such as the area that are mined here.

So it's not really as much a question as a comment, that I think that the issue that is before us and is before us quite often is that we're looking at these isolated pods from within a project and we do worry that

because of what I would say is almost the very qualitative science that we're faced with cumulative effects of really understanding what that means. And so our job here is to look at the cumulative effects now and for what's in place, what's coming with this project and to forecast what it will be.

I think the issue here of course is the short term nature of that, but that's a comment rather than a question.

I'd like to just tidy up, I guess, some ends. Because it's a written submission we don't have the staff making their recommendations in public, and so I'm just going to ask Dr. Thompson to refer to page eight of the document where Item 9, which is the recommendations for the Commission -- and Dr. Thompson, if you would just mind reading number 9A and B so that the Commission has on the record in the public forum the recommendations that you are making to the Commission?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

On the basis of the project-specific guidelines document that is attached to CMD 07-H148 and given the process described in the CMD, the staff's recommendations are as follows.

CNSC staff recommends that the Commission,

a) approve the project-specific guidelines document entitled “Project Specific Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement, Caribou Project, AREVA Resources Canada, Incorporated”, which is attached as Attachment “A” to the Commission Member Document.

The second recommendation is to consider the following options for review of this proposed project:

First, CNSC staff conducts a systematic review of the proposal under both the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* and the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*, the results of which would be provided at a public hearing of the Commission.

Or the second option in “B” which is; two, CNSC staff conducts a review of the proposal under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* followed by review of the proposal under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*. The review under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* would not require a public hearing of the Commission.

Those are the two recommendations that are found in CMD 07-H148.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. In reading the CMD, my understanding as well is that we are required to make a decision with regards to -- pursuant to subsection 17(1) of CEAA of the Commission will delegate the conduct of technical support studies to the proponent,

is that correct?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

That is correct, Madame President.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I'd like to now move to the section of the staff CMD 148 with regards to public consultation.

We have in front of us the approach that's been taken during the EA process. As been noted, the Commission has had applications from AREVA for this area and a number of areas already. I note that we have the Métis Nation of Saskatchewan. The Clearwater Clear Lake Métis Regional Council has provided a comment. I do note that they accept the project-specific guidelines are broad enough to accommodate their concerns.

I would just like to ask first of all AREVA, and then the staff, to comment on the overall relationship with this Métis Nation.

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock for the record.

It actually so happens that representatives from both AREVA and Cameco will be attending a meeting tomorrow in Buffalo Narrows with the Clearwater Clear Lake Métis Regional Council. It's a very broad agenda, although it does provide opportunities should there be specific points related to actually any current project,

to have them raised during the meeting.

But it’s a very broad agenda aimed at continuing the discussions and dialogue with the –- with this particular group, and I believe that the relationship -- I would describe it as constructive now that we’re looking forward to ongoing discussions with not only this group, but any others in northern Saskatchewan that have a wish to discuss whatever issue may -- or question they may wish to raise with us.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Do the staff have any comments?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

With regards to our duty to consult with aboriginal groups, and in particular for the specific Métis group, I will ask Mr. Rinker to talk -- explain what the CNSC and the Province of Saskatchewan are intending to do.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker for the record.

In terms of the relationship the relationship between CNSC staff and the Métis is new. Letters of introduction have been exchanged and there is an intention to meet with the Métis in Saskatchewan near the end of November.

There is currently a plan to meet with the

EQC at the same time. An exact date has not been identified. However, the Métis have provided us with their request to be fully engaged in this environmental assessment. CNSC staff acknowledge and welcome that request. The next step would be to find a date which would work well with the Métis.

I would like to point out that unlike the environmental quality committees the Métis have day jobs and they are not as easily accommodated in terms of what dates that they can provide for us to meet. So that will be one of the challenges.

However, the next step would be to go out to meet with the Métis together with the Province of Saskatchewan.

THE CHAIRPERSON: A question for AREVA again with regard to the Métis Nation.

On page two of their submission which is noted under Attachment “D” there is a comment with regards to the nine communities. So these -- and correct me if I’m wrong here, that these communities are not Métis settlements per se. They are broadly-based communities of which there would be Métis inhabitants.

Would that be a correct assessment?

MR. POLLOCK: Yes, these are not First Nations.

I'm looking for the exact list, but I'm almost certain when I looked through it that none of these are actually identifying First Nations that exist in the form of First Nations reserve land. So these communities have a significant component of Métis people as their -- in the communities. Many of these communities are represented on the EQC as communities.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I guess then we've got some work to do in terms of making sure that we understand their interest and involvement in this project and one would assume other projects in this area as we move forward.

I'll now move to round two.

Dr. Barnes, do you have further questions?

DR. BARNES: Just a couple.

Again, I recognize the distinction of the guidelines versus the actual information in the documents, and I generally have very little difficulty with the guidelines which are fairly traditional for this kind of development. But just coming back to the proposed development of the mine pit which you indicate will have a depth of -- this is to AREVA -- of about 130 meters, could you give me an idea of the thickness of the overburden in that area of the proposed mine?

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock for the record.

I'll ask Jim Corman to respond to your question.

MR. CORMAN: Jim Corman for the record.

The thickness of the overburden is relatively shallow. In that area we're looking at between five and less than ten meters of overburden. Total volume of overburden to be removed is around a half a million cubic metres of till.

DR. BARNES: I was thinking more about slope stability issues, that it was thicker, but I assumed it was readily thin.

You indicate that most of the ore would be in the interval about 100 to 130 metres below surface. That takes us down to the proposed base of the mine pit.

Do you have enough drilling to indicate that there is basically no other significant ore below the 130-metre point.

MR. CORMAN: Jim Corman, for the record.

We have done extensive drilling exploration and delineation-wise that that has identified that the base of the mineralization is predominantly picked up with this pit design. There is maybe very small stringers of mineralization left in the pit floor, but not of significant quantities to warrant the additional excavation required to access them.

DR. BARNES: So little likelihood that this

project as defined in the EA Guidelines is going to change with the development of the pit itself?

MR. CORMAN: Jim Corman, for the record.

That's correct. It's a fairly well-defined small ore body.

DR. BARNES: And to staff, you've given us some options, one of which refers to the recent Cabinet directive on streamlining regulations. It's only just appeared and in the context of that, staff is proposing that the Commission consider this environmental assessment as a "pilot project" for the development of a streamlining approach.

I think whereby most individuals and agencies would commend staff for development in the streamlined approach, I wonder if you could clarify in this context how you would regard this as a so-called pilot project, given that, as I understand, you're going to come back to the Commission with a broader overview document just in the spring. Why would it be necessary to regard this one as a pilot project and the panel meeting that is to follow this one?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

CNSC staff had begun documenting the environmental assessment process and procedures and

considering how we would integrate the system's approach that was described in March 2005 into the CNSC's EA process.

That initiative was under way when consultations and discussions with AREVA and Cameco took place in May. At that time, we, together with the industry, considered many projects that had undergone environmental assessments and looked at the timelines, the project schedules that had been established, and in cases where we were successful in following the schedule and cases where we weren't, to look at where the process had gone astray.

On that basis we looked at best practices essentially that made the projects successful, and looking at further ways of improvements. And at that time the Caribou Project was proposed as a pilot project to test the system's approach and to include best practices from previous assessments.

In the interim, we received further documentation on the Cabinet directive and the major projects management office where there is an expectation that project schedules and process improvements would be brought forward.

So what staff is proposing, essentially, is to move forward with a pilot project while we are

documenting the process and preparing to be in a position to develop project schedules, recognizing that we would be in a position to evaluate the success of this pilot project afterwards.

But there is a period of time where we would be in a position to put in place the process that the Commission would direct us to put in place when we come in front of the Commission in April 2008 and include the lessons learned at a later phase.

Essentially, it was to move on both fronts, the March 2005 direction that we received from the Commission, and to try to integrate into the process the directives from the major projects management office and the Cabinet directive on streamlining.

DR. BARNES: So if I come back to the document that we have, 07-H148.A, which was the supplementary information provided by staff in which you, on page 3, give an illustration, Figure 1. It's in two parts, Figure 1A and Figure 1B, and I think these relate, do they not, to the two options that you read into the record? So on Figure 1A, which provides an opportunity for a one-day Commission hearing, that's at the bottom, but whereas the Figure 1B, do I interpret this, that it would not require a Commission hearing, as opposed to a Commission decision?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

The process, as we understand it and that we are proposing, is that there would be a one-day public hearing to consider the environmental assessment and the staff's assessments of the licence application documentation. Then the Commission would make a decision on the environmental assessment, and then in potentially a closed hearing of the Commission, what people refer sometimes as a paper hearing, the Commission, having heard the evidence to support the licensing decision, would make a licensing decision, but in a non-public hearing with no interventions.

DR. BARNES: So in Figure 1B, where would the public hearing appear?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

In the second to the last box. So the box that reads, "CNSC staff presents EA screening report and assessment of the licence application to the Commission", that would be in a public hearing.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Pollock, you asked to speak to this issue of the process, so perhaps you may want to take this opportunity now before Mr. Harvey and I address the process issues.

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock, for the record.

Thank you, Madam President. We wish to make three comments. Firstly, that from our perspective this represents the same amount of preparation work in terms of preparing environmental assessment and licensing documentation. All that changes is that the timing sequence is somewhat affected, but there is no change in the amount of preparation work.

So we clearly favour the integrated process as an improvement in the effectiveness and efficiency of how this information is then reviewed and subsequently formally considered.

It also appears to us that the integrated approach addresses a concern that we have heard at least on some occasions at licensing hearings from some intervenors in that they would like to be heard sooner in the licensing process than is currently the case.

Certainly, with the public hearing considering everything as shown in that second-last box in Figure 1B, it provides an early opportunity for all parties, licensee staff and intervenors to raise their concerns or questions or present information and have any questions or issues brought forward. So from our viewpoint, we think that would be a good response to some of the concerns we've heard in the past.

And the third point I wanted to make, and this is one that's potentially only for future reference, but if the current process is continued for the caribou EA and licensing process, we may wish to apply at some future time for an amendment to commence site preparation work prior to obtaining the full licensing approval. This would be similar to the process that took place during the EA and licensing of Sue E, as Commission members may recall.

Clearly, this application would be contingent on the rate of progress for the EA process and I think it's fair to say we fully recognize that there would need to be justification that this would be both useful and warranted. We're not in any way assuming that it's automatic, and we can't at this time make a decision because it will depend on how quickly the EA actually processes -- proceeds. But I think it does point to the point of the desirability of having process certainty.

Those are our comments, which we offer for your consideration, Madam Chair or Madam President.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.

Well, I'll do a second round that -- would you like to ask a question right now, Dr. Barnes, before --

MEMBER BARNES: Well, just as a follow-up

maybe to staff, Mr. Pollock indicated that that integrated process on your Figure 1(b) would provide an earlier input by the public interveners. But what would you anticipate to be the timeframe between the last box and the second-last box on 1(b)?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

It's perhaps because I'm French. The second-last box -- the last box is a Commission decision on licence application and the second-last box is the one above it.

If you refer to the figure that follows, which is Figure 2, we have provided some indication of the timing between the two. What is referred as the bottom of Figure 2 is the proposed, integrated process and we have indicated, essentially, that there would be a one-day hearing for the screening, environmental assessment decision and for consideration of the licensing information.

There would be an environmental assessment decision by the Commission, and within the four to six week period, staff would -- if the EA decision is positive then staff would submit a CMD with licensing recommendations for the Commission to consider.

Essentially, the process, if you picture it

with the other one above, would shorten the process by about a month and a half.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Merci, Madame, le President.

I had other question but I will just forgo that one. You said you -- is it just a question of saving times? Is it the main gain that would get out of the new process?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

Gains in efficiency is certainly a consideration but there is also a consideration of effectiveness.

What we found in the numerous environmental assessments and licensing reviews that staff has done, that our reviews are more effective when we can easily go from the environmental assessment technical support documents to the licensing documents, because many of the environmental assessment technical support documents reference existing information, existing programs which we then have to review for licensing assessments.

And so integrating those two components together ensures a better review and ensures that the information that is supposed to be a planning level -- the

information in the environmental assessments is actually carried forward in the programs that are being put forward to manage the operation within the boundaries of the environmental assessment and the licensing decision under the NSCA.

So there is also gains in effectiveness in terms of ensuring that the environmental information and other information required in licensing is well considered early in the process and is integrated with the environmental assessment process.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

I have some difficulties to see exactly what is different between the EA and what is required for the licensing. You gave -- we can find some indications in the document but could you just resume what is very different for licensing? Because most of the items -- I mean, we've got the EA. It was our common with the licensing, and I would like to see the main difference.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

I will start to respond to your question and then I'll ask Mr. Barclay Howden to complete.

Essentially, the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* requires that we consider the project, its design, mitigation measures and potential environmental

effects. In environmental assessments that the CNSC does we have also integrated effects on human health, which is not a requirement under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.*

The requirements under the NSCA and the Regulations are essentially for design information, mitigation measures, a description of the environmental effects; effects on human health. Those are very common to both processes. When licensing is considered, there are a number of programs that are developed to make sure that the facility design, mitigation measures, operations are captured in program documents that are assessed by staff and when the commission makes a licensing decision that becomes part of the requirements for the licensee to operate.

So that’s where the difference is, but there are a lot of common information between both processes that is more easily reviewed together.

MEMBER HARVEY: What limits now to undertake how those studies -- just in parallel and come to the end almost at the same time, with this information, without changing anything?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

There are -- currently my understanding is

that there are no legal impediments to doing this. The *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* requires that an environmental assessment decision is made before a decision on licensing, in our case as the project would take place. There are no requirements for sequential reviews.

It's been the practice essentially for claiming of submissions of licensees. There has not always been an incentive to develop the information early on.

It's more difficult to do when projects are on greenfields for new projects. In the case of many of the EAs we do on existing licence facilities this process is much easier.

We have done concurrent, combined reviews on a number of occasions. But when the time comes to come in front of the Commission with recommendations we have always followed the Commission process; the process that the Commission has put in place with a hearing on the environmental assessment and a second series of hearings for licensing decisions.

That's the process that the Commission has given us to follow but it's not a legal requirement. It's a process that has been put in place to meet the requirements of the NSCA and the CEAA.

MEMBER HARVEY: I asked that question because in the example you gave us I think it was 20 months to prepare the EA and then six months to prepare licensing.

So there's no obligation that it has to stay like that. I mean the -- it's just a question of altering the studies and it could be done, if I'm right. It could be prepared almost at the same time.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

For any process like the proposed integrated process to work requires, essentially, the licensee or the proponent to be prepared to do this with the technical studies and the program documents being prepared in a timely manner so that staff can review them together. The other requirement is to have CNSC resources aligned to conduct those assessments.

In the past, we have tended to focus resources on the environmental assessment in a first stage and then, when licensing documentation become available or when the time comes to write the CMD to prepare recommendations for the Commission, then resources are assigned to licensing assessments essentially.

But there is -- so both the CNSC staff need to align resources to conduct this integrated approach and

the licensee needs to be -- or the proponent needs to be able to provide the information to CNSC staff to integrate those reviews.

MEMBER BARNES: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: My question on process, one of my first questions follows Dr. Barnes' comments about the word "pilot". There is some description in this document as to why if one -- why this is, in your view, a good candidate to put forward this project.

I would just like the staff to elaborate a little bit upon, at this early moment before you've done the CMD on suggesting the process, why this would be considered what one would imagine would be a sterling example of why you would want to go forward on this.

And then my second question is, as Dr. Barnes has discussed, the word "pilot" for me as a scientist has some implications that there's some uncertainty about whether this would work or not. And, you know, why with the vast experience that you have with pilots, why would you need a pilot?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

I guess one could question the use of the word "pilot" but our intention was, in preparation for the consultations last May with Cameco and AREVA on the EA

process, we reviewed a number of environmental assessments, both for mining and non-mining projects looking at project schedules and the timing of each of the steps in the environmental assessment from an EA determination to a Commission decision.

We reviewed that information and we were able to identify when CNSC staff fell short and when proponents fell short, and have identified ways of correcting the process. We essentially thought that moving forward with this project would give us a good way of evaluating this integrated process because McLean Lake mine site has a number of projects or ore bodies in it -- on it that have been assessed.

And I will ask Mr. Michael Rinker to talk about the Sue E environmental assessment and how it will be used as a benchmark or how it's proposed to be used as a benchmark for this proposed integrated assessment for Caribou.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker for the record.

One of the opportunities we have with the Caribou to use it as a pilot is based on an environmental assessment that was initiated in the fall of 2003 for the Sue E open pit that was located several hundred metres I believe from the current Caribou site.

That environmental assessment followed near

identical guidelines that are before you to date for the Caribou. The decision-makers for the federal government was only the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. There were no other responsible authorities and it was a harmonized environmental assessment as well where the province took the lead. So in terms of a project, it was near identical to the Caribou in that it's on the same site.

It would utilize the very same water treatment plants. The ore would be milled in the same mill and tailings stored in the same facilities. And as well, it follows an identical process. So we have a benchmark of which we can compare timelines which would be one potential outcome of this project.

But also we can make a comparison in terms of the resources and person days that the CNSC has applied to this assessment and see if, in fact, this process provides some efficiencies in terms of resource use as well. So in that -- and in that regard it provides a pilot because there's an example to compare it to.

THE CHAIRPERSON: But I'm not sure I really understand the timing that Mr. Pollock has put forward. Perhaps you could just delineate from -- we're talking now that at an April hearing we would have the process CMD but I think Mr. Pollock is talking about several months before

there would be a necessity to move forward on this project, if I'm correct.

Is that a correct assessment?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

Michael Rinker will provide the anticipated timelines in terms of the technical reviews and when the screening and environmental assessment report would be ready.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm getting an indication from Mr. Pollock that he might just want to comment first. So perhaps we could just ask Mr. Pollock to clarify the timelines.

While you're on the screen, Mr. Pollock I realize that what we don't have in front of us is a complete project management for this project.

You're talking about site preparation and adding elements in here which are not before us as well. So you may wish to comment grosso modo in terms of this -- of the overall project management scheme and then specifically on your timelines for this first segment of this.

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock for the record.

Let me clarify, Madam Chair and I think it'll become clear from the schedule that Mr. Rinker's

going to discuss momentarily. No, it would not be three or four months in advance of April but I could see a circumstance that if the EA went very well and if perchance the staff CMD didn't appear in April but came in May or June or if the Commission wished to consider for quite some time before rendering any decision on the process, we would not wish to go past sort of a critical date that would not allow adequate time for the system to process such an application and have it considered.

So let me -- if I gave you an indication that this is virtually guaranteed, let me back up and say that I just wanted to flag that we like to see certainty of process and if we don't have it and we get to a critical time that we need to move, then we have to take a conservative position.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Rinker and then I'll come back with further questions.

MR. RINKER: Mike Rinker for the record.

In terms of timelines for this environmental assessment, we have some expectations from AREVA that we may get technical studies in the New Year, early January. A review of those technical studies could take us into the end of March by the time we have a review completed and responses.

So a screening report would be developed

and out for the public roughly in May and we would be looking for bringing a screening report with a recommendation for a decision in the summer of 2008.

Precise dates aren't known yet because these timelines are quite fluid in terms of the nature of the review and what technical concerns are raised or if none are raised that that has some significant impacts on timelines, but in general that's how I could see this unfolding.

THE CHAIRPERSON: This for Mr. Pollock, obviously because of the requirements that you know and we know very well for CEAA and that is -- was discussed by Dr. Thompson. there is a requirement for the Commission to make a decision under CEAA on the EA before they can go forward on this.

I think that this, if I'm correct, this process would require risk assessment and risk taking by the company to go forward with the studies, understanding that the Commission would be left with a decision, an unencumbered decision with regards to the EA.

Is that clearly understood by AREVA?

MR. POLLOCK: Bob Pollock for the record.

Yes, Madam President it is clearly understood. We, I think, had previous occasions where we have put forward requests that depending on the outcome

may well have represented an investment of time and resources, money in something that come to fruition, and that's just part of the business. So yes, the risks are clearly understood.

THE CHAIRPERSON: My next question is for the staff.

Dr. Thompson you used the word which is not often used here which is the word "duplication", when I think perhaps you meant to delineate it more in terms of the efficiency of effectiveness.

Perhaps you could delineate what you mean by duplication because the Commission doesn't consider that word very often.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

When I used "duplication", I did not mean duplication in terms of the legislation. What I meant was there have been many occasions where staff resources have been used to review technical documents to support an environmental assessment and then staff move to the next stage where we do licensing assessments. We often have to go back to the technical documents that were provided in the EA as well as consider some of the elements of the programs. That has led to a duplication of effort in terms of the technical reviews to support both processes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think I'd consider that more efficiency than duplication.

One of the questions that I have when we look at this process, and Mr. Pollock talked about availability of staff resources in terms of this would require a clear coordination of resources in a very focused way in this effort, what always strikes me though is sometimes it's not the Commission, it's resources that are available from other agencies, federal and provincial agencies, to be brought to bear here.

Dr. Thompson, have you any sense of whether those resources would be available or would we be putting forward a process that makes sense to AREVA, makes sense, makes sense to the CNSC staff and yet taxes resources, either provincially or federally, by other departments?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

The process has been discussed and has been shared. We have also entered into discussions with Natural Resource Canada, for example, and Environment Canada, in terms of providing them information for their business planning needs as well. Traditionally, we have sent over documents for them to review as they come into us with very little notice of what to expect during a year, for example. So we have started the process of

giving them more information so that they can plan their resources as well.

In terms of the other agencies, the level of their work would not necessarily increase because they would not be involved in licensing assessments. They would be involved in the environmental assessments as federal authorities.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr Thompson, Mr. Pollock mentioned that interveners have mentioned to him and to AREVA that they find -- I don’t want to put words in Mr. Pollock’s mouth -- that they find the current process to lack sort of an effectiveness, efficiency in their eyes. Have you heard from interveners, the CNSC staff, with regards to the current process and any advantages or disadvantages they would see in this?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

We have heard on a number of occasions from especially non-government organizations the wish for consultations on projects to be carried by CNSC staff rather than the proponent as being more objective in terms of describing the potential effects of the project.

The plan, and this is what we’ve done since the direction from the Commission in March 2005, is to hold many more public consultations led by CNSC staff

rather than rely almost essentially on proponent-led consultations.

We have also witnessed on a number of Commission hearings for environmental assessments and for licensing where many of the issues brought forward by interveners during the hearing on the environmental assessment went over to licensing issues and vice-versa. Our sense is that the public, in general, would benefit from having all of the information available at once so that the linkages are clearer.

THE CHAIRPERSON: You mentioned earlier that you haven't done the consultation with the regulatory affairs advisory committees on this proposal. Did I understand that correctly?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

We, in the spring meeting of the CNSC NGO regulatory advisory committee, we did indicate that we were in the process of documenting the environmental assessment process and bringing improvements to it. We had agreed that we would hold a one- or two-day workshop on the EA process to include their considerations in what we would be bringing to the Commission next spring.

THE CHAIRPERSON: But this hasn't been done yet.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

No. We had tentatively considered end of November, and I believe now it would be more in January.

THE CHAIRPERSON: What I gather, and Mr. Pollock, raised the issue, which we're aware of before, which is a site preparation licence, has the CNSC staff got a full project management of this from the beginning until the end, going forward for 20 months, including all the various steps in the licensing? Have you received this from AREVA?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

I'll ask Mr. Howden to respond.

MR. HOWDEN: Barclay Howden speaking. I'm going to direct that to Kevin Scissons, the Director of the Uranium Mines and Mills division.

MR. SCISSONS: Good afternoon. Kevin Scissons speaking.

All the detailed licensing project information has not been submitted though there is a fair amount of detail already on the application, but the licensing information is not all in or complete on this. It would fall out as part of the ongoing process and producing the environmental assessment document. Of

course now with direction and communication, with their licensee, to ensure that they would also be providing enough information to support the licensing process that would be -- has to follow in a subsequent phase of that.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Probably I wasn't as clear as I could be.

I'm not talking about the technical information that would look forward as to the details. What I'm talking about is the project plan in a more traditional sense where we start with the EA. We're talking about the process, the EA process, the licensing process, moving towards the 20 months, talking about exactly where it would go. Do you have this document in front of you or with you or do you possess that from AREVA?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

We have not received that from AREVA. What we have is an environmental assessment project schedule with the steps in the EA process identified and the timeline.

THE CHAIRPERSON: But my assumption would be that the Saskatchewan office would have had a project plan before them, which would start at the beginning and stop at the end, that we would have all these various

parts of this project in front of us. If we're looking at this process, this would seem to me to be a pretty essential step in this. What I mean is the Commission doesn't know what it's considering, I mean that's to me. If the staff doesn't have this either, that would be of concern to me.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

The current plan was put forward, was put together, for the environmental assessment and the plan as it would unfold would lead us to the one day hearing on the screening environmental assessment decision and consideration of the licensing information.

The rest of the process in terms of the Commission's decision on the environmental assessment and a process for considering the licensing decision has been sketched out in CMD 07-148.A, but has not been included in the project schedule.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Were there any further questions from my colleagues?

Then with respect to this matter I propose that the Commission confer with regards to the information that we've considered today and then determine if further information is needed or if the Commission is ready to

proceed with a decision, and we will advise accordingly.

We will commence the next hearing, which is the AECL hearing, at 3:30.

Thank you very much.

--- Upon recessing at 3:08 p.m.