



Box 32, Wekweètì, NT X0E 1W0
Tel: 867-713-2500 Fax: 867-713-2502

#1-4905 48th Street, Yellowknife, NT X1A 3S3
Tel: 867-765-4592 Fax: 867-765-4593
www.wlwb.ca

Reasons for Decision

Preliminary Screener	WLWB
Reference/File Number:	W2020C0003 (Type "A" Land Use Permit/Water Licence)
Applicant:	BFR Copper and Gold Inc.
Subject:	Type A Land Use Permit Application W2020C0003

Decision from the Wek'èezhìi Land and Water Board Meeting of May 6, 2020

1.0 Decision

On May 6, 2020, the Wek'èezhìi Land and Water Board (WLWB or the Board) met and considered a Land Use Permit Application by BFR Copper and Gold Inc. (BFR).¹ The Application is for mineral exploration in the Mazenod Project Area. BFR applied for this Permit to further explore the Mazenod Lake Area by means of geophysical surveys, geochemical sampling, geological mapping, and diamond drilling. In consideration of the Application, reviewer comments, and proponent responses, the Board has decided the following:

1. The Application submitted by BFR Copper & Gold Inc. is exempt from preliminary screening in accordance with the *Exemption List Regulations*;
2. To issue Type A Land Use Permit W2020C0003 for a period of five years;
3. To approve Version 1.0 of the Waste Management Plan;
4. To approve the Spill Prevention and Response Plan and to require BFR Gold Inc. to submit Version 1.1 of the Plan within 60 days of Permit issuance. Version 1.1 is to be titled "Spill Contingency Plan, Version 1.1" and is to be updated with the contact information outlined in GNWT-Lands Inspector comment 7; and
5. To approve Version 1.0 of the Closure and Reclamation Plan.

¹ See WLWB Online Registry (www.wlwb.ca) for [Mazenod Project – Land Use Permit Application – Mar 19 20.pdf](#)

2.0 Background

The Board received a Land Use Permit Application from BFR on March 19, 2020.² BFR has previously conducted mineral exploration in the Mazenod Project Area under Land Use Permit W2013C0003. To determine the potential for economic mineralization, BFR applied for this Permit to further explore the Mazenod Lake Area by means of geophysical surveys, geochemical sampling, geological mapping, and diamond drilling.

The Application, a Draft Permit,³ and the previous preliminary screening,⁴ were distributed for public review on March 27, 2020, inviting Parties to provide comments and recommendations using the Online Review System (ORS). In the Application cover letter, BFR requested an exemption from preliminary screening pursuant to the *Exemption List Regulations*. In the Item for Review, WLWB staff indicated they agreed the Application may be exempt from preliminary screening in accordance with the *Preliminary Screening Exemption List Regulations* and *Exemption List Regulations of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act (MVRMA)*. Reviewers were encouraged to provide comments and recommendations on the possible exemption along with associated rationale. Reviewer comments were due by April 17, 2020. The Government of the Northwest Territories Environment and Natural Resources Department – Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (GNWT-ENR-EAM), GNWT Department of Lands (Lands) – Inspector, and the GNWT Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (PWNHC) provided comments and recommendations. Board staff also submitted questions. A letter from GNWT-Lands was received indicating no comments from the GNWT-Lands Administration as the area is wholly on Tłı̄çhǫ-titled land. The Wek'èezhii Renewable Resources Board (WRRB) indicated they had no comments or recommendation at the time. Proponent responses were submitted by the deadline of April 24, 2020. Reviewer comments and recommendations, as well as the proponent responses are available on the WLWB Online Registry.⁵

3.0 Reasons for Decision

3.1 Eligibility

As per section 18 of the *Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations* (MVLUR), eligibility must be determined before the Board can issue a permit. The proposed activities are to take place in the Mazenod Lake area, which is located within Tłı̄çhǫ Lands. As part of the Application, BFR indicated they hold Mining Leases #4664 through #4672, which were confirmed to be active. The Board thus confirms that eligibility under Paragraph 18(a)(i) of the MVLUR has been satisfied.

On March 23, 2020, Board staff contacted Tłı̄çhǫ Government (TG) staff requesting they confirm the Tłı̄çhǫ Wenek'e (Land Use Plan) does not directly apply to BFR's existing interest. TG staff responded that the Tłı̄çhǫ Wenek'e (Land Use Plan) does not directly apply to BFR's existing interests but will apply once BFR's

² See WLWB Online Registry (www.wlwb.ca) for [Mazenod Project – Land Use Permit Application – Mar 19 20](#)

³ See WLWB Online Registry for [Mazenod Project – Draft Land Use Permit – Mar 27 20](#)

⁴ See WLWB Online Registry for [W2013C0002 – Mazenod – LUP Application – Preliminary Screening – May 17 13.pdf](#)

⁵ See WLWB Online Registry for [Mazenod Project – Land Use Permit – Review Summary and Attachments – Apr 29 20](#)

interest in the land expires.⁶ TG staff recommended that the Board consider the intent of the Land Use Plan in its decision-making.

3.2 Exemption from Preliminary Screening

In accordance with section 124(1) of the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (MVRMA), the Board must conduct a preliminary screening of the Application. A preliminary screening of Land Use Permit W2013C0003 was completed May 17, 2013.⁷ It was determined that there was no likelihood that the proposed development might have a significant adverse impact on the environment or might be a cause of public concern.

Schedule 1 (Section 2), Part 1, paragraph 2(b) of the MVRMA *Exemption List Regulations* states that an application can be exempt from preliminary screening if:

A development, or a part thereof, for which renewal of a permit, licence or authorization is requested that (a) has not been modified; and (b) has fulfilled the requirements of the environmental assessment process established by the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act*, the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* or the *Environmental Assessment Review Process Guidelines Order*.

BFR identified in its cover letter that the Application was to renew an existing Land Use Permit (W2013C0003) and requested that the Application be exempt from preliminary screening pursuant to the *Exemption List Regulations*. The preliminary screening for Land Use Permit W2013C0003 was reviewed and it was confirmed that the activities and the area previously screened remain the same. No parties provided comments with respect to the preliminary screening as part of the public review. The Board has determined that the Application is exempt from preliminary screening, pursuant to Schedule 1 (Section 2), Part 1, paragraph 2(b) of the *Exemption List Regulations*.

- ***Decision #1: The Board has determined that the Application submitted by BFR Copper & Gold Inc. is exempt from preliminary screening in accordance with the Exemption List Regulations.***

3.3 Land Use Permit

A Draft Permit was included in the Item for Review. The Draft Permit was developed using the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (2019) *Standard Land Use Permit Conditions Template Version 2.1* (Standard List) and Land Use Permit W2013C0002. The Draft Permit included three non-standard conditions (highlighted in green for reviewers) from Land Use Permit W2013C0002.

3.3.1 Permit Scope

The Application and Draft Permit did not include any changes to the Scope from Land Use Permit W2013C0002. No comments on the Scope were received during the public review. Thus, no changes have been made to the Permit Scope.

⁶ See WLWB Online Registry for [Mazenod Project – Correspondence Regarding Tıçıçı Land Use Plan – Mar 26 20](#)

⁷ See WLWB Online Registry for [W2013C0002 – Mazenod – LUP Application – Preliminary Screening – May 17 13.pdf](#)

3.3.2 Definitions

The Draft Permit included the definition for a Shut Down Period but did not specify dates. Board staff asked BFR to clarify if a Shut Down Period is anticipated and if so, to indicate which dates should be used to define this period (WLWB staff comment 1). BFR's response suggests that there is no clear Shut-Down Period as site operations are anticipated to start and stop multiple times per year; therefore, the definition for Shut Down Period has not been included in the Permit. The removal of this definition is linked to the removal of conditions related to seasonal shut-downs and is discussed further in Section 3.3.3 of this Reasons for Decision.

In review of the Draft Permit, no reference to Spring Break-Up was found in the Permit conditions; therefore, this definition not included in the Permit.

3.3.3 Permit Conditions

Comments and Recommendations from Reviewers

During the public review, the GNWT-Lands Inspector recommended the deletion of two standard conditions (GNWT-Lands Inspector comments 1 and 2) and two non-standard conditions (GNWT-Lands Inspector comments 4 and 5) from the Permit because these conditions are not applicable to the proposed land use operation or because there are other conditions in the Permit that would mitigate potential concerns. These included conditions related to Drilling/Adit Setback (i.e., Condition 5 in the Draft Permit), to Refill Craters (i.e., Condition 16 in the Draft Permit), to Cutting Timber (i.e., Condition 20 in the Draft Permit), and to Brush Disposal (i.e., Condition 68 in the Draft Permit). No objections were received from BFR with respect to the removal of these four conditions. In consideration of the recommendations made by the Inspector and BFR's responses, the Board agrees with the Inspector's recommendations and the Permit has been updated accordingly.

The GNWT-Lands Inspector recommended the addition of the "Garbage Container" standard condition (i.e., Condition 72 from the Standard List) to the Permit (GNWT-Lands Inspector comment 3). No objection was received from BFR with respect to the addition of this condition. The Standard List explains that the Garbage Container condition refers to waste generated in small camps that do not have the capacity to incinerate waste daily. Including this condition would ensure that camp waste is stored appropriately between incinerator cycles and/or before being removed from the site. The Board agrees with the recommendation to include this condition and has updated the Permit accordingly.

During the public review, GNWT-ENR-EAM provided recommendations related to waste disposal; incineration and open burning practices; and hazardous waste generation (GNWT-ENR comments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). With regards to waste disposal, BFR's Application included a copy of an existing contract with KBL Environmental Ltd. for disposal of waste produced by the Project; the Application includes no plans to deposit waste in a community Solid Waste Facility. The Proponent addressed recommendations

regarding incineration and open burning by referencing its Waste Management Plan.⁸ The Board notes that the Waste Management Plan includes the use of an incinerator as a contingency should the volume of waste produced exceed what can be removed from site; decisions regarding the Waste Management Plan are further discussed in Section 3.4.1 of this Reasons for Decision. With respect to generating hazardous waste, BFR confirmed that it is a registered hazardous waste generator and it follows best waste management practices and regulations. The Board is of the opinion that BFR's responses and the Waste Management Plan address the GNWT-ENR's recommendations.

During the public review, GNWT-ENR-EAM provided recommendations with regards to spill reporting; clean-up of spills (e.g., approved methods of spill clean-up); location of fuel storage areas relative to the ordinary high-water mark of a water body; and the provision and use of spill kits (GNWT-ENR comments 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12). BFR responded that it follows best fuel storage and spill prevention and response management practices and regulations. Also, BFR has an approved Spill Contingency Plan⁹ and the Permit includes a condition to comply with this plan. In addition, the Permit includes several standard conditions related to fuel storage and handling, as well as to spill prevention and reporting. Overall, the Board is of the opinion that the Spill Contingency Plan along with the conditions related to the fuel storage, fuel handling, spill prevention, and spill reporting address GNWT-ENR-EAM's recommendations.

With respect to fuel, one other comment was received from the GNWT-Lands Inspector (GNWT-Lands Inspector comment 6). The Inspector recommended that the maximum amount of fuel to be used be included in the [Maximum Fuel On Site] condition. BFR responded that the maximum amount of fuel would be 102,500 litres. The Board agree with the Inspector's recommendation and this amount has been reflected in the Permit.

During the public review, comments related to species at risk and potential impacts to wildlife habitat were received from GNWT-ENR-EAM (comments 13, and 15-23). The Board notes that the Permit includes the [Habitat Damage] standard condition which requires the Permittee to take all reasonable measures to prevent damage to wildlife and fish Habitat during the land-use operation. The Permit also includes the non-standard [Caribou Distance] condition and the standard [Migratory Bird Nest Disturbance] condition for minimizing activity to prevent disturbance to caribou and nesting areas. BFR is also required to comply with its Waste Management Plan, which includes methods to mitigate waste being an attractant to wildlife. Finally, BFR responded to these comments with a commitment to continue following best wildlife mitigation and reporting practices and regulations. For these reasons, the Board is of the opinion that these recommendations have been addressed.

GNWT-ENR-EAM submitted a comment on the importance of monitoring the disturbance footprint of development activities for the purposes of managing cumulative effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat (GNWT-ENR-EAM comment 14). GNWT-ENR-EAM recommended that BFR "submit the bounding

⁸ See WLWB Online Registry for [W2013C0002 – Mazenod – LUP Application – Appendix V – Waste Management Plan – Apr 4 13.pdf](#)

⁹ See WLWB Online Registry for [W2013C0002 - Mazenod - LUP Application - Appendix IV - Spill Plan - Apr 4 13.pdf](#)

coordinates or geospatial data for the proposed project footprint and the completed project footprint to the Land and Water Board for placement on the public registry.” The Board notes that the bounding coordinates were included in Section 4 of the Permit Application and acknowledge BFR’s response that “Any field activates including geography locations are reported to the Inspector in advance, during a program and upon completion a program and Wek’èzhìi Land and Water Board as required.” Thus, the Board is of the opinion that this recommendation by GNWT-ENR-EAM has been addressed.

GNWT-PWNHC provided a recommendation to change conditions related to the protection of historical, archaeological, and burial sites (GNWT-PWNHC comment 1). GNWT-PWNHC recommended that the Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) condition (i.e., condition 47 in the Draft Permit) be removed and that the standard [AIA – High Potential] condition be added. GNWT-PWNHC explained in its comment that BFR has completed an Archaeological Overview (AOA) for early stage exploration activities within Leases 4671 and 4672. BFR responded in support of these changes. The Board agrees with the recommendation and has updated the Permit accordingly.

As discussed in Section 3.3.2 of this Reasons for Decision, BFR does not have a defined Shut Down Period for the Project. As a result, two conditions that were included in the Draft Permit (i.e., Condition 8 [Seasonal Notification – Contact Inspector] and Condition 11 [Reports Before Seasonal Removal]) need to be updated and/or removed. Board staff contacted the GNWT-Lands Inspector by phone who recommended the conditions be updated to require BFR to contact the Inspector at the beginning and ending of any operational period. The Board agrees with this recommendation and has thus made the following changes to the Permit: updated Condition 8 of the Draft Permit to [Notification – Contact Inspector], deleted Condition 11 of the Draft Permit [Reports Before Seasonal Removal], and updated Condition 12 from the Draft Permit to [Reports Before Removal]. The Board is of the opinion that these changes allow for BFR to continue operations while maintaining communication with the Inspector about site activities.

Changes Requested by the Proponent

In its responses to reviewer comments, BFR highlighted several conditions it would like to see removed from the Permit or modified. These proposed changes and the supporting rationale are outlined in the responses provided to GNWT-Lands Inspector comments 1 through 4, and WLWB staff comment 1.

During the public review, BFR requested that the Board remove Draft Permit Condition 4 [Drill Locations] or amend it to remove “final” from the standard condition because “no drillhole location can be considered final before the commencement of drilling and are approximate until the best and least impactful drill configuration is found”. “Final” is included in the standard condition but the Board acknowledges that providing final locations prior to drilling can be difficult. The Board also notes that the previous Permit did not include “final.” The Board has removed “final” from this condition in the Permit.

BFR requested that the Board remove or amend Draft Permit Condition 3 [Use Existing Camp]. BFR stated that it’s “preference is to use the current camp but should that have to change during the duration of the

LUP for a substantive reason, the [condition] should be removed or modified.” The application submitted by BFR states that it “intends to continue using the current temporary campsite” and does not include any information about proposed locations or considerations for alternate campsites. The Board has removed Draft Permit Condition 3 [Use Existing Camp] and added Standard Condition 3 [Camp Setback] with the addition of “and as authorized by an Inspector.” The Board is of the opinion that this change will allow BFR the flexibility to use other areas for a camp if needed, while ensuring that potential impacts of the additional camp are considered and mitigated. These changes are reflected in the Permit.

BFR requested that the Draft Permit Condition 7 [Inspect Locations] be removed or amended because it is “impractical and of limited use to have an inspector inspect a proposed land use area prior to the commencement of a land use operation.” BFR believes that the condition should read as follows: “The Permittee shall accompany an Inspector during an inspection of the land use area at the request of an Inspector,” or be removed from the Permit. Draft Permit Condition 7 is from the Standard List and explains that this is typically for new disturbances and that this condition is used after consultation with an Inspector. The Board is of the opinion that because this is a renewal of an existing Permit, this condition does not apply and can be removed from the Permit. This change is reflected in the Permit.

BFR requested that the Board remove or amend Draft Permit Condition 30 [Equipment: Watercourse Buffer]. This condition prevents the Permittee from removing vegetation and operating heavy equipment within 100 meters of the Ordinary High-Water Mark (OHWM). BFR commented that Condition 30 conflicts with Draft Permit Condition 32 [Drilling Near Water Or On Ice], which allows for the use of a drill and associated equipment within 100 metres of the OHWM. To clarify, a drill is not considered heavy equipment and therefore Draft Permit Condition 30 does not conflict with Draft Permit Condition 32. The Board had determined that this condition should remain in the permit.

BFR commented that Draft Permit Condition 35 [Drilling Waste Containment] conflicts with Draft Permit Condition 33 [Drilling Waste] and stated that BFR does “not intend to allow the spread of any drilling waste beyond a Sump either to other lands or watercourses”. To clarify, the Standard List explains that the following four conditions are used together: Drilling Near Water Or On Ice, Drilling Waste, Drilling Waste Disposal, and Drilling Waste Containment. The [Drilling Waste] condition allows for a specific location (i.e., a Sump) in which non-toxic waste can be deposited. Therefore, the Board has determined that this condition should remain in the Permit.

3.3.3 Permit Issuance

After reviewing the Application, as well as all reviewer comments and Proponent responses submitted during the public review, the Board has decided to issue this Type A Land Use Permit for a period of five years.

- ***Decision #3: The Board has decided to issue Type A Land Use Permit W2020C0003 for a period of five years.***

3.4 Management Plans

As part of its Application, BFR submitted links to the following management plans:

- Waste Management Plan;
- Spill Contingency Plan (referred to as the Spill Prevention and Response Plan by BFR); and
- Closure and Reclamation Plan.¹⁰

These plans were in place for BFR's Permit W2013C0002. As discussed in the sub-sections below, the Board has decided to approve these as Versions 1.0 of the plans for Permit W2020C0003.

3.4.1 Waste Management Plan

The Application referenced the Waste Management Plan associated with Permit W2013C0002. As discussed in Section 3.3.3 of this Reasons for Decision, the GNWT-ENR-EAM provided comments and recommendations related to incineration practices, which BFR responded to by referencing the Waste Management Plan. As noted above, the Waste Management Plan includes the use of an incinerator as a contingency should the volume of waste produced exceed what can be removed from site. However, the plan does not include the details recommended by GNWT-ENR-EAM should an incinerator be required. Should an incinerator be required, the Board would like to remind BFR that the Waste Management Plan is to be updated accordingly and submitted for Board approval as per Condition #41 of the Permit.

No other comments or recommendations regarding this plan were received during the public review. The Plans was reviewed against the MVLWB (2011) *Guidelines for Developing a Waste Management Plan* and the Board is of the opinion that it is appropriate for the proposed activities.

- ***Decision #3: The Board has approved Version 1.0 of the Waste Management Plan.***

3.4.2 Spill Contingency Plan

The Application referenced the Spill Prevention and Response Plan associated with Permit W2013C0002. No comments or recommendations regarding the overall content of this plan were received during the public review, but the GNWT-Lands Inspector recommended updating Section 5.3 of the Spill Contingency Plan to include the contact information for the Department of Lands, Resource Management Officer (GNWT-Lands Inspector comment 7). The Plan was reviewed against INAC's (2007) *Guidelines for Spill Contingency Planning* and the Board is of the opinion that it is appropriate for the proposed activities. The Board believes that it would be helpful to clarify that this plan is understood to be the Spill Contingency Plan associated with the Permit.

- ***Decision #4: The Board has approved the Spill Prevention and Response Plan and requires BFR Gold Inc. to submit Version 1.1 of the Plan within 60 days of Permit issuance. Version 1.1 is to be titled "Spill Contingency Plan, Version 1.1" and is to be updated with the contact information outlined in GNWT-Lands Inspector comment 7.***

¹⁰ See WLWB Online Registry for [W2013C0002 – Mazenod – LUP Application – Appendix VI – Closure Plan – Apr 4 13.pdf](#)

3.4.3 Closure and Reclamation Plan

The Application referenced the Closure and Reclamation Plan associated with Permit W2013C0002. No comments or recommendations regarding this plan were received during the public review. The plan was reviewed, and the Board is satisfied that it is appropriate for the proposed activities.

- **Decision #5: The Board has approved Version 1.0 of the Closure and Reclamation Plan.**

3.5 Security

During the public review, Board staff asked for clarification on two items to complete the security estimate. Board staff asked BFR to clarify the amount of land to be disturbed as part of the Project (WLWB staff comment 3). BFR responded indicating that an estimate of 10 hectares would be used for the camp and potential drilling sites. Board staff also asked for clarification on the weight of explosives that would be on site (WLWB staff comment 4). BFR responded that the weight of explosives would not exceed 500kg. Based on this information, the information included in the Application, and the resulting calculation using the Land Use Permit Application Security Template, the Board has determined that the security to be held for this project be set at \$93,000 (see Appendix I). The Board has updated the [Security Deposit] condition accordingly.

Signed the 6th Day of May, 2020, on behalf of the Wek'èezhii Land and Water Board



Witness



Joe Mackenzie
Chair, Wek'èezhii Land and Water Board

Appendix I - Land Use Permit Security Worksheet

Application Number: W2013C0002

Input
Amount Multiplier

Camp (C1)			
Temporary Structures			
Input number of tent frames or weatherhaven (3.5m x 4.2m)	15	\$200.00	\$3,000.00
Input number of trailers (3.5m x 15.2m)	2	\$300.00	\$600.00
Input total square metres of other temporary structures (i.e. core shacks)	100	\$2.50	\$250.00
Fixed Structures			
Input total square metres of fixed structures	0	\$25.00	\$0.00
Solid Waste			
For non-burnable material, input # of person days per season	1470	\$1.00	\$1,470.00
For burnable material, input # of person days per season	1470	\$0.50	\$735.00
Total C1			\$6,055.00

Regulated / Hazardous Materials (R1)			
Based upon on site volume			
Explosives; up to 500 kg (~pallet) dry explosives input 1, if none, input 0	1	\$500.00	\$500.00
Additional Explosives; input total kg >500	0	\$0.50	\$0.00
Drilling Muds (oil based); enter number of 63 m ³ (or equivalent) containers	0	\$1,000.00	\$0.00
Used Oil, Lubes and Antifreeze: enter number of pieces of heavy equipment	5	\$500.00	\$2,500.00
Other;			

Total R1			\$3,000.00

Hydrocarbon Storage and Transfer (H1)			
Based upon on site volume			
Gasoline and Diesel			
Enter total volume of gasoline&diesel <25,000 L	25000	\$0.50	\$12,500.00
Enter total volume of gasoline&fuel > 25,000 L	39575	\$0.25	\$9,893.75
Total Gasoline and Diesel			\$22,393.75

When fuel is within bermed site or has other safety feature, enter 1, otherwise enter 0	1	25%	-\$5,598.44
Aviation Fuel			
Enter total volume of aviation fuel < 25,000 L	25000	\$0.50	\$12,500.00
Enter total volume of aviation fuel > 25,000 L	5750	\$0.25	\$1,437.50
Total Aviation Fuel	30750		\$13,937.50
When fuel is within bermed site or has other safety feature, enter 1, otherwise enter 0	1	25%	-\$3,484.38
Total H1			\$27,248.44

Land Disturbance (L1)			
Disturbed Surface Area			
<i>(Developed surface area that may require restoration through the use of scarification, reseeding, fertilizing or other similar techniques)</i>			
Enter number of hectares disturbed	10	\$1,000.00	\$10,000.00
Other Land Disturbances			
Creek Crossings; enter number of creek crossings	0	\$500.00	\$0.00
Off-Road Activities; if any activities are likely, enter 1	1	\$500.00	\$500.00
Sump Factor; enter total area occupied by sumps in m ²	1	\$10.00	\$10.00
Well Factor; enter number of wells (OIL and GAS ONLY)		\$25,000.00	\$0.00
Total L1			\$10,510.00

Land Use Permit Security Worksheet (continued)

Application Number: W2013C0002	Input Amount	Multiplier	
Equipment (E1)			
Based upon type of equipment			
Enter number of pieces of heavy equipment (i.e. dozer, forklift, large gensets)	3	\$1,000.00	\$3,000.00
Enter number of drills	2	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00
Enter number of light vehicles (trucks, atvs, snowmobiles, boats)	18	\$250.00	\$4,500.00
Enter number of small generators or pumps	6	\$100.00	\$600.00
Enter number of empty fuel storage tanks (propane)	10	\$500.00	\$5,000.00
Total E1			\$15,100.00

Security Calculation

Preliminary Calculation

Enter amount from C1		\$6,055.00
Enter amount from R1		\$3,000.00
Enter amount from H1		\$27,248.44
Enter amount from L1		\$10,510.00
Enter amount from E1		\$15,100.00
Preliminary Calculation, total of above	A	\$61,913.44

Multipliers

Site Access Multiplier. If the project has all weather road access enter 1, if ice road access enter 1.5, if air access enter 2	B	1.5
Performance Multiplier. If applicant has succssfully completed the terms of a LUP enter 0.85, otherwise enter 1	C	1
Environmental Risk Factor. If location has high environmental value or unusual environmental risk enter 2. If location is previously disturbed enter 0.75. Otherwise enter 1.	D	1

Calculated Security

Multiply preliminary calculation (A) by performance multipliers (B, C and D)	E	\$92,870.16
--	----------	-------------

Existing Securities

List existing associated permits and amount of overlapping security		
Permit:		
Permit:		
Permit:		
Permit:		
Overlapping Securities, total of above	F	\$0.00

Final Security Determination

Subtract overlapping securities (F) from calculated security (E)		\$92,870.16
--	--	-------------

Comments

Original Security	
Current Security	<u>\$92,870</u>
Additional Amount Required	\$92,870
Additional Amount Rounded	\$93,000