



SCREENING DECISION REPORT NIRB FILE No.: 18YN029

Previous NIRB File No.: 17YN016
NPC File No.: 148813

July 13, 2018

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board's (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of University of Rhode Island's (URI) "URI Northwest Passage Project 2018" is not required pursuant to paragraph 92(1)(a) of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (*NuPPAA*).

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

OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT

- 1) REGULATORY FRAMEWORK
- 2) PROJECT REFERRAL
- 3) PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS
- 4) ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF *NuPPAA*
- 5) VIEWS OF THE BOARD
- 6) RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS
- 7) OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
- 8) REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS
- 9) CONCLUSION

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The primary objectives of the NIRB are set out in Section 12.2.5 of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and are confirmed by s. 23 of the *NuPPAA*:

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

The purpose of screening is provided for under s. 88 of the *NuPPAA*:

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

To determine whether a review of a project is required, the NIRB is guided by the considerations as set out under s. 89(1) of *NuPPAA*:

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

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

It is noted that s. 89(2) of the *NuPPAA* provides that the considerations set out in paragraph 89(1)(a) prevail over those set out in paragraph 89(1)(b) of the *NuPPAA*.

As set out under s. 92(1) of the *NuPPAA*, upon conclusion of the screening process, the Board must provide its written report the Minister:

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

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

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

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

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

PROJECT REFERRAL

On April 24, 2018 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) received a referral to screen University of Rhode Island's (URI) "URI Northwest Passage Project 2018" project proposal from the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC or Commission). The NPC noted that the previous conformity determination issued on February 10, 2017 (Previous NIRB File No. 17YN016) for the activities associated with the current proposal continues to apply and has determined that the project proposal requires screening by the NIRB because the proposal does not belong to a class of exempt works or activities set out in Schedule 12-1 of the Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (*Nunavut Agreement*).

Pursuant to Article 12, Sections 12.4.1 and 12.4.4 of the Nunavut Agreement and section 87 of the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (NuPPAA), the NIRB commenced screening this project proposal and assigned it file number 18YN029.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Project Scope

The proposed "URI Northwest Passage Project 2018" project is located within the Qikiqtani (North Baffin) and Kitikmeot regions and encompasses several research sites from Resolute Bay, to Cambridge Bay via Bellot Strait, including Lancaster Sound, Pond Inlet and Iqaluit. The Proponent intends to study how waters of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago (CAA) have changed as a consequence of the secular warming trend over the Arctic Circle, during a scientific expedition aboard a research vessel (M/V *Akademik Ioffe*) along the Northwest Passage. The program is proposed to take place from August to September, 2018.

As required under s. 86(1) of the *NuPPAA*, the Board accepts the scope of the "URI Northwest Passage Project 2018" project as set out by URI in the proposal. The scope of the project proposal includes the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- Undertake marine-based research activities along the Northwest Passage near the communities of Resolute Bay, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Gjoa Haven, Cambridge Bay, Clyde River, Qikiqtarjuaq, Pangnirtung and Iqaluit;
- Undertake shore landings during expedition stops to conduct land-based educational activities and videography;
- Use different equipment and instrumentations (i.e., Acoustic Doppler Current Profile, Conductivity, Temperature, Depth rosette, and Multibeam Echosounder) to monitor water conditions and collect bathymetric data along transits;
- Use of an autonomous underwater glider;
- Use of onboard laser absorption spectrometers to measure stable isotopes of hydrogen and oxygen in seawater samples;
- Conduct zooplankton net tows along the cruise track, and cataloguing of net contents in order to identify and quantify particles in seawater;
- Perform seabird counts and characterize the distribution and abundance of marine birds including marine mammals along the survey route; and

- Collection and analysis of air and water samples with onboard laser spectroscopy instruments, as well as incubation of water to study microbial activity.
- Use of various hazardous chemicals for sample preservation;
- Storage of hazardous chemical wastes onboard and subsequent disposal in Halifax, Nova Scotia; and
- Usage of facilities on the M/V Akademik Ioffe for research, transportation and as a marine research platform for 36 personnel to conduct scientific expedition across the CAA.

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 proceeded with screening the project based on the scope as described above. However, the NIRB noted that ship based as well as land use activities including shore excursions has been previously approved under NIRB File No. 12AN025 and that any activities onboard the M/V *Akademik Ioffe* would be required to also abide by the terms and conditions issued for NIRB File No. 12AN025.

3. Key Stages of the Screening Process

The following key stages were completed:

Date	Stage
April 24, 2018	Receipt of project proposal and positive conformity determination (North Baffin Land Use Plan) from the NPC
April 24, 2018 May 16, 2018	Information request(s)
May 24, 2018	Proponent responded to information request(s)
May 24, 2018	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
June 1, 2018	Public engagement and comment request
June 11, 2018	Receipt of public comments
June 15, 2018	Proponent clarified items in response to comments received
July 5, 2018	Request for Ministerial Extension
July 6, 2018	Ministerial Extension Granted

4. Public Comments and Concerns

Notice regarding the NIRB's screening of this project proposal including the inclusion of scope or exclusion of scope activities was distributed on June 1, 2018 to community organizations in Resolute Bay, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Gjoa Haven, Cambridge Bay, Clyde River, Qikiqtarjuaq, Pangnirtung, and Iqaluit, as well as to relevant federal and territorial government agencies, Inuit organizations and other parties. The NIRB requested that interested parties review the proposal and the NIRB's *proposed* project-specific terms and conditions, and provide the Board with any comments or concerns by June 11, 2018 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.

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

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada

- Recommended that the Proponent clearly describe the impacted valued eco-systemic component/valued socio-economic components, the anticipated negative impacts and provide a rationale for designating the impacts as “negative and non-mitigable” and “unknown”.

Kugluktuk Angoniatit Association

- Indicated support for the project proposal and requested a report on the results of the project.

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

No concerns or comments were received with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit or traditional and community knowledge in relation to the proposed project.

6. Time of Report Extension

As a result of the time required to allow the Board sufficient time to review the materials due to a high volume of screenings and other assessments before the Board, the NIRB was not able to provide its screening decision report to the responsible Minister within 45 days as required by Article 12, Section 12.4.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(3) of the *NuPPAA*. Therefore, on July 5, 2018 the NIRB wrote to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian coast Guard, Government of Canada, seeking an extension to the 45-day timeline for the provision of the Board’s Report.

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

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

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

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

1. *The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.*

The proposed project would take place during the transit of the M/V *Akademik Ioffe* through the Northwest Passage, including stops in or near the communities of Resolute Bay, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Gjoa Haven, Cambridge Bay, Clyde River, Qikiqtarjuaq, Pangnirtung, Iqaluit, and the Prince Leopold Island Migratory Bird Sanctuary.

The proposed activities may take place within habitats for various far ranging terrestrial wildlife, migratory and non-migratory birds, seabirds, marine mammal species, fish populations, benthic vertebrates, and Species at Risk, as identified by the Proponent and NPC mapping sources. Terrestrial wildlife that may be encountered during the shore based activities include caribou, wolves, wolverine, and arctic fox. Marine mammal species that may be encountered during the project activities could include Atlantic walrus, beluga whale, bowhead whale, grey whale, Polar Bear, ringed seal, killer whale, and narwhal. As such, the project may potentially affect wildlife migratory patterns.

2. *The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.*

The proposed project would occur near areas that have identified ecosystemic sensitivities such as the Prince Leopold Island Migratory Bird Sanctuary and would include shore-landings near several communities. The proposed project would occur also along coastal areas where fish population, bird habitats, and marine mammals species such walrus, seal, whale, narwhal, and beluga whale may be present. Further, the various areas that would be traversed during the research expedition have been identified as having value and priority to the local communities for:

- i. Historical travel routes;
- ii. Bird Sanctuaries;
- iii. Marine mammals including various whale species, walrus, and seals;
- iv. Shoreline ecosystems;
- v. Fish species;
- vi. Migratory birds; and
- vii. Polar Bears.

3. *The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.*

Neither the Proponent nor the Government of Nunavut has identified any known areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance associated with the project area. . Should the project be approved to proceed, the Proponent would be required to contact the Government of Nunavut-Department of Culture and Heritage if any sites of historical, cultural or archaeological significance are encountered.

4. *The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.*

The proposed project would transit marine areas and include shore landings near various North Baffin and Kitikmeot communities such as Resolute Bay, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Gjoa Haven, Cambridge Bay, Clyde River, Qikiqtarjuaq, Pangnirtung, and Iqaluit; as such human populations from these communities are likely to be affected by project impacts. Although the proposed project activities may take place within habitats of marine mammal species, fish population, benthic invertebrates, and migratory birds, no animal populations were specifically identified as likely to be affected by potential project impacts.

Although no significant public concerns were raised during the public commenting period, the NIRB notes that the close proximity of the proposed activities to several northern communities, ecological sensitive areas, and areas used by residents for recreational/traditional pursuits could potentially contribute to public concern developing. A term and condition has been recommended to direct engagement with the community, hunters and trappers organization and interested parties, as well as the posting of public notices to ensure residents are aware of the cruise ship project activities being or to be conducted.

5. *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.*

As the “URI Northwest Passage Project 2018” project is a proposed marine research project involving population surveys of seabirds and marine mammals including collection of air and water samples, the nature of potential impacts is considered to be well-known. Potential adverse impacts are likely to be localized, of low magnitude, infrequent, and restricted to the short period of project activities (up to 4 weeks). However, due to the proximity of sampling areas to the Prince Leopold Island Migratory Bird Sanctuary, specific mitigation measures for the protection of critical life stages of terrestrial species, marine wildlife species and migratory and non-migratory birds may be necessary. Based on past evidence of similar scope of activities, potential adverse impacts would be reversible and mitigable with due care.

6. *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.*

The proposed project would take place within a 100 kilometre radius to a number of other projects that are currently active, in addition to other projects proposed and currently undergoing assessment by the Board as listed in Table 1 below. However, it is noted that this project is not likely to result in residual or cumulative impacts. The potential for cumulative impacts to wildlife or traditional activities resulting from the research activity and other projects occurring in the region has been identified and considered in the development of the NIRB’s recommendations. Terms and conditions recommended for

each of these projects are expected to reduce any residual impacts, and as such would limit or eliminate the potential for cumulative effects to occur.

Table 1: Project List

NIRB Number	Project	Project Title	Project Type
<i>Proposed Projects</i>			
18TN035		MS FRAM The Northwest Passage - In the Wake of Great Explorers Westbound 29 August – 10 September 2018 Voyage CENFRNWP1801 and Eastbound 10 - 22 September 2018 Voyage CENFRNWP1802	Tourism
<i>Active Projects</i>			
12AN015		Canadian Arctic Cruise Tourism aboard M/V <i>Akademik Sergey Vavilov</i> and M/V <i>Akademik Ioffe</i>	Tourism
17XN021		Iqaluit Marine Infrastructure – Deep Sea Port	Infrastructure
17XN022		Iqaluit Marine Infrastructure – Small Craft Harbour	Infrastructure
17YN069		Effects of Anthropogenic Stressors on Arctic Seabirds	Research
18YN029		Arctic Driftwood as a Proxy Record of Environmental Change: a Pilot Study	Research
<i>Past Projects</i>			
17AN031		Canada C3 led by the Students on Ice Foundation	Research/Tourism
17YN041		A Coastal, Pan-Canadian Collection of plants, microalgae and marine invertebrates for the Canadian Museum of Nature, as part of Canada C3	Research

7. *Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.*

No other specific factors have been identified as relevant to the assessment of this project proposal.

Views of the Board

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

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: 1-4.

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:

Issue 1: Potential negative impacts to migratory patterns of seabirds, terrestrial wildlife, and migratory and non-migratory birds due to increased noise disturbance associated with research activities and seabird observations.

Board views: As discussed above in the assessment of factors relevant to this project proposal, the potential for impact(s) is applicable to a small geographic area proximal to Bylot Island Migratory Bird Sanctuary and Prince Leopold Island Migratory Bird Sanctuary, including several offshore survey locations near the communities of Resolute Bay, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Gjoa Haven, Cambridge Bay, Clyde River, Qikiqtarjuaq, Pangnirtung, and Iqaluit. Research operations and ground-based excursions could increase disturbance of seabird colonies, terrestrial wildlife, and migratory and non-migratory birds.

Due to the small size of the research crew, and the short and intermittent nature of project activities, the potential negative impacts to affected terrestrial wildlife and seabirds would be expected to be minimal and temporary only.

It is noted that this proposed project is associated with project 12AN025, using the M/V *Akademik Ioffe* as a base for the research activities, accommodations, and shore excursions; therefore, this project is also required to abide by the relevant terms and conditions from the associated project.

The Proponent would also be required to follow the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, *Migratory Birds Regulations*, *Species at Risk Act*, and the *Wildlife Act (Nunavut)* (see Regulatory Requirements section).

Recommended Mitigation Measures: It is recommended that the potential negative impacts from increase in noise may be mitigated by measures such as requiring the Proponent to avoid nesting areas of migratory birds, avoid marine mammals and ensure not to harass wildlife, and to ensure that project personnel are properly briefed on wildlife protocols, environmental sensitivities, and management procedures prior to undertaking research sampling activities. The Proponent has committed to avoiding wildlife and restricting the use of sonar as in potentially sensitive areas. The NIRB recommends the following terms and conditions to mitigate the potential adverse impacts to terrestrial wildlife, marine mammals, seabirds and migratory and non-migratory birds, and Polar Bears from the research activities: 6 through 13. To mitigate the potential adverse impacts to the habitats that may be used by wildlife and birds, the NIRB also recommends terms and conditions 5, and 15 through 17 to ensure areas in which activities are conducted are returned to a natural state as much as possible.

It is noted that this proposed project is associated with project 12AN025, using the M/V *Akademik Ioffe* as a base for the research activities and accommodations; therefore this project is also required to abide by the relevant terms and conditions from the associated project.

Issue 2: Potential negative impacts to marine mammals, fish population, and the marine habitat due to increased noise and physical disturbance associated with research activities, water sampling, and zooplankton collection.

Board views: Noise generated from vessel operations, research activities, use of sonar, and use of an autonomous underwater glider could increase disturbance of marine mammals, fish populations, and marine habitat, in addition to direct disturbance from water sampling and other research activities. However, due to the nature of the equipment used, noise generation, and physical disturbance are expected to be minimal and the potential negative impacts to affected marine mammals, fish populations, and marine habitat would be expected to be minimal and temporary only.

The Proponent has committed to ensuring that it would cease sonar operations when marine mammals are detected within 500 metres of the vessel; within five (5) kilometres of any Nunavut community and would not be used in any harbor, bay, fjord, or channel; in Navy Board Inlet, Eclipse Sound, and Pond Inlet in order to prevent any potential adverse impacts to group of narwhals that may move between the Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet areas; and in the restricted waters of the Bylot Island Migratory Bird Sanctuary or Parks Canada waters.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: It is recommended that the potential negative impacts from increase in noise may be mitigated by measures such as requiring the Proponent to avoid marine mammals and ensure not to harass wildlife, and to ensure that project personnel are properly briefed on wildlife protocols, environmental sensitivities, and management procedures prior to undertaking research sampling activities. The Proponent has committed to avoiding wildlife and restricting the use of sonar as in potentially sensitive areas. The NIRB recommends the following terms and conditions to mitigate the potential adverse impacts to marine mammals, seabirds and migratory birds, and Polar Bears from the research activities: 12 through 14.

Issue 3: Potential adverse impacts to public and traditional land use activities in the area due to vessel movement and research activities.

Board Views: The Proponent has noted that the proposed research project would occur near several northern communities and it is likely that the vicinities of marine sampling locations near these communities would be used for traditional hunting activities. Further, noise from research vessel and sampling activities may temporarily change the distribution of harvested species through avoidance, and may affect personal enjoyment of the marine areas.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: It is recommended that the potential negative impacts may be mitigated by measures such as requiring the Proponent to comply with wildlife management measures for vessel-based research activities. Term and condition 18 is recommended to ensure that the affected communities and organizations are informed about the project proposal and term and condition 19 has been recommended to ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities in the area. In addition, terms and conditions 7, 10 through 12, and 14 have been recommended to minimize interference with the movements of marine mammals, and nesting/breeding birds.

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Issue 4: Potential negative impacts to historical, cultural and archaeological sites from marine-based research activities and land-based excursion activities.

Board Views: The Proponent has indicated that there are no sites of archeological and paleontological significance associated with the project area. The probability of impacts occurring is considered to be low in magnitude; and it is unlikely that the research project, which would be based out research vessel with limited land-based components, would interact with any known archaeological and paleontological resources in the area.

The Proponent is required to comply with the requirements of the *Nunavut Act*, and contact the Government of Nunavut – Department of Culture and Heritage when encountering historical or archaeological sites (see Regulatory Requirements section).

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Terms and condition 18 is recommended to ensure that available Inuit Qaujimaningit can inform project activities, and reduce the potential for negative impacts occurring to any additional historical site.

Issue 5: Potential positive impacts to the local communities during expedition stops to conduct land-based educational activities and videography in collaboration with community members.

Board Views: The Proponent has committed to visiting and touring several northern communities to undertake land-based educational activities and videography which is considered a positive impact to the affected communities. It is encouraged that the Proponent consults with local community members, including the Hunters and Trappers Organization to hire field guides to support research personnel.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Terms and conditions 18 and 20 have been recommended to ensure the Proponent continues to keep the community informed of the research activities, to mitigate any concerns that may arise from the project activities and potentially prepare community members for hiring or learning opportunities.

Significant public concern:

Issue 6: No significant public concern was expressed during the public commenting period for this file.

Board Views: Follow up consultation and involvement of local community members is expected to mitigate any potential for public concern resulting from project activities. Further, it is noted that the Proponent has committed to consult with local communities before and during the implementation of the research project.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Term and condition 18 is recommended to ensure that affected communities and organizations are informed about the project proposal, and to provide the Proponent with an opportunity to proactively address or mitigate any concerns that may arise from the project activities.

Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:

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

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

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

General

1. University of Rhode Island (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times.
2. The Proponent shall forward copies of all permits obtained and required for this project to the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) prior to the commencement of the project.
3. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC File No.: 148813), and the NIRB (Online Application Form, May 24, 2018; Project Description Summaries in English, Inuktitut, Inuinnaqtun and French, May 24, 2018; Response to Comments, June 15, 2018).
4. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.

Waste Disposal

5. The Proponent shall keep all garbage and debris in bags placed in a covered metal container or equivalent until disposed of at an approved facility. All such wastes shall be kept inaccessible to wildlife at all times.

Wildlife - General

6. The Proponent shall ensure that there is no damage to wildlife habitat in conducting this operation.
7. The Proponent shall not harass wildlife. This includes persistently circling, chasing, hovering over pursuing or in any other way harass wildlife, or disturbing large groups of animals.
8. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.
9. The Proponent shall ensure that all project personnel are made aware of the measures to protect wildlife and are provided with training and/or advice on how to implement these measures.

Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance

10. The Proponent shall not disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of any birds. If nests are encountered and/or identified, the Proponent shall take precaution to avoid further interaction and or disturbance (e.g., a 100 metres buffer around the nests). If active nests of any birds are discovered (i.e., with eggs or young), the Proponent shall avoid these areas until nesting is complete and the young have left the nest.
11. The Proponent shall minimize activities during periods when birds are particularly sensitive to disturbance such as migration, nesting and moulting.
12. The Proponent shall avoid the seaward site of seabird colonies and areas used by flocks of migrating waterfowl by three (3) kilometres.

Marine and Ship-based Activities

13. The Proponent shall ensure that all researchers are aware of the Proponent's responsibilities and requirements regarding wildlife (terrestrial and marine) and wildlife habitat protection.
14. While on the research vessel, the Proponent shall limit viewing time of each concentration of marine mammals to a maximum of thirty (30) minutes in order to minimize disturbance.

Land Use

15. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.
16. The Proponent should use existing trails where possible during project activities on land.

Restoration of Disturbed Areas

17. The Proponent shall remove all garbage, fuel and equipment upon abandonment.

Other

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

19. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
20. 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 the NIRB of any changes in operating plans or conditions, including phase advancement, associated with this project prior to any such change.

Bear and Carnivore Safety

2. 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: http://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/default/files/web_pdf_wd_bear_safety_brochure_1_may_2015.pdf.
3. 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.
4. Any problem wildlife or any interaction with carnivores should be reported immediately to the local Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment Conservation Office.

Species at Risk

5. 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

6. 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.

7. 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://www.ec.gc.ca/paom-itmb/>.

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

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

1. The *Fisheries Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/F-14/index.html>).
2. The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* and *Migratory Birds Regulations* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/>).
3. The *Species at Risk Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/S-15.3/index.html>). Attached in **Appendix A** is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut.
4. 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>).
5. 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**.
6. The *Canada National Parks Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-14.01/>).

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board’s screening decision with respect to the URI’s “URI Northwest Passage Project 2018”. The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated July 13, 2018 at Whale Cove, NU.



Elizabeth Copland, 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 (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 2017

Terrestrial Species at Risk ¹	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility ²
Migratory Birds			
Buff-breasted Sandpiper	Special concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Eskimo Curlew	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harlequin Duck (Eastern population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harris's Sparrow	Special Concern	Pending	ECCC
Horned Grebe (Western population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ivory Gull	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peregrine Falcon	Special Concern (<i>anatum-tundrius</i> complex ³)	Schedule 1 - Schedule 3	ECCC
Red Knot (<i>islandica</i> subspecies)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red Knot (<i>rufa</i> subspecies)	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red-necked Phalarope	Special concern	Pending	ECCC
Ross's Gull	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Rusty Blackbird	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Vegetation			
Blanket-leaved Willow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Felt-leaf Willow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Porsild's Bryum (Moss)	Threatened	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Arthropods			
Traverse Lady Beetle	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Terrestrial Wildlife			
Caribou (Barren-Ground population)	Threatened	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Dolphin and Union Caribou	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Grizzly Bear (Western Population)	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Peary Caribou	Endangered	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Peary Caribou (High Arctic Population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	Government of Nunavut
Peary Caribou (Low Arctic Population)	Threatened	Schedule 2	Government of Nunavut
Wolverine	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Wolverine (Western population)	Non-active	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Marine Wildlife			
Atlantic Walrus	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic – Baffin Bay population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern Hudson Bay population)	Endangered	Pending	DFO

Beluga Whale (Southeast Baffin Island – Cumberland Sound population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	DFO
Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Bowhead Whale (Eastern Arctic population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	DFO
Bowhead Whale (Eastern Canada – West Greenland population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Killer Whale (Northwest Atlantic / Eastern Arctic populations)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Narwhal	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut/DFO
Fish			
Atlantic Cod, Arctic Lakes	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Atlantic Wolffish	Special Concern	Schedule 1	DFO
Bering Wolffish	Special Concern	Schedule 3	DFO
Blackline Prickleback	Special Concern	Schedule 3	DFO
Fourhorn Sculpin	Special Concern	Schedule 3	DFO
Fourhorn Sculpin (Freshwater form)	Data Deficient	Schedule 3	DFO
Northern Wolffish	Threatened	Schedule 1	DFO
Roundnose Grenadier	Endangered	Pending	DFO
Spotted Whitefish	Threatened	Schedule 1	DFO
Thorny Skate	Special Concern	Pending	DFO

¹ The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has responsibility for aquatic species.

² Environment Canada (EC) 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 Palaeontological 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 Inventory
c)	Construction of linear disturbances, Extractive disturbances, Impounding disturbances and other land disturbance activities	Archaeological/ Palaeontological Inventory or Assessment 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*¹ to issue such permits.

- 2) The permittee/proponent shall not operate any vehicle over a known or suspected archaeological or palaeontological site.

¹ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

- 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*², the federal government can make regulations for the protection, care and preservation of palaeontological and archaeological sites and specimens in Nunavut. Under

² s. 51(1)

the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*³, it is illegal to alter or disturb any palaeontological or archaeological site in Nunavut unless permission is first granted through the permitting process.

Definitions

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

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

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

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

“fossil” includes:

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

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

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

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

Introduction

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

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

³ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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.