EXHIBIT 1

SOAH DOCKET NOS. 582-09-3064 AND 582-09-6184

TCEQ DOCKET NOS. 2008-1888-UIC AND 2009-1319-UIC

(CONSOLIDATED)

APPLICATION OF URANIUM ENERGY) CORP. FOR PERMIT NO. UR 03075) AND FOR AQUIFER EXEMPTION AND) FOR PRODUCTION AREA) AUTHORIZATION UR 03075PAA1 IN) GOLIAD COUNTY, TEXAS)	STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

ORAL DEPOSITION

PHILIP C. BENNETT

Friday, April 16, 2010

ORAL DEPOSITION OF PHILIP C. BENNETT, produced as a witness at the instance of Protestant Goliad County, Texas, and duly sworn, was taken in the above-styled and numbered cause on Friday, April 16, 2010, from 8:38 a.m. to 1:57 p.m., before Evelyn Coder, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, reported by computerized stenotype machine at the offices of Kelly, Hart & Hallman, 301 Congress Avenue, Suite 2000, Austin, Texas 78701, pursuant to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

A Yes.

Q Is the groundwater in the proposed production zone -- well, let me rephrase that question.

Are the Braquet wells, then, in the B sand hydrologically connected with the proposed production zone Sand B that we've identified?

A Again, assuming that they are screened in the B sand -- and I apologize. I can't recall if they are, but if they were screened in the B sand, then I've seen no evidence to suggest that they would not be connected to -- hydrologically connected to the production zone.

Q Okay. Have you seen evidence to suggest that they are connected?

A I did not recall if they were monitored during the pump test, so I just don't know.

Q Can you -- can cross-sections be evidence of hydraulic connection between one area of a sand and another area of a sand?

A Sure. And I infer that they are, but the way -- the gold standard was did they respond during the pump test, and I don't remember seeing, that they were instrumented up.

Q If you flip the page on the exhibit backwards, actually, there's a cross -- I guess a

1 cross-section of logs, and it is E to E prime and E
2 prime to EE prime, which is represented on the figure
3 that we were looking at. Do you see that?
4 A Yes.
5 Q Do you -- is there any evidence to suggest
6 that the sands are not connected?
7 A No. I have no -- by looking at the logs,
8 they would appear to be connected, and I would expect
9 that they would be a continuous sand.
10 Q Did you do an evaluation or come to a
11 conclusion on what the groundwater flow is regionally
12 at the proposed production site?
13 A Be more specific.
14 Q Broader than the --
15 A Right. But what do you mean about
16 groundwater flow? I mean --
17 Q I meant direction.
18 A Okay. I think you just said groundwater
19 flow. And, well, it flows.
20 Q I'm looking for regional groundwater
21 direction of the flow.
22 A Regional groundwater flow direction is
23 southeast -- southeast to -- south to east. You know,
24 it's variable.
25 Q And what about locally at -- do you agree