



POWERTECH URANIUM CORP.
(An Exploration Stage Company)

ANNUAL INFORMATION FORM

FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2011

March 28, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item 1.	EXPLANATORY NOTES AND CAUTIONARY STATEMENTS	1
	1.1 Explanatory Notes.....	1
	1.2 About Forward-Looking Information.....	1
	1.3 Mineral Reporting Standards	2
	1.4 Documents Incorporated by Reference	3
Item 2.	CORPORATE STRUCTURE.....	3
	2.1 Name, Address and Incorporation.....	3
	2.2 Intercorporate Relationships	4
Item 3.	GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE BUSINESS	4
	3.1 Three Year History	4
Item 4.	DESCRIPTION OF THE BUSINESS	6
	4.1 General.....	6
	4.2 Risk Factors	8
	4.3 Companies with Mineral Projects	15
Item 5.	DIVIDENDS	27
	5.1 Dividends.....	27
Item 6.	DESCRIPTION OF SHARE CAPITAL	28
	6.1 Common Shares	28
Item 7.	MARKET FOR SECURITIES.....	28
	7.1 Trading Price and Volume	28
Item 8.	ESCROW SECURITIES AND SECURITIES SUBJECT TO CONTRACTUAL RESTRICTIONS ON TRANSFER	28
	8.1 Escrowed Securities and Securities Subject to Contractual Restriction on Transfer.....	28
Item 9.	DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS.....	29
	9.1 Name, Occupation and Security Holding.....	29
	9.2 Corporate Cease Trade Orders.....	38
	9.3 Bankruptcies	38
	9.4 Conflicts of Interest.....	38
Item 10.	LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AND REGULATORY ACTIONS	39
	10.1 Legal Proceedings	39
Item 11.	INTEREST OF MANAGEMENT AND OTHERS IN MATERIAL TRANSACTIONS	39
	11.1 Interest of Management and Others in Material Transactions.....	39
Item 12.	TRANSFER AGENT AND REGISTRAR	39
	12.1 Transfer Agent and Registrar	39
Item 13.	MATERIAL CONTRACTS.....	39
	13.1 Material Contracts.....	39
Item 14.	EXPERTS	40
	14.1 Names of Experts.....	40
Item 15.	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	40
	15.1 Additional Information	40

ANNUAL INFORMATION FORM

ITEM 1. EXPLANATORY NOTES AND CAUTIONARY STATEMENTS

1.1 Explanatory Notes

In this Annual Information Form (“AIF”), references to the “Company” or “Powertech” mean Powertech Uranium Corp. and include its subsidiaries, Powertech (USA), Inc. and Indian Springs Land and Cattle Co., LLC, unless the context otherwise requires.

All information contained in this AIF is as of December 31, 2011, unless otherwise indicated. The Company uses the US dollar as its reporting currency. This AIF contains reference to both US dollars and Canadian dollars. All currency amounts are in United States dollars, unless otherwise indicated. References to “CAD\$” refer to Canadian currency and “\$” to United States currency.

1.2 About Forward-Looking Information

Certain statements in this AIF are forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements consist of statements that are not purely historical, including any statements regarding beliefs, plans, expectations or intentions regarding the future. Often, but not always, forward looking statements can be identified by the use of words such as “plans”, “expects”, “budget”, “scheduled”, “estimates”, “forecasts”, “intends”, “anticipates”, or “believes” or variations (including negative and grammatical variations) of such words and phrases or statements that certain actions, events or results “may”, “could”, “would”, “should”, “might” or “will” be taken, occur or be achieved. Such forward-looking statements involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors, which may cause the Company’s actual results, performance or achievements, or industry results, to be materially different from any future results, performance or achievements expressed or implied by such forward-looking statements. No assurance can be given that any of the events anticipated by the forward-looking statements will occur or, if they do occur, what benefits the Company will obtain from them. These forward-looking statements reflect management’s current views, and are based on certain assumptions, and speak only as of March 28, 2012. These assumptions, which include management’s current expectations, estimates and assumptions about certain projects and the markets the Company operates in, the global economic environment, interest rates, exchange rates and the Company’s ability to manage its assets and operating costs, may prove to be incorrect. A number of risks and uncertainties could cause its actual results to differ materially from those expressed or implied by the forward looking statements, including, but not limited to: (1) that events in Japan in early 2011 may affect public acceptance of nuclear energy and the Company’s permitting timelines; (2) a decrease in the market price of uranium; (3) a decrease in the demand for uranium and uranium related products; (4) discrepancies between actual and estimated mineral resources and mineral reserves; (5) changes to the cost of commencing production, the time when production commences and actual ongoing costs; (6) the occurrence of risks associated with the development and commencement of mining operations; (7) unforeseen or changed regulatory restrictions, requirements and limitations, including environmental regulatory restrictions and liability and permitting restrictions; (8) the failure to obtain governmental approvals and fulfil contractual commitments, and the need to obtain new or amended licenses and permits; (9) unforeseen changes in the costs of material inputs, including fuel, steel and other construction materials; (10) the loss of key employees; (11) the loss of, or defective title to, exploration and mining claims, rights, leases or licenses; (12) the number of competitors; (13) political and economic conditions in uranium producing and consuming countries; (14) failure to obtain additional capital at all or on commercially reasonable terms; (15) other factors beyond the Company’s control; and (16) those factors described in the section entitled “Risk Factors and Uncertainties” in this AIF.

Undue reliance should not be placed on forward-looking statements because they involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that are in many cases beyond the Company’s control. By their nature, forward-looking statements involve risks and uncertainties because they relate to events and depend on circumstances that may or may not occur in the future. Forward-looking statements are not guarantees of future performance and the Company’s actual results of operations, financial condition and liquidity, and the development of the industry in which it operates, may differ materially from statements made in or incorporated by reference in this AIF.

Although the Company has attempted to identify factors that could cause actual actions, events or results to differ materially from those described in forward-looking statements, there may be other factors that cause actions, events or results not to be as anticipated, estimated or intended. Forward-looking statements are based upon the beliefs, estimates and opinions of the Company's management at the time they are made and the Company undertakes no obligation to update forward-looking statements if these beliefs, estimates and opinions or circumstances should change. There can be no assurance that forward-looking statements will prove to be accurate, as actual results and future events could differ materially from those anticipated in such statements. Accordingly, readers should not place undue reliance on forward-looking statements.

The Company's forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, expectations and opinions of management on the date the statements are made and the Company does not assume any obligation to update or revise any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, except as may be required by law.

1.3 Mineral Reporting Standards

The disclosure in this AIF in respect of the Company's mineral resources is based on technical reports prepared on the Company's principal projects as set out under the heading "Description of the Business". Such information has been prepared in accordance with the Canadian requirements under National Instrument 43-101 *Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects* ("NI 43-101") and has been reviewed by a qualified person, as such term is defined in NI 43-101. The mineral resources described in this document are current to the dates on which they were estimated.

Unless otherwise noted, the estimated mineral resources for the Company's various mineral projects, as disclosed in this AIF, have been calculated in accordance with the definitions and guidelines for the reporting of exploration information, mineral resources and mineral reserves determined by the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy & Petroleum ("CIM") *Definition Standards for Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves* adopted under NI 43-101 (the "CIM Standards"). Pursuant to NI 43-101, a qualified person's classification of a mineral deposit as a mineral resource or mineral reserve must follow the *CIM Estimation of Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves Best Practice Guidelines* adopted by the CIM. The following definitions are reproduced from those guidelines.

The term "mineral resource" means a concentration or occurrence of diamonds, natural solid inorganic material, or natural solid fossilized organic material including base and precious metals, coal and industrial minerals in or on the Earth's crust in such form and quantity and of such grade or quality that it has reasonable prospects for economic extraction. The location, quantity, grade, geological characteristics and continuity of a mineral resource are known, estimated or interpreted from specific geological evidence and knowledge. Mineral resources are sub-divided, in order of increasing geological confidence, into inferred, indicated and measured categories.

The term "inferred mineral resource" means that part of a mineral resource for which quantity and grade or quality can be estimated on the basis of geological evidence and limited sampling and reasonably assumed, but not verified, geological and grade continuity. The estimate is based on limited information and sampling gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes.

The term "indicated mineral resource" means that part of a mineral resource for which quantity, grade or quality, densities, shape and physical characteristics, can be estimated with a level of confidence sufficient to allow the appropriate application of technical and economic parameters, to support mine planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the deposit. The estimate is based on detailed and reliable exploration and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes that are spaced closely enough for geological and grade continuity to be reasonably assumed.

The term "measured mineral resource" means that part of a mineral resource for which quantity, grade or quality, densities, shape, and physical characteristics are so well established that they can be estimated with confidence sufficient to allow the appropriate application of technical and economic parameters, to support production planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the deposit. The estimate is based on detailed and reliable exploration,

sampling and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes that are spaced closely enough to confirm both geological and grade continuity.

The term “mineral reserve” means the economically mineable part of a measured or indicated mineral resource demonstrated by at least a preliminary feasibility study. This study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction can be justified. A mineral reserve includes diluting materials and allowances for losses that may occur when the material is mined. Mineral reserves are sub-divided in order of increasing confidence into probable and proven categories.

The term “probable mineral reserve” means the economically mineable part of an indicated and, in some circumstances, a measured mineral resource demonstrated by at least a preliminary feasibility study. This study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction can be justified.

The term “proven mineral reserve” means the economically mineable part of a measured mineral resource demonstrated by at least a preliminary feasibility study. This study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction is justified.

1.4 Documents Incorporated by Reference

Information about the Company’s mineral projects contained herein summarizes the information in the following preliminary economic assessment reports with respect to the Company’s Dewey-Burdock and Centennial projects, entitled “Preliminary Assessment on the Dewey-Burdock Uranium Project, Custer and Fall River Counties, South Dakota”, dated July 6, 2010, as updated on February 7, 2011 (the “Dewey Burdock PEA”), and “Preliminary Assessment on the Centennial Uranium Project, Weld County, Colorado”, dated August 13, 2010, as updated on February 7, 2011 (the “Centennial PEA” and, together with the Dewey-Burdock PEA, the “PEAs”). The PEAs were prepared by Allan V. Moran, R.G., CPG, and Frank A. Daviess, MAusIMM, of SRK Consulting (U.S.), Inc. (“SRK”), each of whom is an independent “qualified person” as such term is defined in NI 43-101, as the primary authors. SRK received technical assistance from Lyntek Incorporated (“Lyntek”) and Mr. Jerry Bush for each of the PEAs. The PEAs are incorporated by reference into this AIF, however certain information in the Centennial PEA is superseded by information contained herein as described under the heading “Updates to Information in Centennial PEA”. Complete versions of the PEAs are available on SEDAR at www.sedar.com.

The audited consolidated financial statements of the Company for the year ended December 31, 2011 include its consolidated statement of financial position as at December 31, 2011 and 2010 and the consolidated statements of comprehensive income (loss), consolidated statements of changes in equity, cash flows and schedule of mineral properties of the Company for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, together with the notes thereon. They have been filed with Canadian securities regulatory authorities on SEDAR (available at www.sedar.com), and are incorporated by reference into this AIF. Also incorporated by reference into this AIF is the Company’s Management’s Discussion and Analysis (“MD&A”) dated March 5, 2012, which has also been filed with Canadian securities regulatory authorities on SEDAR (available at www.sedar.com). All financial information in this AIF is prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (“IFRS”).

ITEM 2. CORPORATE STRUCTURE

2.1 Name, Address and Incorporation

Powertech Uranium Corp. was incorporated by registration of its Memorandum and Articles pursuant to the provisions of the *Company Act* (British Columbia) on February 10, 1984 as “Ararat Oil & Minerals Inc.”, with an authorized capital of 20,000,000 shares without par value.

On March 19, 1985, the Company altered its Memorandum to change its name to “International Powertech Systems Inc.” and to increase its authorized capital to 10,000,000 Class “A” Common Shares without par value and 10,000,000 Class “B” Preference Shares without par value. At this time, the Company adopted new articles which were approved by a special resolution of the Company’s shareholders at the annual general meeting held on January 31, 1985.

On October 20, 1987, the Company altered its Memorandum to increase its authorized capital to 20,000,000 Class “A” Common Shares without par value and 10,000,000 Class “B” Preference Shares without par value.

On March 2, 1992, the Company altered its Memorandum to change its name to “Powertech Industries Inc.” and to increase its authorized capital to 20,000,000 Class “A” Common Shares without par value and 10,000,000 Class “B” Preference Shares without par value.

On March 2, 1992, the Company’s issued and outstanding shares were consolidated on a five to one basis.

On May 1, 2000, the Company altered its Memorandum to increase its authorized capital to 100,000,000 Class “A” Common Shares without par value and 50,000,000 Class “B” Preference Shares without par value.

On November 25, 2004, the Company transitioned from the *Company Act* (British Columbia) to the *Business Corporations Act* (British Columbia). At that time the Company filed its Notice of Articles, which effectively replaced its Memorandum, and adopted new Articles.

On June 5, 2006, the Company changed its name from “Powertech Industries Inc.” to “Powertech Uranium Corp.”.

On April 30, 2007, the Company amended its Notice of Articles to increase its authorized capital to an unlimited number of Class “A” Common Shares (each, a “Common Share”) without par value and an unlimited number of Class “B” Preference Shares without par value.

On August 15, 2007, the Company received a court order allowing it to retroactively date the amendments to its Notice of Articles made on April 30, 2007 to November 25, 2004.

The Common Shares are publicly traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange (the “TSX”) under the symbol “PWE” and the Frankfurt Stock Exchange under the symbol “P8A”. Powertech’s registered office is located at Suite 800 – 885 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, British Columbia V6C 3H1. The Company’s corporate head office is located at 5575 DTC Parkway, Suite 140, Greenwood Village, Colorado, USA 80111.

2.2 Intercorporate Relationships

Powertech has two wholly-owned subsidiaries, its direct subsidiary, Powertech (USA), Inc. (“Powertech USA”), which was incorporated in South Dakota, USA, and its indirect subsidiary, Indian Springs Land and Cattle Co., LLC (“Indian Springs”), a limited liability corporation organized under the laws of Colorado, whose shares are wholly owned by Powertech USA.

ITEM 3. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE BUSINESS

Powertech’s principal assets are comprised of mineral properties in Colorado, South Dakota and Wyoming. The properties have been acquired through purchase agreements, lease agreements or staking claims.

3.1 Three Year History

The Company is in the business of exploration for, and development of, uranium properties located in the United States. The Company’s primary projects are its Dewey-Burdock Project, located in Custer and Fall River Counties, South Dakota, and its Centennial Project, located in Weld County, Colorado.

On February 11, 2009, the Company issued a debenture (the “Debenture”) in the principal amount of \$7,547,400 (CAD\$9,000,000) to Société Belge de Combustibles Nucléaires Synatom SA (“Synatom”) pursuant to the terms of a private placement agreement dated December 19, 2008 with Powertech USA and Synatom. The Debenture bore interest at the rate of 7% per annum, compounded annually and had a maturity date of three years from the date of issuance, absent earlier maturity pursuant to the terms of the Debenture. Both the principal of the Debenture and the accrued interest thereon were to be convertible into Common Shares at a fixed conversion price of CAD\$0.50 per share. The Debenture was retired on March 15, 2011, in connection with the Refinancing Transaction (as defined below).

In January 2009, the Company entered into a Mineral Deed and Assignment with Neutron Energy, Inc. (“Neutron”), whereby Neutron agreed to transfer and assign to the Company all of its right title and interest in certain real property in Custer and Fall River Counties, South Dakota, located within and adjacent to the Company’s Dewey Burdock Project, in exchange for the acquisition of approximately 6,072 acres of the Company’s non-core claims and leases in New Mexico, Wyoming and South Dakota. The acreage acquired from Neutron consisted of approximately 1,620 acres of claims and leases within the Company’s proposed permit area at Dewey-Burdock and an additional 4,380 acres of prospective claims and leases outside of the Company’s initial proposed permit area but adjacent to the Dewey-Burdock Project. The terms of the agreement provide for the retention of a 30% net proceeds interest by Neutron from future production on the acquired acreage and the Company will be the operator.

During June 2009, the Company entered into two option agreements for the purchase of an aggregate of 3,585 acres of land, together with the associated water, mineral and lease interests, within the Centennial Project in Weld County, Colorado, for \$11,450,000. These option agreements were both terminated in July 2011, when the Company determined not to exercise such options.

During August 2009, the Company obtained a bridge loan in the amount of \$3,215,745 (CAD\$3,450,000) (the “Bridge Loan”) from Synatom that bore interest at the rate of 9% per annum, compounded annually, and had a maturity date of the earlier of: (i) November 4, 2009; (ii) the time of initial drawdown, if any, under the Loan Facility (as defined below); or (iii) the date on which the Company were to terminate the Loan Facility. Shortly after obtaining the Bridge Loan, the Company entered into a loan facility with Synatom (the “Loan Facility”) for \$12,700,000 (CAD\$13,800,000). The Company utilized the net proceeds of the Loan Facility to repay the Bridge Loan, for working capital and to advance its mineral properties towards production. The Loan Facility was divided into four equal tranches of CAD\$3,450,000 each. Only the principal amount of the second tranche could be convertible into Common Shares at a conversion price of CAD\$0.50 per share, subject to anti-dilution adjustments. The first and second tranches bore interest at the rate of 7% per annum, and each of the third and fourth tranches bore interest at the rate of 9% per annum, with interest for each tranche compounding annually and accruing from the date of drawdown and payable at the respective tranche maturity date. The Company drew down all four tranches. The Loan Facility was retired on March 15, 2011 as part of the Refinancing Transaction.

On March 15, 2011, the Company closed a public offering of 47,872,340 units (each, a “Unit”) at a price of CAD\$0.47 per Unit to raise gross proceeds of \$23,105,250 (CAD\$22,500,000) pursuant to a short form prospectus dated March 2, 2011 (the “Offering”). Each Unit consisted of one Common Share and one half of one share purchase warrant. Each whole warrant (a “Warrant”) entitles the holder to purchase one Common Share at an exercise price of CAD\$0.60 for two years following the closing of the Offering, provided that, if at any time the daily volume-weighted average price of the Common Shares on the TSX, or on any other stock exchange on which the Common Shares may be principally traded at the time, is equal to or greater than CAD\$1.20 per share for a period of 20 consecutive trading days, the Company may, within five days of such event, accelerate the expiry date of the Warrants by giving notice to the holders thereof. In such case, the Warrants will expire on the 30th day after the date on which such notice is given by the Company. A syndicate of agents led by Salman Partners Inc. and including Dundee Securities Ltd. (collectively, the “Agent”) were engaged in respect of the Offering. The Agent received a cash commission equal to 6.5% of the gross proceeds of the Offering and was issued 3,111,702 agent’s warrants, with each agent’s warrant entitling the holder to acquire one Common Share for a period of two years from the closing of the Offering at a price of CAD\$0.47 per share.

On March 15, 2011, the Company also closed a refinancing transaction (the “Refinancing Transaction”) with Synatom, Powertech USA and Indian Springs, which was approved by Powertech’s shareholders at a special meeting

held on March 14, 2011. The Refinancing Transaction restructured Powertech's repayment obligations on approximately \$25 million of debt owed to Synatom. In connection with the closing of the Refinancing Transaction (the "Refinancing Closing"), the following events occurred:

- 1) Powertech paid \$12,836,250 (CAD\$12,500,000) to Synatom;
- 2) Powertech issued an unsecured non-interest bearing promissory note in the principal amount of \$7,701,750 (CAD\$7.5 million) (the "Note") to Synatom, which is repayable in cash or Common Shares at Powertech's election and is due on the earlier of: (i) six months after the last permit is obtained for the Company's Dewey-Burdock Project; and (ii) two years from the Refinancing Closing. At the election of Powertech, the Note may also be prepaid in advance in cash at anytime, provided that such prepayment is for an amount not less than CAD\$250,000, or, after an initial period of 18 months, the Note may be repaid by the issuance of Common Shares to Synatom at a price per share equal to the greater of CAD\$0.60 per share or a 15% discount to the 20-day volume-weighted average price of the Common Shares on the TSX (or such other stock exchange on which the Common Shares may be listed at such time) at the time of payment. Powertech USA has guaranteed Powertech's obligation to repay the Note;
- 3) Powertech, Powertech USA, Indian Springs and Synatom entered into a termination, voting and lock-up agreement (the "Termination Agreement") pursuant to which all prior loans, agreements, rights and obligations among and between the parties were terminated. Under the terms of the Termination Agreement, Synatom irrevocably and unconditionally released and discharged all security interests it had in and to or affecting any of the shares, undertaking, property and assets of Powertech, Powertech USA or Indian Springs; and
- 4) Powertech, Synatom, Wallace Mays, the Wallace Mays 2006 Family Trust No. 1, Richard F. Clement, Jr., the Clement Family Limited Partnership, Thomas A. Doyle and Greg Burnett entered into a termination agreement whereby a shareholders agreement dated June 2, 2008 among those parties was terminated.

ITEM 4. DESCRIPTION OF THE BUSINESS

4.1 General

The Company is engaged, through its subsidiary, Powertech USA, in the acquisition, exploration and development of uranium properties. The Company's principal projects are the Dewey-Burdock Project and the Centennial Project, which it has identified as being material. The Company's other projects include the Plum Creek Prospect, the Aladdin Prospect, the Dewey Terrace Prospect, the Colony Prospect and the Powder River Basin Prospect.

During the year ended December 31, 2011, Powertech continued to focus on the exploration and development of its uranium projects, with its strategic objectives being to progress its development projects to commercial production and to maximize shareholder returns through capital appreciation.

Industry Trends

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan in March 2011, with the resultant damaging effect on that country's nuclear reactors, negatively affected public opinion regarding nuclear energy as a safe and viable source of power. Since the occurrence of these events, the Company and other companies engaged in uranium exploration and development have experienced a reduction in the trading prices of their shares on applicable stock exchanges. Further, a number of heads of government and their legislative bodies announced reviews and/or delays of plans to develop new nuclear power facilities. However, in recent months, certain governments have publicly announced intentions to proceed with nuclear projects. The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the "NRC") recently approved the licensing of new nuclear reactors in the United States for the first time in 34 years, although the Chairman of the NRC has publicly stated that a more stringent review of design risks will be undertaken for both existing facilities and future

applications for new nuclear power facilities. Government officials in India have recently announced that the Indian nuclear programme has the potential to provide long term energy security for that country and are planning a 14 fold expansion in nuclear power generation in the next twenty years from 4,800 MW to 63,000 MW. In Canada, Ontario Power Generation recently stated that it intends to proceed with the refurbishing and expansion of the Darlington, Ontario nuclear station, while incorporating lessons learned from Fukushima in the plans for such refurbishment and expansion. While the Company perceives these developments as favourable to the uranium industry, other relevant regulatory bodies may still react to the events in Japan, resulting in additional delays or barriers in permitting and licensing new uranium production operations. The Company has not yet determined the long-term impact such events will have on the Company's financial condition, results of operations and permitting plans, particularly as pertains to the Company's Dewey-Burdock Project, which is at an advanced stage in the permitting process.

The Market for Uranium

Uranium is supplied from primary production (the mining of uranium ores) and secondary sources, including the inventories held by producers and utilities, government inventories, uranium recycled from government stockpiles and the recycling of highly enriched uranium from Russia. The primary uranium production industry is international in scope, with a small number of companies operating in relatively few countries.

The principal commercial use for uranium is as a fuel for nuclear power plants. Demand for uranium is linked to the level of electricity generated by nuclear power plants. According to the Nuclear Energy Institute ("NEI"), as of March 2012, there were 104 nuclear power plants in 31 states operating 24/7 to produce more than 19% of the United States electricity. The U.S Department of Energy projects that U.S electricity demands will rise 22% by 2035. Even with conservation and efficiency measures, the U.S. will need hundreds of new power plants from a diverse portfolio of fuel sources to supply electricity for a high standard of living and to promote domestic economic growth. Maintaining nuclear energy's current share of generation would require building about one reactor per year starting in 2016 or 20 to 25 new units by 2035, based on Department of Energy forecasts. On a global basis, according to NEI, as of March 2012, 30 countries worldwide are operating 436 nuclear reactors for electricity generation and 65 new nuclear plants are under construction in 14 countries. These plants supplied approximately 13.5% of the world's electricity production in 2010.

Each year since 1985, the consumption of uranium has exceeded primary production by a substantial margin. To date, the supply gap has been accommodated by sales from existing inventories of uranium, stockpiles of highly enriched uranium and recycling programs. However, the shortfall between anticipated world uranium requirements and production is increasing as existing inventories and other sources of secondary supply are depleted.

Utilities secure a substantial proportion of their uranium requirements by entering into medium and long term contracts with producers. Contract prices are established by a number of methods, including base price levels adjusted by inflation indices, reference prices and annual price negotiations. Contracts may contain floor prices, ceiling prices and other negotiated provisions which affect the price paid.

Environmental Protection

All phases of the Company's operations are subject to environmental regulation in the jurisdictions in which it operates. These regulations govern exploration, development, tenure, production, taxes, labour standards, occupational health, waste disposal, protection and remediation of the environment, reclamation, mine safety, toxic substances and other matters. These regulations mandate, among other things, the maintenance of air and water quality standards and land reclamation. They also set forth limitations on the general handling, transportation, storage and disposal of solid and hazardous waste. Environmental legislation is evolving in a manner which will require stricter standards and enforcement, increased fines and penalties for non-compliance, more stringent environmental assessments of proposed projects and a heightened degree of responsibility for companies and their officers, directors and employees.

Foreign Operations

The Company's principal assets are located outside of Canada, in the United States of America.

Employees

As at December 31, 2011, the Company had ten employees and retained four independent contractors. As at the date of this AIF, the Company has ten employees and retains three independent contractors.

Competitive Conditions

The uranium exploration and mining business is highly competitive. There are numerous mining and exploration companies in Canada and the United States, both big and small. All of these mining companies are seeking properties of merit. The market for identifying and acquiring suitable claims with uranium mineral deposits is highly competitive. The Company expects to face competitors and potential competitors with substantially greater financial, marketing and human resources than the Company. The Company's competitive position depends on its ability to successfully and economically explore, acquire and develop new and existing mineral properties. In addition, the Company's competitive position within the uranium mineral industry may be affected by many factors, including the recent trend toward consolidation among competitors, economies of scale in the acquisition and development of mineral properties which accrue to some of the Company's competitors and higher development costs. Increased competition could cause a reduction in the Company's ability to locate suitable mineral properties which could have a material adverse effect on the Company's financial results.

While the Company may compete with other exploration companies in its efforts to locate and license mineral resource properties, it does not expect to compete with them for the removal or sale of mineral products from its properties if it should eventually discover the presence of mineral products in quantities sufficient to make production economically feasible. Readily available markets exist world-wide for the sale of mineral products. Therefore, the Company will likely be able to sell any mineral products that it is able to identify and produce. The Company's ability to be competitive in the market over the long term is dependent upon the quality and amount of ore discovered, the cost of production, the acquisition and retention of qualified employees and its proximity to the market. Due to the large number of companies and variables involved in the mining industry, it is not possible to pinpoint the Company's direct competition.

4.2 Risk Factors

The Company's operations and financial performance are subject to the normal risks of mining and are subject to various factors which are beyond the control of the Company. Certain of these risk factors are described below. The risks described below are not the only ones facing the Company. Additional risks not currently known to the Company, or that it currently considers immaterial, may also adversely impact the Company's business, operations, financial results or prospects, should any such other risks occur.

Events In Japan May Affect Public Acceptance of Nuclear Energy and the Company's Permitting Timelines

Because of unique political, technological and environmental factors that affect the nuclear industry, the industry is subject to public opinion risks that could have an adverse impact on the demand for nuclear power and increase the regulation of the nuclear power industry. In recent years, the nuclear industry had seen increased capacity at existing nuclear plants, extensions of plant licenses and new plant planning and construction. Public opinion in many countries had moved in favor of nuclear power, and recent increases in oil prices had made nuclear energy the lowest cost energy option in some countries. The March 2011 natural disasters in Japan, with the resultant effect of same on certain of the country's nuclear reactors, has caused concern internationally as to the safety of nuclear energy as a viable source of power.

Further, a number of heads of government and their legislative bodies have announced reviews and/or delays of plans to develop new nuclear power facilities. In the United States, the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory

Commission has publicly stated that a more stringent review of design risks will be undertaken for both existing facilities and future applications for new nuclear power facilities. The additional scrutiny by the NRC could affect all parts of the organization including the licensing of new uranium production facilities. Other relevant regulatory bodies could also react to these recent events, resulting in additional delays or barriers in permitting and licensing new uranium production operations. It is too soon for the Company to determine the long-term impact such events will have on the Company's financial condition, results of operations and permitting plans, particularly as pertains to the Company's Dewey-Burdock Project, which is at an advanced stage in the permitting process.

The Company's Financial Condition and Results of Operations May Be Adversely Affected by Changes in the Market Price of Uranium

The majority of the Company's potential revenues are anticipated to be derived from the sale of uranium products. The Company's financial condition, results of operations, earnings and operating cash flow will be closely related and sensitive to fluctuations in the long- and short-term market price of uranium. Historically, these prices have fluctuated widely. Between 1970 and 2011, the spot price of uranium has fluctuated between approximately \$7 per pound and approximately \$138 per pound. The current spot price of uranium is approximately \$52 per pound and the most recently reported long-term contract price is approximately \$61 per pound. The price of uranium has been and will continue to be affected by numerous factors beyond the Company's control. Such factors include, among others: demand for nuclear power; political and economic conditions in uranium producing and consuming countries; reprocessing of used reactor fuel and the re-enrichment of depleted uranium tails; sales of excess civilian and military inventories (including from the dismantling of nuclear weapons) by governments and industry participants; and production levels and costs of production. Events in Japan in March 2011 have resulted in downward pressure on the spot price of uranium and many uranium exploration and development companies have experienced a corresponding reduction in the trading value of their shares. It is too early to evaluate the long term effects of the events in Japan on the Company and the uranium industry generally.

If, after the commencement of uranium production, the price of uranium falls below the cost of production at the Company's planned mines, it may not be economically feasible to continue production at such sites. This would materially and adversely affect production, profitability and the Company's financial position. A continued decline in the market price of uranium may also require a write-down of the Company's mineral reserves and resources which would have a material and adverse affect on its financial condition, results of operations and profitability. Should any significant write-down in reserves and resources be required, material write-downs of the Company's investment in the affected mining properties and increased amortization, reclamation and closure charges may be required.

Nuclear Energy Competes With Other Viable Energy Sources

Nuclear energy competes with other sources of energy, including oil, natural gas, coal and hydro-electricity. These other sources are to some extent interchangeable with nuclear energy, particularly over the longer term. Sustained lower prices of oil, natural gas, coal and hydro-electricity may result in lower demand for uranium concentrates and uranium conversion services, which in turn may result in lower market prices for uranium, which would materially and adversely affect the Company's business, financial condition and results of operations.

The Company Will Require Significant Amounts of Additional Capital in the Future

The Company has limited financial resources. The Company will continue to make substantial capital expenditures related to exploration, development and production. In particular the Company will have further capital requirements as it expands its present exploration activities at its uranium projects or if it takes advantage of opportunities for acquisitions, joint ventures or other business opportunities that may be presented to it.

Volatile demand for uranium and the volatile price of uranium or the incurrence of unanticipated major liabilities or expenses may make it difficult or impossible for the Company to obtain debt financing or equity financing on commercially acceptable terms or at all. Failure to obtain such additional financing could result in delay or indefinite postponement of further exploration and development of its uranium projects with the possible loss of the rights to

such properties. If the exploration or development of any mine is delayed, such delay would have a material and adverse effect on the Company's business, financial condition and results of operation.

The Company Faces Competition from Other Mining Companies for the Acquisition of New Properties

There is a limited supply of desirable mineral lands available for acquisition, claim staking or leasing in the areas where the Company is currently active. Many participants are engaged in the mining business, including large, established mining companies with substantial technical and financial capabilities and long earnings records and which have access to more capital, in some cases have state support, have access to more efficient technology, and have access to reserves of uranium that are cheaper to extract and process. The Company may be at a competitive disadvantage in acquiring mining properties as many of its competitors have greater financial resources and larger technical staffs. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that the Company will be able to compete successfully with its industry competitors.

Sale of Uranium is Restricted by International Trade Regulations

The supply of uranium is, to some extent, impeded by a number of international trade agreements and policies. These agreements and any similar future agreements, governmental policies or trade restrictions are beyond the control of the Company and may affect the supply of uranium available in the United States and Europe, which are the largest markets for uranium in the world. If the Company is unable to supply uranium to important markets in the United States or Europe, its business, financial condition and results of operations may be materially and adversely affected.

Deregulation of the Electrical Utility Industry May Affect the Demand for Uranium

The Company's future prospects are tied directly to the electrical utility industry worldwide. Deregulation of the utility industry, particularly in the United States and Europe, is expected to impact the market for nuclear and other fuels for years to come, and may result in the premature shutdown of some nuclear reactors. Experience to date with deregulation indicates that utilities are improving the performance of their reactors, achieving record capacity factors. There can be no assurance that this trend will continue.

Possible Loss of Interests in Exploration Properties

If the Company fails to make any property payments or expenditures required to maintain its properties in good standing in a timely fashion, the Company may lose some or all of its interest in those properties. This is particularly significant with respect to its two key projects, Dewey-Burdock and Centennial. A loss of an interest in either of these properties could have a material adverse effect on the Company's reported indicated and inferred resources.

The Company's Operations are Subject to Operational Risks and Hazards Inherent in the Mining Industry

The Company's business is subject to a number of inherent risks and hazards, including environmental pollution, accidents or spills; industrial and transportation accidents, which may involve radioactive or hazardous materials; labor disputes; power disruptions, catastrophic accidents; failure of plant and equipment to function correctly, the inability to obtain suitable or adequate equipment, fires; blockades or other acts of social activism; changes in the regulatory environment; impact of non-compliance with laws and regulations; natural phenomena, such as inclement weather conditions, earthquakes, pit wall failures, ground movements, tailings, pipeline and dam failures and cave-ins; and encountering unusual or unexpected geological conditions and technical failure of mining methods. The Company may also contract for the transport of its uranium and uranium products to refining, conversion and enrichment facilities in North America, which will expose the Company to risks inherent in transportation including loss or damage of transportation equipment and spills of cargo.

There is no assurance that the foregoing risks and hazards will not result in damage to, or destruction of, the Company's uranium properties, personal injury or death, environmental damage, delays in the Company's exploration or development activities, costs, monetary losses and potential legal liability and adverse governmental

action, all of which could have a material and adverse effect on the Company's future cash flows, earnings, results of operations and financial condition.

Mineral Resource Estimates are Only Estimates and May Not Reflect the Actual Deposits or the Economic Viability of Uranium Extraction

Resource figures included for uranium are estimates only and no assurances can be given that the estimated levels of uranium will actually be produced or that the Company will receive the uranium price assumed in determining its resources. Such estimates are expressions of judgment based on knowledge, mining experience, analysis of drilling and exploration results and industry practices. Estimates made at any given time may significantly change when new information becomes available or when parameters that were used for such estimates change. While the Company believes that the resource estimates included herein and in its technical reports are well established and reflect management's best estimates, by their nature resource estimates are imprecise and depend, to a certain extent, upon statistical inferences which may ultimately prove unreliable. Furthermore, market price fluctuations in uranium, as well as increased capital or production costs or reduced recovery rates, may render ore resources containing lower grades of mineralization uneconomic and may ultimately result in a restatement of resources. The extent to which resources may ultimately be reclassified as proven or probable reserves is dependent upon the demonstration of their profitable recovery. The evaluation of resources is always influenced by economic and technological factors, which may change over time.

Exploration, Development and Operating Risk

The exploration for and development of uranium properties involves significant risks which even a combination of careful evaluation, experience and knowledge may not eliminate. While the discovery of an ore body may result in substantial rewards, few properties which are explored are ultimately developed into producing mines. Major expenses may be required to locate and establish mineral reserves, to develop metallurgical processes and to construct mining and processing facilities at a particular site. Whether a mineral deposit will be commercially viable depends on a number of factors, some of which are: the particular attributes of the deposit, such as size, grade and proximity to infrastructure; metal prices which are highly cyclical, drilling and other related costs which appear to be rising; and government regulations, including regulations relating to prices, taxes, royalties, land tenure, land use, importing and exporting of minerals and environmental protection. The exact effect of these factors cannot be accurately predicted, but the combination of these factors may result in the Company not receiving an adequate return on invested capital.

Currency

Exchange rate fluctuations may affect the costs that the Company incurs in its exploration activities. Uranium is generally sold in United States dollars. Since the Company principally raises funds in Canadian dollars, but the Company's costs are primarily incurred in United States dollars, the appreciation/depreciation of the United States dollar against the Canadian dollar can impact the Company's operating costs and debt obligations.

Environmental Risks and Hazards

All phases of the Company's operations are subject to environmental regulation in the jurisdictions in which it operates. These regulations mandate, among other things, the maintenance of air and water quality standards and land reclamation. They also set forth limitations on the general handling, transportation, storage and disposal of solid and hazardous waste. Environmental legislation is evolving in a manner which will require stricter standards and enforcement, increased fines and penalties for non-compliance, more stringent environmental assessments of proposed projects and a heightened degree of responsibility for companies and their officers, directors and employees. There is no assurance that future changes in environmental regulation, if any, will not adversely affect the Company's operations. Environmental hazards may exist on the properties which are unknown to the Company at present and which have been caused by previous or existing owners or operators of the properties. Reclamation costs are uncertain and planned expenditures estimated by management may differ from the actual expenditures required.

The Company's Activities are Subject to Extensive Legislation in respect of Environment, Health and Safety

The Company's activities are subject to extensive federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations governing environmental protection and employee health and safety. In addition, the uranium industry is subject not only to the worker health and safety and environmental risks associated with all mining businesses, but also to additional risks uniquely associated with uranium mining and milling. The Company is required to obtain governmental permits and provide associated financial assurance to carry on certain activities. The Company is also subject to various reclamation and other bonding requirements under federal, provincial, state or local air, water quality and mine reclamation rules and permits. Although the Company makes provision for reclamation costs, where appropriate, there is no assurance that these provisions will be adequate to discharge its obligations for these costs. Environmental and employee health and safety laws and regulations have tended to become more stringent over time. Any changes in such laws or in the environmental conditions at the Company's properties could have a material adverse effect on the Company's financial condition, cash flow or results of operations.

Failure to comply with applicable environmental and health and safety laws may result in injunctions, damages, suspension or revocation of licenses or permits and the imposition of penalties. There can be no assurance that the Company has been or will be at all times in complete compliance with such laws, regulations and permits, or that the costs of complying with current and future environmental and health and safety laws and permits will not adversely affect the Company's business, results of operations, financial condition or prospects.

Government Regulation

The Company's mineral exploration and planned development activities are subject to various laws governing prospecting, mining, development, production, taxes, labor standards and occupational health, mine safety, toxic substances, land use, water use, land claims of local people and other matters. Although the Company believes its exploration and development activities are currently carried out in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations, no assurance can be given that new rules and regulations will not be enacted or that existing rules and regulations will not be applied in a manner which could limit or curtail production or development.

Many of the mineral rights and interests of the Company are subject to government approvals, licenses and permits. Such approvals, licenses and permits are subject to various federal, state and local statutory requirements. No assurance can be given that the Company will be successful in obtaining or maintaining any or all of the various approvals, licenses and permits in full force and effect without modification or revocation. To the extent such approvals are required and not obtained, the Company may be curtailed or prohibited from continuing or proceeding with planned exploration or development of mineral properties.

Failure to comply with applicable laws, regulations and permitting requirements may result in enforcement actions hereunder, including orders issued by regulatory or judicial authorities causing operations to cease or be curtailed, and may include corrective measures requiring capital expenditures, installation of additional equipment or remedial actions. Parties engaged in mining operations or in the exploration or development of mineral properties may be required to compensate those suffering loss or damage by reason of the mining activities and may have civil or criminal fines or penalties imposed for violations or applicable laws or regulations.

Amendments to current laws and regulation governing operations or more stringent implementation thereof could have a substantial impact on the Company and cause increases in exploration expenses, capital expenditures or production costs, reduction in levels of production at producing properties or require abandonment or delays in the development of new mining properties.

Specific to the Company's Centennial Project, originating from opposition to the Project by numerous interested parties in Colorado, a new bill was signed (House Bill 1161) creating a specialized regulatory regime for in-situ uranium recovery in the State of Colorado. This new law could, upon implementation, establish standards for in-situ recovery mining and restoration that may ultimately affect the profitability of the Centennial Project.

Public Involvement in the Permitting Process

The process of obtaining radioactive materials licenses (“RML”) from the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission and those required in the states that the Company is operating in allow for public participation. If a third party chooses to object to the issuance of any RML or permit required by the Company, significant delays may occur before the Company is able to secure an RML or permit. Generally, the public objections can be overcome with the passage of time and through the procedures set forth in the applicable permitting legislation. However, the regulatory agencies must also allow and fully consider public comment according to such procedures and there can be no assurance that the Company will be successful in obtaining any RML or permit.

Native American Involvement in the Permitting Process

None of the Company’s properties are located within the boundaries of “Indian Country.” This term means several types of property interests that are controlled or owned by Native Americans under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Federal Government. However, under Federal legislation, “historic cultural properties of religious significance that can be identified are to be avoided or activities are to be mitigated such that the essential nature of the properties is not lost to a culture. Throughout the western United States, Indian tribes have had historical relationship with properties that are now owned by private parties, the Federal Government or State Government. In any Federal permitting action on these properties, the agency involved is required to make an effort to communicate with Native American Tribes to determine any areas of “Traditional Cultural Significance.” Because this process involves “Government to Government” discussions with potentially affected tribes, some delays in review of these issues can occur and in the event that “Traditional Cultural Properties” are determined to exist within a project area, the company and agency must determine the best manner of development with minimum disturbance or determine how to mitigate that disturbance. This process could affect the timing for final licensing of the Company’s Dewey-Burdock Project.

Political Risk

The Company’s future prospects may be affected by political decisions about the uranium market. There can be no assurance that the United States or other government or quasi-governmental authority will not enact legislation or other rules restricting uranium extraction and processing activities, or restricting to whom the Company can sell uranium. In addition the price of uranium may be affected by decisions of national governments to decommission nuclear weapons, thereby increasing the supply of uranium.

The Company has no History of Mineral Production or Mining Operations

The Company has never had uranium producing properties. There is no assurance that commercial quantities of uranium will be discovered at its properties or other future properties nor is there any assurance that the Company’s exploration program thereon will yield positive results. Even if commercial quantities of uranium are discovered, there can be no assurance that any property of the Company will ever be brought to a stage where uranium resources can profitably be produced therefrom. Factors which may limit the ability of the Company to produce uranium resources from its properties include, but are not limited to, the spot price of uranium, availability of additional capital and financing and the nature of any mineral deposits.

The Company does not have a history of mining operations and there is no assurance that it will produce revenue, operate profitably or provide a return on investment in the future.

Future Sales of Common Shares by Existing Shareholders

Sales of a large number of the Company’s common shares in the public markets, or the potential for such sales, could decrease the trading price of the Company’s common shares and could impair the Company’s ability to raise capital through future sales of the Company’s common shares. Substantially all of the Company’s common shares can be resold without material restriction in Canada.

No Assurance of Titles or Borders

The acquisition of the right to exploit mineral properties is a very detailed and time consuming process. There can be no guarantee that the Company will be able to acquire title to surface and mineral rights in the future. Titles to the Company's current and/or future surface or mineral properties may be challenged or impugned and title insurance is generally not available. The Company's surface or mineral properties may be subject to prior unregistered agreements, transfers or claims and title may be affected by, among other things, undetected defects. Such third party claims could have a material adverse impact on the Company's operations. In addition, the Company may be unable to operate its properties as permitted or to enforce its rights with respect to its properties.

Availability of Qualified Personnel

The mining industry generally is experiencing a significant shortage of qualified personnel particularly in the availability of professionals such as mining engineers, metallurgists and geologists. There is also a shortage of staff and skilled workers and, as a result, training to fill the positions may be necessary in order to achieve the Company's planned production activities. The uranium industry is further impacted based on the need for professionals and skilled workers because the downturn of the uranium market in the 1980's resulted in a loss of skills and considerably fewer people entering the market in this area of mineral industry. The current demand for people has also resulted in a significant escalation of salaries and wages.

Need for Additional Mineral Reserves and Delineation of Mineral Reserves

Because mines have limited lives based on proven and probable mineral reserves, the Company will be required to continually replace and expand its mineral reserves if, and when its mines produce uranium. The Company's ability to maintain or increase its annual production of uranium in the future will be dependent in significant part on its ability to bring new mines into production and to expand mineral reserves at existing mines.

The Company may be unable to acquire rights to explore additional attractive mining properties on acceptable terms due to competition for mineral acquisition opportunities with larger, better established mining companies with greater financial and technical resources. There can be no assurance that the Company will be able to bring any of its properties into production or achieve mineral reserves on its properties.

The Company's Insurance Coverage Does Not Cover All of its Potential Losses, Liabilities and Damage Related to its Business, and Certain Risks are Uninsured or Uninsurable

While the Company may obtain insurance against certain risks, the nature of these risks is such that liability could exceed policy limits or could be excluded from coverage. There are also risks against which the Company cannot insure or against which it may elect not to insure. The potential costs which could be associated with any liabilities not covered by insurance, or in excess of insurance coverage, or compliance with applicable laws and regulations may cause substantial delays and require significant capital outlays, adversely affecting the future earnings and competitive position of the Company and potentially its financial condition and results of operations.

No assurance can be given that the Company's insurance will be available at economically feasible premiums or at all, or that it will provide sufficient coverage for losses related to these or other risks and hazards.

Proposed Amendments to the United States General Mining Law of 1872 May Have an Adverse Effect on the Company's Business

Some of the Company's mineral properties comprise unpatented mining claims in the United States. There is a risk that a portion of the Company's unpatented mining claims could be determined to be invalid, in which case the Company could lose the right to mine mineral reserves contained within those mining claims. Unpatented mining claims are created and maintained in accordance with the General Mining Law of 1872. Unpatented mining claims are unique to United States property interests, and are generally considered to be subject to greater title risk than other real property interests due to the validity of unpatented mining claims often being uncertain. This uncertainty

arises, in part, out of the complex federal and state laws and regulations under the General Mining Law of 1872. Unpatented mining claims are always subject to possible challenges of third parties or contests by the federal government. The validity of an unpatented mining claim, in terms of both its location and its maintenance, is dependent on strict compliance with a complex body of federal and state statutory and decisional law.

In recent years, the United States Congress has considered a number of proposed amendments to the General Mining Law of 1872. If adopted, such legislation, among other things, could impose royalties on mineral production from unpatented mining claims located on United States federal lands, result in the denial of permits to mine after the expenditure of significant funds for exploration and development, reduce estimates of mineral reserves and reduce the amount of future exploration and development activity on United States federal lands, all of which could have a material and adverse affect on the Company's cash flow, results of operations and financial condition.

Shareholders' Interest in the Company May Be Diluted in the Future

The Company may require additional funds to fund the Company's exploration and development Programs and potential acquisitions. If the Company raises additional funding by issuing additional equity securities, such financing may substantially dilute the interests of shareholders.

The Company May Issue Additional Common Shares in the Future to Raise Capital or on the Exercise of Outstanding Stock Options and Warrants

Sales of substantial amounts of common shares of the Company, or the availability of such common shares for sale, could adversely affect the prevailing market prices for the Company's common shares. A decline in the market prices of the Company's common shares could impair its ability to raise additional capital through the sale of new common shares should the Company desire to do so.

The Market Price for Common Shares Cannot be Assured

Securities markets have experienced a high level of price and volume volatility, and the market price of securities of many companies has experienced wide fluctuations which have not necessarily been related to the operating performance, underlying asset values or prospects of such companies.

In the past, following periods of volatility in the market price of a company's securities, shareholders have instituted class action securities litigation against those companies. Such litigation, if instituted, could result in substantial costs and diversion of management attention and resources, which could significantly harm the Company's profitability and reputation.

The Company has Never Paid Dividends and May Not do so in the Foreseeable Future

The Company has never paid cash dividends on its common shares. Currently, the Company intends to retain its future earnings, if any, to fund the development and growth of its business, and does not anticipate paying any cash dividends on its common shares in the near future. As a result, shareholders of the Company will have to rely on capital appreciation, if any, to earn a return on their investment in common shares of the Company for the foreseeable future. The Company's dividend policy will be reviewed from time to time by the board of directors of the Company (the "Board").

4.3 Companies with Mineral Projects

The information in this section, with the exception of: (i) disclosure under the heading "Recent Developments" for each of the Dewey-Burdock Project and the Centennial Project; and (ii) disclosure under the heading "Note Regarding Centennial Resources", has been reproduced from the summaries of the Dewey-Burdock PEA and the Centennial PEA. The PEAs have been specifically incorporated by reference into this AIF. For a complete description of assumptions, qualifications and procedures associated with the information in the PEAs, reference should be made to the full text of the PEAs, which are available for review on SEDAR at www.sedar.com. There

have been no material changes with respect to either of the Company's Dewey Burdock or Centennial Projects since the filing of the respective PEAs.

Dewey-Burdock Project – Custer and Fall River Counties, South Dakota

The Company engaged Allan V. Moran, R.G., CPG, and Frank A. Daviess, MAusIMM, of SRK, who are both qualified persons independent from Powertech under NI 43-101, to prepare the Dewey-Burdock PEA. SRK received technical assistance from Lyntek and Mr. Jerry Bush, P.G. SRK and Lyntek are based in Lakewood, Colorado and are well known as providers of a full range of engineering and construction services for the global uranium sector. The purpose of the Dewey-Burdock PEA is to provide an independent analysis of the potential economic viability of the mineral resources of the Dewey-Burdock Project. The engineering staff of Powertech assembled an extensive amount of information as part of the Company's production planning for the Dewey-Burdock Project. This data was used by SRK and Lyntek as the basis of the Dewey-Burdock PEA.

Summary of Dewey-Burdock PEA

Property Description and Location

The Dewey-Burdock project is located in southwest South Dakota and forms part of the northwestern extension of the Edgemont Uranium Mining District, a former open-pit uranium producing district on the southwest flank of the Black Hills. The project area was extensively explored by drilling prior to acquisition by Powertech. The project is located in Townships 6 and 7 South Range 1 East of the Black Hills Prime Meridian, Custer and Fall River counties. The nearest population center to the Dewey-Burdock Project is Edgemont, South Dakota (population 900) located on US Highway 18, 14 miles east from the Wyoming-South Dakota state line.

Ownership

Powertech controls approximately 18,820 acres of mineral rights and 16,206 acres of surface rights in the project area. Powertech acquired leases from the various landowners with several levels of payments and obligations. In the portions of the project area where Powertech seeks to develop an ISR uranium operation, both surface and minerals are leased. Powertech granted the mineral owners a 5% overriding royalty payment out of sales of the product. The surface owners will be paid a 2% overriding royalty. In addition, surface owners are paid an annual rental to cover the cost of surface use and damage. The payments of royalty to the surface owners are reduced by the amount of bonuses and rentals to be paid. The basic terms of the leases are a five-year initial term and are renewable two times for five years each extension. In the case of production, all leases will be held as long as minerals are produced.

In December 2008, Powertech purchased a large block of properties in South Dakota and Wyoming from Bayswater Uranium Corporation (Bayswater). There were 37 mining claims (740 acres) located adjacent to Powertech properties within the Dewey-Burdock Project. Bayswater (and others) retained a Yellowcake Royalty of 5% on these properties.

Summary

The Dewey-Burdock Project is an advanced-stage uranium exploration project located in South Dakota, controlled 100% by Powertech. Powertech conducted confirmatory drilling to verify the results of extensive historic drilling, established current Indicated and Inferred classified resources, and conducted hydrogeologic tests to evaluate the project as an in situ leach and recovery (ISR) mining and uranium production operation. Powertech, conceptually designed well fields and a uranium recovery processing facility, and developed cost estimates for a proposed ISR operation that would be similar to existing uranium ISR operations currently in production nearby in Nebraska and Wyoming. Lyntek Inc. reviewed and confirmed the designs and cost estimates as part of preparing this report.

SRK reviewed and compiled all project information into this Preliminary Assessment NI 43-101 technical report document.

The Dewey-Burdock uranium mineralization is comprised of “roll-front” type uranium mineralization hosted in several sandstone stratigraphic horizons that are hydrogeologically isolated and therefore amenable to ISR technology. The deposits, in the Dewey and adjacent Burdock areas contain Indicated resources totaling 1.56 million tons @ 0.214% eU₃O₈ for 6.68 million contained pounds U₃O₈, and an additional Inferred resource of 1.26 million tons @ 0.179% eU₃O₈ for 4.53 million contained pounds U₃O₈.

The proposed ISR project envisions a 1.0 million pound per year U₃O₈ yellowcake production rate, and a 75% ultimate recovery; generating a nine year mine life. The base case project economics for this Preliminary Assessment at a long-term uranium price of USD65/lb U₃O₈ are positive, and indicate a pre-tax NPV of \$55.4 million at an 8% discount rate, with an IRR of 27%. Phase I capital costs are estimated at \$65 million and cash operating costs of \$34.90/lb U₃O₈. The Dewey uranium ISR project is sufficiently attractive from a technical and economic perspective that it justifies pursuit by Powertech toward completion of project permitting and project development. Using data from TradeTech’s “Long Term Uranium Price Indicator” as published in <http://www.uranium.info>, a three year trailing average of monthly long term prices from the period April 2007 to March 2010 was calculated to be \$77.81. For the same period, the “TradeTech Uranium (Weekly) Spot Price indicator” was calculated to be approximately \$65.89. A sales price of \$65.00 was used in the base case economic analysis, being significantly below the three year average long term price but nearly at the three year average spot price.

Geology and Mineralization

Uranium deposits in the Dewey-Burdock Project are sandstone, roll-front type. This type of deposit is usually “C”-shaped in cross section, with the down gradient center of the “C” having the greatest thickness and highest tenor. These “roll fronts” are typically a few tens of feet wide and often can be thousands of feet long. Uranium minerals are deposited at the interface of oxidizing solutions and reducing solutions. As the uranium minerals precipitate, they coat sand grains and partially fill the interstices between grains. Thickness of the deposits is generally a factor of the thickness of the sandstone host unit. Mineralization may be 10 to 15ft thick within the roll front while being inches to feet thick in the trailing tail portions. Deposit configuration determines the geometry of the well field and is a major economic factor in ISR mining.

The tectono-stratigraphic setting for roll-front uranium ores is in arkosic and fluvial sandstone formations deposited in sedimentary basins. Host rocks are continental fluvial and near-shore sandstone. The principal ages of the host rocks at Dewey-Burdock are Early Cretaceous (144–97 Ma); the uranium host units are the marginal marine Lakota and Fall River sandstone units within the Inyan Kara Group of earliest Cretaceous Age.

Ore mineralogy consists of uraninite, pitchblende, coffinite, with associated vanadium in some deposits. Typical alteration in the roll-front sandstone deposit includes oxidation of iron minerals up-dip from the front and reduction of iron minerals down-dip along advancing redox interface boundaries.

The primary ore control of uranium mineralization in the Dewey-Burdock Project is the presence of permeable sandstone within a major sand channel system that is also a groundwater aquifer. The source rock for uranium that infiltrated the aquifer is considered the uranium-rich tuffaceous ash White River formation, which was originally deposited unconformably on top of the subcropping sandstone units of the Lakota and Fall River formations. The source of reductant that effected a precipitation of the uranium is postulated to be carbon and carbon trash that occurs in varying quantities throughout the Inyan Kara group sedimentary rocks, and/or hydrocarbons, which are also regionally present in these formations.

Exploration

In 2007 and 2008, Powertech conducted confirmatory exploration drilling, including 155 holes. In addition, Powertech installed water wells for water quality testing and for aquifer testing. This work confirmed and replicated the historic drill data and provided some in-fill definition of uranium roll-fronts. In addition, the hydrogeologic investigations defined the premining water quality and determined the capacity for the uranium-bearing aquifers to allow for circulation of ISR recovery fluid, and confinement of the fluids to the aquifer.

Powertech used the verified historic drill data, and its own confirmatory drilling results to estimate in situ uranium resources for the Dewey Burdock Project. Powertech resources were estimated by an independent consultant, Jerry Bush, and audited by SRK. The Powertech reported resources are shown in the Table ES-1 below:

Table ES-1: 2010 Dewey-Burdock Resources – 0.50 GT Cut-off (Bush 2010)

Classification	Tons	Average Grade	Pounds (U ₃ O ₈)
Indicated Resources	1,561,560	0.214 % U ₃ O ₈	6,684,285
Inferred Resources	1,259,438	0.179 % U ₃ O ₈	4,525,500

Mineral resources that are not mineral reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability. This preliminary assessment is preliminary in nature. It includes inferred mineral resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as mineral reserves, and there is no certainty that the preliminary assessment will be realized.

Proposed Development and Operations

The Dewey-Burdock mineralization is located at depths of 500 to 800ft below surface at Dewey and 300 to 550ft below surface at Burdock, as several stacked horizons, which are sinuous and narrow but extend over several miles along trend of mineralization. The deposits are planned for ISR mining by development of individual well fields for each mineralized horizon. A well field will be developed as a series of injection and recovery wells, with a pattern to fit the mineralized horizon, typically a five spot well pattern on 70 to 100ft drillhole spacing.

The Dewey-Burdock project has two distinct locations, Dewey, and Burdock, which conceptually will be ISR-mined simultaneously. The Burdock site is planned for a central uranium recovery and processing plant with Dewey being the location of a satellite plant. Loaded uranium-bearing resin will be trucked from the Dewey satellite Ion-Exchange (IX) facility to the Burdock central processing plant. Confined groundwater aquifers containing the uranium are locally artesian to the surface or near surface. This characteristic is highly favorable for ISR and will aid in the dissolution of oxygen in the lixiviant that is used in the recovery process.

Total recovery of uranium from the mineral deposits is projected at 75%. This value is an estimate based on similar existing operations in Powertech’s experience profile. Leaching studies have been conducted on the mineralization in a lab setting to support this estimate of recovery. Therefore, the overall potential yellowcake production is estimated to be 8.41 million pounds U₃O₈. Considering the well field development and production schedule, the life of mine, at a production rate of 1,000,000 pounds per year U₃O₈ is nine years.

The Dewey-Burdock area is well supported by nearby towns and services. Major power lines are located across the project and can be accessed for electrical service for the mining operation. A major rail line (Burlington Northern-Santa Fe) cuts diagonally across the project area. A major railroad siding occurs at Edgemont and will assist in shipment of materials and equipment for development of the producing facilities.

Preliminary Economic Assessment

Powertech technical and management staff have prior experience with ISR uranium mine development and operations. Therefore, Powertech has developed much of the preliminary well field design and cost estimates in-house, with vendor quotes as support in many instances. Lyntek Inc. provided independent preliminary engineering design support for the surface uranium recovery and processing facilities, and is a major contributor to the estimate of project costs for Dewey-Burdock.

SRK completed a preliminary economic analysis for the Project. The base case economic analysis results indicate a pre-tax NPV of USD55.4 million at an 8% discount rate with an IRR of 27% (Table ES-2). Payback will be in the first quarter of production, Year 4.

The SRK Life of Mine plan and economics are based on the following:

- CIM-compliant Mineral Resources;

- a mine life of nine years;
- a cash operating cost of \$34.90/lb- U₃O₈;
- capital costs of Phase I capital costs of \$65 million; and
- no provision for salvage value is assumed in the analysis.

This Preliminary Assessment has been conducted as a study of the potential ISR mineability of the Project, utilizing industry standard criteria for Scoping Level studies, which is normally at ±35 to 40% on costing estimates. In many cases, the cost estimates provided by Powertech are defined to a prefeasibility level, with vendor quote backup; as a result, contingency costs for the base case are set at 20%. This report includes the economic basis for the preliminary assessment and any qualifications and/or assumptions of the responsible qualified persons.

Mineral resources that are not mineral reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability. This preliminary assessment is preliminary in nature. It includes inferred mineral resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as mineral reserves, and there is no certainty that the preliminary assessment will be realized.

Conclusions and Recommendations

SRK concludes the Dewey-Burdock Project is a sufficiently drill-defined sandstone-hosted roll front uranium deposit that contains approximately 6.7 Mlbs U₃O₈ as Indicated mineral resource and 4.5 Mlbs U₃O₈ as Inferred mineral resource, such that continued work is justified by Powertech towards the goal of ISR uranium recovery and production. Historic and current drilling information support the resource estimation defining several stacked horizons of uranium mineralization at the Dewey and Burdock areas. All basic information necessary to evaluate the conceptual development of the resources by ISR methods has been addressed at a scoping level study to determine the project's potential economic viability.

Powertech's plan is to fully permit to operation and upon receiving all permits to proceed to delineate the initial well fields, conduct baseline and hydrogeologic studies of the initial well fields, and construct the processing facilities. Upon review of the detailed site specific well field data, including additional baseline, resource definition, and hydrogeologic data, Powertech plans to design, construct, and operate their well fields. SRK recommends that Powertech continue the ongoing process of project permitting toward eventual project development and well field construction.

Powertech will permit for full production and will obtain the information to satisfy the prefeasibility study, which is ISR recovery information and operation cost details, during the initial mine start-up phase – during the processing of the first set of ISR wellfield cells that are brought on-line. To achieve initial well field construction, Powertech will require capital expenditures of \$65 million over a 1 year period (initial project capital), as a recommended Phase I program and budget.

Powertech will determine whether or not it will file a pre-feasibility report prior to commencing capital construction for production, with the understanding that the parameters of actual ISR recovery and wellfield production costs are the only items lacking to achieve a pre-feasibility level understanding and a statement of reserves for Dewey-Burdock.

SRK concurs with Powertech's approach to proceed from preliminary economic assessment to a production decision, with the caveat that the reader understand the risks of investing large initial capital for a production scale recovery plant. This is a business decision and risk that Powertech is willing to accept based on prior ISR production history on similar deposits elsewhere in the U.S.

Recent Developments

The Company's business objectives are currently focused on obtaining the necessary permits and licenses for the Dewey-Burdock Project. In order to obtain such permits and licenses, the Company must:

- continue to interface with the NRC regarding its license application, which was submitted in August 2009 and deemed complete in October 2009;
- continue to interface with the Bureau of Land Management (the “BLM”) regarding its Plan of Operations which was submitted in October 2009 and considered administratively complete in March 2010;
- submit an ISR large-scale mine permit application to the South Dakota Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (the “DENR”);
- submit a groundwater discharge permit application to the DENR;
- continue to interface with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (the “EPA”) regarding its underground injection control (“UIC”) Class III and Class V permit applications, of which the Class III application was submitted in December 2008 and deemed complete in February 2009, and the Class V application was submitted to the EPA in March 2010 and deemed complete in April 2010;
- submit a water rights permit to the DENR; and
- respond to any requests for additional information from the NRC and all other agencies necessary to obtain the necessary licenses and permits.

The NRC is expected to provide a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (“SEIS”) for the Dewey-Burdock Project in 2012. After a public comment period, the NRC will respond to any comments it may receive from other federal government agencies and the public, and then provide a final SEIS, which is expected in the first half of 2013. The NRC is also preparing a Safety Evaluation Report (“SER”), which is schedule to be complete by June 2012. The license from the NRC, and the ancillary permits, are expected to be obtained in 2012 and 2013.

During January 2012, the NRC published a schedule for completion of the above items as follows:

<u>Report type</u>	<u>Estimated completion date</u>
Draft SEIS	August 2012
SER	June 2012
Final SEIS	First half of 2013

This schedule has remained in place since October 2011.

In December 2011, the NRC notified Powertech that the response to the Request for Additional Information on the Technical Report submitted in June 2011 was deemed sufficient for technical review. Additionally, Powertech met with NRC staff in December 2011 in Washington DC to present its initial draft of a ground water model of the Dewey-Burdock Project. This model was filed in late February and is expected to facilitate the permitting process with the NRC and other agencies.

In January 2012, Powertech responded to the EPA on questions presented on the UIC Class V permit application for deep disposal injection. It is expected that the responses are sufficient to proceed to draft permit, pending approval.

Powertech’s preparation of several permit applications to the DENR of South Dakota is well advanced and Powertech has been focused on this activity during the past quarter. These applications include the groundwater discharge permit, the water rights permit and the ISR large scale mine permit, all of which are on schedule to be submitted within the first half of 2012. The applications are being prepared under the direction of WWC Engineering and have been discussed at numerous meetings with the DENR staff during the past quarter.

Powertech has continued to work with the EPA on the UIC Class III permit application, with assistance from WWC Engineering and Petrotek. This work includes updating the application submitted in January 2008. The update will include information supplied to the NRC in June 2011, as well as a revised basis for the aquifer exemption boundary. The update is planned for submittal following review meetings scheduled in February and March 2012.

Dewey-Burdock Contractual Commitments

The Company leases both surface and minerals within the Dewey-Burdock Project area. In general, the mineral owners will be paid a 5% overriding royalty. The surface owners will be paid a two percent overriding royalty as incentive to support the development of uranium under their lands. In addition, surface owners are paid an annual rental to cover the cost of surface damage and to compensate for reduction of husbandry grazing during field operations. Generally, royalty payments to the surface owners will be reduced by the amount of rentals previously paid. The basic terms of the leases are five-year initial terms and are renewable two times at the five-year mark and ten years from original signing. Additional bonuses are paid to the landowners at the time of renewal. The majority of the leases are in force through 2020 without production. In the case of production, all leases will be held as long as minerals are produced. The average annual payments under the agreements are approximately \$215,000. As further disclosed in Note 6 of the Company's audited financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2011 (as filed on SEDAR) an additional \$2,050,000 is payable upon receipt of certain permits and authorizations.

Centennial Project – Weld County, Colorado

The Company engaged Allan V. Moran, R.G., CPG, and Frank A. Daviess, MAusIMM, of SRK, who are both qualified persons independent from Powertech under NI 43-101, to prepare the Centennial PEA. SRK received technical assistance from Lyntek and Mr. Cary Voss, P.G. SRK and Lyntek are based in Lakewood, Colorado and are well known as providers of a full range of engineering and construction services for the global uranium sector. The purpose of the Centennial PEA is to provide an independent analysis of the potential economic viability of the mineral resources of the Centennial Project. The engineering staff of Powertech assembled an extensive amount of information as part of the Company's production planning for the Centennial Project. This data was used by SRK and Lyntek as the basis of the Centennial PEA.

Updates to Information in Centennial PEA

In July 2009, Powertech entered into an option agreement with M.J. Diehl & Sons, Inc. and Howard Diehl and Donna Diehl (collectively, "Diehl") to purchase approximately 2,160 acres of land in the area of the Centennial Project. Pursuant to that option agreement, the Company had 24 months to exercise the option. During the term of the option, the Company was permitted to access the property for the purposes of pumping, testing, monitoring and sampling water. An option agreement was also entered into with Thomas Varra and Dianna Varra (collectively, "Varra") in July 2009 for the purchase of approximately 1,425 acres of land. Powertech determined to terminate both of these option agreements in June 2011. As a result of those terminations, the size of the Centennial Property and the inferred and indicated resources contained therein as set out in the Centennial PEA have been reduced and such disclosure in the Centennial PEA is expressly superseded by the disclosure contained in this AIF, including in the following paragraph.

As a result of the termination of the Varra and Diehl option agreements, the Company's mineral rights were reduced to 7,098 acres, and its surface area acreage was reduced to 3,675 acres. The Centennial PEA indicated that combined Centennial deposits contained Indicated resources totaling 6.87 million tons at 0.09% eU₃O₈ for 10.4 million contained pounds U₃O₈, and an additional Inferred resource of 1.36 million tons at 0.09% eU₃O₈ for 2.3 million contained pounds U₃O₈, at a 0.2GT (grade-thickness product) cut-off. As a result of the termination of the Diehl and Varra option agreements, the Company has determined that the Indicated resources at the Centennial Project were reduced by 0.61 million tons, to 6.26 million tons at 0.09% eU₃O₈ for 9.5 million contained pounds U₃O₈, and that Inferred resources were reduced by 0.15 million tons, to 1.21 million tons at 0.09% eU₃O₈ for 2.1 million contained pounds U₃O₈, each at a 0.2GT (grade-thickness product) cut-off.

Summary of Centennial PEA

Property Description and Location

The Centennial Project is located in west central Weld County, in north central Colorado; about 13 miles south of the Colorado-Wyoming state line. Property access includes major U.S. Highways and numerous state and county roads that follow land subdivision lines. Interstate Highway 25 between Denver, Colorado and Cheyenne, Wyoming is

approximately 4 miles west of the project. The project lies within portions of Townships 8, 9 and 10 North, Range 67 West, approximately 14 miles northeast of the city of Fort Collins and 16 miles northwest of Greeley.

Ownership

Originally, the Centennial Project consisted of private mineral rights totaling 6,880 acres. This total included 5,760 acres (nine sections) of mineral rights purchased by Powertech from Anadarko. The Anadarko mineral rights were originally part of the Union Pacific Railroad land grant, which was comprised of alternate sections (checkerboard pattern) for 20 miles on both sides of the railroad right-of-way. Anadarko retained mineral rights pertaining to oil and gas and leasable minerals.

Powertech's land position has steadily increased. In July 2009, Powertech entered into two option agreements for the purchase of an aggregate of 3,585 acres of land, together with the associated water, mineral and lease interests. Powertech entered into an option agreement with M.J. Diehl & Sons, Inc. and Howard Diehl and Donna Diehl (collectively, "Diehl") to purchase approximately 2,160 acres of land. Pursuant to the option agreement, the Company has 24 months to exercise the option. During the term of the option, the Company is permitted to access the property for the purposes of pumping, testing, monitoring and sampling water. An option agreement was also established with Thomas Varra and Dianna Varra (collectively, "Varra") for the purchase of approximately 1,425 acres of land. The option agreement is for a term of 12 months but can be extended for two 12-month periods. Powertech's gross mineral rights in the area include 9,615 acres, while its surface use acreage increased to 7,262 acres. The addition of the surface use acreage provides Powertech access to its privately owned minerals, as well as enabling it to conduct drilling, pump testing, mine planning, and support operational facility design.

Summary

The Centennial Project is an advanced-stage uranium exploration project located in northern Colorado, controlled 100% by Powertech. Powertech conducted confirmatory drilling to verify the results of extensive historical drilling, established current Indicated and Inferred classified resources, and conducted hydrogeologic tests to evaluate the project as an in situ recovery (ISR) mining and uranium production operation. Powertech conceptually designed well fields and a uranium recovery processing facility, and developed cost estimates for a proposed ISR operation that would be similar to existing uranium ISR operations currently in production in Nebraska and Wyoming. Lyntek, Inc. (Lyntek) reviewed and confirmed these designs and cost estimates in the preparation of this report.

SRK reviewed and compiled all project information into this Preliminary Assessment NI 43-101 technical report document.

The uranium mineralization of the Centennial Project is comprised of "roll-front" type uranium mineralization hosted in sandstone stratigraphic horizons of the Fox Hills Sandstone that is amenable to ISR technology. Several deposits are located along the reduction-oxidation boundary that trends generally north-south.

The proposed ISR project envisions a 700,000 pound per year U_3O_8 production rate and a 75% ultimate recovery; generating a 14 year mine life. The base case economic analysis results indicate a pre-tax Net Present Value (NPV) of \$51.8 million at an 8% discount rate with an Internal Rate of Return (IRR) of 18%. Phase I (initial) capital costs are estimated at \$71.1 million and Life of Mine operating unit costs of \$34.95/lb U_3O_8 . The Centennial Uranium ISR project is sufficiently attractive from a technical and economic perspective that it justifies further work by Powertech toward completion of project permitting, and further definition of hydrogeological characteristics that would allow for ISR production parameters. Using data from TradeTech's "Long Term Uranium Price Indicator" as published on <http://www.uranium.info>, a three year trailing average of monthly long term prices from the period June 2007 to May 2010 was calculated to be \$76.14. For the same period, the "TradeTech Uranium (Weekly) Spot Price indicator" was calculated to be approximately \$61.68. A sales price of \$65.00 was used in the base case economic analysis, being significantly below the three year average long term price but nearly at the three year average spot price.

Geology and Mineralization

The uranium deposits in the Centennial Project are classic roll front type deposits occurring in subsurface sandstones deposited in shallow marine regressive and transgressive sequences within the Fox Hills Sandstone of late-Cretaceous age. The uranium roll fronts in the Centennial area are associated with oxidation/reduction interfaces and are known to cover a linear distance of at least 30 miles, extending throughout an area of more than 50 square miles. Maps prepared by a prior property owner, Rocky Mountain Energy Company (RME) from 1978 until 1984, indicate the regional oxidation occurs in three separate sands within the Fox Hills Sandstone and that potentially economic concentrations of uranium occur in seven distinct deposits within the Project along the oxidation/reduction boundary. Historical exploration drilling by RME defined the deposits that comprise the Centennial Project, and Powertech performed confirmatory drilling to verify the mineralization.

Exploration

Historical exploration by RME provides Powertech with a project database including data from 3,500 drillholes. The exploration drillhole data obtained consists of the original electric down hole probe log of each hole. Samples of the cuttings from each hole were collected at 5-foot intervals and the geologic description of the cuttings was recorded on lithologic logs by the project geologist. Numerous cores were taken and chemically assayed from the mineralized zones to substantiate the radiometric values determined by the electric log. RME also logged nearly 800 holes with Princeton Gamma Tech (PGT) instrumentation that conducted spectrometric down hole measurements of protactinium. Protactinium is an early radiometric decay product of uranium and historically it was determined that the presence of protactinium, due to its short half-life, can be directly related to the quantity of uranium present within the subsurface. RME drilled another 12 holes to depths of 250-400 feet on the northern portion of the project that were also probed using a PGT down hole tool. These data are also included with the Powertech database received from Anadarko. Numerous historical reports define uranium “reserves” (resources by current standards).

From August 2007 to October 2007 and from August 2008 to September 2008, Powertech completed three drilling programs, totaling 41 drillholes and 14,931 feet of drilling on the Centennial Project. The depths of these holes ranged from 103 to 900 feet-below-surface. Geological and geophysical information was collected from all drillholes. There were 18 holes completed as water wells, 15 as rotary drillholes, and 8 as core holes.

During 2009, Powertech drilled 16 water wells and 2 additional core holes on the project for a total of 8,677 feet of drilling. These water wells are for the purpose of conducting an aquifer test to investigate the characteristics of the aquifer and the quality of groundwater in the vicinity of Powertech’s initial ISR well field. As of the effective date of this report, the aquifer test has not yet been conducted.

Powertech used the historical data and Powertech drilling data to estimate resources for the Centennial Project compliant with CIM definitions sufficient for NI 43-101 reporting. Powertech first reported resources for the Centennial Project in March 2007, with a second revision in June 2009. The most recent revision of the resources was completed in an updated 43-101 technical report dated February 25, 2010 and stated in this report. The Powertech resource estimate was completed by an independent consultant, Cary Voss, and audited by SRK. The resources reported by Powertech are shown in the Table ES.1 below:

Table ES.1: 2010 Centennial Resources – 0.20 GT Cut-off (Voss 2010)

Classification	Tons	Average Grade (eU ₃ O ₈)	Pounds (U ₃ O ₈)
Indicated Resources	6,873,199	0.09%	10,371,571
Inferred Resources	1,364,703	0.09%	2,325,514

Mineral resources that are not mineral reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability. This preliminary assessment is preliminary in nature. It includes inferred mineral resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as mineral reserves, and there is no certainty that the preliminary assessment will be realized.

Proposed Development and Operations

The Centennial mineralization is located at depths of 100 to 700 feet below surface, as primarily three separate mineralized horizons, which are sinuous and narrow but extend for several miles along trend. The deposits are planned for ISR mining by development of individual well fields for each mineralized horizon. A well field will be developed as a series of injection and recovery wells, with a pattern to fit the mineralized horizon, typically a five-spot well pattern on 70 to 100 foot (ft) drillhole spacing depending on local hydrogeologic character.

The Centennial Project has two sections, the Northern project area and the Southern project area, both of which will be developed for ISR mining. The Northern deposits are located below the water table in the host formations with conditions favorable for ISR methods. Much of the mineralization in the Southern project area lies at or just above the water table, which will require a localized enhancement of the water table with a well field encircling freshwater injection fence to facilitate ISR mining methods.

A Central Processing Plant (CPP) will be constructed in the Northern project area, and a satellite facility (SF) in the Southern project area. The SF will only contain ion exchange vessels for resin loading, and the loaded resin will be hauled by truck to the CPP. The central uranium recovery and processing plant is planned to produce uranium as “yellowcake”.

Total recovery of uranium from the mineral deposits is projected at 75%. This value is an estimate based on similar existing operations in Powertech’s experience profile. Leaching studies were conducted in a lab setting to support this estimate of recovery. Therefore, the overall potential yellowcake production is estimated to be 9.52 million pounds U₃O₈. Considering the well field development and production schedule, the life of mine, at a production rate of 700,000 pounds per year U₃O₈ is 14 years.

The Centennial area is well positioned for technical and support services from nearby towns and infrastructure. Major highways and a railroad line are located a few miles west of the property, and a power sub-station of the Colorado power grid is located a few miles east of the project at the community of Nunn.

Preliminary Assessment

Powertech technical and management staff have prior experience with ISR uranium mine development and operations. Therefore, Powertech developed much of the preliminary well field design and cost estimates in-house, with vendor quotes as support in many instances. Lyntek provided independent preliminary engineering design support for the surface uranium recovery and processing facilities, and is a major contributor to the estimate of project costs for Centennial.

SRK completed a preliminary economic analysis for the Project. The base case economic analysis results indicate a pre-tax NPV of USD 51.8 million at an 8% discount rate with an IRR of 18%. The economics are based on a \$65/lb U₃O₈ long-term uranium price and a design production rate of 700,000lbs U₃O₈/yr. Total capital costs are estimated at \$129.3 million comprised of initial capital costs of \$71.1 million, and ongoing capital costs over the life of mine of \$58.2 million.

This Preliminary Assessment presents a study of the potential ISR minability of the project, utilizing industry standard criteria for Scoping Level studies, which is normally at ±35 to 40% on costing estimates. In many cases, the cost estimates provided by Powertech are defined to a prefeasibility level, with vendor quote backup; as a result, contingency costs for the base case are set at 20%. This report includes the economic basis for the preliminary assessment and any qualifications and/or assumptions of the responsible qualified persons.

Mineral resources that are not mineral reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability. This preliminary assessment is preliminary in nature. It includes inferred mineral resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as mineral reserves, and there is no certainty that the preliminary assessment will be realized.

Conclusions and Recommendations

SRK concludes the Centennial Project is a sufficiently drill-defined sandstone-hosted roll front uranium deposit to support the approximately 12.7 million pounds of in-situ uranium resource stated by Powertech and confirmed by SRK. Historical and current drilling information support the resource estimation defining several deposits of uranium mineralization on private surface and mineral lands at the Centennial Project. Continued work is justified by Powertech towards the goal of defining the potential ISR uranium recovery and production operation. Most of the basic information necessary to evaluate the conceptual development of the resources by ISR methods has been addressed at a scoping study level to assess the project's potential economic viability. SRK recommends that Powertech's 2010 aquifer testing program be completed, and the data be evaluated to better define the hydrogeologic characteristics, to progress the evaluation of the Centennial Project for ISR development.

Powertech's plan is to fully permit the Centennial Project for operations and upon receiving all permits to proceed, delineate the initial well fields, conduct detailed hydrogeologic studies of the initial well fields and aquifer enhancement in the Southern project area, and construct the processing facilities. Upon review of the detailed site-specific well field data, including additional resource definition and hydrogeologic data, Powertech plans to design, construct, and operate their well fields. SRK recommends that Powertech continue the ongoing process of project permitting and hydrogeologic data collection, advancing towards project development and production. Powertech will permit for full production and will obtain the information to satisfy the prefeasibility study, which is ISR recovery information and operation cost details, during the initial mine start-up phase – during the processing of the first set of ISR well field cells that are brought on-line. To achieve initial well field construction, Powertech will require capital expenditures of \$71.1 million over a 1-year period (initial project capital), as a recommended Phase I program and budget.

Powertech will determine whether or not it will file a pre-feasibility report prior to commencing capital construction for production, with the understanding that the parameters of actual ISR recovery and well field production costs are the only items lacking to achieve a pre-feasibility level understanding and a statement of reserves for Centennial.

SRK concurs with Powertech's approach to proceed from preliminary economic assessment to a production decision, with the caveat that the reader understands the risks of investing large initial capital for a production scale recovery plant. This is a business decision and risk that Powertech is willing to accept based on prior ISR production history on similar deposits elsewhere in the U.S.

Recent Developments

Powertech has completed a significant amount of work focused primarily on preparing the Centennial Project for ISR leach permitting and feasibility. This work has included drilling, recovery tests, water well tests and environmental studies. At the request of the Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety, the Company prepared and submitted an updated Site Characterization Plan in April 2009. All the required environmental surveys and studies have been completed and the draft reports have been received. Powertech completed its application to EPA for a Class I UIC Permit in November 2010. In December 2010, the EPA informed the Company that the application was deemed complete. The Company has decided to forego additional permitting activities on Centennial until the completion of the permitting and licensing of Dewey-Burdock in order to conserve cash and focus activities on its most advanced project.

Centennial Contractual Commitments

The Company maintains lease agreements with mineral owners in the Centennial Project area. The Company granted the mineral owners a five percent, escalating, overriding royalty payment out of sales of the product. The surface owners will be paid a two percent overriding royalty as incentive to support the development of uranium under their lands. In addition, surface owners are paid an annual rental to cover the cost of surface damage and to compensate for reduction of husbandry grazing during field operations. Generally, royalty payments to the surface owners will be reduced by the amount of rentals previously paid. The leases have an initial term of five years and are renewable upon payment of the annual rental fee. The average annual payments under the agreements are approximately

\$57,000. As further disclosed in Note 6 of the Company's audited financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2011 (as filed on SEDAR), an additional \$2,000,000 is due upon receipt of certain permits and licenses.

Other Properties

The Company also holds interests in the properties described below, which are not material to the Company. The Company currently does not have any ongoing exploration activity at its Wyoming projects/prospects as it has prioritized its resources to the permitting activities at its Dewey-Burdock Project. While the Company continues to maintain the prospects in expectation of future development, there are no additional exploration activities or expenditures planned with respect to these properties for the 2012 fiscal year. The Company did not incur any expenditures on its Wyoming projects other than necessary claim fees and land/lease payments and staff time to review, compile, and evaluate historic drilling results, as well as results from the Company's 2007 exploratory drilling program.

Aladdin Exploration Project – Crook County

The Company acquired the Aladdin Project through the acquisition of private and State of Wyoming mining leases and through the staking of federal mining claims. This Project is located along the northwest flank of the Black Hills Uplift in a geologic environment similar to that of the Dewey-Burdock Project area. The Company is focused on the highly prospective portion of the project area and has released some lower-priority properties. In 2011, all outlying mining claims, two State of Wyoming leases and one private mining lease were released. The Aladdin Project area contains approximately 16,000 acres of surface rights and approximately 15,000 acres of mineral rights.

There is a historic uranium resource within the project area of 1.2 million pounds U_3O_8 . This historical estimate was prepared in April 2007, by R.B. Smith & Associates, a geological consulting firm. This firm had access to and used drill hole data from Teton Exploration's 1800-hole historic exploratory drilling program on the Aladdin Project. A 0.02% U_3O_8 grade cut-off and a GT (Grade X Thickness) cut-off of 0.10 were applied to all mineralized intercepts. Resources were estimated by applying this GT information to a 100-foot square grid system that was superimposed over the historic drilling areas. Both mineralized and un-mineralized holes were factored into this grid system, which resulted in the calculation of a reliable global uranium resource estimate for the project. This grid system evaluation provides no categorization of uranium resources and is not compliant with National Instrument 43-101. A qualified person has not done sufficient work to classify the historical estimate as current mineral resources or mineral reserves and the Company is not treating the historical estimate as current mineral resources or mineral reserves. However, at the present time, Powertech is conducting subsurface mapping of multiple mineralized units within the project and will perform a GT contouring analysis. This resource evaluation will utilize historic drilling results, as well as results from the Company's 2007 exploratory drilling program and is expected to upgrade the historical estimate to a current mineral resource.

The Company has also had two recent meetings with Aladdin Project landowners concerning lengthening the term and eliminating bonus payments associated with the existing leases. The meetings were positive and draft amendments to restructure the existing leases have been mailed to the landowners. Discussions will continue and a resolution is envisioned well before the third quarter exercise dates of the current leases.

The Company maintains lease agreements with mineral owners in the Aladdin Prospect area. The Company granted the mineral owners a six percent overriding royalty payment out of sales of the product. The surface owners will be paid a two percent overriding royalty as incentive to support the development of uranium under their lands. In addition, surface owners are paid an annual rental to cover the cost of surface damage and to compensate for reduction of husbandry grazing during field operations. The basic terms of the leases are five-year initial terms and are renewable one time at the five-year mark from original signing. Additional bonuses are paid to the landowners at the time of renewal. Most of the leases are in force through 2017 without production. In the case of production, all leases will be held as long as minerals are produced. The average annual payments under the agreements are approximately \$109,000.

During the year ended December 31, 2011, as discussed above, the Company decided not to renew portions of certain lease agreements and elected not to continue its annual maintenance payments on 65 claims associated with

its Aladdin project. As a result, the Company wrote-down historical capitalized costs associated with those leases and claims in the amount of \$85,340. There were no such charges for the year ended December 31, 2010.

Dewey Terrace Project – Weston and Niobrara Counties

The Dewey Terrace Project is located in Weston and Niobrara Counties, Wyoming on the western continuation of mineralized trends from the Dewey-Burdock Project in South Dakota. The Company acquired this prospect primarily through the staking of federal mining claims, along with the acquisition of private and State of Wyoming mining leases.

In 2011, the Company consolidated its land position into the southern portion of the project area where the uranium exploration potential is considered to be the highest. In this southern area, a small historic resource was developed in the 1980's and projections of mineralized trends from Dewey-Burdock are expected. However, one private mining lease was acquired within the favorable area. The Company controls 468 mining claims, along with eight private and State of Wyoming mining leases in the project area for a total of approximately 5,600 acres of surface rights and approximately 13,000 acres of mineral rights.

During 2011 and 2010, the Company elected not to continue its annual maintenance payments on approximately 300 claims and four leases or options to lease. As a result, during the year ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, the Company wrote-down all historical charges associated with those claims/leases in the amount of approximately \$38,745 and 113,000, respectively, (January 1, 2010: \$nil).

Colony Prospect – Crook County

The Colony Prospect is located on the northwest flank of the Black Hills Uplift approximately 10 miles north of the Aladdin Prospect. The Company acquired the Colony prospect through the staking of 190 mining claims and three State of Wyoming leases through December 31, 2009. During 2011 and 2010, the Company elected not to continue its annual maintenance payments on its claims. As a result, during the year ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, the Company wrote-down all historical charges associated with those claims in the amount of approximately \$14,000 and \$117,800, respectively, (January 1, 2010:\$Nil). The Company still maintains three State of Wyoming mining leases, totaling approximately 1,300 acres on land that is strategically located with respect to mapped, regional mineralized trend.

Powder River Basin (Savageton Project) – Campbell County

As of December 31, 2011, the Powder River Basin prospect consisted of 319 mining claims. This 6,000 acre exploration area is now designated as the Savageton Project (named after a local abandoned townsite). Included within these claims is a historic uranium resource of 1.0 million pounds U_3O_8 . This historic resource was calculated by the Colorado School of Mines Research Institute (CSMRI) in 1976, using exploration drill hole data provided by Getty Oil Company. CSMRI was a professional research organization, well-respected by the uranium industry and whose uranium resource estimates were suitable for public disclosure. A geostatistical method of resource estimation, specifically developed for sedimentary basin roll front deposits, was used by CSMRI. This method utilized uranium intercept data obtained from closely-spaced drill holes, along drill-hole fences oriented perpendicular to the mineralized trend. In addition to generating a total resource estimate, this method also estimated an average width and grade of the deposit. This geostatistical methodology provides no categorization of uranium resources and is not compliant with National Instrument 43-101. A qualified person has not done sufficient work to classify the historical estimate as current mineral resources or mineral reserves and the Company is not treating the historical estimate as current mineral resources or mineral reserves.

ITEM 5. DIVIDENDS

5.1 Dividends

The Company has not paid any dividends since its incorporation. Any determination to pay any future dividends will remain at the discretion of the Board and will be made based on the Company's financial condition and other factors

deemed relevant by the Board. There are no restrictions on the ability of the Company to pay dividends except as set out under its governing statute.

ITEM 6. DESCRIPTION OF SHARE CAPITAL

6.1 Common Shares

The Company is authorized to issue an unlimited number of Common Shares without par value and an unlimited number of Class B Preference Shares without par value. As of December 31, 2011 and as of the date of this AIF, 103,301,362 Common Shares were issued and outstanding. No Class B Preference Shares have been issued.

Holders of Common Shares are entitled to one vote for each Common Share held on all matters to be voted on by such holders and are entitled to receive, pro rata, such dividends as may be declared by the Board out of funds legally available for such dividends, and to receive, pro rata, the remaining property of the Company on a liquidation, dissolution or winding-up of the Company.

6.2 Class B Preference Shares

The Company is authorized to issue an unlimited number of Class B Preference Shares without par value. As of December 31, 2011, no Class B Preference Shares have been issued.

ITEM 7. MARKET FOR SECURITIES

7.1 Trading Price and Volume

Powertech's Common Shares are listed and posted for trading on the TSX under the symbol "PWE". The table below sets forth the high and low closing prices and the volumes for the Common Shares traded through the TSX on a monthly basis for the year ended December 31, 2011, as stated in Canadian dollars.

	High	Low	Volume
January 2011	\$0.60	\$0.29	7,002,500
February 2011	\$0.58	\$0.48	3,489,200
March 2011	\$0.49	\$0.28	7,617,600
April 2011	\$0.32	\$0.25	679,100
May 2011	\$0.27	\$0.17	4,905,600
June 2011	\$0.20	\$0.17	1,689,700
July 2011	\$0.19	\$0.16	1,799,600
August 2011	\$0.19	\$0.13	1,217,200
September 2011	\$0.15	\$0.10	2,385,800
October 2011	\$0.15	\$0.09	1,230,800
November 2011	\$0.15	\$0.10	3,389,800
December 2011	\$0.11	\$0.09	1,497,700

ITEM 8. ESCROW SECURITIES AND SECURITIES SUBJECT TO CONTRACTUAL RESTRICTIONS ON TRANSFER

8.1 Escrowed Securities and Securities Subject to Contractual Restriction on Transfer

As of the date of this AIF, none of the Company's securities are held in escrow or subject to contractual restrictions on transfer.

ITEM 9. DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

9.1 Name, Occupation and Security Holding

At present, the directors of the Company are elected at each annual general meeting and hold office until the next annual general meeting, or until their successors are duly elected or appointed in accordance with the Company's Articles or until such director's earlier death, resignation or removal. The Company's current Board consists of Wallace M. Mays, Richard F. Clement, Jr., Thomas A. Doyle, Douglas E. Eacrett, Greg Burnett, Malcolm F. Clay and John Dustan.

The following table sets forth, for each of the directors and executive officers of the Company, the individual's name, municipality of residence, position held with the Company, principal occupation and, in the case of the directors, the period during which the individual has served as a director of the Company.

Name Province/State Country of Residence and Position(s) with the Company⁽¹⁾	Principal Occupation Business or Employment for Last Five Years⁽¹⁾	Periods during which Nominee has Served as a Director	Number of Common Shares Owned⁽¹⁾
Richard F. Clement, Jr. New Mexico, USA President, Chief Executive Officer and Director Compensation Committee Member and Disclosure Committee Member	Mr. Clement has been the President, Chief Executive Officer and a director of the Company since May 11, 2006. Mr. Clement is a professional geologist with over 35 years of experience in uranium recovery. Prior to joining the Company, Mr. Clement was the owner of Lone Mountain Archaeological Services Inc., a contract cultural resources consulting company. This ownership continued until it was divested in 2009. Mr. Clement has a B.Sc. in Geology from Boston College and M.Sc. in Geology from the University of Vermont.	May 11, 2006 to present	3,520,000 ⁽²⁾ 3.4%
Thomas A. Doyle British Columbia, Canada Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer, Vice President – Finance and Director Disclosure Committee Member	Mr. Doyle has been the Chief Financial Officer, Vice President – Finance, Secretary and a director of the Company since May 11, 2006. Effective July 15, 2008, he resigned from the position of Secretary and accepted the position of Treasurer. He is also currently the President, Chief Executive Officer and a director of Wolverine Minerals Corp., a junior mining company listed on the TSX Venture Exchange. He was formerly the President, Chief Executive Officer, and a director of Ridgemont Iron Ore Corp. (formerly Ridgemont Capital Corp.) until November 2010.	May 11, 2006 to present	2,913,400 ⁽³⁾ 2.8%
Douglas E. Eacrett British Columbia, Canada Director Audit Committee Member and Compensation Committee Member	Mr. Eacrett has been a director of the Company since February 27, 2005. He is currently a practicing corporate finance and securities lawyer and a chartered accountant registered with the Institute of Chartered Accountants in British Columbia. Mr. Eacrett has been a director and or officer of a number of public companies in the past five years, all of which have traded on the TSX Venture Exchange. Mr. Eacrett has been a director of Regent Ventures Ltd. since May 2002, a director of Everett Resources Ltd. since January 2007, the Secretary of Clear Frame Solutions Corp. since April 6, 2005, a director of Baroyeca Gold and Silver Inc. since December 2010 and a director of Wedona Capital Inc. since February 2011.	February 27, 2005 to present	175,000 ⁽⁴⁾ *
Greg Burnett British Columbia, Canada Vice President – Administration, Secretary and Director Disclosure Committee Member	Mr. Burnett has been the Vice President – Administration of the Company since May 11, 2006. He became a director on June 30, 2006 and was appointed as Secretary on July 15, 2008. Since 1989, he has been President and principal shareholder of Carob Management Ltd., a private management consulting company based in Vancouver, British Columbia, specializing in the provision of due diligence services, development of business plans, and structuring /financing / management of venture capital projects, primarily in the public market arena. Mr. Burnett presently serves on the boards of directors of the	June 30, 2006 to present	2,285,000 ⁽⁵⁾ 2.2%

Name Province/State Country of Residence and Position(s) with the Company ⁽¹⁾	Principal Occupation Business or Employment for Last Five Years ⁽¹⁾	Periods during which Nominee has Served as a Director	Number of Common Shares Owned ⁽¹⁾
	following public companies: Garibaldi Resources Corp., a junior gold exploration company focusing on projects in Mexico; Wolverine Minerals Corp., a junior mineral exploration company; and Marifil Mines Limited, a junior metals exploration company focused in Argentina. Mr. Burnett holds a Master of Business Administration degree (1986) and a Bachelor of Applied Sciences degree in Civil Engineering (1984) from the University of British Columbia.		
Malcolm F. Clay British Columbia, Canada Director Chairman of the Audit Committee and Compensation Committee Member	Mr. Clay has been a director of the Company since January 14, 2008. He was a partner of KPMG, Chartered Accountants, for 27 years. As a public accountant, he served as lead audit or concurring partner for public companies listed on AMEX, NYSE and the Canadian stock exchanges. Mr. Clay was Partner in Charge of the Vancouver Audit Practice of KPMG for 10 years. In 1997, he was elected non-executive chairman of KPMG Canada. Mr. Clay retired from his career at KPMG in 2002 and since then, has served as a consultant and advisor to numerous public and private companies. Mr. Clay currently serves on the board of directors and as Chairman of the Audit Committee for Versatile Systems Inc., Zongshen Pem Power Systems Inc., Oakmont Capital Corp., Wolverine Minerals Corp. and Minco Gold Corporation.	January 14, 2008 to present	40,000 ⁽⁶⁾ *
John Dustan British Columbia, Canada Director Audit Committee Member	Mr. Dustan has been a director of the Company since May 31, 2011. In the past five years, Mr. Dustan has served as an advisor to, or director of, numerous public and private sector groups. He has served as an advisor and investment committee member of the Alberta Public Service Pension Fund since 2002 and as an investment committee member of Pacific Blue Cross and its subsidiary, BC Life Insurance Company, since 2005. From April 2003 to April 2011, he was a director of the Vancouver Foundation, where he served on its investment, distribution, environment, finance and audit, governance and nominations, and executive committees. He was a governor of the Law Foundation of British Columbia from June 2004 to November 2010 and a public representative on the Professional Conduct Enquiry Committee of the BC Institute of Chartered Accountants, of which he is currently an ad hoc member, from June 2004 to June 2010. He was appointed by the Attorney General of British Columbia to serve as a commissioner on the Judicial Compensation Committee for the Province of British Columbia, a five member committee that recommended salary and benefits for a three year period for British Columbia provincial court judges, from June 2010 to September 2010. From 1996 to 2009 he served as a director of the BC Special Olympics, including as its chair for a number of years, and he served as a director of Special Olympics Canada from 2006 to 2009.	May 31, 2011 to present	Nil
Wallace M. Mays Colorado, USA Director	Mr. Mays has been a director of the Company since May 11, 2006 and was Chief Operating Officer from February 2008 to April 2011. From 2005 to early 2008, he held the position of Operations Manager for Central Asia with Uranium One Inc., formerly Urasia Energy Ltd., focused on initiating and developing the Uranium One/ Urasia in situ recovery uranium projects in Kazakhstan and uranium exploration activities in Kyrgyzstan. Mr. Mays has also been involved, as a principal and/or senior executive, in other mining ventures in Mongolia during the last five years. Mr. Mays is a Registered Professional Engineer with Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Chemical Engineering from the University of Texas.	May 11, 2006 to present	1,868,000 ⁽⁷⁾ 1.8%

Name Province/State Country of Residence and Position(s) with the Company ⁽¹⁾	Principal Occupation Business or Employment for Last Five Years ⁽¹⁾	Periods during which Nominee has Served as a Director	Number of Common Shares Owned ⁽¹⁾
TOTAL:			10,801,400
			10.5%

* Less than one percent.

(1) Information has been furnished by the directors individually. Percentages are based on a total of 103,301,362 Common Shares issued and outstanding, on a non-diluted basis, as of December 31, 2011.

(2) These Common Shares are registered in the name of the Clement Family Limited Partnership. This number does not include stock options to acquire an aggregate of 400,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$1.50 per Common Share until June 18, 2013.

(3) 100,000 of these Common Shares are registered in the name of TAD Financial Corp. This number does not include: (i) stock options to acquire an aggregate of 400,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$1.50 per Common Share until June 18, 2013, and (ii) a private option to acquire an aggregate of 934,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$0.12 per Common Share from Wallace Mays until June 30, 2013.

(4) This number does not include stock options to acquire an aggregate of 50,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$1.50 per Common Share until June 18, 2013.

(5) This number does not include: (i) stock options to acquire an aggregate of 400,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$1.50 per Common Share until June 18, 2013, and (ii) a private option to acquire an aggregate of 934,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$0.12 per Common Share from Wallace Mays until June 30, 2013.

(6) This number does not include stock options to acquire an aggregate of 200,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$1.50 per share until January 14, 2013.

(7) This number does not include stock options to acquire an aggregate of 400,000 Common Shares at a price of CAD\$1.50 per Common Share until June 18, 2013. 1,868,000 of these Common Shares are subject to a private option to purchase pursuant to which Mr. Mays has agreed to sell such Common Shares at a price of CAD\$0.12 per Common Share until June 30, 2013.

Advisory Board

On August 2, 2006, the Company announced the establishment of an advisory board to provide strategic support to management in regards to the exploration and development of its uranium properties and the identification of new business opportunities. The Company has appointed Dr. Charles G. Groat and Anthony J. Thompson as the first two members of this board.

Dr. Groat is the director of the Center for International Energy and Environmental Policy at the University of Texas at Austin. The Center supports research and informs governments and corporations on the formulation of policies and strategies on energy and environment. In addition, Dr. Groat leads the graduate program in energy and mineral resources within the Jackson School of Geosciences. Prior to adding this honor to his accomplishments, Dr. Groat was director of the United States Geological Survey from 1998 through 2005 and before that, he was executive director of the American Geological Institute. Throughout his career, Dr. Groat has combined geotechnical pursuits and public interests. He held top positions at the University of Texas as an associate professor and associate director and acting director of the Bureau of Economic Geology. He was director of the Louisiana Geologic survey and assistant to the Secretary of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources. Dr. Groat received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Geology from the University of Rochester, a Master of Science in Geology from the University of Massachusetts, and a Ph.D. in Geology from the University of Texas at Austin.

Anthony J. Thompson has been practicing environmental and occupational health and safety law since the mid-1970s. His practice includes legislation, regulatory counseling and litigation involving development of and compliance with environmental and natural resources law and regulations, risk assessment and management, and occupational health and safety regulatory matters. As primary outside counsel to the American Mining Congress (AMC), now the National Mining Association (NMA), for radioactive waste issues, he has represented virtually the entire domestic uranium mining and milling industry either as counsel to AMC/NMA or as a counsel to individual licensees since the late 1970's. Thus, for over two decades, his practice has encompassed uranium recovery

legislative, regulatory, licensing and litigation issues for both conventional and ISR facilities, radiation health and safety issues, including radioactive waste disposal issues, Clean Air Act (CAA) and title (CERCLA) issues, issues related to releases of radionuclides, and constitutional issues related to federal preemption of Atomic Energy Act (AEA) materials. Mr. Thompson is the prime author of NMA's White Paper entitled "Recommendations for a Coordinated Approach to Regulating the Uranium Recovery Industry" and NMA's Fuel Cycle Facilities Forum's (FCFF) joint White Paper entitled "Direct Disposal of Non-11e.(2) Byproduct materials in uranium Mill Tailings Impoundments". Mr. Thompson received his B.A. degree in History from Princeton University and his law degree from the University Of Virginia School Of Law. He was a member of the National Risk Assessment and Management Commission, appointed by President Bush in 1992. He is currently a member of the American Nuclear Society, the American Bar Association, Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration, Inc., and numerous other associations.

Audit Committee Disclosure

National Instrument 52-110 of the Canadian Securities Administrators ("NI 52-110") requires the Company to disclose annually in its AIF certain information concerning the constitution of its Audit Committee and its relationship with its independent auditor.

The Audit Committee Charter

The following Audit Committee Charter was adopted by the Board:

Mandate

The primary function of the audit committee (the "Committee") is to assist the Company's board of directors in fulfilling its financial oversight responsibilities by reviewing the financial reports and other financial information provided by the Company to regulatory authorities and shareholders, the Company's systems of internal controls regarding finance and accounting and the Company's auditing, accounting and financial reporting processes. Consistent with this function, the Committee will encourage continuous improvement of, and should foster adherence to, the Company's policies, procedures and practices at all levels. The Committee's primary duties and responsibilities are to:

- serve as an independent and objective party to monitor the Company's financial reporting and internal control system and review the Company's financial statements;
- review and appraise the performance of the Company's external auditors; and
- provide an open avenue of communication among the Company's auditors, financial and senior management and the board of directors.

Composition

The Committee shall be comprised of a minimum three directors as determined by the board of directors. All of the members of the Committee shall be free from any relationship that, in the opinion of the board of directors, would interfere with the exercise of his or her independent judgment as a member of the Committee.

All members of the Committee shall have accounting or related financial management expertise. All members of the Committee that are not financially literate will work towards becoming financially literate to obtain a working familiarity with basic finance and accounting practices. For the purposes of the Company's Audit Committee Charter, the definition of "financially literate" is the ability to read and understand a set of financial statements that present a breadth and level of complexity of accounting issues that are generally comparable to the breadth and complexity of the issues that can presumably be expected to be raised by the Company's financial statements.

The members of the Committee shall be elected by the board of directors at its first meeting following the annual shareholders' meeting. Unless a Chair is elected by the full board of directors, the members of the Committee may designate a Chair by a majority vote of the full Committee membership.

Meetings

The Committee shall meet at least twice annually, or more frequently as circumstances dictate. As part of its job to foster open communication, the Committee will meet at least annually with the Chief Financial Officer and the external auditors in separate sessions.

Responsibilities and Duties

To fulfill its responsibilities and duties, the Committee shall:

1. Documents/Reports Review

- (a) review and update this Audit Committee Charter annually; and
- (b) review the Company's financial statements, MD&A and any annual and interim earnings press releases before the Company publicly discloses this information and any reports or other financial information (including quarterly financial statements), which are submitted to any governmental body, or to the public, including any certification, report, opinion, or review rendered by the external auditors.

2. External Auditors

- (a) review annually, the performance of the external auditors who shall be ultimately accountable to the Company's board of directors and the Committee as representatives of the shareholders of the Company;
- (b) obtain annually, a formal written statement of external auditors setting forth all relationships between the external auditors and the Company, consistent with Independence Standards Board Standard 1;
- (c) review and discuss with the external auditors any disclosed relationships or services that may impact the objectivity and independence of the external auditors;
- (d) take, or recommend that the Company's full board of directors take appropriate action to oversee the independence of the external auditors, including the resolution of disagreements between management and the external auditor regarding financial reporting;
- (e) recommend to the Company's board of directors the selection and, where applicable, the replacement of the external auditors nominated annually for shareholder approval;
- (f) recommend to the Company's board of directors the compensation to be paid to the external auditors;
- (g) at each meeting, consult with the external auditors about the quality of the Company's accounting principles, internal controls and the completeness and accuracy of the Company's financial statements;
- (h) review and approve the Company's hiring policies regarding partners, employees and former partners and employees of the present and former external auditors of the Company;

- (i) review with management and the external auditors the audit plan for the year-end financial statements and intended template for such statements; and
- (j) review and pre-approve all audit and audit-related services and the fees and other compensation related thereto, and any non-audit services, provided by the Company's external auditors. The pre-approval requirement is waived with respect to the provision of non-audit services if:
 - (i) the aggregate amount of all such non-audit services provided to the Company constitutes not more than five percent of the total amount of revenues paid by the Company to its external auditors during the fiscal year in which the non-audit services are provided,
 - (ii) such services were not recognized by the Company at the time of the engagement to be non-audit services, and
 - (iii) such services are promptly brought to the attention of the Committee by the Company and approved prior to the completion of the audit by the Committee or by one or more members of the Committee who are members of the board of directors to whom authority to grant such approvals has been delegated by the Committee.

Provided the pre-approval of the non-audit services is presented to the Committee's first scheduled meeting following such approval, such authority may be delegated by the Committee to one or more independent members of the Committee.

3. Financial Reporting Processes

- (a) in consultation with the external auditors, review with management the integrity of the Company's financial reporting process, both internal and external;
- (b) consider the external auditors' judgments about the quality and appropriateness of the Company's accounting principles as applied in its financial reporting;
- (c) consider and approve, if appropriate, changes to the Company's auditing and accounting principles and practices as suggested by the external auditors and management;
- (d) review significant judgments made by management in the preparation of the financial statements and the view of the external auditors as to appropriateness of such judgments;
- (e) following completion of the annual audit, review separately with management and the external auditors any significant difficulties encountered during the course of the audit, including any restrictions on the scope of work or access to required information;
- (f) review any significant disagreement among management and the external auditors in connection with the preparation of the financial statements;
- (g) review with the external auditors and management the extent to which changes and improvements in financial or accounting practices have been implemented;
- (h) review any complaints or concerns about any questionable accounting, internal accounting controls or auditing matters;
- (i) review certification process;
- (j) establish a procedure for the receipt, retention and treatment of complaints received by the Company regarding accounting, internal accounting controls or auditing matters; and

- (k) establish a procedure for the confidential, anonymous submission by employees of the Company of concerns regarding questionable accounting or auditing matters.

4. Other

- (a) review any related-party transactions;
- (b) engage independent counsel and other advisors as it determines necessary to carry out its duties; and
- (c) to set and pay compensation for any independent counsel and other advisors employed by the Committee.

Composition of the Audit Committee

The Company's Audit Committee is comprised of three directors, Douglas E. Eacrett, John Dustan and Malcolm Clay. As defined in NI 52-110, Douglas E. Eacrett, Malcolm Clay and John Dustan are all "independent". All of the Audit Committee members are "financially literate", as defined in NI 52-110.

Relevant Education and Experience

The following sets out the education and experience of each audit committee member that is relevant to the performance of his responsibilities as an audit committee member and that provides each member with: (i) an understanding of the accounting principles used by the Company to prepare its financial statements; (ii) the ability to assess the general application of such accounting principles in connection with the accounting for estimates, accruals and provisions, (iii) experience preparing, auditing, analyzing or evaluating financial statements that present a breadth and level of complexity of accounting issues that are generally comparable to the breadth and complexity of issues that can reasonably be expected to be raised by the Company's financial statements, or experience actively supervising one or more individuals engaged in such activities; and (iv) an understanding of internal controls and procedures for financial reporting:

Mr. Eacrett is currently a practicing corporate finance and securities lawyer and a chartered accountant registered with the Institute of Chartered Accountants in British Columbia. Mr. Eacrett has been a director and or officer of a number of public companies in the past five years, all of which have traded on the TSX Venture Exchange.

Mr. Dustan has an MBA from McMaster University. In 1989, he founded Dustan Wachell Capital Management, and oversaw the firm's transition to Genus Capital Management until he retired in 2001. He served as an advisor and investment committee member of the Alberta Public Service Pension Fund since 2002 and as an investment committee member of Pacific Blue Cross since 2005. He was a public representative on the Professional Conduct Enquiry Committee of the BC Institute of Chartered Accountants, of which he is currently an ad hoc member, from June 2004 to June 2010.

Mr. Clay was a partner of KPMG, Chartered Accountants, for 27 years. As a public accountant, he served as lead audit or concurring partner for public companies listed on AMEX, NYSE and the Canadian stock exchanges. Mr. Clay was Partner in Charge of the Vancouver Audit Practice of KPMG for 10 years. In 1997, he was elected non-executive chairman of KPMG Canada.

Reliance on Certain Exemptions

Since the commencement of the Company's most recently completed financial year, the Company has not relied on the exemptions contained in sections 2.4, 3.2, 3.3(2), 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 or Part 8 of NI 52-110.

Audit Committee Oversight

Since the commencement of the Company's most recently completed financial year, the Board has not failed to adopt a recommendation of the Audit Committee to nominate or compensate an external auditor.

Pre-Approval Policies and Procedures

The Audit Committee has adopted specific policies and procedures for the engagement of non-audit services as set out in the Audit Committee Charter of the Company. Please refer to Section 2(j) under the heading entitled "Responsibilities and Duties" under the section entitled "Audit Committee Disclosure" to review the terms of the Audit Committee Charter.

External Auditor Service Fees

In the following table, "audit fees" are fees billed by the Company's external auditor for services provided in auditing the Company's annual financial statements for the subject year. "Non-Audit fees" are fees not included in audit fees that are billed by the auditor for assurance and related services that are reasonably related to the performance of the audit review of the Company's financial statements. "Tax fees" are fees billed by the auditor for professional services rendered for tax compliance, tax advice and tax planning. "All other fees" are fees billed by the auditor for products and services not included in the foregoing categories.

The fees paid by the Company to its auditor in each of the last two fiscal years, by category, are as follows:

Financial Year Ended	Audit Fees	Non-Audit Fees	Tax Fees	All Other Fees
December 31, 2011	\$141,109	\$13,000	\$4,500	Nil
December 31, 2010	\$59,040	\$22,100	\$4,380	Nil

Disclosure Committee

On July 24, 2007, the Company adopted a Disclosure, Confidentiality and Insider Trading Policy. In accordance with this Policy, a Disclosure Committee was created to implement the terms of the Policy.

Mandate

The Disclosure Committee will have the responsibility to:

- evaluate the necessity of making public disclosures;
- review and approve, before they are generally disclosed, each document to assess the quality of the disclosures made in the document including, but not limited to, whether the document is accurate and complete in all material respects;
- review and approve the guidelines and procedures to be distributed to appropriate management and other Company personnel designed to gather the information required to be disclosed in core documents;
- establish timelines for the preparation of core documents, which timelines will include critical dates and deadlines during the disclosure process relating to: (i) the preparation of drafts, (ii) the circulation of drafts to appropriate Company personnel, the Company's independent auditors and the Audit Committee of the board of directors of the Company (the "Board"), (iii) the receipt of comments, and (iv) the review of the comments by the Disclosure Committee. Such timetables will allow for circulation of draft Core Documents to the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Financial Officer, the Audit Committee of the Board and the Board

sufficiently in advance of the applicable filing deadline in order to enable such persons to review carefully the filing and discuss any questions and comments related thereto;

- make determinations about whether:
 - any information is Material Information,
 - a Material Change has occurred,
 - selective disclosure has been or might be made, or
 - a Misrepresentation has been made;
- oversee the design and implementation of this Policy and the Company's "Disclosure Controls and Procedures", which are defined as controls and procedures that are designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed by the Company in its Core Documents is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the specified time periods;
- periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the Company's Disclosure Controls and Procedures, particularly prior to the filing of each Core Document, and assist the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer with their evaluation of the effectiveness of such Disclosure Controls and Procedures. The Disclosure Committee's evaluation will include an assessment of the adequacy of the controls and procedures in place to ensure that material information required to be disclosed in the Core Documents is being recorded, processed, summarized and reported;
- make recommendations to the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer with respect to the disclosures to be contained in the Core Documents to be filed by the Company;
- in its discretion, conduct interim evaluations of the Company's Disclosure Controls and Procedures in the event of significant changes in securities regulatory requirements, Canadian GAAP, legal or other regulatory policies, or stock exchange requirements, or if it otherwise considers such evaluations appropriate;
- educate the Directors, Officers, Employees and Contractors about the matters contemplated by this Policy;
- monitor the effectiveness of, and compliance with, this Policy and report to the Audit Committee of the Board on the operation of this Policy, or to the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer in the case of the effectiveness of the Disclosure Controls and Procedures and the Disclosure Committee's assessment of the quality of the disclosures made in Documents, and recommend any necessary changes to this Policy;
- annually review and re-assess the adequacy of this Policy and, if necessary, recommend any proposed changes to the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer for approval such that the Policy complies with changing requirements and best practices;
- accumulate information which may be required to be reported upon or disclosed and communicated to the executive officers of the Company to allow the Company to meet its disclosure obligations on a timely basis; and
- report to the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer prior to such officers executing their certifications related to the Core Documents setting out the evaluation, findings and conclusions of the Disclosure Committee regarding the effectiveness of the Disclosure Controls and Procedures and the Disclosure Committee's assessment of the quality of the disclosures made in the Core Documents.

Composition

Various representatives of the Company, as may be designated by the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer, from time to time, will be responsible for the implementation of this Policy. Currently, the Disclosure Committee is composed of Greg Burnett, Tom Doyle and Richard Clement.

9.2 Corporate Cease Trade Orders

Other than as set out below, to the best of management's knowledge, no director or executive officer of the Company is or has been within 10 years before the date of this AIF, a director, chief executive officer ("CEO") or chief financial officer ("CFO") of any company that: (i) while that person was acting in that capacity, was the subject of a cease trade or similar order or an order that denied that person or company access to any exemption under securities legislation for a period of more than 30 consecutive days, or (ii) was subject to a cease trade or similar order or an order that denied the relevant company access to any exemption under securities legislation, for a period of more than 30 consecutive days, that was issued after the director or executive officer ceased to be a director, CEO or CFO and which resulted from an event that occurred while that person was acting in the capacity of director, CEO or CFO.

On November 3, 2005, ClearFrame Solution Corp. was made the subject of a cease trade order for failing to file financial statements, which order was revoked on January 24, 2012. Douglas Eacrett is the Secretary of that company.

Greg Burnett was a director of Arctos Petroleum Corp. and Orko Gold Corp. when these companies were subject to cease trade orders for failing to file certain financial information in a timely manner. All cease trade orders were revoked upon filing the required financial information.

Tom Doyle was a director of Arctos Petroleum Corp. when this company was subject to a cease trade order for failing to file certain financial information in a timely manner. This cease trade order was revoked upon filing the required financial information.

9.3 Bankruptcies

Other than as set out below, to the best of management's knowledge, no director, executive officer or shareholder holding a sufficient number of shares to materially affect control of the Company: (i) is or has been within the 10 years before the date of this AIF, a director or executive officer of any company that, while that person was acting in that capacity, or within a year of that person ceasing to act in that capacity, became bankrupt, made a proposal under any legislation relating to bankruptcy or insolvency, or was subject to or instituted any proceedings, arrangement or compromise with creditors, or had a receiver, receiver manager or trustee appointed to hold its assets; or (ii) has, within the 10 years before the date of this AIF, become bankrupt, made a proposal under any legislation relating to bankruptcy or insolvency or became subject to or instituted any proceedings, arrangement or compromise with creditors, or had a receiver, receiver manager or trustee appointed to hold its assets.

In the year subsequent to Greg Burnett resigning as a director of Commercial Consolidators Corp. and Prefco Enterprises Inc., both companies were subject to bankruptcy and receivership proceedings.

9.4 Conflicts of Interest

In the event conflicts arise at a meeting of the Board, a director who has such a conflict will declare the conflict and abstain from voting. In appropriate cases, the Company will establish a special committee of independent non-executive directors (drawn from the majority of its members who must at all times be "independent" within the meaning of NI 52-110) to review a matter in which one or more directors or management may have a conflict.

To the best of the Company's knowledge there are no known existing or potential conflicts of interest between the Company and any director or officer of the Company, except that certain of the directors of the Company serve as

directors and officers of other public companies and it is therefore possible that a conflict may arise between their duties as a director or officer of the Company and their duties as a director or officer of such other companies. Where such conflicts arise, they will be addressed as indicated above.

ITEM 10. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AND REGULATORY ACTIONS

10.1 Legal Proceedings

The Company is subject from time to time to legal proceedings and claims, either asserted or unasserted, that arise in the ordinary course of business. While the outcome of these proceedings and claims cannot be predicted with certainty, the Company's management does not believe that the outcome of any of these legal matters will have a material adverse affect on its consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

ITEM 11. INTEREST OF MANAGEMENT AND OTHERS IN MATERIAL TRANSACTIONS

11.1 Interest of Management and Others in Material Transactions

At the time that the Company issued the Debenture and entered into the Bridge Loan and Loan Facility with Synatom, Synatom owned 10,890,000 Common Shares. In addition, on March 15, 2011, the Company completed the Refinancing Transaction with Synatom. For details on these transactions and Synatom's interest with respect to those transactions, see the section entitled "General Development of the Business – Three Year History".

ITEM 12. TRANSFER AGENT AND REGISTRAR

12.1 Transfer Agent and Registrar

The transfer agent and registrar for the Common Shares is Computershare Trust Company of Canada in Vancouver, British Columbia. The register of transfers of the Common Shares is located at Computershare's office in Vancouver, British Columbia.

ITEM 13. MATERIAL CONTRACTS

13.1 Material Contracts

There are no other contracts, other than those disclosed in this AIF and those entered into in the ordinary course of the Company's business, that are material to the Company and which were entered into in the most recently completed fiscal year or which were entered into before the most recently completed fiscal year but are still in effect as of the date of this AIF.

1. Purchase and Sale Agreement dated September 7, 2006 between Anadarko Land Corp. and the Company pursuant to which Anadarko granted the Company uranium rights over portions of the Centennial Project.
2. Assignment and Purchase Agreement, dated December 10, 2008, between Bayswater Uranium Corporation and the Company pursuant to which Bayswater assigned and transferred to the Company all of its right, title and interest in certain mineral lands and a surface access agreement to the Company and also sold certain properties to the Company, consisting of an aggregate of 381 mining claims and 8,186 acres of Wyoming State mining leases, for a total of 15,806 acres of property in South Dakota and Wyoming in exchange for the payment by the Company to Bayswater of \$50,000. Pursuant to the terms of the agreement, the Company agreed to maintain all properties for one year from the date of the agreement. The Company has the right, in its sole discretion, to remove or surrender up to 25% of the acquired properties in each year, upon giving Bayswater 90-days notice in accordance with Bayswater's right to reacquire such properties in

such circumstances. Bayswater will retain a yellowcake royalty on all properties ranging from 1% to 5%, depending on the terms of underlying royalty agreements inherited by the Company.

3. Quit Claim Deed and Assignment Agreement, dated January 12, 2009, between Powertech USA and Neutron Energy Inc.
4. Refinancing Agreement among Powertech, Powertech USA, Indian Springs and Synatom dated February 4, 2011.
5. Termination, Voting and Lock-Up Agreement among Powertech, Powertech USA, Indian Springs and Synatom dated March 15, 2011.
6. Termination Agreement among Powertech, Synatom, the Wallace M. Mays 2006 Family Trust No. 1, Richard F. Clement, Jr., the Clement Family Limited Partnership, Thomas A. Doyle and Greg Burnett dated March 15, 2011.
7. Unsecured, Non-Interest Bearing Promissory Note dated March 15, 2011 issued by Powertech in favour of Synatom.
8. Guaranty Agreement of Powertech USA in favour of Synatom dated March 15, 2011.

ITEM 14. EXPERTS

14.1 Names of Experts

The PEAs which are incorporated by reference into this AIF were prepared by SRK, and endorsed by qualified persons, Allan V. Moran, R.G., CPG and Frank A. Daviess, MAus IMM of SRK and John I. Kyle, P.E. of Lyntek. Jerry D. Bush, a Certified Professional Geologist (Wyoming PG No. 630), and an independent qualified person as contemplated by NI 43-101, assisted with the preparation of the PEAs.

BDO Canada LLP, the Company's independent auditors, have audited the Company's consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2011. As of the date hereof, BDO Canada LLP has confirmed they are independent with respect to the Company within the meaning of the Rules of Professional Conduct of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of British Columbia.

To the best of the Company's knowledge, none of the foregoing experts held any registered or beneficial interest, direct or indirect, in any securities or other property of the Company or any of its associates or affiliates and no securities or other property of the Company or any of its associates or affiliates were subsequently received or are to be received by such experts.

ITEM 15. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

15.1 Additional Information

Additional information relating to the Company may be found on SEDAR at www.sedar.com. Additional information, including directors' and officers' remuneration and indebtedness, principal holders of the Company's securities and securities authorized for issuance under equity compensation plans, will be contained in the management information circular to be prepared in connection with the Company's annual meeting of shareholders which is currently scheduled for May 15, 2012. When completed, the management information circular will be available on SEDAR at www.sedar.com. Additional financial information is provided in the Company's financial statements and MD&A for the financial period ended December 31, 2011, which are incorporated by reference herein.

The technical information in this AIF has been reviewed and approved by Richard F. Clement, Jr., the President and CEO of the Company and a “qualified person” as defined under NI 43-101.