



SCREENING DECISION REPORT
NIRB FILE No.: 26EN014

NPC File No.: 150613

May 20, 2026

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board’s (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Bayridge Resources Corp’s “Baker Basin 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*).

Screening Decision and Recommendation

After reviewing the project proposal, comments, and responses received during screening, the NIRB has determined that Bayridge Resources Corp’s “Baker Basin Project” may proceed without a review, provided the Proponent complies with the project-specific terms and conditions set out by the NIRB pursuant to s. 92(2)(a) of the *NuPPAA*.

During the screening process, the NIRB received comments and concerns related to potential impacts to caribou and associated habitat, cumulative regional exploration activity, traditional land use, cultural and archaeological protection, and uranium exploration activities within the region. The NIRB also notes that the scope of this screening applies only to a single-season, early-stage mineral exploration program. Any future advanced exploration, development, or mining activities would require separate review and assessment through the applicable regulatory processes.

On this basis, the Board has concluded that, if carried out in accordance with the recommended project-specific terms and conditions, applicable regulatory requirements, and Proponent commitments, the Baker Basin Project is not likely to result in significant adverse ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts. The NIRB therefore recommends that the responsible Minister accept this Screening Decision Report together with the recommended project-specific terms and conditions outlined herein.

OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....	2
PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	2
ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF <i>NUPPAA</i>	10
VIEWS OF THE BOARD	15
RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS	21
MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.....	26
OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
CONCLUSION	31
TABLES	
TABLE 1: NIRB’S ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	3
TABLE 2: COMMENTS RECEIVED	4
TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS S. 90 <i>NuPPAA</i>	10
TABLE 4: PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS CONSIDERED.....	14
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT	32
APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS	34

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

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*. The purpose of screening is provided for under Article 12, Section 12.4.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 88 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 indicating one of three options:

- (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.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

On February 20, 2026, the NIRB received a referral to screen Bayridge Resources Corp’s “Baker Basin Project” project proposal (NIRB File No: 26EN014) from the Nunavut Planning Commission (Commission), with an accompanying positive conformity determination with the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan. All documents received and pertaining to this project proposal can be accessed from the NIRB’s Public Registry by using any of the following search criteria or www.nirb.ca/project/126353.

- Project Name: Baker Basin Project
- NIRB File No.: 26EN014

- NIRB Application No.: 126353

Table 1: NIRB’s Assessment Process

Date	Stage
February 20, 2026	Receipt of project proposal and positive conformity determination (Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan) from the Commission
February 20, 2026	Pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> the NIRB requested the Proponent complete an online application to address information required for Screening
March 11, 2026	Receipt of online application from Proponent
March 16, 2026	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
March 16, 2026	Public engagement and comment request was issued in English with translations provided once available
April 6, 2026	Receipt of public comments (later extended to April 13, 2026)
April 14, 2026	Proponent provided with an opportunity to address comments/concerns raised by public
April 27, 2026	Proponent responded to comments/concerns raised by public
April 27, 2026	Pursuant to Article 12 s 12.4.5 of the <i>Nunavut Agreement</i> and s. 92(3) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> , an extension to the 45-day timeline for the provision of the Board’s Report was requested from the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs
May 20, 2026	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

1. Project Scope

Location	Kivalliq region, approximately 64 km southeast of Baker Lake (Qamani’tuaq)
Objective	The Proponent intends to conduct a single-season of mineral exploration, targeting uranium, including geological mapping, prospecting, ground-based radiometric surveys, and diamond drilling programs supported by daily fly-in/fly-out to a temporary historic exploration outpost.
Timeline	June 8, 2026, to August 29, 2026 (single season exploration)

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

- Access sites on a daily fly-in/fly-out basis from Baker Lake using fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft. Limited overland transportation activities may occur using snowmobiles or ATVs.
- Establish a small temporary exploration outpost at a previously disturbed site to support up to six (6) personnel.
- The temporary exploration outpost may include canvas tents for core logging, emergency shelter, and equipment storage.

- Conduct early-stage exploration, targeting uranium, which include geological mapping, prospecting, ground-based radiometric surveys, verification of historic drill hole locations, and review of historic drill core.
- Use of a diamond drill for up to 3,500 meters of cores.
- Use of generators, water pumps, and an incinerator to support field operations.
- Store fuel and hazardous goods (oil, coolant, hydraulic fluid, and calcium chloride) near the temporary outpost with secondary containment.
- Greywater and drill water would be contained in sumps, while all other wastes would be backhauled to approved disposal facilities.
- All drill sites and sumps would be progressively reclaimed, and all infrastructure would be removed at the conclusion of the field season.

2. 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 will proceed with screening the project based on the scope as described above.

3. Public Comments and Concerns

As outlined in Table 1 above, notices regarding the NIRB’s screening of this project proposal were distributed to community organizations as well as to relevant federal and territorial government agencies, Inuit organizations and other parties with a request for interested parties to provide the Board with any comments or concerns 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 April 13, 2026, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

Table 2: Comments Received

Commenting Party	NIRB Doc ID No.
Kivalliq Inuit Association (KivIA)	360583
Government of Nunavut (GN)	360747
Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)	360667
Transport Canada (TC)	360170
A. Andreassen 1 (Public Comment)	360606
A. Andreassen 2 (Public Comment)	360607
Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB)	360770
Ghotelnene K’odtineh Dene (GKD)	360605

a. Summary of Comments and Concerns Received

The following provides a summary of the comments and concerns received by the NIRB in relation to the Baker Basin Project:

KivIA

- States that the Proponent must have caribou protection measures in place from May 15 to July 15, and after that date mobile protection measures apply.

GN

Requests that the Proponent:

- Clarify on the proposed overland hauling activities.
- Update their Wildlife Plan to provide details about how raptor and non-migratory bird nests, as well as terrestrial mammals and their dens, would be avoided and protected during project activities
- Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager, Wildlife Monitor, and other personnel with respect to reporting wildlife encounters, deciding where to establish of wildlife buffers, when to stop or start work, determining when an animal residence is inactive, and reporting incidents to regulatory agencies.
- Provide a copy of the Spill Contingency Plan, Radiation and a Hazard Control Plan for review with the application.
- Confirm that all waste streams would be classified, segregated, labelled, stored, transported, treated, and disposed of in accordance with the GN's Environmental Guidelines: General Management of Special and Hazardous Waste.
- Confirm that all waste removed from the Project area will be transported to authorized recycling or disposal facilities, and that waste tracking, manifests, and disposal records would be retained and made available to GN regulators upon request.
- Commit to maintaining records of waste management training, incinerator operation, inspections, and monitoring, and to implementing the Waste Plan in coordination with other applicable Project management plans.
- Revise the Spill Plan to include a reference to the Regulations, ensure that information required per the Regulations is included, and clearly reference Schedule B to ensure spills are reported when necessary.
- In the Abandonment and Restoration Plan, clarify how site inspections would be conducted and how inspection results would be documented. And describe the procedure that would be followed if evidence of contamination is identified, including assessment of the extent of contamination and implementation of appropriate cleanup or remediation measures.
- Noted that proposed terrestrial ground disturbance activities may result in impacts to archaeological resources, and that a chance-find protocol is not considered a substitute for a prior archaeological assessment, including at previously disturbed historic exploration sites.
- The Department of Culture and Heritage recommends that the Proponent consult directly with Culture and Heritage on archaeological permitting and regulatory review processes prior to any ground disturbance, including any requirements of archaeological assessment, avoidance, buffering, monitoring, mitigation, and chance-find response.

CIRNAC

Recommends the following:

Regarding fuel storage and spill response:

- Demonstrating that secondary containment capacity is sufficient to contain at least 110% of the volume of the largest fuel container, with allowance for precipitation and snowmelt.
- Aligning the spill response capacity with credible worst-case spill scenarios at the outpost and drill sites.
- Updating the spill response plan to include descriptions of handling and disposition of contaminated materials generated during a spill response.

Regarding waste management:

- Demonstrating sump/trench capacity, siting, and operation remain effective under field conditions.
- Describing a water-quality verification approach capable of detecting potential changes in receiving environments, including baseline characterization where practicable and monitoring at representative locations.
- Undertaking sump inspection, maintenance, and end-of-season closure to maintain containment and limit seepage.

Regarding acid rock drainage/metal leaching (ARD/ML):

- Identifying whether ARD/ML is expected based on-site geology/history and state what field screening or sampling would be used where uncertainty exists.

Regarding consultation with interested parties:

- Engaging with potentially interested parties on its project proposal including the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization, the Hamlet of Baker Lake, the Kivalliq Inuit Association, the Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dene (GKD), and any other relevant organizations or individuals.
- Further states that the Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dene have traditionally used and occupied these lands since time immemorial and continue to maintain a presence and connection to these lands today. Recommends the Proponent consult with GKD if not already done so.

TC

- Advises the use of the Navigation Protection Program (NPP) Project Review Tool to self-assess if any approval is required under the Canadian Navigable Waters Act.

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

The following provides a summary of the comments and concerns received by the NIRB in relation to the Baker Basin Project, with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge:

A. Andreassen 1 (Public Comment)

- Raised concerns regarding limited consultation and the lack of adequate incorporation of Inuit knowledge, traditional hunting areas, migration routes, and archaeological information into project planning.
- Expressed concern that community members opposed disturbances near the Kazan River area due to caribou migration patterns and environmental concerns, including impacts to water and food security.
- Identified concerns that aircraft activity and exploration activities may disturb caribou migration and harvesting opportunities relied upon by the community for country food.
- Referenced the historical opposition of Inuit in Baker Lake to uranium exploration and mining activities and noted concerns regarding impacts to traditional land use and caribou movement.
- Raised concerns regarding the protection of archaeological and cultural resources and referenced the importance of Inuit involvement in the protection and conservation of archaeological sites under Article 33 of the Nunavut Agreement.
- Referenced Truth and Reconciliation and expressed opposition to further uranium exploration activities within traditional Inuit land use areas.

A. Andreassen 2 (Public Comment)

- Reiterated opposition to the proposed uranium exploration program and raised concerns regarding potential impacts to wildlife, water, traditional land use, human health, and food security.
- Noted concerns that exploration activities are a precursor to future uranium mining activities and may increase risks to caribou migration routes and Inuit harvesting opportunities relied upon for food security.
- Highlighted concerns regarding cultural and archaeological protection and the need for extensive engagement with Inuit Heritage Trust and Inuit knowledge holders.
- Referenced historical Inuit opposition to uranium exploration and mining in the Baker Lake region and concerns regarding aircraft disturbance to caribou migration routes.

BQCMB

- Raised concerns regarding overlap with sensitive Qamanirjuaq caribou calving, post-calving, and summer habitat, including concerns related to project timing, aircraft activity, monitoring and mitigation measures, harvesting impacts, and cumulative regional exploration activity.
- To address the listed concerns, BQCMB recommends the following:
 - Give substantial weight in screening to the project's overlap with Qamanirjuaq calving, post-calving and summer habitat.
 - Assess the proposal in the context of the broader pattern of exploration and development across the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq ranges, rather than treating it as an isolated project.
 - If NIRB determines that future consideration of the proposal is warranted, require the Proponent to work with Baker Lake and relevant Indigenous organizations to hire Indigenous wildlife monitors to observe caribou presence and movement, inform on-the-ground decisions, and support accountability to communities. As well as require the Proponent to clearly identify who has the authority to stop, delay, or relocate activities when caribou are present, what situation would trigger those

measures, and how wildlife interactions and responses will be recorded and communicated. And require the Proponent to minimize helicopter and fixed-wing activity as much as possible and to avoid aircraft activity when caribou are present or moving through the area.

- Continue engagement with affected communities and rights holders: the Proponent should continue direct engagement with Baker Lake and with Indigenous organizations and rights holders whose harvesting and caribou use may be affected by the project
- Do not support the approval of this project due to its overlap with sensitive Qamanirjuaq calving, post-calving, and summer habitat, the likelihood of disturbance from the scale and type of proposed activity, and ongoing cumulative effects concerns.

GKD

- State that they have and continue to harvest Beverly/Qamanirjuaq caribou throughout their traditional territory (Nunavut, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and the Northwest Territories) and have Section 35 rights throughout this area.
- The activities described in the Project may result in significant adverse impacts to caribou and their habitat as the Project is in the calving and post-calving grounds of the Qamanirjuaq herd. The Project timeline overlaps with these seasons. They do not have the confidence in the effectiveness of the Proponents proposed adaptive measures for caribou protection.
- Also, of concern to GKD is the need for greater assessment of the cumulative impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, particularly caribou. They list a number of projects in the area that may contribute to cumulative effects on disturbance to caribou.
- Expressed concern that there does not appear to be an effective framework for the identification and assessment of cumulative impacts to caribou resulting from existing and reasonably foreseeable projects within the Beverly/Qamanirjuaq herd range.
- State that the activities described in this Project proposal may result in significant adverse impacts on the ecosystem, wildlife, wildlife habitat, and the harvesting activities of Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dene and other Indigenous peoples, as well as other potential socio-economic effects on Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dene.
- Do not support this project Proposal.

5. Proponent's Response to Public Comments and Concerns

Due to the comments, and questions received from parties, the NIRB provided an opportunity for the Proponent to respond. The following is a summary of the Proponent's response to concerns:

Response to TC

- The Proponent would assess the navigability of any waterbodies proposed for water withdrawal using TC's NPP Project Review Tool.

Response to GKD

- Understand that the project area overlaps with caribou calving and post-calving habitat and that timing of activities is a key concern, in response to feedback, the 2026 exploration program has been revised such that higher impact activities, including diamond drilling,

are planned to occur after mid-July to reduce potential interactions during calving and early post-calving periods.

- The proposed program has been designed as a low-impact, helicopter-supported exploration program with no overland access, no permanent camp, and a limited duration. Additional mitigation measures include real-time monitoring, wildlife observers, defined buffer distances, and stop-work protocols where caribou are present.
- Acknowledges the importance of understanding broader regional pressures on the Beverly/Qamanirjuaq herd, with respect to cumulative effects. Will comply with all applicable regulatory requirements and will continue to engage with regulators and rights holders regarding cumulative effects.
- Remains committed to ongoing engagement with GKD and other Indigenous groups, and to adjusting activities where feasible in response to concerns raised.

Response to KivIA

- The 2026 exploration program has been revised such that higher-impact activities are planned to occur after mid-July to align with this timing and reduce potential interactions during calving and early post-calving periods.
- Activities will be planned and implemented to align with applicable Nunavut Land Use Plan requirements, permit conditions, and caribou protection measures, including the application of mobile protection measures and stop-work protocols where caribou are present.

Response to A. Andreassen

- Recognizes the importance of caribou to the Baker Lake community and the role of country food in supporting food security, culture, and traditional practices.
- Reiterates above responses regarding changed plans based on feedback.
- Clarifies that the proposed activities are early-stage exploration only, and do not include mining, processing, or development of permanent infrastructure. Any future phases of development would be subject to separate regulatory review.
- Acknowledges the importance of cultural and archaeological protection and will comply with all applicable requirements, including engagement with appropriate authorities such as Inuit Heritage Trust, where required.

Response to CIRNAC

- Has updated the Spill Contingency Plan, Waste Management Plan, and Abandonment and Restoration Plan to accommodate to the comments.
- Significant acid rock drainage or metal leaching potential is not anticipated; however, the Project will apply a precautionary approach. Field observations will be used to identify materials that may require additional handling. Any materials requiring special management will be handled in accordance with the Waste Management Plan and Radiation Hazard Control Plan.
- Recognizes the importance of engagement with interested parties and mentions early engagement has begun with various parties. Is committed to ongoing engagement and to incorporating Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, Indigenous knowledge, and local knowledge into project planning and implementation where feasible.

- Engagement has been focused on the Baker Lake community and local Inuit organizations, is committed to engaging with GKD and other potentially interested parties as appropriate as the project advances and in coordination with regulatory processes.

Response to BQCMB

- Recognizes the importance of the Qamanirjuaq herd and its calving and post-calving habitat to Indigenous communities and long-term herd sustainability.
- Reiterates above responses regarding changed plans based on feedback. As well as managing aircraft activity to avoid wildlife and adjusting or suspending operations where caribou are present. References the Wildlife Management Plan which includes defined monitoring protocols, roles and responsibilities, buffer distances, and stop work triggers.
- Acknowledges the importance of cumulative effects and broader regional pressures on the Qamanirjuaq herd, and clarifies that as an early-stage, temporary exploration program, the Project is limited in scope and duration.
- Reiterates their commitment to ongoing engagement.

Response to GN

- Has updated project descriptions reflecting the changes as no overland hauling will occur, all project access and logistics will be helicopter-supported.
- Has updated the Wildlife Management Plan to provide additional requested information regarding raptor and non-migratory bird nests, terrestrial mammals and dens, and the roles and responsibilities of specific personnel.
- Has updated the Waste Management Plan to provide additional requested information regarding the General Management of Special and Hazardous Waste from the GN guidelines. Has also included supporting plans such as the Spill Contingency Plan and Radiation Hazard Control Plan. Confirms that all waste will be managed, transported, and disposed of in accordance with applicable GN guidelines, and records will be maintained and made available to regulators as required.
- Has updated the Spill Contingency Plan to provide additional requested information regarding applicable GN spill contingency planning and reporting requirements.
- Has updated the Abandonment and Restoration Plan to clarify inspection procedures, documentation of results, and response measures, as well as assessment and remediation actions.
- Will comply with all applicable requirements under the Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations and will engage with GN Department of Culture and Heritage.

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. Table 3. The Board took particular care to consider Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

Table 3: Summary of the Board’s Assessment of Factors s. 90 *NuPPAA*

Factor	Comment
<p>The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The physical footprint of the proposed project would be localized within the project claim area, approximately 64 km southeast of Baker Lake (Qamani'tuaq). Direct impacts primarily would be associated with drilling sites, the temporary camp, and aircraft flight paths. ▪ The proposed project would take place within habitats of far-ranging wildlife species such as the Beverly Qamanirjuaq caribou herd, migratory and non-migratory birds, Arctic mammals, and Species at Risk such as Polar Bears.
<p>The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While no site-specific sensitive features were identified within the immediate physical footprint of proposed drilling and temporary infrastructure areas, portions of the broader project claim area overlap with Qamanirjuaq caribou calving and post-calving habitat identified in the Wildlife Management Plan. ▪ The broader ecological context is considered sensitive due to seasonal wildlife movements, important wildlife habitat, and overlapping exploration activity in the region. Activities occurring during sensitive wildlife periods may result in greater ecological effects and therefore require enhanced mitigation.
<p>The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project. However, the GN Department of Culture and Heritage noted that terrestrial ground disturbance activities may result in potential impacts to archaeological resources. ▪ The temporary camp would be located at a previously disturbed historic exploration site. However, previous disturbance does not remove the requirement for archaeological consideration and applicable regulatory requirements. ▪ The Project is located within a region used for ongoing Inuit and Indigenous traditional land use activities, including harvesting and travel. Although no confirmed archaeological sites have been identified within the project footprint, the potential for undocumented archaeological or culturally significant resources cannot be excluded.
<p>The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Due to the remote location of the proposed project, it is unlikely to result in direct impacts to local human populations.

Factor	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wildlife species potentially affected by the proposed activities include caribou, migratory and non-migratory birds, and other wildlife species sensitive to disturbance. Potential effects to wildlife are expected to be temporary and localized; however, disturbance during migration and calving, and post-calving periods may increase the potential for disturbance effects. ▪ The broader region also supports Inuit and Indigenous communities that rely on wildlife, particularly caribou, for subsistence, harvesting, and cultural purposes. Indirect effects may occur if wildlife movement, behaviour, or availability is altered as a result of project activities.
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The primary potential impacts are associated with temporary disturbance resulting from aircraft activity, drilling operations, and outpost presence. The magnitude of direct habitat alteration is expected to be low and spatially limited; however, indirect disturbance effects (e.g., noise and human presence) may extend beyond the immediate project footprint. ▪ The likelihood of wildlife disturbance may increase during sensitive seasonal periods, particularly migration and calving, if activities overlap spatially and temporally with wildlife presence. ▪ Impacts would occur intermittently during active operations and are anticipated to be short-term in duration. ▪ Most potential effects are considered reversible following demobilization and site restoration. ▪ 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.
<p>The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Table 4 is a list of past, present and reasonably foreseeable mineral exploration projects within the broader region. While the Baker Basin Project individually represents a temporary and limited disturbance, the proposed activities would occur within an active regional exploration environment. ▪ Incremental disturbance from multiple projects operating within overlapping migration routes and seasonal habitats may contribute to cumulative behavioural effects on wildlife. Accordingly, cumulative effects remain a relevant consideration in assessing the overall significance of impacts.

Factor	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Board recommended terms and conditions along with mitigation measures designed with consideration for the potential for cumulative effects in the Board Views section.
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engagement with community members, Indigenous organizations, and the consideration of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit (IQ), Indigenous knowledge, and community knowledge remain important considerations in project planning, mitigation, adaptive management, and wildlife protection measures, particularly with respect to caribou habitat, harvesting activities, and cumulative effects concerns identified during the screening process.

Regulatory Requirements

The Proponent is also advised that the following legislation may apply to the Project:

Acts and Regulations

1. The *Fisheries Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/F-14/index.html>).
2. The *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-28.8/>).
3. The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/>), the *Migratory Birds Regulations* (https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,_c._1035/index.html) and the *Migratory Bird Sanctuary Regulations* (https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,_c._1036/index.html).
4. The *Species at Risk Act* (<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/s-15.3/>). Attached in **Appendix A** is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut.
5. The *Wildlife Act (Nunavut)* and its corresponding regulations (<http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html>).
6. The *Nunavut Act* (<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**.
7. The *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/t-19.01/>) and the *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations* (<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/clear-tofc-211.htm>).
8. The *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/>).

The Proponent is advised that the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* 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.

9. The incineration of combustible camp wastes shall comply with the *Canadian Wide Standards for Dioxins and Furans* (https://www.ccme.ca/en/resources/air/dioxins_furans.html), and the *Canadian Wide Standards for Mercury* (<https://www.ccme.ca/en/resources/air/mercury.html>).
10. The *Aeronautics Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-2/>) and the *Canadian Aviation Regulations* (<https://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/acts-regulations/regulations-sor96-433.html>).

Other Applicable Guidelines

11. Solid Waste Management for Northern and Remote Communities (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2017) (<https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/managing-reducing-waste/municipal-solid/environment/northern-remote-communities.html>).
12. The Canadian Guidelines for the Management of Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/health-risks-safety/canadian-guidelines-management-naturally-occurring-radioactive-materials.html>.
13. Environmental Guideline for the Burning and Incineration of Solid Waste, Government of Nunavut, Revised January 2012 (https://www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/guideline_burning_and_incineration_of_solid_waste_2012.pdf).
14. Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Contaminated Sites, Department of the Environment, Government of Nunavut, Revised December 2014 (https://www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/contaminated_sites_remediation_2014.pdf).
15. 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).

Table 4: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects Considered

NIRB Project Number	Project Title	Project Type
<i>Proposed Developments – undergoing assessment</i>		
25EA090	Whale Cove Project Camp and Regional Exploration Expansion	Mineral Exploration
<i>Present Projects – approved or in operation</i>		
25EN084	Angilak Property	Mineral Exploration
26EN012	Cache Zone 2026	Mineral Exploration
25EN080	Hook Lake Project	Mineral Exploration
25EN025	Nut Lake Project	Mineral Exploration
26EN006	Victory Lake	Mineral Exploration
<i>Past Projects</i>		
17EN029	Gibson MacQuoid Project	Mineral Exploration
17EA068	Huckleberry Claim	Mineral Exploration

NIRB Project Number	Project Title	Project Type
17EN020	Meadowbank Precious Metal Project	Mineral Exploration
22EN032	Nunavut Uranium Project	Mineral Exploration
11EN016	NxGold's Kuulu Project	Mineral Exploration
16EN049	Tagak	Mineral Exploration
24EN052	Thelon Property	Mineral Exploration
17EA068	Whale Cove Area, Exploration Projects	Mineral Exploration
24EN039	Yath Property	Mineral Exploration
18EN033	Tugak Gold Project	Mineral Exploration
17EN044	Witch Lake Claim Staking	Mineral Exploration

VIEWS OF THE BOARD

At the outset, the Board notes some of the public concern expressed is based on general opposition to uranium exploration and concern that the exploration program will lead to uranium mining. These general concerns were also presented to the Board during the Board's previous assessments of similar projects. As there is currently no moratorium or other type of land use limitation for these types of activities in the region, the NIRB is tasked with assessing the potential for negative environmental and socio-economic impacts associated with this Project Proposal specifically as proposed. Several commenters expressed concern if the early exploration activities proposed in this proposal were to be allowed to proceed, a potential uranium mine project would inevitably follow. The Board emphasizes the scope of the activities proposed in this Project Proposal are limited to exploration activities only and do not include mining activities. If the Proponent were to decide in future to advance the Project Proposal to develop a mine, assessment of the full scope of activities associated with developing, operating, closing and reclaiming a uranium mine would be triggered and would be subject to a new NIRB impact assessment.

In reviewing the factors outlined above during the Board's screening of the Project Proposal, the Board has identified a series of specific issues. Below is a summary of the Board's views and conclusions regarding the potential for the Project Proposal to have significant negative impacts. The NIRB has also proposed terms and conditions that would prevent, mitigate and adaptively manage the potential for adverse impacts. The NIRB has recommended terms and conditions that require the proponent to monitor and report to the NIRB as the project progresses. These requirements ensure all commitments are fulfilled, mitigation measures remain effective, terms and conditions are properly implemented, and potential impacts are identified and adaptively managed.

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and 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 from disturbance and disruption of movement from project-related noise, including the

	<p>temporary outpost site, drilling, exploration and air transportation activities.</p> <p>In combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities in the region, the Project may contribute incrementally to cumulative disturbance within wildlife habitat and tundra ecosystems.</p>
Nature of Impacts:	<p>Impacts are expected to be localized and intermittent during active operations, however, indirect disturbance from aircraft noise and human presence may extend beyond the immediate project footprint. Effects on caribou are anticipated to be behavioural in nature and reversible at the site level. No permanent infrastructure or barriers to migration are proposed. The Project's contribution to cumulative disturbance would occur during the single season of exploration within its operational area.</p>
Mitigating Factors:	<p>The Proponent has committed to executing its work in a way that minimizes the adverse effects of caribou and has developed a <i>Wildlife Management Plan</i>. 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.</p> <p>Due to the concerns of cumulative effects on caribou in the area, the Board has recommended monitoring and reporting requirements. Caribou observations should include location, species, number of animals observed, observed behaviour, and age and sex, where feasible.</p>
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	<p>Wildlife – General – 19 to 21 Aircraft Flight Restrictions – 24 to 28 Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance – 29 to 34</p>

Valued Component	Terrestrial Ecosystem and Wildlife Habitat
Potential effects:	Potential adverse effects to terrestrial wildlife, migratory and non-migratory birds, due to increased noise generated from the project activities, including the operation of a temporary outpost camp, exploration and air transportation activities.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential adverse effects of the proposed project activities on terrestrial wildlife and birds are considered to be of low magnitude, of short duration, and reversible.
Mitigating Factors:	Mitigation measures include the proponent's Wildlife Management Plan, aircraft operating practices to minimize disturbance, and adherence to wildlife interaction protocols. Aircraft flight restrictions and setback requirements would reduce wildlife disturbance. Fuel and hazardous materials would be stored within secondary containment systems, supported by routine inspection and spill response procedures.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	<p>Waste Management – 9 and 10 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 12 and 15 to 18 Migratory Birds and Raptor Disturbance – 22 and 23</p>

	<p>Drilling – General – 36 and 38 Drilling on Land – 40, 41, and 43 Drilling and Disposal of Related Radioactive Substances – 44 to 49 Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas 50 to 53</p>
--	--

Valued Component	Freshwater (Water and Fish)
Potential effects:	The Project may result in temporary changes to surface water quality associated with water withdrawal for drilling and camp use or the unintended release of fuel or drilling related substances in areas adjacent to freshwater bodies. Localized increases in turbidity may occur near water withdrawal or discharge points.
Nature of Impacts:	Potential impacts are expected to be localized, temporary, and low in magnitude. Effects would be primarily indirect and operational in nature, related to human presence, and water use. No in-water construction or permanent alteration of watercourses is proposed, and there would be no permanent barriers, channel modifications, or habitat conversion. Any effects are expected to be reversible with appropriate management and reclamation.
Mitigating Factors:	Water use would be regulated under Nunavut Water Board licensing requirements, and water recycling during drilling would be implemented to reduce withdrawals. Secondary containment would be used for fuels and hazardous materials, supported by spill prevention and response procedures outlined in the <i>Spill Contingency Plan</i> . Wastewater and greywater would be managed in accordance with approved waste management practices. No permanent infrastructure would be located in or near waterbodies.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	<p>Water courses/Water bodies – 6 to 8 Waste Management – 9 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 11 to 16 and 18 Drilling – General – 36 and 37 Drilling on Land – 39 to 42 Drilling and Disposal of Related Radioactive Substances – 44 to 49</p>

Valued Component	Vegetation, Land, Soil, and Permafrost
Potential effects:	Potential adverse effects to ground stability, vegetation health, soil quality, terrain, and permafrost from the operation of the temporary outpost camp; the storage, transportation, and use of fuel; as well as exploration drilling activities.
Nature of Impacts:	Potential impacts are expected to be localized, low in magnitude, temporary, and reversible. Disturbance would be limited to the immediate footprint of outpost and drill sites; they would primarily involve minor surface and vegetation disturbance rather than large-scale terrain alteration or long-term permafrost degradation. No permanent land conversion or structural ground disturbance is proposed.

Mitigating Factors:	Mitigation measures include the avoidance of permanent ground disturbance, the use of secondary containment for fuels, and spill prevention and response procedures.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Waste Management – 9 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 12, 14 to 16, and 18 Road and Ground Disturbance – 35 Drilling – General – 36 and 38 Drilling on Land – 41 and 43 Drilling and Disposal of Related Radioactive Substances – 44 to 49 Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas – 50 to 53

Valued Component	Wildlife Harvesting and Traditional Land Use
Potential effects:	<p>Exploration activities, including temporary outpost use, transport of equipment and personnel, and drilling operations, may interact with areas used for travel, harvesting, or other traditional land use activities. Increased aircraft traffic and localized ground disturbance may temporarily affect access routes or create avoidance behaviour in nearby wildlife, which could influence land use patterns.</p> <p>The presence of industrial activity may also affect perceptions of land use quality or safety within the project area. When considered alongside other regional exploration activities, there is potential for cumulative interaction with traditional land use and access within the broader landscape.</p> <p>As a result, temporary disturbance to caribou movement or habitat use may indirectly affect harvesting opportunities and the availability of country food within the area. This area also contains local travel routes, outpost camps, and is known for traditional land use activities.</p>
Nature of Impacts:	<p>Potential impacts are expected to be localized and temporary, occurring during periods of active exploration. No permanent infrastructure or access restrictions are proposed. Effects would primarily relate to short-term disruption such as noise and presence of equipment and personnel.</p> <p>Potential indirect effects on harvesting activities may occur if wildlife, particularly caribou, temporarily avoid areas affected by exploration activities during sensitive seasonal periods. The Project's contribution to cumulative effects would primarily be associated with the timing and location of exploration activities relative to traditional land use and harvesting patterns occurring within the broader region</p>
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has committed to executing its work in a way that minimizes the negative effects on wildlife and has an updated <i>Wildlife Management Plan</i> , including not to work in sensitive caribou habitat and not to implement higher-impact activities during sensitive times of the year.

	<p>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 wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities in the area. Terms and conditions associated with the protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat have also been recommended and are identified above.</p> <p>Due to the concerns of cumulative effects on wildlife harvesting and traditional land use in the area, proposed monitoring requirements have been proposed to be included in a final report to be submitted to the NIRB. Included should be 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 shall include the location and number of people encountered, activity being undertaken, date and time; and any mitigation measures or adaptive management undertaken to prevent disturbance.</p>
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Other – 57 and 58

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Valued Component	Historical, Cultural and Archeological Sites
Potential effects:	Potential for disturbance of unknown or undocumented archaeological, palaeontological, or cultural resources associated with temporary exploration infrastructure, drill sites, aircraft-supported activities, or equipment movement. Temporary and indirect effects on the use or perception of culturally important areas may also occur due to human presence and noise.
Nature of Impacts:	Potential impacts are expected to be highly localized; however, if unidentified heritage resources were disturbed, impacts could be significant at the site-specific level. No known or documented archaeological or heritage sites have been identified within the project footprint, and no permanent land disturbance, excavation, or large-scale ground alteration is proposed.
Mitigating Factors:	<p>Project personnel would be informed of heritage protection requirements prior to commencement of activities. Activities would avoid known heritage locations. If archaeological or palaeontological materials are encountered, work would cease in the immediate area, and the appropriate authority would be notified. A buffer zone would be maintained around identified sites in accordance with regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Proposed monitoring requirements regarding heritage sites to be included in a final report submitted to the NIRB. This should include a summary of any heritage sites encountered during the exploration</p>

	activities, any follow-up action or reporting required as a result, and how project activities were modified to mitigate impacts on heritage sites.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Heritage Sites – 54 to 56

Valued Component	Local hiring, contracting, and Economic impact
Potential effects:	Potential short-term positive effects through local employment, contracting opportunities, and associated economic activity during exploration operations.
Nature of Impacts:	Positive effects are expected to be localized, temporary, and proportional to the scale and duration of the project. Given the single season and exploratory nature of the activities, long-term or transformative economic effects are not anticipated.
Mitigating Factors:	Enhancing factors include the proponent’s stated commitment to hiring locally where possible, provision of information to communities regarding project activities and employment opportunities, and coordination with local organizations to facilitate access to job opportunities.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Other – 59

Significant public concern:

Valued Component	Public Concern
Potential effects:	<p>During the review process, comments were received regarding environmental risks, potential disturbance to wildlife particularly caribou and protection of caribou habitat. Concerns also related to cumulative regional activity within caribou range, the protection of culturally significant land use areas, as well as consultation with other Indigenous rights holders of the area.</p> <p>The need for Truth and Reconciliation as well as other ethical considerations were mentioned. These concerns reflect the sensitivity of Arctic ecosystems and the importance of wildlife and land use to the people in surrounding areas.</p>
Nature of Impacts:	Public concern relates primarily to socio-economic effects, environmental protection, cumulative regional activity, and confidence in mitigation and monitoring measures. The level and scope of concern would inform the Board’s assessment of significance.
Mitigating Factors:	The Project is subject to detailed Terms and Conditions from the Board regarding environmental and socio-economic protection, including addressing fuel storage, spill response, wildlife protection, aircraft operations, and engagement with local residents. Clarifications provided during the comment period strengthen operational controls and transparency.

Proposed Terms and Conditions:	General – 1 to 5 Other – 57 and 58
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

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 regulatory requirements and the terms and conditions necessary to mitigate against the potential adverse environmental and social effects, the Board despite public concerns expressed about uranium mining in the region in general, recognizing that the scope of activities in this screening is limited to early stage exploration only, if the project proposal is carried out in compliance with the recommended project-specific terms and conditions and the applicable laws and regulations, potential adverse ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts associated with the Project Proposal 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. Bayridge Resources 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.: 150613) and the NIRB (Online Application Form, March 11, 2026). 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 ensure that water extraction from any fish-bearing waterbody is done with appropriate care and caution. Small lakes or streams should not be used for water withdrawal unless approved 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 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

9. 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.
10. The Proponent shall dispose of all combustible wastes 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

11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. All fuel and chemical storage containers must be clearly marked with the Proponent's name for ease of identification.
15. 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.
16. 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).
17. 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.

18. 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.

Wildlife – General

19. 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.

20. 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.

21. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.

Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance

22. 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*.

23. 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

24. The Proponent shall not alter flight paths to approach wildlife and avoid flying directly over animals.

25. 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.

26. 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.

27. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft/helicopter do not, unless for emergency, touch-down in areas where wildlife are present.

28. 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

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.

29. 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.
30. The Proponent shall not locate any operation or undertake activities that could block or cause any diversion to migration of caribou or muskoxen.
31. The Proponent shall immediately cease activities likely to interfere with the migration or calving of caribou or muskoxen until such time as the caribou or muskox have passed.
32. During the period of May 15 to July 15, the Proponent shall suspend all 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.
33. 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.
34. 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

35. 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

36. The Proponent shall not allow any drilling wastes to spread to the surrounding lands or water bodies.
37. 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.
38. The Proponent shall ensure that all drill areas are constructed to facilitate minimizing the environmental footprint of the project area.

Drilling on Land

39. 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.

40. If an artesian flow is encountered, the Proponent shall ensure the drill hole is immediately plugged and permanently sealed.
41. 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.
42. 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.
43. 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.

Drilling and Disposal of Related Radioactive Substances

44. The Proponent shall ensure that all drill holes are sealed by cementing (grouting) the upper 31 meters of the bedrock or the entire depth of the holes; whichever is less.
45. The Proponent shall ensure that drill holes which encounter uranium mineralization with a content greater than 1.0% over a length of one (1) metre, or with a metre-percent concentration greater than 5%, are sealed by cementing over the entire mineralization zone; this shall be at least ten (10) metres above and below each mineralization zone.
46. The Proponent shall ensure that drill cuttings with a uranium concentration greater than 0.05% are disposed of down the drill hole and the hole subsequently sealed.
47. Following backfilling, the Proponent shall conduct a radiometric survey. When material is found to exceed background radiation levels, the appropriate authorizing agencies must be contacted for review and approval of actions and handling procedures, required to remedy radioactivity.
48. The Proponent shall ensure that core storage shacks/tents are well ventilated and remain open when employees or contractors are working within. Core storage areas should be located at least 100 metres from the high-water mark of all water bodies.
49. The Proponent shall ensure that gamma radiation levels of a long-term core storage area are not greater than 1.0 micro-Sievert (μSv) and never exceeds 2.5 μSv . When core is found to exceed the levels identified, then the appropriate authorizing agencies must be contacted for review and approval of the handling procedures.

Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas

50. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.
51. The Proponent shall avoid disturbance on slopes prone to natural erosion, and alternative locations shall be utilized.
52. The Proponent shall remove all garbage, fuel and equipment at the end of each field season and/or upon completion of work and/or upon abandonment.
53. 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.

Heritage Sites

54. The Proponent shall ensure that archaeological and paleontological sites are not purposely or inadvertently disturbed as a result of project activities.
55. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel 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.
56. 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

57. The Proponent should engage with local residents regarding planned activities in the area and should solicit available Inuit Qaujimaningit and information regarding current recreational and traditional usage of the project area which may inform project activities. Posting of translated public notices and direct engagement with potentially interested groups and individuals prior to undertaking project activities is strongly encouraged.
58. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
59. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and access local services where possible.

MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

In addition, the Board is recommending the following:

Final Report

1. The Proponent shall submit a comprehensive final report with copies provided to the Nunavut Impact Review Board by December 18, 2026. The final report must contain at least the following information:
 - a) A summary of activities undertaken during the exploration program, 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 summary of community consultations undertaken during the exploration program, 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;

- c) 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;
- d) A discussion of issues related to wildlife and environmental monitoring, including the number of temporary suspension of activities required as a result of proximity to caribou and any other wildlife;
- e) A brief summary of Wildlife Management Plan 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.
- f) An analysis of the effectiveness of mitigation measures for wildlife;
- g) 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;
- h) 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
- i) 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, and reports 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.

Transport of Dangerous Goods and Waste Management

11. Environment and Climate Change Canada recommends that all hazardous wastes, including waste oil, receive proper treatment and disposal at an approved facility.
12. The Proponent shall ensure that proper shipping documents (waste manifests, transportation of dangerous goods, etc.) accompany all movements of dangerous goods. Further, the Proponent shall ensure that the shipment of all dangerous goods is registered with the Government of Nunavut Department of Environment, Department of Environment Manager. Contact the Manager (867) 975-7748 to obtain a manifest if dangerous goods including hazardous wastes will be transported.

Aircraft Identification

13. The Proponent shall provide the community of Baker Lake the planned helicopter activities, including photo(s) of the helicopter to be used, approximate flight paths, plans and times as available prior to commencement of activities to ensure community members are aware of the planned activities.

Caribou Management

14. Territorial and federal government agencies in Nunavut should work together with Regional Inuit Associations, co-management boards and industry to develop an action plan to identify and mitigate potential cumulative effects of human land use activities, including mineral exploration, on barren-ground caribou. This assessment of cumulative effects should occur at a regional scale (i.e., larger than individual project areas).

15. Territorial and federal government agencies update the Caribou Protection Map with updated data and information from the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board.
16. As a result of expressed concerns regarding mineral exploration and the associated potential for cumulative effects on caribou and caribou habitat within the Kivalliq region, the NPC, territorial and federal government agencies should work together with Regional Inuit Associations, co-management boards, the public, and industry to develop a plan that identifies appropriate land use in these areas prior to potential mineral exploration. The plan should identify and mitigate potential cumulative effects of human land use activities on barren-ground caribou on both localized and regional scales.
17. The NPC should be aware of the public concerns regarding a perceived lack of protection for caribou and caribou habitat within the Kivalliq region of Nunavut. In developing a Nunavut-wide land use plan, the NPC may wish to consider formalized protection of important caribou habitat, and seasonal restrictions on potentially disruptive activities in these areas to minimize disturbance to caribou lifecycles and Inuit harvesting activities.

Crown Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada

18. Crown Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC) impose mitigation measures, conditions and monitoring requirements pursuant to the Federal Land Use Permit, which require the Proponent to respect the sensitivities and importance of the area. These mitigation measures, conditions and monitoring requirements should be in regard to the location and area; type, location, capacity and operation of facilities; use, storage, handling and disposal of chemical or toxic material; wildlife and fisheries habitat; and petroleum fuel storage.
19. CIRNAC consider the importance of conducting regular Land Use Inspections, pursuant to the authority of the Federal Land Use Permit, while the project is in operation. The Land Use Inspections should be focused on ensuring the Proponent is in compliance with the conditions imposed through the Federal Land Use Permit.
20. CIRNAC forward to the NIRB copies of any decisions by Inspectors which allow project activities to continue in areas of caribou presence between dates indicating work stoppages are necessary (exemptions from Caribou Protection Measures).

Kivalliq Inuit Association

21. The Kivalliq Inuit Association impose strict mitigation measures and/or conditions upon the Proponent pursuant to the Inuit Owned Lands License in regard to fuel and chemical storage, drilling, water conditions, ground disturbance, and wildlife on Inuit Owned Lands.

Nunavut Water Board

22. The Nunavut Water Board impose mitigation measures, conditions and monitoring requirements pursuant to the Water Licence, which require the Proponent to respect the sensitivities and importance of water in the area. These mitigation measures, conditions and monitoring requirements should be in regard to use of water, snow and ice; waste disposal; access infrastructure and operation for camps; drilling operations; spill contingency planning; abandonment and restoration planning; and monitoring programs.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to the Bayridge Resources Corp's "Baker Basin Project". The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated May 20, 2026 at Iqaluit, NU.



Albert Ehloak, Chairperson

Attachments: Appendix A: Species at Risk in Nunavut
Appendix B: Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources Terms and Conditions for Land Use Permit Holders

APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT

Due to the requirements of Section 79(2) of the *Species at Risk Act*, S.C. 2002, c. 29 (*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 2024

Terrestrial Species at Risk²	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility³
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
Porsild's Bryum	Threatened	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut (GN)
Transverse Lady Beetle	Special Concern	No Schedule	GN
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
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
Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic-Baffin Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
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

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.

**APPENDIX B: 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.

⁵ s. 51(1)

⁶ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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 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:

- allow the identification of research and conservation opportunities;
- enable the developer to make planning decisions and recognize their likely effects on the known or predicted resources; and

- 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.