



**SCREENING DECISION REPORT  
NIRB FILE No.: 25XN056**

NPC File No.: 150831

January 23, 2026

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board’s (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Government of Nunavut Petroleum Products Division's "Baker Lake Land Farm" is not required pursuant to Article 12, Section 12.4.4(a) of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and s. 92(1)(a) of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (*NuPPAA*).

Subject to the Proponent’s compliance with the terms and conditions as set out in below, issued in accordance with s. 92(2)(a) of *NuPPAA*, the NIRB is of the view that the project proposal is not likely to cause significant public concerns, and it is unlikely to result in significant adverse environmental and social impacts. The NIRB therefore recommends that the responsible Minister accepts this Screening Decision Report.

**OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT**

<b>REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROJECT OVERVIEW &amp; THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF NUPPAA.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>VIEWS OF THE BOARD .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b><u>TABLES</u></b>	
<b>TABLE 1: NIRB’S ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TABLE 2: COMMENTS RECEIVED .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS s. 90 NUPPAA .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>TABLE 4: PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS CONSIDERED.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b><u>APPENDICES</u></b>	
<b>APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## 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 June 25, 2025, the NIRB received a referral to screen Government of Nunavut Petroleum Products Division's "Baker Lake Land Farm" project proposal (NIRB File No: 25XN056) 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/126204](http://www.nirb.ca/project/126204) .

- Project Name: Baker Lake Land Farm
- NIRB File No.: 25XN056
- NIRB Application No.: 126204

**Table 1: NIRB's Assessment Process**

Date	Stage
June 25, 2025	Receipt of project proposal and positive conformity determination (Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan) from the Commission
June 25, 2025	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
August 28, 2025	Receipt of online application from Proponent
October 3, 2025	Request(s) to Proponent for additional information in order to carry out screening pursuant to s. s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
October 20, 2025	Proponent responded to information request(s) and provided additional information
October 29, 2025	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
November 28, 2025	Translated Public engagement and comment request was issued to the following communities
December 19, 2025	Receipt of public comments
December 12, 2025	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 Crown-Indigenous Relations

<b>Date</b>	<b>Stage</b>
January 23, 2026	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

## 1. Project Scope

<b>Location</b>	Kivalliq region, northwest of built-up area; north of airport; municipal lands
<b>Objective</b>	The Proponent intends to construct a new land farm for the treatment of contaminated soils from a 2021 spill at the Baker Lake Bulk Fuel Storage Facility.
<b>Timeline</b>	Construction Phase: from 2026-06-01 to 2026-06-30 Operations Phase: from 2026-07-01 to 2030-09-01

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

- Construction Activities:
  - Installation of a lined Land Treatment Unit (LTU) approximately 35m by 50 m with base and walls composed of granular fill and sand at a previously used quarry/borrow site;
  - Construction of berms using a locally sourced pit;
  - Installation of a non-woven geotextile, high-density polyethylene liner, and overlying sand and aggregate;
  - Installation of perimeter fencing;
  - Use of heavy equipment including an excavator, telehandler, loader, and tandem dump trucks for soil movement and construction;
- Operational Activities:
  - Transportation of petroleum hydrocarbon impacted soil from the Baker Lake tank farm to the LTU;
  - Bioremediation through aeration and the addition of nutrient amendments as required;
  - Regular soil sampling to monitor containment concentrations, capacity for treatment of up to 2,500m<sup>3</sup>;
- Fuel Use
  - Use of fuel during the project construction supplied via mobile fueling from community, (no bulk storage on site);
- Monitoring and Mitigation
  - Routine soil sampling to confirm treatment progress and compliance with regulatory thresholds; and
  - Water sampling to verify effective containment of impacted soils within the LTU;
  - Implementation of dust suppression measures to reduce airborne contaminants;
  - Standard mitigation during construction, including restricting activities to designated work hours, designing the LTU to minimize changes to topography and runoff, and utilizing equipment selected for lower emissions and noise ratings

## 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 December 19, 2025, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

**Table 2: Comments Received**

Commenting Party	NIRB Doc ID No.
Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)	358692
Transport Canada (TC)	358687

### *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 Lake Land Farm project proposal:

#### **ECCC**

- Recommends that the Proponent review and consider applying the Federal Environmental Quality Guidelines in screening of water collected in the land farm to determine whether treatment is required.

#### **TC**

- Noted that they have reviewed the project proposal and do not have any comments at this time.

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

No concerns or comments were received with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit or Indigenous and Community knowledge in relation to the proposed project. However, Inuit Qaujimaningit and

Indigenous and community knowledge is incorporated into the terms and conditions recommended below based on information collected from prior and similar projects, data collected and mapped by the Commission, and other available sources.

**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***

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Comment</b>
The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The physical footprint is limited to a ~35 m × 50 m lined landfarm cell with associated berms and fencing.</li> <li>▪ The proposed project is small, localized, and engineered to contain effects within the immediate footprint.</li> </ul>
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project.</li> </ul>
The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project.</li> </ul>
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed project is unlikely to result in impacts to local human and animal populations.</li> </ul>
The nature, magnitude and complexity of the impacts; the probability of the impacts occurring; the frequency and duration of the impacts; and the reversibility or irreversibility of the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project impacts are localized, low in magnitude, and low in complexity, consisting mainly of short-term construction disturbance and periodic soil handling during operations. Minor intermittent effects such as noise, dust, and localized ground disturbance may occur; however, the likelihood of significant or widespread impacts is low due to the facility’s contained design. The project is reversible, as soils will be treated for reuse and the site reclaimed upon decommissioning. With standard mitigation and regulatory controls, residual effects are expected to be minimal.</li> </ul>
The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Table 4 is a list of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects. The Board recommended terms and conditions along with mitigation measures designed with consideration for the potential for cumulative effects in the Board Views section.</li> </ul>

Factor	Comment
out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out.	
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No other relevant factors were identified; however, see below for Regulatory Requirements mandating mitigation and/or reporting.</li> </ul>

## Regulatory Requirements

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

### Acts and Regulations

1. 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](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](https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,_c._1036/index.html)).
2. 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>).
3. 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**.

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

NIRB Project Number	Project Title	Project Type
<b><i>Proposed Developments – undergoing assessment</i></b>		
25RN083	Aberdeen Lake-Pelly Lake Overland Haul	Winter Road/Winter Trail
<b><i>Present Projects – approved or in operation</i></b>		
25YN035	Water quality and sediment collection near Chesterfield Inlet, Whale Cove, Rankin Inlet, Baker Lake, Arviat, Nauyasat, and Coral Harbour	Research
25XN036	Hamlet of Baker Lake Sealift Infrastructure Project	Infrastructure
<b><i>Past Projects</i></b>		
24YN010	Evaluation of the Deep Geothermal Potential of Baker Lake, Nunavut, Canada	Research
24YN012	OPP 2.0 Baseline Shoreline Mapping 2024	Research
24YN026	Estimating the abundance of Foxe Basin polar bear subpopulation	Research
25YN026	Impacts of Past Glacial Ice Sheets	Research

VIEWS OF THE BOARD

In considering the above factors, the Board has identified the following and respectfully provides its views regarding whether or not the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts. The NIRB has also proposed terms and conditions that would mitigate the potential adverse impacts identified.

**Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:**

<b>Valued Component</b>	Migratory and non-migratory birds, terrestrial
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential adverse effects are considered to be localized, temporary, and low in magnitude to migratory and non-migratory birds and terrestrial wildlife from the use of heavy equipment and the construction activities for the land farm.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for impacts is considered to be limited due to the small footprint, and contained design and reversible nature of any disturbance, and should acknowledge both construction and intermittent operational activities.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The potential adverse impacts to terrestrial wildlife and birds may be mitigated by requiring the Proponent to avoid wildlife, wildlife habitat, and nesting areas, and to ensure wastes and fuels are inaccessible to wildlife.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Water courses/Water bodies – 6 through 8 Waste Management – 9 Wildlife – General – 17 through 22 Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance – 23 and 24

<b>Valued Component</b>	Land, terrestrial vegetation, and ground stability.
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential adverse impacts to the ground stability, vegetation quality, and terrain due to the removal of soils, moving of equipment and personnel, and construction activities.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for impacts is considered to be limited if regulations and best practices for construction operations are followed. The potential for disturbance due to other activities is considered to be minimal due to the localized nature of the construction and operational activities.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	As noted, the Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure that project activities do not negatively affect land, terrestrial vegetation, and ground stability.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Road and Ground Disturbance – 25 Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas – 26 through 30

<b>Valued Component</b>	Public and traditional land use activities
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential effects are considered to be localized, temporary, and low magnitude, however, the Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure project activities are informed by available Inuit

	Qaujimaningit and that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	Potential for impacts is considered to be minimal due to the location of the project.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure that project activities do not negatively affect the public and traditional land use activities.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other – 31

**Socio-economic effects on northerners:**

<b>Valued Component</b>	Local hiring, contracting and economic impact
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential positive impacts from the hiring of local community members for various projects and activities.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	Potential for impacts is considered to be positive if the Proponent adheres to its commitment to hiring locally to the extent possible.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure that the Proponent continues to inform the communities of the ongoing site activities and to ensure community members are aware of and best able to successfully connect with hiring opportunities.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other – 33

**Significant public concern:**

<b>Valued Component</b>	Public Concern
<b>Potential effects:</b>	No significant public concern was expressed during the public commenting period for this file, however, the Board recommends terms and conditions.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for impacts is considered to be minimal if the Proponent follows the recommended terms and conditions.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	Based on the small footprint, contained design, and controlled access site, direct impacts on Inuit are considered highly unlikely.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other – 31 and 32

**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 is of the view that the proposed project is unlikely to cause significant public concern and its adverse ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts are unlikely to be significant, or are highly predictable and can be adequately mitigated by known technologies.

## RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

### General

1. Hamlet of Baker Lake (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.: 150689), and the NIRB (Online Application Form, July 15, 2025). 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 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.
7. The Proponent shall implement erosion and sediment suppression measures on all areas during all project activities in order to prevent sediment or fugitive dust from entering any water body or surrounding environment. Erosion prevention measures may include berms or silt fences.
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.

## **Fuel and Chemical Storage**

10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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).
15. 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.
16. 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**

17. 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.
18. 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.
19. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.
20. The Proponent shall ensure that all wildlife have the right-of-way on any roads or trails. Vehicles are required to slow down or stop and wait to permit the free and unrestricted movement of wildlife across roads or trails at any location.

21. The Proponent shall enforce safe speed limits for vehicles travelling along the road to ensure drivers have sufficient time to react in a safe manner if wildlife are encountered on or adjacent to the road or trail.
22. The Proponent shall ensure that drivers maintain spacing appropriate for driving and road conditions, and speed limits, to ensure drivers have time to safely react to any wildlife on the road.

### **Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance**

23. 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*.
24. 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 zone<sup>1</sup> appropriate for the species and the surrounding habitat.

### **Road and Ground Disturbance**

25. 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.

### **Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas**

26. The Proponent shall use existing trails where possible during project activities on the land.
27. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.
28. The Proponent shall avoid disturbance on slopes prone to natural erosion, and alternative locations shall be utilized.
29. 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.
30. 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.

### **Other**

31. 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](http://www.ec.gc.ca/paom-itmb).

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

## 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](mailto:info@nirb.ca) or upload a copy to the NIRB's online registry at [www.nirb.ca](http://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 produced as part of the project. Care should be taken to ensure that Inuit Qaujimaningit and local knowledge collected for the project is used with permission and is accurately represented.

### Species at Risk

4. 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%20004.pdf](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/policies/EA%20Best%20Practices%20004.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

5. 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.
6. 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](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/ec/CW66-324-2013-eng.pdf).

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board’s screening decision with respect to Government of Nunavut Petroleum Products Division's "Baker Lake Land Farm". The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated January 23, 2026 at Iqaluit, NU.



Albert Ehaloak, *Acting* Chairperson

Attachments: Appendix A: Species at Risk in Nunavut

## 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](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca)) to get the current status of a species.

Updated: September 2024

Terrestrial Species at Risk <sup>2</sup>	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility <sup>3</sup>
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

<sup>2</sup> The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has responsibility for aquatic species.

<sup>3</sup> 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.