



**SCREENING DECISION REPORT
NIRB FILE No.: 22EN032**

NPC File No.: 149726

August 3, 2022

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board’s (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Forum Energy Metals Corp.’s “Nunavut Uranium Project” is not required pursuant to Article 12, Section 12.4.4(a) of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and s. 92(1)(a) of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (NuPPAA)*.

Subject to the Proponent’s compliance with the terms and conditions as set out in below, the NIRB is of the view that the project proposal is not likely to cause significant public concerns, and it is unlikely to result in significant adverse environmental and social impacts. The NIRB therefore recommends that the responsible Minister accepts this Screening Decision Report.

OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK..... 2

PROJECT REFERRAL 3

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS..... 3

ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF NUPPAA..... 9

VIEWS OF THE BOARD 11

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS 18

MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS..... 24

OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 25

CONCLUSION 26

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PROPONENT’S RESPONSE TO COMMENTS.....28

APPENDIX B: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT30

APPENDIX C: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS33

The primary objectives of the NIRB are set out in Article 12, Section 12.2.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and are confirmed by s. 23 of the *NuPPAA*:

Nunavut Agreement, Article 12, Section 12.2.5: In carrying out its functions, the primary objectives of NIRB shall be at all times to protect and promote the existing and future well-being of the residents and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, and to protect the ecosystemic integrity of the Nunavut Settlement Area. NIRB shall take into account the well-being of the residents of Canada outside the Nunavut Settlement Area.

The purpose of screening is provided for under Article 12, Section 12.4.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 88 of the *NuPPAA* which states:

NuPPAA, s. 88: The purpose of screening a project is to determine whether the project has the potential to result in significant ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts and, accordingly, whether it requires a review by the Board...

To determine whether a review of a project is required, the NIRB is guided by the considerations as set out under Article 12, Section 12.4.2(a) and (b) of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 89(1) of *NuPPAA* which states:

NuPPAA, s. 89(1): The Board must be guided by the following considerations when it is called on to determine, on the completion of a screening, whether a review of the project is required:

- (a) a review is required if, in the Board's opinion,
 - i. the project may have significant adverse ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts or significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities,
 - ii. the project will cause significant public concern, or
 - iii. the project involves technological innovations, the effects of which are unknown; and
- (b) a review is not required if, in the Board's opinion,
 - i. the project is unlikely to cause significant public concern, and
 - ii. its adverse ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts are unlikely to be significant, or are highly predictable and can be adequately mitigated by known technologies.

It is noted that under Article 12, Section 12.4.2(c) and s. 89(2) of the *NuPPAA* provides that the considerations set out in s.89(1)(a) prevail over the considerations set out in s. 89(1)(b) of the *NuPPAA*.

As set out under Article 12, Section 12.4.4 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(1) of the *NuPPAA*, upon conclusion of the screening process, the Board must provide its written report the Minister. The contents of the NIRB's report are specified under *NuPPAA*:

NuPPAA, s. 92(1): The Board must submit a written report to the responsible Minister containing a description of the project that specifies its scope and indicating that:

- (a) a review of the project is not required;
- (b) a review of the project is required; or
- (c) the project should be modified or abandoned.

Where the NIRB determines that a project may be carried out without a review, the NIRB has the discretion to recommend specific terms and conditions to be attached to any approval of the project proposal pursuant to paragraph 92(2)(a) of *NuPPAA* as follows:

NuPPAA, s. 92(2) In its report, the Board may also

- (a) recommend specific terms and conditions to apply in respect of a project that it determines may be carried out without a review.

PROJECT REFERRAL

On May 24, 2022, the NIRB received a referral to screen Forum Energy Metals Corp.’s “Nunavut Uranium Project” proposal from the Nunavut Planning Commission (Commission), with an accompanying positive conformity determination with the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan.

Pursuant to Article 12, Sections 12.4.1 and 12.4.4 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 87 of the *NuPPAA*, the NIRB commenced screening this project proposal and assigned it file number **22EN032**.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Screening Process Timelines

The following key stages were completed for the screening process:

| Date | Stage |
|---------------|---|
| May 24, 2022 | Receipt of project proposal and positive conformity determination (Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan) from the Commission. |
| May 24, 2022 | Request to Proponent for additional information in order to carry out screening pursuant to s. s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> |
| June 3, 2022 | Proponent responded to information request and provided additional information |
| June 3, 2022 | Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> |
| June 14, 2022 | Public engagement and comment request |
| July 5, 2022 | Receipt of public comments |
| July 7, 2022 | Proponent provided with an opportunity to address comments/concerns raised by public |
| July 14, 2022 | Proponent responded to comments/concerns raised by public |
| July 22, 2022 | Ministerial extension requested from the Minister of Northern Affairs |

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Date | Stage |
| August 3, 2022 | Issuance of Screening Decision Report |

2. Project Scope

All documents received and pertaining to this project proposal can be accessed from the NIRB's online public registry at www.nirb.ca/project/125699.

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------|
| Project: | Nunavut Uranium Project | | | | |
| Region: | Kivalliq | | | | |
| Location: | West of the Kiggavik Exploration Project near Aberdeen and Judge Sissons lakes. | | | | |
| Closest Community: | Baker Lake | Distance (approximate) | 90 kilometres (km) | Direction | West |
| Summary of Project Description: | The Proponent intends to conduct uranium exploration activities. | | | | |
| Project Proposed Timeline: | Summer 2022 to September 2023 | | | | |

As required under s. 86(1) of the *NuPPAA*, the Board accepts the scope of the project as set out by Forum Energy Metals Corp. in the proposal. The scope of the project proposal includes the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- 2022 activities include:
 - A thirty-day program based out of Baker Lake for a six-person helicopter supported exploration program;
 - Use of helicopter for day trips for exploration activities;
 - Examining drill cores at the previous campsite;
 - Conduct site investigation on Aberdeen Lake and in the vicinity of Gerhard Lake;
 - Ground gravity surveys;
 - Airborne geophysical surveys;
 - Bringing fuel, three drills, and other camp and exploration-related equipment and supplies to Baker Lake by barge in 2022 to build a temporary 20-30 person camp;
- 2023 activities include:
 - Over land transport of camp and exploration-related equipment and supplies to the proposed campsite via sled trains in the Spring of 2023;
 - Use of snowmobiles, ATVs, Snowcats, and Deltas
 - Set up and use of temporary camp;
 - Drilling conducted from June to September;
 - Use of 1-2 helicopter(s) for drill and crew movements;
 - Use of an incinerator for waste disposal;
 - Water consumption from nearby waterbodies;
 - Combustible, non-combustible and hazardous waste will be backhauled and disposed of at an approved facility;
 - Transportation, storage and use of up to six (6) 50,000 Litre (L) double walled fuel tanks at the campsite; and
 - Use fuel and lubricants, including:

- 140,000 L of aviation fuel,
- 145,000 L of diesel,
- 4,000 pounds of propane, and
- Other assorted fuel, motor oils, hydraulic fluid, and coolants.

3. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

The NIRB has identified no additional works or activities in relation to the project proposal. As a result, the NIRB proceeded with screening the project based on the scope as described above.

4. Public Comments and Concerns

Notice regarding the NIRB’s screening of this project proposal was distributed on June 14, 2022, to community organizations in Baker Lake and Rankin Inlet, as well as to relevant federal and territorial government agencies, Inuit organizations and other parties. The NIRB requested that interested parties review the proposal and provide the Board with any comments or concerns by July 5, 2022, regarding:

- Whether the project proposal is likely to arouse significant public concern; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse eco-systemic or socio-economic effects; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is of a type where the potential adverse effects are highly predictable and mitigable with known technology, (and providing any recommended mitigation measures); and
- Any matter of importance to the Party related to the project proposal.

On or before July 5, 2022, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

- **Kivalliq Inuit Association (KivIA)**
- **Government of Nunavut (GN)**
- **Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)**
- **Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)**
- **Members of the Public**
 - Kim Auplaluktuq
 - Paula Kigjugalik Hughson
 - Philip Idviat
 - Maggie Qaqimat Perkison
 - Jean M Pudnak
 - Billie Jo Ukpatiku

a. Summary of Public Comments and Concerns Received during the Public comment period of this file

The following provides a summary of the comments and concerns received by the NIRB:

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat

- Proposed project is located within the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou herd migration and calving routes;
- Concerns regarding the proposed project effecting caribou calving;
- Stated that one caribou migration is already interrupted by Agnico Eagles project;
- Concerns regarding wildlife that Inuit depend on such as caribou and fish. Seeing changes in their movements already and numbers of caribou are declining;
- Recommend the Proponent consult the Species at Risk registry to obtain the most current information for their operations;
- Recommend the Proponent consult the Government of Nunavut to identify appropriate mitigation and/or monitoring measures to avoid and lessen project effects to species under their management responsibility;
- Recommends that the Proponent carry out all phases of the project in a manner that reduces risk to migratory birds and to avoid harming, killing or disturbing migratory birds or destroying, disturbing or taking their nests and eggs;
- Recommends that the Proponent make food, domestic wastes, and petroleum-based chemicals inaccessible to wildlife at all times; and
- ECCC has management responsibilities for migratory birds. ECCC should be contacted for any guidance and in instances involving mortalities or interactions with individuals, nests, or eggs of these species.

Traditional Land Use and Harvesting Activities

- Concerns regarding the proposed project effecting the enjoyment of traditional harvesting activities;
- Noted that this area has been used by Inuit ancestors before colonization and Inuit still travel for traditional land use to this day;
- Elders have always wanted to protect the land surrounding the project because they have used it for hunting for hundreds of years;
- Thelon River and Aberdeen Lake and surrounding area is especially important to Inuit who have family ties to these landscapes, recreation travelers and wildlife who call this home and so much more;
- A search of the Nunavut Archeological Site Database indicates that there are one hundred and sixty-five (165) recorded archeological sites within the boundaries of the proposed exploration areas;
- A class 2 Archeology Permit is required from the Government of Nunavut - Department of Culture and Heritage; and
- The Department of Culture and Heritage recommends that the applicant avoids conducting activities in the vicinity of archaeological/historical sites. If archaeological sites or features are encountered, activities should immediately be interrupted and moved away from this location. Each site encountered needs to be recorded and reported to our office.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

- Concerns regarding the proposed project affecting the quality of water of the Thelon River, which is the main drinking water for Baker Lake and all wildlife surrounding the area;
- Concerns regarding climate change and seeing higher water levels and the melt going into freshwater bodies;

- Concerns regarding the land changing colours more frequently and that having an effect on wildlife migration;
- Concerns regarding the Proponent not properly cleaning up old exploration site. Also noted that other mining companies promised to follow procedures, but evidence shows that they did not follow through. Samples and other equipment left at the sites after the project was complete;
- Stated that there have been many attempts to explore for uranium in the past with no success;
- Concerns regarding damage to the land and that it will never return to its original state;
- When the temporary camp is removed there should be a final inspection report completed and signed off by the project manager, or their designate, and any contractors responsible for the cleanup;
- Recommends the Proponent identifies, and proposes mitigation measures for, any negative environmental impacts that may result from physical scarring and land disturbance at the camp and drilling sites, generation of radioactive dust, and use of drilling fluids;
- Recommends that the Proponent provide a rationale why impacts on some physical and socio-economic components are characterized as positive while impacts on most biological components are classified as “negative and non-mitigable”; and
- Potential impacts to heritage resources, proponent to understand their responsibility to ensure that no heritage resources are disturbed throughout project activities.

Community Consultation and Employment

- KivIA asks that Forum provide written responses to the questions asked at the June 20th, 2022, meeting held in Baker Lake;
- KivIA would like a response in regard to the number and size of the sleds and komatiks to be used with the SnowCats, Challengers and Delta’s for the overland hauling during 2023;
- Unclear of the involvement of communities in the project including:
 - Incorporation of Inuit knowledge and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit in the Project design;
 - Briefing community members on planned activities;
 - Briefing community members on monitoring results; and
 - Training and economic opportunities for community members.
- Recommends that an Annual Report be submitted to the NIRB which provide updates on its implementation of project specific terms and conditions included in a Screening Decision Report, compliance with regulatory authorizations, and community engagement activities, including interactions with the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization.

Cumulative Effects

- Proposed project combined with other projects in the area may cause cumulative effects on Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou herd abundance and habitat quality.

Fuel and Chemical Storage

- Ensure convoys have sufficient spill response materials in the spill kits, up to 1,000L;
- Ensure drill sites and drill cuttings sumps are located a minimum distance of 31 metres from all nearby water sources; and
- Ensure to use lined berm with all tanks and secondary containments where fuel transfer will be conducted.

Mining

- Exposure to uranium can result in both chemical and radiological toxicity. Uranium mining has widespread effects contaminating the environment with radioactive dust, radon gas and water-borne toxins;
- The dangers of uranium exploration are too much of a risk for the people of Baker Lake, the wildlife and the environment;
- In addition to before and after pictures, there should be a final inspection sheet signed off by the project manager, or their designate, for each drill hole site;
- The wind will surely pick up the uranium dust and spread it around to the land and water.
- The whole start to finish of this mineral needs proper inclusion community level input and consultation with an Inuit worldview. The footprint of this activity is large and not just the permits or lease site; its from site to shipping and beyond;
- Clarification on handling and disposal of radioactive drill cuttings;
- Clarification on details of measurement techniques available for identifying wastes requiring segregation and disposal due to radioactivity; and
- Recommends that before final inspection of the drill sites, that a gamma scan and radon scan be conducted at the drill holes that encountered uranium mineralization in order to ensure radiation levels do not pose any danger.

Waste Management

- Hazardous waste is to be disposed of at a facility that is capable of this, but it is not outlined where, by what method, or how it will be stored and timeline to leave the community landfill for further storage south.

Monitoring Reporting Requirements

- In the Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan please add KivIA contact name and number for Baker Lake and Rankin Inlet for reporting any bear incidents and/or interactions, wolf or fox den sightings and any large herd sightings.

Aircraft Flight Restrictions

- Have a local monitor to ensure flight rules are followed, in particular, refrain from low level flights near all wildlife, especially caribou; and
- Concerns regarding aircrafts affecting caribou calving and migration routes.

b. Comments and Concerns with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit, Traditional, and Community Knowledge

The following is a summary of the comments and concerns received with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit, traditional and community knowledge:

Traditional Land Use and Harvesting Activities

- Concerns regarding the proposed project effecting the enjoyment of traditional harvesting activities;
- Noted that this area has been used by Inuit ancestors before colonization and Inuit still travel for traditional land use to this day;

- Elders have always wanted to protect the land surrounding the project because they have used it for hunting for hundreds of years;
- Thelon River and Aberdeen Lake and surrounding area is especially important to Inuit who have family ties to these landscapes, recreation travelers and wildlife who call this home and so much more;
- A search of the Nunavut Archeological Site Database indicates that there are one hundred and sixty-five (165) recorded archeological sites within the boundaries of the proposed exploration areas;
- A class 2 Archeology Permit is required from the Government of Nunavut - Department of Culture and Heritage; and
- The Department of Culture and Heritage recommends that the applicant avoids conducting activities in the vicinity of archaeological/historical sites. If archaeological sites or features are encountered, activities should immediately be interrupted and moved away from this location. Each site encountered needs to be recorded and reported to our office.

5. Proponent's Response to Public Comments and Concerns

On July 7, 2022, due to the concerns and questions identified in the comments received from parties, the NIRB provided an opportunity for the Proponent to respond to the concerns raised during the commenting period. The following is a summary of the Proponent's response to concerns as received on July 14, 2022:

- The Proponent's Response to Comments is included as **Appendix A**.

6. Time of Report Extension

As a result of the time required to accommodate the opportunity for the Proponent to respond to concerns raised during the public commenting period, the NIRB was not able to provide its screening decision report to the responsible Minister within 45 days as required by Article 12, Section 12.4.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(3) of the *NuPPAA*. Therefore, on July 22, 2022, the NIRB wrote to the Minister of Northern Affairs, Government of Canada, seeking an extension to the 45-day timeline for the provision of the Board's Report.

ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF *NuPPAA*

In determining whether a review of the project is required, the Board considered whether the project proposal had potential to result in significant ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts.

Accordingly, the assessment of impact significance was based on the analysis of those factors that are set out under s. 90 of the *NuPPAA*. The Board took particular care to take into account Inuit Qaujimaningit, traditional and community knowledge in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

The following is a summary of the Board's assessment of the factors that are relevant to the determination of significant impacts with respect of this project proposal:

| Factor | Comment |
|--|---|
| The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The physical footprint of the proposed project components is 104,262 hectares, and west of the Kiggavik Exploration Project. ▪ The proposed activities may take place within habitat of far-ranging wildlife species such as migratory and non-migratory birds, terrestrial wildlife such as caribou (Beverly and Qamanirjuaq herd), muskoxen, wolves, wolverine, Arctic fox, Arctic hare, and Species at Risk (Grizzly Bear, Wolverine, Peregrine Falcon, Short-eared Owl and Red-necked Phalarope). As such, project activities may potentially affect terrestrial habitat and migratory patterns. |
| The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project. |
| The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The GN noted one hundred and sixty-five (165) recorded archeological sites within the boundaries of the proposed exploration area. The Proponent shall avoid conducting activities in the vicinity of archeological/historical sites, and if any archeological sites or features are encountered, activities shall immediately be interrupted and moved away from this location. Local community members also noted multiple areas of cultural and historical importance in the proposed exploration area. The Board notes that the incorporation of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit in the early planning of the proposed project should mitigate any impacts to cultural and archeological areas of significance. |
| The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Human populations may be affected due to increase in noise and dust from drilling, material transportation, and construction activities at the drill site. |
| The nature, magnitude and complexity of the impacts; the probability of the impacts occurring; the frequency and duration of the impacts; and the reversibility or irreversibility of the impacts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A zone of influence of up to 100 km from the most potentially-disruptive project activities was selected for the NIRB's assessment. ▪ With adherence to the relevant regulatory requirements and application of the mitigation measures recommended by the NIRB, no significant residual effects are expected to occur. |
| The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The mitigation measures recommended by the NIRB have been designed with consideration for the potential for cumulative effects to result from |

| Factor | Comment |
|--|---|
| project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out. | the impacts of the project combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects. |
| Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No other relevant factors were identified. |

Other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects considered in this assessment:

| NIRB Project Number | Project Title | Project Type |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| <i>Proposed Developments – undergoing assessment</i> | | |
| 22YN042 | Baker Lake Geothermal Project | Research |
| 22YN048 | Mobile Wind Resource Assessment Project | Research |
| <i>Present Projects – approved or in operation</i> | | |
| 17EA020 | Meadowbank Precious Metal Property | Mineral Exploration |
| 17EN029 | Gibson-MacQuoid Project | Mineral Exploration |
| 18YN016 | Churchill Marine Observatory – Environmental Observing (CMO-EO) | Research |
| 19XN042 | Rankin Inlet and Baker Lake Meteorological Towers | Research |
| 22XN014 | Baker Lake Landfarm | Site Cleanup / Remediation |
| 21YN027 | Kivalliq Hydro-Fibre Link Baseline Research | Research |
| <i>Past Projects</i> | | |
| 15EN049 | Peter, Fox and Parker Lakes | Mineral Exploration |

IEWS OF THE BOARD

In considering the factors as set out above in the screening of the project proposal, the NIRB has identified a number of issues below and respectfully provide the following views regarding whether or not the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts. In addition, the NIRB has proposed terms and conditions that would mitigate the potential adverse impacts identified.

The NIRB has listed specific Acts and Regulations below that may be applicable to the project proposal but this list should not be considered as a complete list and the Proponent is responsible to ensure that it follows all Acts and Regulations that may be applicable to the project proposal.

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Valued Component | Caribou, Caribou Calving and Post-Calving Habitat, and Caribou Migration Corridors |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Potential effects: | Potential adverse effects to caribou and caribou habitat particularly calving, post-calving and migration areas of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou herd from disturbance and disruption of movement from project-related noise, including the construction and use of a temporary camp, movement of fuel cache, drilling, exploration and air transportation activities. Project activities would occur during May through October when the caribou are the most sensitive to noise disturbance. Further, there is potential for cumulative effects on disturbance to the caribou from other projects in the area. |
| Nature of Impacts: | Potential long-term adverse effects are possible from increased stress to caribou. If the mitigation measures proposed by the Proponent and the terms and conditions recommended by the NIRB are adhered to, the potential adverse effects to caribou and caribou habitat are considered to be of moderate magnitude, over the short-term and reversible upon cessation of activities. |
| Mitigating Factors: | The Proponent has committed to executing its work in a way that minimizes the adverse effects to caribou. In addition to the Proponent's proposed mitigation measures, it is expected that the terms and conditions including measures such as requiring the Proponent to cease activities that may interfere with the migration or calving of caribou until the caribou have left the area would mitigate any potential adverse impacts to caribou in the direct project area and areas adjacent to the proposed project. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Wildlife General – 23 through 28 Aircraft Flight Restrictions – 31 through 36 Caribou and Muskox – 37 through 43 Road and Ground Disturbance – 44 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | 1. The <i>Wildlife Act (Nunavut)</i> and its corresponding regulations (http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html). |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Valued Component | Terrestrial wildlife including muskoxen, wolves, wolverine, Arctic fox, Arctic hare, migratory and non-migratory birds and Species at Risk (Grizzly Bear, Wolverine, Peregrine Falcon, Short-eared Owl and Red-necked Phalarope) |
| Potential effects: | Potential adverse effects to terrestrial wildlife, migratory and non migratory birds, and their associated habitats due to increased noise and dust generated from the project activities, including the construction and use of a temporary camp, movement of fuel cache, drilling, exploration and air transportation activities. |
| Nature of Impacts: | The potential adverse effects of the proposed project activities to terrestrial wildlife and birds is considered to be of low magnitude, of short duration and reversible. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Mitigating Factors: | The Proponent has committed to executing its work in a way that minimizes the adverse effects to wildlife. The Board is also recommending terms and conditions that ensure that the potential adverse impacts can be mitigated by measures such as minimizing activities when wildlife and birds are particularly sensitive to disturbance especially during denning periods, migration, nesting and moulting, that minimum flight heights and restrictions are adhered to, and ensuring that all project personnel are made aware of the measures to protect wildlife. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Waste Disposal – 10 and 11 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 12 through 21 Wildlife General – 23 through 28 Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance – 29 and 30 Aircraft Flight Restrictions – 31 through 36 Caribou and MuskoX – 37 through 43 Road and Ground Disturbance – 44 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act</i> and <i>Migratory Birds Regulations</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/). 2. The <i>Species at Risk Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/S-15.3/index.html). Attached in Appendix A is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut. 3. The <i>Wildlife Act (Nunavut)</i> and its corresponding regulations (http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html). 4. The <i>Aeronautics Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-2/). |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Valued Component | Surface water quality, fish and fish habitat |
| Potential effects: | Potential adverse effects on surface water quality, and fish and fish habitat, from the establishment and operation of the temporary camp, the storage, transportation, and use of fuel, and exploration drilling activities. |
| Nature of Impacts: | It is expected that standard operational considerations would mitigate any potential adverse impacts to water quality, fish, and fish habitat. As such, potential impacts would be considered to have a low magnitude, be mostly reversible and temporary in nature, and would have a low probability of extending beyond the immediate project area. |
| Mitigating Factors: | The Proponent has developed a <i>Spill Prevention and Response Plan</i> for the project and has committed to adequate spill response equipment materials and personnel during fuel transfer, and to maintain fuel storage and transfer within secondary containment. The Board is also recommending terms and conditions such as requiring the Proponent to employ mitigation measures related to water protection during operations; fuel storage, use, and spill response; waste management; and |

| | |
|---|--|
| | personnel training related to fuel and waste. It is expected that these terms and conditions would mitigate any potential adverse impacts to water quality, fish and fish habitat in the direct project area and areas adjacent to the proposed project. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Water Courses/Water bodies – 6 through 9 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 12 through 21 Road and Ground Disturbance – 44 Drilling – General – 45 through 47 Drilling on Land – 48 through 52 Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas – 53 through 57 Camps – 58 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Proponent is advised that the Canadian Environmental Protection Act (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-15.31/) lists calcium chloride (CaCl) as a toxic substance. The Proponent should assess alternatives to the use of CaCl as a drill additive, including biodegradable and non-toxic additives. 2. The <i>Fisheries Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/F-14/index.html). 3. The <i>Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-28.8/). 4. The <i>Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations</i> (http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/clear-tofc-211.htm), <i>Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/t-19.01/), and the <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/). 5. The <i>Storage Tank System for Petroleum Products and Allied Petroleum Products Regulations</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2008-197/FullText.html). The Proponent must identify their tank system to Environment and Climate Change Canada and installation of new systems must comply with the regulations' design requirements. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Valued Component | Terrestrial vegetation, land, soil quality, terrain stability and permafrost |
| Potential effects: | Potential adverse effects to ground stability, vegetation health, soil quality, terrain, and permafrost from the establishment and operation of the temporary camp; the storage, transportation, and use of fuel; and exploration drilling activities. |
| Nature of Impacts: | The potential for adverse effects is limited to the project footprint and the probability of long-term impacts occurring is considered to be low, and with proper remediation is reversible. |
| Mitigating Factors: | The Board is recommending terms and conditions such as requiring the Proponent to employ mitigation measures related to the vegetation, soil, permafrost and surface water quality, spill response, personnel training |

| | |
|---|--|
| | related to fuel and waste; use appropriate measures to prevent unplanned deposition of sediment and runoff. The Board is also recommending terms and conditions to ensure that the potential adverse effects are minimized should they be observed. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Fuel and Chemical Storage – 12 through 21 Road and Ground Disturbance – 44 Drilling – General – 45 through 47 Drilling on Land – 48 through 52 Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas – 53 through 57 Camps - 58 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations (http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/clear-tofc-211.htm), Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/t-19.01/), and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/). 2. The Storage Tank System for Petroleum Products and Allied Petroleum Products Regulations (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2008-197/FullText.html). The Proponent must identify their tank system to Environment and Climate Change Canada and installation of new systems must comply with the regulations’ design requirements. 3. Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Hazardous Waste, Government of Nunavut, Revised October 2010 (https://www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/Guideline%20-%20General%20Management%20of%20Hazardous%20Waste%20-%28revised%20Oct%202010%29_0.pdf). |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Valued Component | Air Quality |
| Potential effects: | Potential adverse impacts to air quality including dust and emissions generated by site activities including the use of heavy equipment for excavation and drilling activities, vehicles traffic and the incineration of combustible wastes. |
| Nature of Impacts: | The potential adverse impacts to air quality would be limited to within the project footprint with a low probability of extending beyond the geographic area. The potential adverse impacts to air quality are considered to be of low magnitude, short-term, and reversible. |
| Mitigating Factors: | It is recommended that the potential adverse impacts may be mitigated by ensuring the Proponent undertakes appropriate dust suppression measures and that the incineration of combustible wastes comply with the <i>Canadian Wide Standards for Dioxins and Furans</i> , and the <i>Canadian Wide Standards for Mercury</i> . |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Waste Management – 10 and 11 Air Quality - 22 |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Road and Ground Disturbance – 44 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | <i>Canadian Wide Standards for Mercury</i> <i>Canadian Wide Standards for Dioxins and Furans</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Valued Component | Wildlife harvesting and traditional land use activities. |
| Potential effects: | Potential adverse effects to traditional land use pursuits in the area from caribou migration disruptions and other wildlife disturbances from increased noise associated with the operational and drilling activities, the transportation of personnel and equipment to and from the drill locations, the construction and use of a temporary camp, and the mineral exploration activities. The Proponent is proposing to work in an area in proximity to caribou calving, post-calving and caribou migration routes and the potential for disruption may cause stress and avoidance of critical caribou habitat. As a result, local caribou populations may be reduced and subsequently the availability of caribou as country food. |
| Nature of Impacts: | Although the proposed project would include temporary and intermittent activities that would have limited potential for direct interaction with traditional land use activities, potential long-term impacts are possible from increased stress to wildlife (particularly to caribou) in key habitat areas. Unmitigated project impacts could affect the migratory patterns of the caribou herds and could result in indirect impacts. |
| Mitigating Factors: | The Proponent has committed to executing its work in a way that minimizes the negative effects to wildlife and has developed an <i>Environmental Management Plan</i> and has committed to adopting mobile caribou protection measures. The Board is also recommending terms and conditions that ensure that the affected communities and organizations are informed about the project proposal, and that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities in the area. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Other – 62 and 63 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | N/A |

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Valued Component | Historical, archeological, and heritage sites |
| Potential effects: | No historical sites in the proposed project area were identified by the Proponent, however, the Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure project activities are informed by available Inuit Qaujimaningit and that project activities do not negatively effect historical or heritage sites. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Nature of Impacts: | The potential for impacts are considered minimal as the area has no historical, archeological, and heritage sites that have been previously identified. |
| Mitigating Factors: | As noted, the Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure that project activities do not negatively effect historical or heritage sites. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Other – 59 through 61 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | 1. The <i>Nunavut Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-28.6/). The Proponent must comply with the proposed terms and conditions listed in the attached Appendix B . |

| | |
|---|--|
| Valued Component | Local hiring, contracting and economic impact |
| Potential effects: | Potential positive impacts from the hiring of local community members for various projects and activities. |
| Nature of Impacts: | Potential for impacts is considered to be positive if the Proponent adheres to its commitment to hiring locally to the extent possible. |
| Mitigating Factors: | The Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure that the Proponent continues to inform the communities of the ongoing site activities and to ensure community members are aware of and best able to successfully connect with hiring opportunities. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Other – 62 and 64 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | N/A |

Significant public concern:

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Valued Component | Public Concern |
| Potential effects: | Public concern was expressed over the potential impacts on the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou herd calving and post-calving areas and the resultant adverse impacts on communities which rely on harvesting of this herd. Additional concerns were expressed over the timing of project operation, during summer months, from May to August which is the most sensitive time for caribou. |
| Nature of Impacts: | Proposed project activities are located in proximity to the calving, post-calving and migration areas of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Herd; this is also an area that may be used for traditional activities, such as hunting and camping. There is also the potential for cumulative effects of the proposed with other projects in the area which may cause cumulative effects on both the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq and Lorillard Caribou herds' abundance and habitat quality. |
| Mitigating Factors: | Follow up consultation and involvement of local community members is expected to mitigate any potential for public concern resulting from project activities. The Board has recommended a term and condition to |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ensure that available Inuit Qaujimaningit and community knowledge of the area can inform project design. Additionally, the Board is recommending that the Proponent provide an annual report that includes wildlife observations and an evaluation of the success of the mitigative measures applied. |
| Proposed Terms and Conditions: | Other – 62 and 63 |
| Related Acts and/or Regulations: | N/A |

Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:

- No specific issues have been identified associated with this project proposal.

Administrative Conditions:

To encourage compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and assist the Board and responsible authorities with compliance and effects monitoring for project activities, the following project-specific terms and conditions have been recommended: 1-5.

In considering the above factors and subject to the Proponent’s compliance with the terms and conditions necessary to mitigate against the potential adverse environmental and social effects, the Board is of the view that the proposed project is unlikely to cause significant public concern and its adverse ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts are unlikely to be significant, or are highly predictable and can be adequately mitigated by known technologies.

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The Board is recommending the following specific terms and conditions to apply in respect of the project:

General

1. Forum Energy Metals Corp. (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times and make it accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
2. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC File No.: 149726) and the NIRB (Online Application Form, June 3, 2022). This information should be accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
3. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.
4. The Proponent shall ensure that it meets the standards and/or limits as set out in the authorizing agencies’ permits or licences as required for this project.

5. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel, staff and contractors are adequately trained prior to commencement of all project activities, and shall be made aware of all operational plans, management plans, guidelines and Proponent commitments relating to the project.

Water courses/Water bodies (including fresh and marine waters)

6. The Proponent shall not extract water from any fish-bearing water body unless the water intake hose is equipped with a screen of appropriate mesh size to ensure that there is no entrapment of fish. Small lakes or streams should not be used for water withdrawal unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate authorizing agency.
7. The Proponent shall ensure that no disturbance of the stream bed, lakebed or the banks of any definable watercourse be permitted, except where deemed necessary for maintaining project-specific operational commitments or approved by a responsible authority in cases of spill management.
8. The Proponent shall implement erosion and sediment suppression measures on all areas during all project activities in order to prevent sediment or fugitive dust from entering any water body or surrounding environment. Erosion prevention measures may include berms or silt fences.
9. The Proponent shall not deposit, nor permit the deposit of any fuel, chemicals, wastes (including wastewater) or sediment into any water body. The Proponent should have in place an Emergency Spill Response Plan that is approved by the appropriate authorizing agency(ies).

Waste Management

10. The Proponent shall manage all hazardous and non-hazardous waste including food, domestic wastes, debris and petroleum-based chemicals (e.g., greases, gasoline, glycol-based antifreeze) in such a manner to avoid release into the environment and access to wildlife at all times until disposed of appropriately or at an approved facility.
11. The Proponent shall incinerate all combustible wastes as needed and dispose of as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies. All non-combustible wastes from the project site shall be removed to an approved facility for disposal.

Fuel and Chemical Storage

12. The Proponent shall locate all fuel and other hazardous materials a minimum distance away from the high-water mark of any water body and environmentally sensitive areas as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies. The materials shall be stored in such a manner as to prevent their release into the environment.
13. The Proponent shall use adequate secondary containment or a surface liner (e.g., self-supporting insta-berms and fold-a-tanks) when storing barreled fuel and chemicals at all locations.
14. The Proponent shall ensure that re-fuelling of all equipment occurs a minimum distance away from the high-water mark of any water body as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies.
15. Fuel and hazardous material storage areas and fuel lines should be clearly marked with signs or flagging to avoid accidental breaks and punctures, and to ensure areas remain visible during the winter months.

16. All fuel and chemical storage containers must be clearly marked with the Proponent's name for ease of identification.
17. The Proponent shall routinely inspect and document the conditions of fuel and hazardous material storage containers and containment areas as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies. Fuel containment areas shall be kept clear of debris, water and snow to facilitate inspections for leaks.
18. The Proponent shall have a Spill Contingency Plan in place at all fuel storage or transfer locations and shall ensure that appropriate spill response equipment and clean-up materials (e.g., shovels, pumps, barrels, drip pans, and absorbents) are readily available.
19. The Proponent shall follow the authorizing agencies' direction for management and removal of hazardous materials and wastes (e.g., contaminated soils, sediment and waste oil).
20. The Proponent shall ensure that wildlife deterrent systems are utilized at the time of a spill incident in order to avoid wildlife (terrestrial or marine) and migratory birds from being contaminated.
21. The Proponent shall ensure that all spills of fuel or other deleterious materials of 100 litres or more must be reported immediately to the 24-hour Spill Line at (867) 920-8130.

Air Quality

22. The Proponent shall take appropriate dust suppression measures in conducting all activities for this Project including using approved dust suppression additives and techniques as necessary to maintain ambient air quality.

Wildlife – General

23. The Proponent shall not substantially alter or damage or destroy any wildlife habitat in conducting this operation unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate authorizing agencies.
24. The Proponent shall not chase, weary, harass or molest wildlife. This includes persistently circling, chasing, hovering over, pursuing or in any other way harass wildlife, or disturbing large groups of animals.
25. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.
26. The Proponent shall ensure that all wildlife have the right-of-way on any roads or trails. Vehicles are required to slow down or stop and wait to permit the free and unrestricted movement of wildlife across roads or trails at any location.
27. The Proponent shall enforce safe speed limits for vehicles travelling along the road to ensure drivers have sufficient time to react in a safe manner if wildlife are encountered on or adjacent to the road or trail.
28. The Proponent shall ensure that drivers maintain spacing appropriate for driving and road conditions, and speed limits, to ensure drivers have time to safely react to any wildlife on the road.

Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance

29. The Proponent shall carry out all phases of the project in a manner that protects migratory birds and avoids harming, killing or disturbing migratory birds or destroying, disturbing or taking

their nests or eggs. In this regard, the Proponent shall take into account Environment and Climate Change Canada's *Avoidance Guidelines*. The Proponent's actions in applying the *Avoidance Guidelines* shall be in compliance with the *Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994* and with the *Species at Risk Act*.

30. The Proponent shall not disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of any birds. If active nests of any birds are discovered or located (i.e., with eggs or young), the Proponent shall avoid these areas until nesting is complete and the young have naturally left the vicinity of the nest by establishing a protection buffer zone¹ appropriate for the species and the surrounding habitat.

Aircraft Flight Restrictions

31. The Proponent shall not alter flight paths to approach wildlife and avoid flying directly over animals.
32. The Proponent shall plan flight paths that minimize flights over known habitat likely to have birds or concentrations of wildlife. Aircraft should avoid critical and sensitive wildlife areas at all times by choosing alternate flight corridors.
33. The Proponent shall restrict aircraft/helicopter activity related to the project to a minimum flight altitude of 610 metres (2,100 ft) above ground level except during landing, take-off or if there is a specific requirement for low-level flying, which does not disturb wildlife or migratory birds.
34. The Proponent shall avoid known concentrations of birds (e.g., bird colonies, moulting areas) by a lateral distance of 1.5 kilometre. If avoidance is not possible maintain a minimum flight altitude of 1,100 metres (3,500 feet) over these areas.
35. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft/helicopter do not, unless for emergency, touch-down in areas where wildlife are present.
36. The Proponent shall advise all pilots of relevant flight restrictions and enforce their application over the project area, including flight paths to/from the project area.

Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance

37. The Proponent shall avoid interfering with any paths or crossings known to be frequented by caribou during periods of migration as identified by current land use plans in place and/or by Inuit Qaujimaningit.
38. The Proponent shall not locate any operation or undertake activities that could block or cause any diversion to migration of caribou or muskoxen.
39. The Proponent shall implement mobile caribou conservation measures and immediately cease activities that may interfere with the migration or calving of caribou or muskox, until the caribou or muskox have passed.
40. The Proponent shall not construct or operate any camp, cache any fuel or conduct blasting within ten (10) kilometres, or conduct any drilling operation within five (5) kilometres of any designated caribou water crossings.

¹ Recommended setback distances to define buffer zones have been established by Environment and Climate Change Canada for different bird groups nesting in tundra habitat and can be found at www.ec.gc.ca/paom-itmb.

41. During the period of May 15 to July 15, the Proponent shall suspend all project operations and activities outside the immediate vicinity of the camps. Restricted activities include, but are not limited to, air and vehicle traffic, loud or repetitive noise or vibration disturbances, low-level over flights, blasting, and use of mobile equipment including snowmobiles and all terrain vehicles, and personnel walking within sight of the caribou group(s), until the caribou are no longer in the immediate area. Should the results of localized monitoring satisfy the land use inspector the project operations may resume without disturbing pregnant caribou cows or cows with young calves the suspension may be lifted for the periods specified.
42. Should pregnant caribou cows, cows with young calves, or groups of 50 or more caribou be observed within one (1) kilometer of project operations at any time, the Proponent shall suspend all operations in the vicinity, including low level overflights, drilling, blasting/trenching, and use of snowmobiles and all terrain vehicles outside the immediate vicinity of the camp, until caribou are no longer in the immediate area.
43. During the period of April 14 to June 1 when muskoxen are present, the Proponent shall not approach muskoxen closer than one (1) kilometer. This includes all operations, including low-level over flights, blasting, and use of snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles outside the immediate vicinity of the camps.

Road and Ground Disturbance

44. The Proponent shall not move any equipment or vehicles unless the ground surface is in a state capable of fully supporting the equipment or vehicles without rutting or gouging. Overland travel of equipment or vehicles must be suspended if rutting occurs.

Drilling – General

45. The Proponent shall not allow any drilling wastes to spread to the surrounding lands or water bodies.
46. The Proponent shall ensure that that any deleterious substances (as defined in the *Fisheries Act*) resulting from its activities do not enter into any water bodies frequented by fish.
47. The Proponent shall ensure that all drill areas are constructed to facilitate minimizing the environmental footprint of the project area.

Drilling on Land

48. The Proponent shall not conduct any land-based drilling or mechanized clearing activities a minimum distance of the normal high-water mark of any water body as required by an authorizing agency.
49. If an artesian flow is encountered, the Proponent shall ensure the drill hole is immediately plugged and permanently sealed.
50. The Proponent shall ensure that all sump/depression capacities are sufficient to accommodate the volume of wastewater and any fines that are produced. The sumps shall only be used for inert drilling fluids, and not any other materials or substances.
51. The Proponent shall not locate any sumps within a minimum distance of the normal high-water mark of any water body as required by an authorizing agency.

52. The Proponent shall ensure all drill holes are backfilled or capped prior to the end of each field season. All sumps must be backfilled and restored to original or stable profile prior to the end of each field season.

Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas

53. The Proponent shall use existing trails where possible during project activities on the land.

54. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.

55. The Proponent shall avoid disturbance on slopes prone to natural erosion, and alternative locations shall be utilized.

56. The Proponent shall remove all garbage, fuel and equipment at the end of each field season.

57. The Proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are restored to a stable or pre-disturbed state using Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BATEA) upon completion of work and/or abandonment.

Camps

58. The Proponent shall ensure that all camps are located durable surfaces, such as gravel or sand that is consolidated and can withstand repeated, heavy use. Measures shall be put in place to prevent erosion, trail formation and damage to the ground.

Heritage Sites

59. The Proponent shall ensure that archaeological and paleontological sites are not purposely or inadvertently disturbed by clients or staff as a result of project activities.

60. The Proponent shall ensure that all clients and staff are aware of the Proponent's responsibilities and requirements regarding archaeological or palaeontological sites that are encountered during land-based activities. This should include briefings explaining the prohibitions regarding removal of artifacts, and defacing or writing on rocks and infrastructure.

61. No activities shall be conducted in the vicinity (50 metres buffer zone) of any archaeological/historical sites. If archaeological sites or features are encountered, activities shall immediately be interrupted and moved away from this location. Each site encountered needs to be recorded and reported to the Government of Nunavut-Department of Culture and Heritage.

Other

62. The Proponent should consult with local residents regarding their activities in the area and solicit available Inuit Qaujimaningit and information that can inform project activities.

63. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.

64. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and access local services where possible.

In addition, the Board is recommending the following:

Annual Report

1. The Proponent shall submit a comprehensive annual report with copies provided to the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Government of Nunavut, by March 31st of each year of permitted activities beginning March 31, 2023. The annual report must contain at least the following information:
 - a) A summary of activities undertaken for the year, including:
 - a map showing the approximate location of drill sites;
 - a map showing the location of the fuel cache;
 - a description of local hires, contracting opportunities and initiatives;
 - flight altitudes, frequency of flights and anticipated flight routes;
 - site photos;
 - b) A work plan for the following year, including any progressive reclamation work undertaken;
 - c) A summary of community consultations undertaken throughout the year, providing copy of materials presented to community members, a description of issues and concerns raised, discussions with community members and advice offered to the company as well as any follow-up actions that were required or taken to resolve any concerns expressed about the project proposal;
 - d) A log of instances in which community residents occupy or transit through the project area for the purpose of traditional land use or harvesting. This log should include the location and number of people encountered, activity being undertaken (e.g., berry picking, fishing, hunting, camping, etc.), date and time; and any mitigation measures or adaptive management undertaken to prevent disturbance;
 - e) A discussion of issues related to wildlife and environmental monitoring, including the number of cease-work orders required as a result of proximity to caribou and any other wildlife;
 - f) A brief summary of WMMP results as well as any mitigation actions that were undertaken. In addition, the Proponent shall maintain a record of wildlife observations while operating within the project area and include it as part of the summary report. The summary report based on wildlife observations should include the following:
 1. Locations (i.e., latitude and longitude), species, number of animals, a description of the animal activity, and a description of the gender and age of animals if possible.
 2. Prior to conducting project activities, the Proponent should map the location of any sensitive wildlife sites such as denning sites, calving areas, caribou crossing sites, and raptor nests in the project area, and identify the timing of critical life history events (i.e., calving, mating, denning and nesting).

3. Additionally, the Proponent should indicate potential impacts from the project, and ensure that operational activities are managed and modified to avoid impacts on wildlife and sensitive sites.
 - g) An analysis of the effectiveness of mitigation measures for wildlife;
 - h) Summary of any heritage sites encountered during the exploration activities, any follow-up action or reporting required as a result and how project activities were modified to mitigate impacts on the heritage sites;
 - i) Summary of its knowledge of Inuit land use in/near the project area and explain how project activities were modified to mitigate impacts on Inuit land use; and
 - j) A summary of how the Proponent has complied with conditions contained within this Screening Decision, and all conditions as required by other authorizations associated with the project proposal.

OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the project-specific terms and conditions, the Board is recommending the following:

Change in Project Scope

1. Responsible authorities or Proponent shall notify the Nunavut Planning Commission and/or Parks Canada as appropriate, and the NIRB of any changes in operating plans or conditions, including phase advancement, associated with this project prior to any such change.

Copy of licences, etc. to the Board and Commission

2. The NIRB respectfully requests that responsible authorities submit a copy of each licence, permit or other authorization issued for the Project to the NIRB to assist in enabling possible project monitoring that may be required. Please forward a copy of the licences, permits and/or other authorizations to the NIRB directly at info@nirb.ca or upload a copy to the NIRB's online registry at www.nirb.ca.

Use of Inuit Qaujimaningit

3. The Proponent is encouraged to work with local communities and knowledge holders to inform project design, to carry out the project, and to confirm or validate the perspectives represented in publications produced as part of the project. Care should be taken to ensure that Inuit Qaujimaningit and local knowledge collected for the project is used with permission and is accurately represented.

Bear and Carnivore Safety

4. The Proponent should review the Government of Nunavut's booklet on Bear Safety, which can be downloaded from this link: http://gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/bear_safety_-_reducing_bear-people_conflicts_in_nunavut.pdf. Further information on bear/carnivore detection and deterrent techniques can be found in the "*Safety in Grizzly and Black Bear Country*" pamphlet, which can be downloaded from this link: https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/resources/safety_in_grizzly_and_black_bear_country_english.pdf.

5. There are Polar Bear and grizzly bear safety resources available from the Bear Smart Society with videos on Polar Bear safety available in English, French and Inuktitut at <http://www.bearsmart.com/play/safety-in-polar-bear-country/>. Information can also be obtained from Parks Canada's website on bear safety at the following link: <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nu/quttinirpaaq/visit/visit6/d.aspx> or in reviewing the "Safety in Polar Bear Country" pamphlet, which can be downloaded from the following link: http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nu/quttinirpaaq/visit/visit6/~media/pn-np/nu/auyuittuq/pdf/shared/PolarBearSafety_English.ashx.
6. Any problem wildlife or any interaction with carnivores should be reported immediately to the local Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment Conservation Office (Conservation Officer of Baker Lake, phone: (867) 793-2944).

Species at Risk

7. The Proponent review Environment and Climate Change Canada's "Environment Assessment Best Practice Guide for Wildlife at Risk in Canada", available at the following link: http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/policies/EA%20Best%20Practices%202004.pdf. The guide provides information to the Proponent on what is required when Wildlife at Risk, including *Species at Risk*, are encountered or affected by the project.

Migratory Birds

8. The Proponent review Canadian Wildlife Services' "Key migratory bird terrestrial habitat sites in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut", available at the following link: <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/317630/publication.html> and "Key marine habitat sites for migratory birds in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories", available at the following link: <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/392824/publication.html>. The guide provides information to the Proponent on key terrestrial and marine habitat areas that are essential to the welfare of various migratory bird species in Canada.
9. For further information on how to protect migratory birds, their nests and eggs when planning or carrying out project activities, consult Environment and Climate Change Canada's Incidental Take web page and the fact sheet "Planning Ahead to Reduce the Risk of Detrimental Effects to Migratory Birds, and their Nests and Eggs" available at: http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/ec/CW66-324-2013-eng.pdf.

Incineration of Wastes

10. The Proponent review Environment and Climate Change Canada's "Technical Document for Batch Waste Incineration", available at the following link: <http://www.ec.gc.ca/gdd-mw/default.asp?lang=En&n=F53EDE13-1>. The technical document provides information on appropriate incineration technologies, best management and operational practices, monitoring and reporting.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to the Forum Energy Metals Corp.'s "Nunavut Uranium Project". The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated August 3, 2022 at Baker Lake, NU.



Kaviq Kaluraq, Chairperson

Attachments: Appendix A: Proponent's Response to Comments
Appendix B: Species at Risk in Nunavut
Appendix C: Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources Terms and Conditions for Land Use
Permit Holders

APPENDIX A: PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Forum Energy Corp. Review Comments

| Reviewer | Comment | Response | Attachment |
|------------------|---|---|--|
| <p>P, Idviat</p> | <p>P. Idviat: (June 14, 2022) <i>“uranium and metals will have an impact on our environment especially with our wildlife we depend on as our daily source of foods, such as our fish mitigations on our herds and now with ECCC information with declining of our herds and already weve seen changes in the movements of our wildlife,yea for others for future use in job creations some wang it but still with explorations working and drilling still gonna affect our environment with our water and what our herds feed on ,the most impact weve seen is air traffic and during calving and now with our climate changing noticing high water levels and by thaw out going into our fresh waters and changes in each year with our environment ,starting to see different colorations in environment and changes in the mitigations where wild life walks, Where the old drill sites arent cleaned up properly and that powdered area never goes away quick and will stick around and will not revive back to its natural course”</i></p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. (FEMC) would like to thank the reviewer for his comments and for attendance and participation in the meeting with the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization (BLHTO) on June 22, 2022.</p> <p>FEMC would like BLHTO, as well as the Kivalliq Inuit Association (KIA) Community Lands and Resources Committee (CLARC) to appoint wildlife monitors that will have the authority to direct the company to suspend operations if wildlife are in the area in accordance with the KIA’s Mobile Mitigation Measures as well as Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)’s Caribou Protection Measures.</p> <p>Forum commits to reducing any impact on the environment and the wildlife by strictly following the terms and conditions of all licenses and permits.</p> <p>No low-level flights will be allowed except for take off, landing and in the case of an emergency.</p> | <p>Forum Response to meetings held in Baker Lake.</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:919448d1-70a0-3cc2-b8f2-b46135796aea</p> <p>appendices including pictures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:1080bb5e-ae9d-3ec9-b56f-c7d7e488fff7</p> <p>CIRNAC signed final inspection</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:55f96e87-b3b9-3e5f-a727-d6a56d5359ba</p> <p>KIA mobile mitigation measures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:44208b21-3f98-3dd7-a96f-60075ef3df39</p> |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>On its claims previously explored by its predecessor company, Forum Uranium, FEMC removed its camp in two stages when it decided to suspend operations in 2015 and regrets that it took several years to cut drill casings to the ground level as directed by the CIRNAC inspector. FEMC commits to cutting drill casings to ground level and remediating drill sites immediately following completion of each drill hole. A representative from the KIA CLARC may inspect all drill sites upon completion of the program.</p> | |
| <p>Billie Jo Ukpatiku.</p> | <p>Billie Jo Ukpatiku. (June 20, 2022) <i>“Indicate your concerns about the project proposal below: - Water quality, Terrain, - Air quality, - Traditional uses of land, - Local development in the area, - Human health issues, - Fish and their habitat, - Other: Caribou and grizzly bear migration is in and around the spot where the company want to explore for uranium. Please describe the concerns indicated above: Migration will be forced to halt. Environmental team not doing a good job with caribou migration with Agnico Eagle, one migration already interrupted, Baker Lake doesn’t need another interruption where environmental team will not do anything. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for this application? I oppose to the exploration for uranium, the community members thrive on what is left for us to hunt. Any additional comments? Thank you for your time</i></p> | <p>Forum would like to thank the reviewer for the comments and would like to reinforce its commitment to working closely together with the BLHTO by hiring wildlife monitors who will have the authority to suspend operations when wildlife are in the area, and allow the caribou to pass without disturbance from exploration activities. The Company commits to working within the terms and conditions of its licences and permits especially with respect to the KIA’s Mobile Mitigation Measures and CIRNAC’s Caribou Protection Measures.</p> | <p>KIA mobile mitigation measures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:44208b21-3f98-3dd7-a96f-60075ef3df39</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | <p><i>Do you support the project proposal? No</i></p> | <p>Forum does not want to negatively impact the environment and wildlife and believes that working together with the BLHTO, they can achieve that goal.</p> <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. does not mine and is only planning to conduct exploration activities, mainly drilling.</p> | |
| <p>Jean M. Pudnak</p> | <p><i>Jean M. Pudnak (June 20, 2022) If this exploration group already left pipes in the ground, how are we going to trust them? I am concerned for the future of our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren and so on even us who are here right now if there were spills/leaks. The air quality, land, water would be a devastation if there was some spill/leak etc... Our Beverly and Qamanirjuaq herd will end up losing their route which goes up that way and we will end up losing thousands of caribou. It is not just one herd but two herds that goes through that route for thousands of years! This would disturb their usual route and we will end up without our traditional harvesting. Especially with inflation happening right now. We already haven't had much caribou the last 10 years or so. And companies and exploration groups always promise not to disturb the caribou herds but they still scare them away using helicopters flying low and chasing them away. And if there was a spill, it is right next to the Thelon River which is also under the Territorial and National Parks! Not only that it is our ONLY drinking water, what then if our only drinking water source is destroyed? They will end up leaving us and us dying. We will have no help. Our whole community will die so quick and there will be no more Baker Lakers. All the birds, fish, caribou</i></p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. would like to thank the reviewer for her comments and for attending the Public Meeting held on June 20, 2022, in Baker Lake. Unfortunately, at the public meeting, statements were made without representatives from the Company being able to answer properly and thoroughly without interruption. In addition, the photographs that were circulated by Joan Scottie, and said to be on the Company's previous exploration site, were determined by CIRNAC to belonging to another company and not Forum Uranium.</p> <p>It took Forum Uranium two seasons to remove its camp and subsequent time to cut drill casings to ground level and commits that this will not happen in the future. Pictures of each drill site will be taken prior to drilling and after drilling and</p> | <p>Forum Response to meetings held in Baker Lake.</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:919448d1-70a0-3cc2-b8f2-b46135796aea</p> <p>appendices including pictures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:1080bb5e-ae9d-3ec9-b56f-c7d7e488fff7</p> <p>CIRNAC signed final inspection</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:55f96e87-b3b9-3e5f-a727-d6a56d5359ba</p> <p>KIA mobile mitigation measures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:44208b21-3f98-3dd7-a96f-60075ef3df39</p> <p>FEMC Spill Plan</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:503759fb-7b78-31cc-9c26-a478b070935a</p> <p>GN Uranium Policy</p> <p>GN announces Uranium Policy Statement Government of Nunavut</p> |

*and other animals will be destroyed along with us people of Baker Lake. Uranium is not a source for Climate change! It is a source for wars. Climate is already happening who can help but us? And that is to say no to the experts and start of a Uranium Mine! Any additional comments? I say no to this proposal as it will destroy us people, we will be gone and our land, animals and birds.
Do you support the project proposal?: No*

shared with the regulators. Drill sites will be remediated immediately after drilling.

Forum Energy Metals Corp. is fully committed to working closely with the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization, and other interested citizens to ensure that the project is respectful of wildlife and the environment. Wildlife monitors contracted through the HTO will have the authority to suspend activities until wildlife have moved an approved distance away.

Low level flights are not allowed, (except for take off and landing and in the case of an emergency) and the Company commits to working strictly within the terms and conditions of all licenses and permits.

As shown in the accompanying map, the sites proposed for drilling are not close to the Thelon River. FEMC understand the concern regarding spills and water contamination. A Spill Plan with strict reporting and treatment plans have been filed with regulators. Forum will conduct all exploration activities while respecting the land and the wildlife.

Map

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:00736e9a-44a5-3ac1-aadc-065d16d442c7>

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>The Government of Nunavut, Uranium Policy states, “<i>The Government of Nunavut will support the exploration and mining of uranium subject to the following principles: Uranium mined in Nunavut shall be used only for peaceful and environmentally responsible purposes. Nunavummiut must be the major beneficiaries of uranium exploration and mining activities.</i>”.</p> | |
| <p>K.Aupaluktu q</p> | <p>The Nunavut Uranium Project to conduct uranium exploration activities on Aberdeen Lake and the vicinity of Gerhard Lake will arouse significant public concern due to the fact that the area is close to the community of Baker Lake. Baker Lake is the only inland community with fresh water in Nunavut. The area of exploration is right by one of the rivers that flow into the community which would be a major concern to the public. The land is also a place where some our ancestors travelled through before colonization and Inuit still travel to for hunting and fishing purposes to this day. It is a migratory route for caribou which will be disrupted by exploration.</p> <p>The purposed area is also known as calving grounds for caribou. There have been recent declines in the numbers of caribou in Nunavut. The Baffin and the Kitkmeot regions have had restrictions on hunting caribou due to the decline. The public certainly does not want to have the same restrictions.</p> <p>Exploration in the area could disrupt calving in the area. There have been many attempts in the past to explore uranium in the area with no success. It is very clear that Inuit want</p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. Would like to thank the reviewer for her comments and understands the concern regarding contamination of fresh water and would like to state that procedures and plans (e.g., Spill Plan) will be in place to avoid any contamination. Forum’s camp and drill areas are shown on the accompanying map and will be a long distance from the Thelon River and caribou migration areas. Forum understands the Archaeological significance of the proposed exploration area and has contracted a archaeological consultant to conduct a field archaeological assessment prior to any ground disturbance on the recommendation of the Government of Nunavut Department of Culture and</p> | <p>Forum Response to meetings held in Baker Lake.</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:919448d1-70a0-3cc2-b8f2-b46135796aea</p> <p>appendices including pictures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:1080bb5e-ae9d-3ec9-b56f-c7d7e488fff7</p> <p>CIRNAC signed final inspection</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:55f96e87-b3b9-3e5f-a727-d6a56d5359ba</p> <p>KIA mobile mitigation measures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:44208b21-3f98-3dd7-a96f-60075ef3df39</p> <p>FEMC Spill Plan</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:503759fb-7b78-31cc-9c26-a478b070935a</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | <p>to protect the area of concern. It is the land of their ancestors, they want to protect the wildlife and the water source. Yes, exploration/mining may have some benefits for the community but that would only last as long as the exploration/mine. The damage to the land would have life long effects. It would never go back to the way it was. There are serious dangers with uranium exploration. Yes, there are procedures to try to prevent any damages but they aren't certain. The last exploration company said they would follow policies and procedures but there is evidence that they didn't follow through. It was said they would clean up the area and wouldn't leave anything behind however, after site visits there were samples left along with some other products. Uranium is a radioactive substance which is unstable and produces dangerous kinds of radiation. Exposure to uranium can result in both chemical and radiological toxicity. Exploration leads to mining and uranium mining has widespread effects contaminating the environment with radioactive dust, radon gas and water-borne toxins. After uranium is extracted from rock, the processes leave behind radioactive waste. The dangers of uranium exploration and mining are too much of a risk for the people of Baker Lake, the wildlife and the environment.</p> | <p>Heritage.</p> <p>Local wildlife Monitors will be contracted through the BLHTO to ensure that the Company is complying with the terms and conditions of their licenses and permits. e.g., no low-level flights (With the exception of take-off, landing and in case of an emergency).</p> <p>The Wildlife Monitors will have the authority to suspend all exploration activities in accordance with the KIA's Mobile Mitigation Measures until wildlife has moved an approved distance away.</p> <p>Regretfully, at the public meeting, statements were made without representatives from the Company being able to answer properly and thoroughly without interruption. In addition, the photographs that were circulated by Joan Scottie, and said to be on the Company's previous exploration site, were determined by CIRNAC to belonging to another company and not Forum Uranium.</p> <p>Forum Uranium did take two seasons to remove its camp and subsequent time to cut drill</p> | <p>Map</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:00736e9a-44a5-3ac1-aadc-065d16d442c7</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | casings to ground level and has committed to not letting this happen again. CIRNAC signed off on all remediation and the company is in good standing with all their previous licences and permits. | |
| Kivalliq Inuit Association | <p>KIA (July 4, 2022) Kivalliq Inuit Association (KIA) (July 4, 2022) NIRB Question: <i>Whether the proposed project is likely to arouse significant public concern.</i> KivIA Answer: <i>The project is a uranium exploration project so it will arouse some public concern. This concern was evident at the public meeting held by Forum Energy Metals Corp. in Baker Lake on the evening of June 20, 2022. One of the attendees from Baker Lake gave a short presentation with copies of photographs showing drill casing above ground level and steel cables from a site visited in 2012. Forum Energy Metals Corp. (Forum) still retains the mineral claims that they held in 2012. In addition, claims formerly held by Cameco Corporation have been acquired by Forum. It is still uncertain if the photographs shown at the June 20th meeting are related to previous work by Forum Energy Metals Corp. or work related to Cameco Corporation from the same period. The following is recommended by the KivIA:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) Forum provide copies of the final inspection reports by CIRNAC and the KivIA from the 2012 period for their properties,</i> <i>2) Forum provide copies of the final inspection reports on the public record by CIRNAC and the KivIA from the 2012 period for the Cameco Corporation properties, and</i> <i>3) Forum provide written responses to the questions asked at the June 20th, 2022 meeting held in Baker Lake.</i> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. thanks the KIA for having representatives at the Public Meeting held in Baker Lake on June 20, 2022, and for the Community Lands and Resources Committee on June 22, 2022.</p> <p>In response to KIA recommendations, Forum Energy Metals Corp. commits to providing to the KIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) copies of the final inspection reports by CIRNAC (attached) and the KivIA from the 2012 period for their properties,</i> <p>Forum has asked the KivIA to provide copies of their inspection reports.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>2) copies of the final inspection reports on the public record by CIRNAC and the KivIA from the 2012 period for the Cameco Corporation properties, and</i> <p>Forum will obtain these and provide them to the KIA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>3) written responses to the questions asked at the June</i> | <p>CIRNAC signed final inspection</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:55f96e87-b3b9-3e5f-a727-d6a56d5359ba</p> <p>Forum Response to meetings held in Baker Lake.</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:919448d1-70a0-3cc2-b8f2-b46135796aea</p> <p>appendices including pictures</p> <p>https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:1080bb5e-ae9d-3ec9-b56f-c7d7e488fff7</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>NIRB Question: <i>Whether the proposed project is likely to cause significant adverse ecosysytemic or socio-economic effects</i></p> <p>KivIA Answer: <i>The project as proposed is likely not to cause significant adverse ecosysytemic or socio-economic effects.</i></p> <p>NIRB Question: <i>Whether the proposed project is likely to cause significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities.</i></p> <p>KivIA Answer: <i>The project as proposed is likely not to cause significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities.</i></p> <p>NIRB Question: <i>Whether the proposed project is a type where the potentially adverse effects are highly predictable and can be prevented/managed appropriately with known technology.</i></p> <p>KivIA Answer: <i>The project as proposed is a type where the potentially adverse effects are highly predictable and can be prevented/managed appropriately with known technology.</i></p> <p>General KivIA Comments: The KivIA would like responses from Forum and the NIRB in regard to the following questions/comments:</p> <p>1) <i>The number and size of the sleds and komatiks to be used with the SnowCats, Challengers and Deltas’s for overland hauling during 2023 should be added to the Equipment lists in the NIRB application and in the Abandonment & Restoration Plan.</i></p> <p>2) <i>There is reference in the NIRB Notice of Screening for this project dated June 14, 2022 under the 2023 activities of “Transportation, storage and use of up to six (6) 50,000 Litre (L) double walled fuel tanks at the campsite.” However, there is no reference in the actual application of these tanks. The only reference is</i></p> | <p>20th, 2022, meeting held in Baker Lake.</p> <p>The KivIA would like responses from Forum and the NIRB in regard to the following questions/comments:</p> <p>1) <i>The number and size of the sleds and komatiks to be used with the SnowCats, Challengers and Deltas’s for overland hauling during 2023 should be added to the Equipment lists in the NIRB application and in the Abandonment & Restoration Plan.</i></p> <p>Forum: Forum will contract Peter’s Expediting Ltd. (PEL) to do the overland haul to its camp location. PEL will use two Delta tractors with tundra tires and three rubber tracked vehicles that each will haul 40-foot sleds of supplies.</p> <p><i>Thank you and the NIRB application as well as the Abandonment and Restoration Plan will be updated.</i></p> <p>2) <i>There is reference in the NIRB Notice of Screening for this project dated June 14, 2022 under the 2023 activities of “Transportation, storage and use of up to six (6) 50,000 Litre (L) double walled fuel tanks at the campsite.” However, there is no reference in the actual</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>to 683 drums of JET A, 708 drums of Diesel (P-50) and 2 drums of gasoline.</p> <p>3) In addition to before and after pictures there should be a final inspection sheet signed off by the project manager, or their designate, for each drill hole site.</p> <p>4) When the temporary campsite is removed there should be a final inspection report completed and signed off by the project manager, or their designate, and any contractors responsible for the clean-up.</p> <p>5) In the Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan please add a KivIA contact name and number for Baker Lake and Rankin Inlet for reporting any bear incidents and/or interactions, wolf or fox den sightings and any large herd sightings.</p> <p>Specific KivIA Comments for 2022 and 2023 Activities:</p> <p>2022 Activities:</p> <p>o Activity - A thirty-day program based out of Baker Lake for day trips by a six-person helicopter supported exploration program.</p> <p>Recommendation – have a local monitor to ensure flight rules are followed, in particular, refrain from low level flights near all wildlife, especially caribou.</p> <p>o Activity - Airborne geophysical surveys</p> <p>Recommendation – ensure all flight regulations are followed, in particular, refrain from low level flights near all wildlife, especially caribou.</p> <p>2023 Activities</p> <p>o Activity - Over land transport of camp and exploration-related equipment and supplies to the proposed campsite via sled trains in the Spring of 2023</p> | <p>application of these tanks. The only reference is to 683 drums of JET A, 708 drums of Diesel (P-50) and 2 drums of gasoline.</p> <p>Forum will update the application to reflect the six (6) 50,000 Litre (L) double walled fuel tanks.</p> <p>3) In addition to before and after pictures there should be a final inspection sheet signed off by the project manager, or their designate, for each drill hole site.</p> <p>Forum agrees with this recommendation.</p> <p>4) When the temporary campsite is removed there should be a final inspection report completed and signed off by the project manager, or their designate, and any contractors responsible for the clean-up.</p> <p>Forum agrees with this recommendation.</p> <p>5) In the Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan please add a KivIA contact name and number for Baker Lake and Rankin Inlet for reporting any bear incidents and/or interactions, wolf or fox den sightings and any large herd sightings.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Recommendation – ensure convoys have sufficient spill response materials in the spill kits, up to 1000L</p> <p><i>o Activity</i> - Drilling conducted from June to September</p> <p>Recommendations – ensure drills are equipped with Spill response kits, up to 1000L - Ensure the drill sites and drill cuttings sumps are located a minimum distance of 31 meters from all nearby water sources.</p> <p><i>o Activity</i> - Transportation, storage and use of up to six (6) 50,000 Litre (L) double walled fuel tanks at the campsite</p> <p>Recommendation – ensure to use lined berm with all tanks</p> <p><i>o Activity</i> - Use fuel and lubricants</p> <p>Recommendation – ensure to use lined berms and 2ndary containments where fuel transfer will be conducted</p> | <p>Forum agrees with this recommendation and requests current contact information for the contact name and number.</p> <p>Specific KivIA Comments for 2022 and 2023 Activities:</p> <p>2022 Activities: <i>o Activity</i> - A thirty-day program based out of Baker Lake for day trips by a six-person helicopter supported exploration program.</p> <p>Recommendation – have a local monitor to ensure flight rules are followed, in particular, refrain from low level flights near all wildlife, especially caribou.</p> <p><i>o Activity</i> - Airborne geophysical surveys</p> <p>Recommendation – ensure all flight regulations are followed, in particular, refrain from low level flights near all wildlife, especially caribou.</p> <p>Forum has consulted with the Baker Lake HTO and the KIA CLARC and have committed to contracting wildlife monitors to ensure company compliance with terms and conditions of licenses and permits including, no low-level flights especially near any wildlife including caribou.</p> <p>2023 Activities <i>o Activity</i></p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

- Over land transport of camp and exploration-related equipment and supplies to the proposed campsite via sled trains in the Spring of 2023

Recommendation

- ensure convoys have sufficient spill response materials in the spill kits, up to 1000L

o Activity

- Drilling conducted from June to September

Recommendations

- ensure drills are equipped with Spill response kits, up to 1000L

- Ensure the drill sites and drill cuttings sumps are located a minimum distance of 31 meters from all nearby water sources.

Forum commits to ensuring that overland transport of camp and exploration related equipment and supplied to the proposed campsite via sled trains in the /spring of 2023 have sufficient spills kits, up to 1,000L and that drilling is conducted between June and September.

Drill sites will be equipped with spill response kids, up to 1000L, and Drill sites and drill cutting sumps are located a minimum distance of 31 meters from all nearby water sources.

o Activity

- Transportation, storage and use of up to six (6) 50,000 Litre (L) double walled fuel tanks at the campsite

Recommendation

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | | <p>– ensure to use lined berm with all tanks o Activity - Use fuel and lubricants Recommendation – ensure to use lined berms and 2ndary containments where fuel transfer will be conducted</p> <p>Forum commits to ensuring that lined berms will be used with all tanks, drums fuels and lubricants as secondary containment.</p> | |
| KIA | <p>Kivalliq Inuit Association (July 5, 2022) To: Nunavut Impact Review Board From: Kivalliq Inuit Association Project Proposal Title: Nunavut Uranium Project Proponent: Forum Energy Metals Corp. Location: Kivalliq Region Comments Due By: July 5, 2022 NIRB #: 22EN032 Re: June 20th Public Meeting, Nunamiut Lodge, Baker Lake</p> <p>Forum Energy Metals Corporation held a community consultation in Baker Lake on June 20, 2022. The community consultation was held at the Nunamiut Lodge conference room and a total of 31 members of the public attended. A presentation on the planned 2022 activities related to uranium exploration was given by Forum representatives Rebecca Hunter (Geologist) and Denise Lockett (Community Liaison). The mineral exploration activities are summarized as follows: 2022: A thirty-day program based out of Baker Lake for a six-person helicopter supported exploration program that will consist of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of helicopter for day trips for exploration activities; | <p>Due to Forum representatives inability to respond thoroughly or accurately to the photos in question due to interruptions in the meeting, Forum subsequently has confirmed with the CIRNAC inspector that these photos were not of Forum’s camp but indeed that of another companies camp.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FEMC has not had the opportunity to directly speak with elders who were born in the proposed exploration area but would welcome the opportunity to hear their concerns and stories. 2. FEMC will work closely with the BLHTO to ensure that disturbance to wildlife will not occur. 3. Forum Energy Metals Corp. commits to working within the terms and conditions of their licenses and permits and being a good corporate citizen. | <p>Map https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:2fbcbad0-9c05-3177-b2fa-9c3391796674</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examining drill cores at the previous campsite; • Conduct site investigation on Aberdeen Lake and in the vicinity of Gerhard Lake; • Conduct ground gravity and airborne geophysical surveys; • Bringing fuel, three drills and other camp / exploration related equipment and supplies to Baker Lake by barge in 2022, in advance of building a temporary 20 to 30-person camp in the spring of 2023. <p>Once the Forum presentation was completed, the floor was opened to the public for any questions or concerns they may have. There was very little time between questions for the Forum representatives to answer or comment on any of the questions/comments that were asked. This was due to a small percentage of the public attendees asking the questions and making comments in a very rapid manner, in both English and Inuktitut. A petition opposing the requested exploration project was circulated by one of the attendees which most attendees signed. The same attendee did a short presentation to inform of previous explorations which dated back to about early 2000's. She used photo's that circulated around the meeting room which showed drill casings sticking out of the ground and metal cables on the ground. Some of the photo's showed old camp sites, landmarks left behind to indicate either fishing spots or caribou migration passing the area. The questions and concerns voiced by the public are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have you spoken to the elders who were born on those areas? 2. Also, there are a lot of hunting areas where you will be exploring. Have you spoken to the hunters? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Forum commits to working within the terms and conditions of its licenses and permits, and not negatively impact the land and the water. Forum's activities are a long distance from the Thelon River as shown in the accompanying map. 5. Any uranium discovered during exploration, and subsequent development, will be used as fuel for nuclear power electricity generation. 6. Permission to conduct exploration in Nunavut is granted by the Government of Canada (on Crown Land) and by the Regional Inuit Association's (on Inuit Owned Land). 7. Forum has committed to working closely with the BLHTO to ensure minimal disturbance to all wildlife including caribou and their migration. 8. Please direct Forum to the video that you saw. Uranium mining and nuclear energy are the most highly regulated industries in the world to prevent harm to humans, animals and the environment Uranium mining has been conducted in a safe manner for over 75 years and constantly being updated with new technology. 9. We are not sure where you heard that people have suffered | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>3. We were promised a lot of things by Agnico but they become broken all their promises. Will you guys be doing that as well?</p> <p>4. Uranium is more dangerous than gold which is right by the Thelon River. Will the Thelon River become contaminated by uranium?</p> <p>5. What are you going to use the uranium for?</p> <p>6. Who gave you permission to explore the area?</p> <p>7. The Caribou migrations are being changed by mines and explorations. How will your work change the migration?</p> <p>8. I have seen videos of people getting sick from being exposed to uranium.</p> <p>9. You provided jobs in Saskatchewan and these people have suffered, why aren't they here to talk uranium mining to us?</p> <p>10. The majority of the people here live off the caribou and the migrations have been affected.</p> <p>11. It's also our water source that flows from Aberdeen Lake through Thelon river into Baker Lake than to the Hudson Bay. Water looks clean for now but later down the road will it become contaminated?</p> <p>12. Explain "clean mining".</p> <p>13. The Company doesn't seem to adhere to the Terms and Conditions set out by the government. Your previous company violated Terms and Conditions and reporting. It'll be 10 years this month since those violations have happened. There were drill rod casings that have been left behind. When will these be removed?</p> <p>14. Does NTI, KIA or other levels of government come to your sites to inspect them?</p> <p>15. Once you open the orange areas indicated on the map, you are going to change caribou migration routes. We need caribou. We don't always want to rely on store bought food.</p> | <p>by Forum's hiring of local First Nations workers. At some point in time, we would be pleased to initiate a dialogue between First Nations in Saskatchewan and the Inuit in Nunavut.</p> <p>10. (not a question but a statement)</p> <p>11. FEMC commits to adhering to the terms and conditions of its licenses and permits and to not negatively impacting the land, the wildlife, and the water. Every effort will be made to avoid any contamination. Forum's activities are a long distance from the Thelon River as shown in the accompanying map.</p> <p>12. We think the question was in response to Forum's view that uranium provides "Clean Energy". Clean Energy means that energy from uranium to produce electricity does not emit carbon dioxide like the burning of fossil fuels such as diesel for the generation of electricity that contribute to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>13. Unfortunately the annual reports for 2017 and 2018 were not submitted to the NIRB during a period of inactivity in Nunavut on the project. These reports have now been submitted. In addition, it took couple of years to cut the drill casings down to ground level at the previous</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>16. Was the public informed of the work put in place?</p> <p>17. It is very important that the public is informed.</p> <p>18. Once mining for uranium, how is it transported?</p> <p>19. Who did you guys talk to in order to explore the areas?</p> <p>20. Jobs for who? Southerners? Why not hire locally?</p> <p>21. If the uranium gets into our waters, will it affect the fish as well?</p> <p>22. I know radiation can be detected, how much more radiation will there be from the drill holes? It can affect a lot of stuff.</p> <p>23. When you are done drilling, does it become a quarry to store drill cores?</p> <p>24. Which is more dangerous in mining? Gold? or uranium?</p> <p>25. Some companies have started and proceeded without proper authorization, will it be the case here too?</p> <p>26. Is there asbestos in uranium?</p> <p>27. Can animals digest uranium that has contaminated the ground?</p> <p>28. What does radioactive mean?</p> <p>29. Are you going on radio shows as some elders can't always attend public meetings?</p> <p>30. It is your responsibility to inform everyone.</p> <p>31. Uranium is used in nuclear power, what do you do when the reactors break down to do a clean up?</p> <p>32. Will there be local employment? How many?</p> <p>33. Can you give clarification as to how many locals will be hired for the season?</p> <p>34. How do we comment on Forum's permit application?</p> | <p>exploration site, and the Company is committed to not allow that to happen again. (The commenter was confused between Forum's site and that of another company's site shown in pictures distributed at the meeting by Joan Scottie. It was subsequently determined by CIRNAC that these photos were not of Forum's previous camp.)</p> <p>14. Yes, CIRNAC and KIA both conduct inspections. NTI does if the company is exploring on IOL subsurface land.</p> <p>15. The Company has committed to working with the BLHTO to limit the disturbance to all wildlife including caribou. Only a very small area in the "orange area" will be explored on as shown on the accompanying map.</p> <p>16. No work has begun. Forum Energy Metals Corp. is proposing exploration activities and is consulting with regulators and the community first.</p> <p>17. Agreed and the Company also commits to ongoing information exchange with the community via local liaison officers.</p> <p>18. Once uranium is taken out of the ground, it is processed on site in a concentrator- all similar activities as gold mining. The uranium concentrate is stored in</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>35. If there is an earthquake in Baler Lake will uranium leak out of the drill holes?</p> <p>36. Will you train the local people that work for you?</p> <p>37. If uranium gets into the Thelon River will our fish have uranium in them?</p> <p>38. Does uranium leave the rocks and go into the air?</p> <p>39. The NIRB, NWB, Feds and KIA all have meetings and speak for Baker Lake but these organizations don't ask the residents of Baker Lake what they want.</p> | <p>45-gallon barrels and shipped overland and by sea to the customer, usually a company that generates electricity.</p> <p>19. The Company applies to CIRNAC for exploration activities on Crown Land, and the KIA/NTI for exploration on IOL (surface and subsurface)</p> <p>20. FEMC is committed to hiring and training local employees during its exploration activities.</p> <p>21. Firstly, uranium in rock will not affect the fish. Secondly, mining activities are controlled so that when mined, it does not get into the water. Thirdly, when the uranium is processed all the uranium is removed from the rock and any remaining rock or water from the processing is regulated before release to the environment.</p> <p>22. If uranium is found in the drill core, it is stored in a core storage facility on site. If the radiation from the core exceeds limits set by regulation, it will be removed and shipped to a facility in Saskatchewan. Every drill hole is filled with cement.</p> <p>23. We do not understand what the commenter means by quarry. The core is stored on racks in a core storage area on site until the next drill program is started and more core is added to the core storage racks.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>24. Mining for uranium is done in the same fashion as for gold or copper or nickel. Because uranium is radioactive, the regulations for protection of the environment are much more stringent, thus making uranium mining as dangerous as mining gold.</p> <p>25. Forum plans to conduct its exploration activities under all regulations set out by CIRNAC on Crown Land, and the KIA/NTI for exploration on IOL (surface and subsurface)</p> <p>26. No asbestos and uranium are different. There is no asbestos found in a uranium deposit or used for mining.</p> <p>27. That would depend on the level of contamination. All regulations for the exploration, development and production of uranium are strictly regulated to prevent contamination. There is uranium in some concentration everywhere in soil, fresh water, seawater and rock.</p> <p>28. Radioactivity is a naturally occurring property of certain atoms that transform into other atoms by emitting radiation in the form of alpha, beta or gamma particles. Natural radioactivity occurs in many things including rainwater, seawater, milk, fish, the human body and the bodies of animals.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

29. That's a great suggestion.

30. Agreed and there is always room for improvement.

31. Forum is a uranium exploration company that has been exploring for uranium for 18 years and before that, management has been involved in uranium exploration for 45 years. The company has expertise in the safe handling of uranium at the exploration stage. This is a question for a nuclear energy physicist and/or engineer.

32. Forum will indeed require local workers for mobilization of equipment, camp construction, core technicians, driller helpers, camp maintenance, camp cook's helpers, wildlife monitors. Forum will be seeking Community Liaison Officers to keep the community informed of its activities. The company is still formulating its plans for the quantity of workers required but can estimate 10 to 15 temporary and full time workers during the exploration season.

33. See 32 above. Given a successful program, there could be more in the future.

34. Through NIRB (address provided)

35. No

36. Yes, we would like to train core technicians to work with

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>the geologists and helpers for the drillers.</p> <p>37. FEMC commits to adhering to the terms and conditions of its licenses and permits and to not negatively impacting the land, the wildlife, and the water. Every effort will be made to avoid any contamination. Forum's activities are a long distance from the Thelon River as shown in the accompanying map, so the likelihood of any uranium getting into the Thelon River and contaminating fish is negligible. As pointed out in the response to question 28, fish have natural radioactivity in them.</p> <p>38. No uranium does not leave the rocks and go up in the air. The radiation that is emitted from uranium does go into the air.</p> <p>39. Statement not a question.</p> | |
| <p>Maggie Qaqimat Perkison</p> | <p>Maggie Qaqimat Perkison (July 5, 2022) The Forum Energy Metals Company that wants to make a proposal to extract uranium from the our community Baker Lake, Nu. Me and my grandfather Thomas Qaqimat are concerned about all these areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -significant public concerns. -significant adverse eco systemic or social economic effects. -significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities. <p>My grandfather Thomas (age 92) was raised in that area Aberdeen. He says that our community was always concerned when companies would try make proposals to extract uranium since the 1980's.</p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. thanks Ms. Perkison and her grandfather for their comments, and for Ms. Perkison's attendance at the Public Meeting held on June 20, 2022, in Baker Lake.</p> <p>Whereas, we understand and appreciate the concerns raised, Forum believes that they can conduct exploration activities in a way that respects the wildlife the water, and the land.</p> | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>There answer was always no because they wanted to protect the eco system and social economic effects of the animals and land which in return would have significantly effect the Inuit who go camping and hunt for wildlife. My grandfather said that there is an abundance of wildlife in that area. There is also a big caribou herd that migrates that way and circles around Baker Lake area. And another concern is that we get our main drinking water from the lake that comes from the Thelon River which is connected to the Aberdeen area. Yes, the companies say they will be very careful when extracting uranium from the land but my grandfather said that the wind will surely pick up the uranium and spread it around the land and water.</p> <p>If this were to go ahead, where are we going to go if our land, animals and drinking water get effected? Who will buy us a new community? Who will buy us new homes? Who will support our businesses that help us function as a community? Who will buy us schools for our children?</p> <p>This will effect everyone and everything for us and that's not fair. It's easier to say no to a company because they won't loose anything. They can look else where. This is our community, our life, our animals. It's not a work place, it's our home.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to listen to me and my grandfather Thomas Qaqimat concerns.</p> <p>Maggie Perkison</p> | <p>Forum has proposed working closely with the BLHTO by contracting local wildlife monitors who will have the authority to shut down any exploration activities if wildlife are in the area. In addition, the Company has stated that they will abide by all terms and conditions of any licences and permits including the KIA's Mobile Mitigation Measures.</p> <p>The Company proposed to bring elders and community as well as regulatory officials to the project site so that they can see how the company is operating and to provide any feedback and advice. Forum wants to work closely with the Hamlet, the HTO and the KIA CLARC to ensure that mitigation measures are identified to reduce any impact on the wildlife, the land and ensure that there is no contamination into the water.</p> | |
| <p>Paula Kinjugalik Hughson</p> | <p>Paula Kinjugalik Hughson (July 5, 2022) Kangirjuap Kuunga/Thelon River and Akulliqpaaq Qamaniq/Aberdeen Lake and surrounding area is an important landscape to Inuit who not only consider the community as home (recent in the last 60 years) but the land surrounding (all</p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. would like to thank Paula Kinjugalik Hughson for her thoughtful comments and her attendance and participation in the meeting with Hamlet as well</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Inuit lived on the landscape and still do to hunt, to rejuvenate their mind body and spirit, to connect with the land and all it gives; fresh air, clean water, fish, birds, wildlife and connection to spirit) – this is especially important to Inuit who have family ties to these landscapes, recreation travelers (paddlers or ecotourists) and wildlife/fish/birds who call this home and so much more.</p> <p>Uranium exploration/mining/milling/decommissioning leads to a domino effect for the whole region which will forever negatively be impacted by the uranium industry; piece by piece,</p> <p>permit by permit, lease by lease with uranium companies “owning” the land with permits that were not properly consulted with the people of the area with no regard to those who came before them; our ancestors and who we are today: Akillinirmiut, Qairnirmiut, Haunigtuurmiut, Hanningayuqmiut, Ukkuhiksalingmiut, Harvaqtuurmiut and Paalirmiut to name a few.</p> <p>Land management regulatory system in Nunavut is not inclusive for the general public and most Inuit as they are not aware of the colonial Fee Simple land distribution system that is in place in Nunavut to hand out land that Inuit have occupied and have long connections, bonds, associations and share with wildlife/fish/birds and habitat. Land managers for: NPC, Government of Canada/Government of Nunavut, NTI and KIA do not disseminate or consult with the communities in person to learn if these activities are wanted or not in their backyard, it is left to the regulatory</p> | <p>as the Public Meeting held on Jun 20, 2022, in Baker Lake.</p> <p>As comments raised were with regards to Land Claims Organizations and Institutes of Public Government, it is not appropriate for the Company to comment on, other than to recommend that they all work together with Nunavumiut on resolving outstanding issues.</p> <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. has stated and strongly feels that they can work together with the HTO, and the KIA CLARC to ensure that the exploration activities are conducted in a manner that respects the wildlife, the water, the land, and the environment. No low-level flights will be allowed. Wildlife monitors will have the authority to suspend activities until wildlife have moved an authorized distance away and no activities will take place during the annual migration.</p> <p>CIRNAC and KIA inspectors will likely monitor activities closely and they, as well as community leaders, the HTO and KIA CLARC members will be invited to inspect activities to ensure that they are comfortable with the proposed project.</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>system which is very colonial and foreign to most people in the communities. It is more invisible with online staking and such for land resource extraction. Input from mining industry, mining industry lobbyists or business – economic aspect/mining on the other hand to the land in question have more say than those who live here all year round because industry knows this colonial system which is skewed to their terms from the start of the regulatory process. The general public and Inuit are left on the side lines and left to catch up but lose in the end because major decisions are made on their behalf without meaningful and proper consultation or discussions regarding these contentious issues. Staking claims by industry is part of the fee entry system and applies to all land in Nunavut where applicable and eventually exploration for minerals, bulk sampling/advanced exploration, feasibility studies, environmental assessments, permitting, mine construction, mine operation, tailings, smelting, decommissioning: regulatory system. This system is not in sync with Inuit worldview or at the community level where industry can change “land” staked by different companies without consulting the people who are most impacted at the landscape level not the shareholders who live the majority live outside of Nunavut and even outside the country of Canada. Most times Inuit who live and use the area in question learn about the activity long after the permits have been long approved with aircraft or machinery suddenly in their hunting or camping grounds. Land</p> | <p>No hazardous waste will be disposed of in the Baker Lake landfill but will be transported to an approved facility for proper disposal.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>resource managers for Nunavut are part of this issue too as they do not come to the communities to properly consult and learn what the community wants. A minimum threshold must be established where there is community support at least 85% for uranium activity for example. Article 32 has not been implemented for Inuit societal worldview for mineral industry. It is not only the economic “benefit” that will benefit the majority outside Nunavut but leave us with the mess as money will not buy back clean air, water, habitat for caribou or other wildlife, fish or birds.</p> <p>The NPC 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan gives EXISTING RIGHTS to mineral/exploration/mining companies who stake claims. In this draft plan NPC are giving land to outsiders and they have more rights than Inuit who have lived and occupied these lands for generations and generations; Inuit rights to say yes or no to mineral extraction companies holding permits/leases to lands Inuit have rights to are not true because NTI, KIA, NPC and other Land resource managers have not properly consulted Inuit and communities regarding these activities or resource extraction.</p> <p>Investment in our people through education from K to 12 and college and university where Inuit are the majority employed at all levels of jobs/careers in the mining industry. This could be engineers, chemistry technicians, biologists, nurses, doctors, tailings pit engineers, geologists and the list goes on. This will not happen right away and will likely take at least 50 to 100 years</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>and that is ok because the minerals are not going anywhere. We as Inuit will be in a much better position to negotiate our precious land resources and be more equal at the negotiating table.</p> <p>Water Quality: Kangirjuap Kuunga/Thelon River and Akulliqpaaq Qamaniq/Aberdeen Lake and the whole water system/drainage basin draining into Baker Lake is an important drinking water source for the community of Baker Lake.</p> <p>Terrain: the habitat is important to wildlife especially the Beverly/Qamanirjuaq Caribou herd. Waste from uranium exploration, bore holes, radiation equipment, radiative wastewater and other waster from exploration all contribute negatively to the landscape, people, wildlife and environment.</p> <p>Air Quality: Radon gas from bore holes is a major concern over time especially when sites are left because the site are not “productive” enough for the company.</p> <p>Noise Disturbance: Air traffic from helicopters, airplanes transporting drill rigs or crew or supplies and grid work to learn what the earth material composition. To winter transport of materials that can disturb wildlife and with pockets of activity taking place over time and with other projects ongoing, the cumulative effects can be detrimental to wildlife and Inuit who rely on this wildlife.</p> <p>Caribou: the Beverly/Qamanirjuaq Caribou herd is our last precious resource that must be held in the upmost regard in terms of protecting habitat, lifecyle of caribou use of the</p> | | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>landscape, protecting water crossings and ensure more are protected as they change due to outside influence especially increased activity from aircraft or ships. Caribou are increasingly more and more important as food insecurity is very prevalent in Nunavut. Qamani'tuaq is the only inland Inuit community and caribou is a very important food source which also provides clothing and warmth during the harsh winter months.</p> <p>Fish: fish is an important food source for Qamani'tuaq as it is the only inland Inuit community in Nunavut. The people rely on fish as a food source. Fresh water, habitat and environment are required to keep this important food source available.</p> <p>Uranium: the whole start to finish of this mineral; from exploration, to mining, milling, mine operation, tailings, decommissioning, transportation and all aspects needs proper inclusion community level input and consultation with an Inuit worldview input. The footprint of this activity is large and not just the permit or lease site; its from site to shipping and beyond.</p> <p>NIRB Areva Hearing: I asked NTI/KIA at the hearing for information regarding IOLs pertaining to BL parcels and surrounding areas as I wanted to know why they were selected as per the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement article 17.1.2. (a), (b), (c) and (d). I received information from NTI about CH which is Coral Harbour, but that was all. I wanted to see the documents as they are part of our living history. These</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>organizations represent me as an Inuk and I want to know what they are saying and negotiating on my behalf and if it is best for us or not. I have yet to hear from NTI or KIA regarding this question and try to find on their website what decisions have been made on my behalf. Communication at the community level is nonexistent and use the regulatory process to promote their initiatives without properly consulting their electorate is what I see at the community level.</p> <p>Waste Management: waste management permits are issued for disposal at local landfills. Where are the supporting documents that the local landfill will accept the waste from the project; combustible waste, grey water, non-combustibles, sewage and hazardous wastes. Hazardous waste is to be disposed of a facility that is capable of this, but it is not outlined where, by what method, how it will be stored and timeline to leave the community landfill for further storage south.</p> <p>Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for this application?</p> <p>Do not permit this project as uranium is still a very contentious issue in Nunavut that has not been properly consulted with Inuit at the community level by all land resource managers (NTI, KIA. Government of Canada, Government of Nunavut, NPC) who use the fee simple nonrenewable resource system to communicate this nonrenewable</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>resource in which the general public is not familiar with or aware of at the community level. Meetings and decisions are made on their behalf without meaningful and proper consultation.</p> <p>Article 32 of the NLCA has not been properly adhered to by all parties of land management in Nunavut as social issues are very integral to this issue</p> <p>Do you support the project proposal? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Any additional comments?</p> <p>This project and all uranium projects should NOT proceed.</p> <p>Uranium mineral exploration and/or extraction and/or processing have not properly informed Inuit at the community level by land managers (NPC, government of Canada, Government of Nunavut, NTI, KIA) or consulted Inuit or communities and the regulatory system has been manipulated to have this activity proceed and have a positive conformity in Nunavut without true Inuit community level participation or understanding of the issue.</p> <p>Land permits/leases should not have been permitted by regulatory system by all permit/lease issuers without properly consulting the communities with a majority being Inuit and Inuit who have ties to areas of exploration, and not big business or lobbyists of this industry. Money and promises of jobs will not buy back our habitat for wildlife or landscapes</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|
| | <p>that are not only for minerals but everything else we cherish.</p> | | |
| <p>GN</p> | <p>GN Department of Culture and Heritage (July 5, 2022) The proponent intends to carry out a two-year (2022-2023) exploration program on various claims and leases in the vicinity of Aberdeen and Gerhard Lakes. The project is located approximately 90 km from Baker Lake. The proposed land use activities include drilling, the use of helicopters for daily activities, the use of snowcats for the overland transport of equipment, the building of a temporary camp and associated components (incinerator, fuel storage, ect.). A search of the Nunavut Archaeological Site Database indicates that there are one hundred sixtyfive (165) recorded archaeological sites within the boundaries of the proposed exploration areas. Specifically, large concentrations of sites are found in the immediate vicinity of proposed Camp A, on the northern shore of Aberdeen</p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. (FEMC) thanks the Government of Nunavut, Department of Culture and Heritage for their recommendations that since” <i>no systematic archaeological surveys have been conducted in the proposed exploration areas and that the potential for the presence of archaeological sites is high the Department of Culture and Heritage recommends that a field archaeological assessment program be initiated prior to any land disturbance activities”</i>. FEMC agrees with this recommendation and has</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>Lake and throughout the Orano claim. This however does not preclude the presence of unidentified sites or cultural features as to this day no systematic archaeological reconnaissance has been conducted in this specific area. Several archaeological sites are reported on exploration properties nearby. The project area may potentially yield significant archaeological/cultural resources as it is geographically located at the intersection of both the Beverley and Ahiak and Qamanirjuaq caribou herd ranges. The vast interconnecting system of rivers and lakes also points out to the high potential for archaeological/cultural resources of the area. Thus, the Department of Culture and Heritage considers that there are reasonable grounds to believe that there could be sites of archaeological significance on the lands affected by the current project (NA 33.5.12). SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS A Class 2 Archaeology Permit is required from the Department of Culture and Heritage. On the basis that no systematic archaeological surveys have been conducted in the proposed exploration areas and that the potential for the presence of archaeological sites is high the Department of Culture and Heritage recommends that a field archaeological assessment program be initiated prior to any land disturbance activities. CH recommendations are the following: 13 Page GN Comments for Forum Energy Metals Corp.'s "Nunavut Uranium Project" Proposal. (1) A qualified archaeologist must apply for a Class 2 permit in order to conduct a field archaeological assessment of any areas subject to ground disturbance activities; (2) Assessment of any drilling locations (50 m radius) and water-hose route to the closest water intake; (3) Assessment of any proposed camp locations and associated components; (4) Assessment of the overland route to be used</p> | <p>contracted a company to conduct the field archaeological assessment this year.</p> | |
|--|---|---|--|

| | | | |
|--------|--|---|--|
| | <p>for the transportation of equipment; (5) The Department of Culture and Heritage recommends that the applicant avoids conducting activities in the vicinity (50 m buffer zone) of archaeological/historical sites. If archaeological sites or features are encountered, activities should immediately be interrupted and moved away from this location. Each site encountered needs to be recorded and reported to our office. All archaeological and palaeontological sites in Nunavut are protected by law. The applicant must understand that it is their responsibility to ensure that no heritage resource sites are disturbed in the course of their activities. No person shall alter, or otherwise disturb an archaeological site, or remove any artifact from an archaeological site. Moreover, the building of inuksuit is not recommended.</p> | | |
| CIRNAC | <p>Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC) July 5, 2022</p> <p>CIRNAC 1: Environmental Impacts The Proponent has not identified the possible negative environmental impacts associated with physical scarring and land disturbance at the camp and drilling sites, use of drilling fluids, and uranium specific impacts (radioactive dust). Additionally, the Proponent has identified positive and negative non-mitigatable impacts on the physical, biological and socio-economic components in the “identification of Environmental Impacts” matrix, but has not provided any commentary justifying how these impacts are classified as “positive” or “non-mitigatable”.</p> <p>CIRNAC recommends that the Proponent identifies, and proposes mitigation measures for, any negative environmental impacts that may result from physical scarring and land disturbance at the camp and drilling sites,</p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. thanks CIRNAC for their helpful comments and suggestions.</p> <p>FEMC will clarify and provide more justification to possible negative environmental impacts as well as positive and negative non-mitigatable impacts on the physical, biological and socio-economic components in the “identification of Environmental Impacts” matrix.</p> <p>In addition, FEMC will provide rationale on “<i>why impacts on some physical components (e.g., designated environmental areas, ground stability, permafrost, water quality) and socio-economic</i></p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>generation of radioactive dust, and use of drilling fluids. Additionally, CIRNAC recommends that the Proponent provides a rationale why impacts on some physical components (e.g., designated environmental areas, ground stability, permafrost, water quality) and socio-economic components (e.g., community wellness and human health) are characterized as positive while impacts on most biological components (vegetation, wildlife, birds, aquatic species, and wildlife protected areas) are classified as “negative and nonmitigable”.</p> <p>CIRNAC 2: Potential for positive effects to Inuit through employment, training, and procurement opportunities CIRNAC recommends that the Proponent prioritize the employment and training of local Inuit as well as procurement with Inuit-owned businesses when implementing project activities. Such efforts will allow for positive effects to be realized by community members and the local Inuit population. As a result, Inuit and Inuit-owned businesses situated in Baker Lake should be prioritized in any project-related employment, training, and procurement opportunities that may be made available.</p> <p>CIRNAC 3: Consultation with interested parties CIRNAC recommends that the Proponent consult with the Hamlet of Baker Lake and the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization. Issues that should be considered as part of any consultation activities should include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Incorporation of Inuit knowledge and Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit into project activities; ☑ Mitigation measures designed to prevent any disturbance to wildlife and the environment; | <p><i>components(e.g., community wellness and human health) are characterized as positive while impacts on most biological components(vegetation, wildlife, birds, aquatic species, and wildlife protected areas) are classified as “negative and non mitigable”</i></p> <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. has in the past, as Forum Uranium, and proposes again to utilize local contractors, businesses as well as local employment whenever possible. FEMC has established a good business relationship in the community and looks forward to learning of any new businesses they should contact. On-the-job training at the exploration camp will be implemented to attract more local employees.</p> <p>Community Consultation meetings with the Hamlet of Baker Lake, a Public Meeting as well as separate meetings with the BLHTO and the KIA CLARC were held in Baker Lake during the week of June 20, 2022. At the meetings, the Company committed to contracting local Wildlife Monitors through the BLHTO who will have the authority to suspend exploration</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ The experience of community members who participate in traditional and nontraditional activities within or in close proximity to the project area; ☑ Training and employment opportunities for community members; ☑ Procurement opportunities for local businesses, and ☑ Regular updates on the status of project activities. <p>CIRNAC 4: Potential identification of archaeological and/or paleontological resources CIRNAC recommends that the Proponent contact the Government of Nunavut's Department of Culture and Heritage to determine if any actions are needed to ensure the protection of Nunavut's archaeological and paleontological resources. The Department of Culture and Heritage oversees the protection and management of heritage resources in Nunavut, in partnership with land claim authorities, regulatory agencies, and the federal government. It would be able to provide any needed guidance or direction to the Proponent.</p> <p>CIRNAC 5: Annual Report If the project is approved, CIRNAC recommends that the Proponent be required to submit Annual Reports to the NIRB which provide updates on its implementation of project-specific terms and conditions included in a Screening Decision Report, compliance with regulatory authorizations, and community engagement activities, including interactions with the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization. This practice of providing timely monitoring and reporting information would support the NIRB and interested parties' understanding of the Proponent's management of project activities.</p> | <p>activities should wildlife be in the area.</p> <p>Additional follow up meetings are proposed as well as ongoing measures to contract local community liaisons to help provide timely advice to the community regarding exploration activities.</p> <p>FEMC looks forward to engaging elders in the community, especially those who were born in the proposed exploration area to learn of their experiences, knowledge and how best to incorporate Qaujimajatuqangit into project activities.</p> <p>The company agrees with the GN, Department of Culture and Heritage's recommendation of an archaeological field assessment prior to any surface disturbance.</p> <p>Annual Reports will be submitted to the NIRB, NWB and the KIA including updated on project-specific terms and conditions, inspections, and community engagement activities as well as local hiring and business activities.</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| | <p>It would also provide an opportunity to seek clarification from the Proponent on its implementation of measures to prevent, minimize, and manage any ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts associated with its project.</p> <p>CIRNAC appreciates the opportunity to provide comments and looks forward to working with the NIRB and the Proponent throughout any further review phases related to this project. Should you have any questions, please contact Courtney White by e-mail at courtney.white@canada.ca or David Abernethy at (867) 222-1610 or email at david.abernethy@canada.ca.</p> | | |
| ECCC | <p>Government of Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) July 5, 2022</p> <p>Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) has reviewed the information submitted to the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) regarding the above-mentioned screening.</p> <p>ECCC is providing technical, science-based information and knowledge based on our mandate pursuant to the <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act</i>, the pollution prevention provisions of the <i>Fisheries Act</i>, the <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act</i>, and the <i>Species at Risk Act</i>. These comments are intended to inform the assessment of this project's potential effects in the receiving environment and on valued ecosystem components. Any comments received from ECCC in this context does not relieve the proponent of its obligations to respect all applicable federal legislation. The following comments are provided:</p> <p>1. Drill Cutting Disposal</p> | <p>Forum Energy Metals Corp. would like to that ECCC for their thoughtful suggestions and comments.</p> <p><u>Drill Cutting Disposal</u> FEMC will correct the discrepancy between the handling of uranium cuttings in the Waste Management Plan, and the Abandonment and Reclamation Plan including clarity on: Monitoring of radiation levels can reliably be done in real time and we will provide more details on handling and disposal of radioactive drill cuttings;</p> <p>details of measurement techniques available for identifying drilling wastes requiring segregation and disposal due to radioactivity</p> <p><u>Drill Site Scans</u> ECCC recommends before final inspection of the drill sites, that a Geiger counter scan (gamma scan)</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Reference(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Waste Management Plan; Table 2.1: Non - hazardous (Inert) Wastes ☑ Abandonment and Reclamation Plan; Ongoing Operations, Seasonal Abandonment, Final Abandonment and Restoration Plans – Ongoing Operations – Drill Hole Locations <p>Comment</p> <p>The Waste Management Plan states that disposal of drill cuttings will depend on uranium mineralization; if uranium mineralization is encountered the cuttings in sumps will be scanned to determine the gamma radiation levels. Cuttings with levels above 1 uSv/h at a height of 1 m will be collected and shipped to an appropriate disposal location. The cuttings will already be in a sump, and removal will be done after they have been deposited. This will result in double handling of the cuttings and leave a disturbed surface which could be vulnerable to thermal erosion and surface erosion, as well as containing residual radioactive cuttings.</p> <p>This contradicts the practices outlined in the Abandonment and Restoration Plan which states: “If uranium mineralization is encountered in a drill hole and down hole conditions are such that drill return circulation persists, a drill cuttings separator will be employed to remove the radioactive material from the drilling fluids. Drill mud solids or cuttings with uranium concentration greater than 0.05 per cent must be collected pending completion of the hole at which time they will be disposed down the drill hole and sealed by grouting the upper 30 metres of bedrock.”</p> <p>Dealing with any radioactive cuttings at source as described represents a more efficient and</p> | <p>and radon gas scan be conducted at the drill holes that encountered uranium mineralization in order to ensure radiation levels do not pose any danger.</p> <p>FEMC will use a scintillometer gamma scan as Geiger counters have been old technology for over 50 years. We do not feel that radon gas scans are necessary at each drill site as this is not standard industry practice. All drill holes are cemented at the bedrock/overburden interface and if radioactivity is encountered in the drill hole, the entire hole is cemented.</p> <p><u>Species at Risk:</u> ECCC Recommendation(s) As species are assessed and listed on a regular basis, ECCC recommends the Proponent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consult the Species at Risk registry to obtain the most current information for their operations. b) Consult the Government of Nunavut to identify appropriate mitigation and/or monitoring measures to avoid and lessen project effects to species under their management responsibility. <p>Forum thanks ECCC for their recommendation and links and the current Species at Risk table and will update the Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan with this information.</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>proactive approach. It is unclear if monitoring of radiation levels can reliably be done in real time.</p> <p>ECCC Recommendation(s) ECCC requests clarification be provided on: ☑ handling and disposal of radioactive drill cuttings. ☑ details of measurement techniques available for identifying drilling wastes requiring segregation and disposal due to radioactivity.</p> <p>2. Drill Site Scans</p> <p>Reference(s) ☑ Abandonment and Reclamation Plan; Ongoing Operations, Seasonal Abandonment, Final Abandonment and Restoration Plans – Ongoing Operations – Drill Hole Locations</p> <p>Comment The Abandonment and Restoration Plan states: “Any drill hole that encounters mineralization with uranium content greater than 1.0 per cent over a length of more than 1.0 metre, and with a meter-per-cent concentration greater than 5.0, will be sealed by grouting over the entire length of the mineralization zone and not less than 10 meters above or below each mineralization zone. The top 30 meters of the hole within bedrock will also be sealed by grouting once any radioactive cuttings and sludge have been disposed down the hole... A final inspection of the site will ensure that there is no remaining material at the site upon completion of the drill hole.” During restoration of the drill site after completion of drilling, it may be necessary to conduct gamma and radon gas scans of the drill holes that contain uranium mineralization in order to ensure that there are no residual radiation issues. It is likely where uranium</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

mineralization is present, radon-222 would also be present at corresponding levels; the radon gas scan would be useful to detect the tightness of the grouting.

ECCC Recommendation(s)

ECCC recommends before final inspection of the drill sites, that a Geiger counter scan (gamma scan) and radon gas scan be conducted at the drill holes that encountered uranium mineralization in order to ensure radiation levels do not pose any danger.

3. Species at Risk

Reference(s)

☑ Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan

Comment

Species at risk are assessed by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) or added to Schedule 1 of *Species at Risk Act* (SARA) on a regular basis. It is important for Proponents to ensure they are aware of what species are present in the project area and take appropriate actions to ensure compliance with the SARA. The killing, harming or harassing of listed species as well as the damage and destruction of their residences is prohibited under SARA. In the territories, the prohibitions apply to:

☑ Threatened, Endangered and Extirpated species listed on Schedule 1 of SARA on ECCC and Parks Canada lands¹

☑ Migratory Birds (as defined under the *Migratory Birds Convention Act* (MBCA)) everywhere they are found.

1 SARA s.35

(1) Sections 32 and 33 apply in each of the territories in respect of a listed wildlife species only to the extent that the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, makes

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>an order providing that they, or any of them, apply. Exception (2) Subsection (1) does not apply (a) in respect of individuals of aquatic species and their habitat or species of birds that are migratory birds protected by the Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994; or (b) on land under the authority of the Minister or the Parks Canada Agency.</p> <p>The destruction of critical habitat of species listed under Schedule 1 of SARA is prohibited on all lands identified within the critical habitat protection order for the species.</p> <p>ECCC Recommendation(s) As species are assessed and listed on a regular basis, ECCC recommends the Proponent: a) Consult the Species at Risk registry to obtain the most current information for their operations. b) Consult the Government of Nunavut to identify appropriate mitigation and/or monitoring measures to avoid and lessen project effects to species under their management responsibility.</p> <p>4. Species at Risk Missing and/or Effects and Measures Missing</p> <p>Reference(s) ☑ Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan</p> <p>Comment Section 79 of SARA requires the assessor and decision body to ensure that where a project is likely to affect a listed species or its critical habitat, all adverse effects of the project are identified and considered in the assessment of the project. Appropriate measures must be taken to avoid or lessen those effects and include monitoring.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Measures should be consistent with applicable recovery documents.</p> <p>Section 79 applies to all listed species on schedule 1 of SARA including those listed as Special Concern, Threatened, Endangered, and Extirpated.</p> <p>The Proponent has not identified all species at risk that are likely to be present in the project area; and the status of all of the identified species at risk have not been provided. The Proponent has not identified adverse effects of the Project on identified species at risk specifically.</p> <p>As a matter of best practice, COSEWIC-assessed species should be assessed similar to those listed under SARA.</p> <p>The Table below lists species that may be encountered in the Project area that have been designated as at risk by COSEWIC as well as their current listing on Schedule 1 of SARA (and designation if different from that of COSEWIC). This list may not include all species identified as at risk by the territorial government. As species are assessed and listed on a regular basis, consult the Species at Risk registry to maintain the most current information.</p> | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

APPENDIX B: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT

Due to the requirements of Section 79(2) of the Species at Risk Act (SARA), and the potential for project-specific adverse effects on listed wildlife species and its critical habitat, measures should be taken as appropriate to avoid or lessen those effects, and the effects need to be monitored. Project effects could include species disturbance, attraction to operations and destruction of habitat. This section applies to all species listed on Schedule 1 of SARA, as listed in the table below, or have been assessed by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), which may be encountered in the project area. This list may not include all species identified as at risk by the Territorial Government. The following points provide clarification on the applicability of the species outlined in the table.

- Schedule 1 is the official legal list of Species at Risk for SARA. SARA applies to all species on Schedule 1. The term “listed” species refers to species on Schedule 1.
- Schedule 2 and 3 of SARA identify species that were designated at risk by the COSEWIC prior to October 1999 and must be reassessed using revised criteria before they can be considered for addition to Schedule 1.
- Some species identified at risk by COSEWIC are “pending” addition to Schedule 1 of SARA. These species are under consideration for addition to Schedule 1, subject to further consultation or assessment.

If species at risk are encountered or affected, the primary mitigation measure should be avoidance. The Proponent should avoid contact with or disturbance to each species, its habitat and/or its residence. All direct, indirect, and cumulative effects should be considered. Refer to species status reports and other information on the species at risk Registry at <http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca> for information on specific species.

Monitoring should be undertaken by the Proponent to determine the effectiveness of mitigation and/or identify where further mitigation is required. As a minimum, this monitoring should include recording the locations and dates of any observations of species at risk, behaviour or actions taken by the animals when project activities were encountered, and any actions taken by the proponent to avoid contact or disturbance to the species, its habitat, and/or its residence. This information should be submitted to the appropriate regulators and organizations with management responsibility for that species, as requested.

For species primarily managed by the Territorial Government, the Territorial Government should be consulted to identify other appropriate mitigation and/or monitoring measures to minimize effects to these species from the project.

Mitigation and monitoring measures must be undertaken in a way that is consistent with applicable recovery strategies and action/management plans.

Schedules of SARA are amended on a regular basis so it is important to check the SARA registry (www.sararegistry.gc.ca) to get the current status of a species.

Updated: September 2019

| Terrestrial Species at Risk ² | COSEWIC Designation | Schedule of SARA | Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility ³ |
|---|---------------------|------------------|---|
| Migratory Birds | | | |
| Buff-breasted Sandpiper | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) |
| Common Nighthawk | Threatened | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Eskimo Curlew | Endangered | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Harlequin Duck | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Harris's Sparrow | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Horned Grebe | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Ivory Gull | Endangered | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Olive-sided Flycatcher | Threatened | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Peregrine Falcon | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Red Knot Islandica Subspecies | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Red-necked Phalarope | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Ross's Gull | Threatened | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Rusty Blackbird | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Short-eared Owl | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Vegetation | | | |
| Porsild's Bryum | Threatened | Schedule 1 | Government of Nunavut (GN) |
| Arthropods | | | |
| Transverse Lady Beetle | Special Concern | No Schedule | GN |
| Terrestrial Wildlife | | | |
| Caribou (Dolphin and Union Population) | Endangered | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Caribou (Barren-ground Population) | Threatened | No Schedule | GN |
| Caribou (Torngat Mountains Population) | Endangered | No Schedule | GN |
| Grizzly Bear (Western Population) | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Peary Caribou | Endangered | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Polar Bear | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Wolverine | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Marine Wildlife | | | |
| Atlantic Walrus (High Arctic Population) | Special Concern | No Schedule | Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) |
| Atlantic Walrus (Central/Low Arctic Population) | Special Concern | No Schedule | DFO |
| Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound Population) | Threatened | Schedule 1 | DFO |
| Beluga Whale (Eastern Hudson Bay Population) | Endangered | No Schedule | DFO |

² The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has responsibility for aquatic species.

³ Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) has a national role to play in the conservation and recovery of Species at Risk in Canada, as well as responsibility for management of birds described in the Migratory Birds Convention Act (MBCA). Day-to-day management of terrestrial species not covered in the MBCA is the responsibility of the Territorial Government. Populations that exist in National Parks are also managed under the authority of the Parks Canada Agency.

| Terrestrial Species at Risk² | COSEWIC Designation | Schedule of SARA | Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility³ |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic-Baffin Bay Population) | Special Concern | No Schedule | DFO |
| Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay Population) | Special Concern | No Schedule | DFO |
| Fish | | | |
| Atlantic Cod (Arctic Lakes Population) | Special Concern | No Schedule | DFO |
| Fourhorn Sculpin (Freshwater Form) | Data Deficient | Schedule 3 | DFO |
| Lumpfish | Threatened | No Schedule | DFO |
| Thorny Skate | Special Concern | No Schedule | DFO |

**APPENDIX C: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND
CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS**



INTRODUCTION

The Department of Culture and Heritage (CH) routinely reviews land use applications sent to the Nunavut Water Board, Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. These terms and conditions provide general direction to the permittee/proponent regarding the appropriate actions to be taken to ensure the permittee/proponent carries out its role in the protection of Nunavut’s archaeological and palaeontological resources.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- 1) The permittee/proponent shall have a professional archaeologist and/or palaeontologist perform the following **Functions** associated with the **Types of Development** listed below or similar development activities:

| | Types of Development (See Guidelines below) | Function (See Guidelines below) |
|----|---|--|
| a) | Large scale prospecting | Archaeological/Palaeontological Overview Assessment |
| b) | Diamond drilling for exploration or geotechnical purpose or planning of linear disturbances | Archaeological/Palaeontological Overview Assessment and/or Inventory and Documentation and/or Mitigation |
| c) | Construction of linear disturbances, Extractive disturbances, Impounding disturbances and other land disturbance activities | Archaeological/Palaeontological Overview Assessment and/or Inventory and Documentation and/or Mitigation |

Note that the above-mentioned functions require either a Nunavut Archaeologist Permit or a Nunavut Palaeontologist Permit. CH is authorized by way of the *Nunavut and Archaeological and Palaeontological Site Regulations*⁴ to issue such permits.

⁴P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

- 2) The permittee/proponent shall not operate any vehicle over a known or suspected archaeological or palaeontological site.
- 3) The permittee/proponent shall not remove, disturb, or displace any archaeological artifact or site, or any fossil or palaeontological site.
- 4) The permittee/proponent shall immediately contact CH at (867) 934-2046 or (867) 975-5500 should an archaeological site or specimen, or a palaeontological site or fossil, be encountered or disturbed by any land use activity.
- 5) The permittee/proponent shall immediately cease any activity that disturbs an archaeological or palaeontological site encountered during the course of a land use operation until permitted to proceed with the authorization of CH.
- 6) The permittee/proponent shall follow the direction of CH in restoring disturbed archaeological or palaeontological sites to an acceptable condition. If these conditions are attached to either a Class A or B Permit under the Territorial Lands Act Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada directions will also be followed.
- 7) The permittee/proponent shall provide all information requested by CH concerning all archaeological sites or artifacts and all palaeontological sites and fossils encountered in the course of any land use activity.
- 8) The permittee/proponent shall make best efforts to ensure that all persons working under its authority are aware of these conditions concerning archaeological sites and artifacts and palaeontological sites and fossils.
- 9) If a list of recorded archaeological and/or palaeontological sites is provided to the permittee/proponent by CH as part of the review of the land use application the permittee/proponent shall avoid the archaeological and/or palaeontological sites listed.
- 10) Should a list of recorded sites be provided to the permittee/proponent, the information is provided solely for the purpose of the proponent's land use activities as described in the land use application, and must otherwise be treated confidentially by the proponent.

Legal Framework

As stated in Article 33 of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)*:

Where an application is made for a land use permit in the Nunavut Settlement Area, and there are reasonable grounds to believe that there could be sites of archaeological importance on the lands affected, no land use permit shall be issued without written consent of the Designated Agency. Such consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. [33.5.12]

Each land use permit referred to in Section 33.5.12 shall specify the plans and methods of archeological site protection and restoration to be followed by the permit holder, and any other conditions the Designated Agency may deem fit. [33.5.13]

Palaeontology and Archaeology

Under the *Nunavut Act*⁵, the federal government can make regulations for the protection, care and preservation of palaeontological and archaeological sites and specimens in Nunavut. Under the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*⁶, it is illegal to alter or disturb any palaeontological or archaeological site in Nunavut unless permission is first granted through the permitting process.

Definitions

As defined in the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*, the following definitions apply:

“archaeological site” means a place where an archaeological artifact is found.

“archaeological artifact” means any tangible evidence of human activity that is more than 50 years old and in respect of which an unbroken chain of possession or regular pattern of usage cannot be demonstrated, and includes a Denesuline archaeological specimen referred to in section 40.4.9 of the Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement).

“palaeontological site” means a site where a fossil is found.

“fossil” includes:

Fossil means the hardened or preserved remains or impression of previously living organisms or vegetation and includes:

- (a) natural casts;*
- (b) preserved tracks, coprolites and plant remains; and*
- (c) the preserved shells and exoskeletons of invertebrates and the preserved eggs, teeth and bones of vertebrates.*

Guidelines for Developers for the Protection of Archaeological Resources in the Nunavut Territory

(Note: Partial document only, complete document at: www.ch.gov.nu.ca/en/Archaeology.aspx)

Introduction

The following guidelines have been formulated to ensure that the impacts of proposed developments upon heritage resources are assessed and mitigated before ground surface altering activities occur. Heritage resources are defined as, but not limited to, archaeological and historical sites, burial grounds, palaeontological sites, historic buildings and cairns. Effective collaboration between the developer, the Department of Culture, and Heritage (CH), and the contract archaeologist(s) will ensure proper preservation of heritage resources in the Nunavut Territory. The roles of each are briefly described.

CH is the Nunavut Government agency which oversees the protection and management of heritage resources in Nunavut, in partnership with land claim authorities, regulatory agencies, and

⁵ s. 51(1)

⁶ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

the federal government. Its role in mitigating impacts of developments on heritage resources is as follows: to identify the need for an impact assessment and make recommendations to the appropriate regulatory agency; set the terms of reference for the study depending upon the scope of the development; suggest the names of qualified individuals prepared to undertake the study to the developer; issue an archaeologist or palaeontologist permit authorizing field work; assess the completeness of the study and its recommendations; and ensure that the developer complies with the recommendations.

The primary regulatory agencies that CH provides information and assistance to are the Nunavut Impact Review Board, for development activities proposed for Inuit Owned Lands (as defined in Section 1.1.1 of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)*), and the Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, for development activities proposed for federal Crown Lands.

A developer is the initiator of a land use activity. It is the obligation of the developer to ensure that a qualified archaeologist or palaeontologist is hired to perform the required study and that provisions of the contract with the archaeologist or palaeontologist allow permit requirements to be met; i.e. fieldwork, collections management, artifact and specimen conservation, and report preparation. On the recommendation of the contract archaeologist or palaeontologist in the field and the Government of Nunavut, the developer shall implement avoidance or mitigative measures to protect heritage resources or to salvage the information they contain through excavation, analysis, and report writing. The developer assumes all costs associated with the study in its entirety.

Through his or her active participation and supervision of the study, the contract archaeologist or palaeontologist is accountable for the quality of work undertaken and the quality of the report produced. Facilities to conduct fieldwork, analysis, and report preparation should be available to this individual through institutional, agency, or company affiliations. Responsibility for the curation of objects recovered during field work while under study and for documents generated in the course of the study as well as remittance of artifacts, specimens and documents to the repository specified on the permit accrue to the contract archaeologist or palaeontologist. This individual is also bound by the legal requirements of the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*.

Types of Development

In general, those developments that cause concern for the safety of heritage resources will include one or more of the following kinds of surface disturbances. These categories, in combination, are comprehensive of the major kinds of developments commonly proposed in Nunavut. For any single development proposal, several kinds of these disturbances may be involved

- *Linear disturbances: including the construction of highways, roads, winter roads, transmission lines, and pipelines;*
- *Extractive disturbances: including mining, gravel removal, quarrying, and land filling;*
- *Impoundment disturbances: including dams, reservoirs, and tailings ponds;*

- *Intensive land use disturbances: including industrial, residential, commercial, recreational, and land reclamation work, and use of heritage resources as tourist developments.*
- *Mineral, oil and gas exploration: establishment of camps, temporary airstrips, access routes, well sites, or quarries all have potential for impacting heritage resources.*

Types of Studies Undertaken to Preserve Heritage Resources

Overview: An overview study of heritage resources should be conducted at the same time as the development project is being designed or its feasibility addressed. They usually lack specificity with regard to the exact location(s) and form(s) of impact and involve limited, if any, field surveys. Their main aim is to accumulate, evaluate, and synthesize the existing knowledge of the heritage of the known area of impact. The overview study provides managers with baseline data from which recommendations for future research and forecasts of potential impacts can be made. A Class I Permit is required for this type of study if field surveys are undertaken.

Reconnaissance: This is done to provide a judgmental appraisal of a region sufficient to provide the developer, the consultant, and government managers with recommendations for further development planning. This study may be implemented as a preliminary step to inventory and assessment investigations except in cases where a reconnaissance may indicate a very low or negligible heritage resource potential. Alternately, in the case of small-scale or linear developments, an inventory study may be recommended and obviate the need for a reconnaissance.

The main goal of a reconnaissance study is to provide baseline data for the verification of the presence of potential heritage resources, the determination of impacts to these resources, the generation of terms of reference for further studies and, if required, the advancement of preliminary mitigative and compensatory plans. The results of reconnaissance studies are primarily useful for the selection of alternatives and secondarily as a means of identifying impacts that must be mitigated after the final siting and design of the development project. Depending on the scope of the study, a Class 1 or Class 2 Permit is required for this type of investigation.

Inventory: A resource inventory is generally conducted at that stage in a project's development at which the geographical area(s) likely to sustain direct, indirect, and perceived impacts can be well defined. This requires systematic and intensive fieldwork to ascertain the effects of all possible and alternate construction components on heritage resources. All heritage sites must be recorded on Government of Nunavut Site Survey forms. Sufficient information must be amassed from field, library and archival components of the study to generate a predictive model of the heritage resource base that will:

65. allow the identification of research and conservation opportunities;
66. enable the developer to make planning decisions and recognize their likely effects on the known or predicted resources; and
67. make the developer aware of the expenditures, which may be required for subsequent studies and mitigation. A Class 1 or 2 permit is required.

Assessment: At this stage, sufficient information concerning the numbers and locations of heritage resources will be available, as well as data to predict the forms and magnitude of impacts. Assessments provide information on the size, volume, complexity and content of a heritage resource, which is used to rank the values of different sites or site types given current archaeological knowledge. As this information will shape subsequent mitigation program(s), great care is necessary during this phase.

Mitigation: This refers to the amelioration of adverse impacts to heritage resources and involves the avoidance of impact through the redesign or relocation of a development or its components; the protection of the resource by constructing physical facilities; or, the scientific investigation and recovery of information from the resource by excavation or other method. The type(s) of appropriate mitigative measures are dictated by their viability in the context of the development project. Mitigation strategies must be developed in consultation with, and approved by, the Department of Culture and Heritage. It is important to note that mitigation activities should be initiated as far in advance of the construction of the development as possible.

Surveillance and monitoring: These may be required as part of the mitigation program.

Surveillance may be conducted during the construction phase of a project to ensure that the developer has complied with the recommendations.

Monitoring involves identification and inspection of residual and long-term impacts of a development (i.e. shoreline stability of a reservoir); or the use of impacts to disclose the presence of heritage resources, for example, the uncovering of buried sites during the construction of a pipeline.