



CMD 25-H104.2

2025-06-03

**Written Submission from
Steve Lawrence**

**Mémoire de
Steve Lawrence**

In the matter of

À l'égard de

Cameco Corporation

Cigar Lake Operation and McArthur
River Operation – Financial Guarantee
Review

Cameco Corporation

Exploitation de Cigar Lake et de
McArthur River – Examen des garanties
financières

Hearing in Writing

Audience par écrit

August 2025

Août 2025

From:
Sent: June 3, 2025 1:20 AM
To: Interventions / Interventions (CNSC/CCSN)
Subject: Cameco financial guarantees

EXTERNAL EMAIL – USE CAUTION / COURRIEL EXTERNE – FAITES PREUVE DE PRUDENCE

Please keep personal information separate from intervention

To members of the CNSC Commission, Cameco Corporation's updated financial guarantees for its Cigar Lake Operation and McArthur River Operation **and** Cigar Lake Operation to incorporate a new site map.

The CNSC is considering Cameco's financial guarantees to decommissioning of two mines and changes to its operations plan at Cigar Lake. Cameco is requesting confidentiality, on the grounds of commercial sensitivity, and is only offering summaries that are very brief. Apparently CNSC staff can not find a position to justify confidentiality.

The decommissioning of a mine involves the safe care of materials that can remain toxic and radioactive for a million years, perhaps more - AKA, a period of time that is beyond imagination. After decommissioning the site will be turned over to the Province of

Saskatchewan - AKA, the public. I do not think the decommissioning is of a significant commercially sensitive nature and the longevity of materials involved demand transparency to the public, who will be given the responsibility to care for it. The CNSC has asked for written interventions on the guarantees from interested parties for its public hearings on these matters. How can interventions be made if the details of what is to occur are not provided? I also have to wonder what is the rationale given for wanting to reduce the area of operations at Cigar Lake when the area asked to be removed from the license is apparently undisturbed - why, what possible difference could this make?? I find this whole process disturbing, and can only invoke suspicion.

Granted, the decommissioning of surface operations of a mine site is quite different to what is required for a mill. Why not, in detail, describe to the public how this decommissioning is going to take place so, if interested, they can determine if the financial guarantees are adequate - how can the public put a price on an unknown.

The mines have been operating for some time, presumably with some kind of ventilation and ore has been brought out onto ore pads where it is exposed to the weather before being transferred to the mill. When the ore is underground, it is in a reducing environment that binds it to its mineralization. When it is brought to the surface it is oxidized in the weather, releasing its mineral bonds and the surface winds can carry its dust. Surely, both the ventilation and the wind must have spread some of the ore materials into the surrounding environment - the public needs the details of the aerial extent and total load onto the surrounding environment that requires details of the monitoring that has occurred to describe this incursion into the local environment. This must be scientifically done with predictive modeling of where contamination of the local environment would have been most likely. Without this, how can this

area ever be opened up to unrestricted public use, and how can there be an estimate made of the cost of cleanup.

Will the oxidized waste that is to be put back underground going to be a threat to the underground aquifers as a certain percentage of this is now more mobile than the original mineralization in the ore that had stabilized in a reducing environment?

Given a basic knowledge of the erosional and tectonic forces at play over extended periods of time, what guarantee is available to the plugging of boreholes and stainless steel caps on the mineshafts. Are these going to have to be revisited in the future and is there money for these interventions?

What are the details of the monitoring that is going to take place during decommissioning to ensure the environment has been effectively cleansed of harmful materials? What are the details of the ongoing monitoring after decommissioning and if problems are identified, are there financial guarantees in place for these. Would it be reasonable to provide such guarantees for an extended period of time? Justification for such?

After all this time, if it hasn't been disturbed up to this point, why would Cigar Lake need to remove some of the operations area from their care? Would sampling, to reveal aerial extent of contamination, reveal some concerns?

I am asking for full transparency in this process. Paramount is the very long term protection of the environment and not the very limited commercial sensitivity of the decommissioning process .

Thanks for your considerations, Steve Lawrence