



**SCREENING DECISION REPORT
NIRB FILE No.: 24KN042**

NPC File No.: 150257

December 20, 2024

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board’s (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada’s “Bernard Harbour PIN-C Contaminated Site Remediation Project” is not required pursuant to Article 12, Section 12.4.4(a) of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and s. 92(1)(a) of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (*NuPPAA*).

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

OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....	2
PROJECT REFERRAL	3
PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	3
ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF NUPPAA.....	6
VIEWS OF THE BOARD	7
RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS	13
OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
CONCLUSION	21
APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT	22
APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS	25

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT	22
APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS	25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROJECT REFERRAL

On August 15, 2024, the NIRB received a referral to screen Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada’s “Bernard Harbour PIN-C Contaminated Site Remediation Project” proposal from the Nunavut Planning Commission (Commission), which noted that the project proposal is outside the area of an applicable regional land use plan.

On November 14, 2024, the NIRB received the complete application from the Proponent.

Pursuant to Article 12, Sections 12.4.1 and 12.4.4 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 87 of the *NuPPAA*, the NIRB commenced screening this project proposal and assigned it file number **24KN042**.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Screening Process Timelines

The following key stages were completed for the screening process:

Date	Stage
August 15, 2024	Receipt of project proposal and referral from the Commission.
August 16, 2024	Request to complete public registry online and provide information pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
November 5, 2024	Receipt of online application from Proponent
September 27, 2024	Request(s) to Proponent for additional information in order to carry out screening pursuant to s. s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
November 15, 2024	Proponent responded to information request(s) and provided additional information
November 14, 2024	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
November 18, 2024	Public engagement and comment request

Date	Stage
December 9, 2024	Receipt of public comments
December 20, 2024	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

2. Project Scope

All documents received and pertaining to this project proposal can be accessed from the NIRB's online public registry at <https://www.nirb.ca/project/125992>.

Project:	Bernard Harbour PIN-C Contaminated Site Remediation Project				
Region:	Kitikmeot Region				
Location:	Bernard Harbour DEW Line Site				
Closest Community:	Kugluktuk	Distance (approximate)	100 kilometres (km)	Direction	north-northeast
Summary of Project Description:	The Proponent intends to remediate the Site by removing, treating, or isolating impacted soil, debris, and building materials from historical activities.				
Project Proposed Timeline:	August 2025 to September 2026				

As required under s. 86(1) of the *NuPPAA*, the Board accepts the scope of the project as set out by the Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (the Proponent) in the proposal. The scope of the project proposal includes the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- Site cleanup and remediation:
 - constructing contaminated soil treatment facilities
 - staging work areas for shipment and machinery maintenance
 - excavating, removing, and containerizing contaminated soil (heavy metals, PCBs and PHCs) for onsite treatment or offsite disposal
 - demolishing, packaging and containerizing onsite debris, structures and facilities
 - excavating and removing buried debris, and backfilling and regrading of the areas
 - collecting and separating hazardous and non-hazardous wastes for onsite incineration or offsite shipment to approved facilities
 - decommissioning and reclaiming the work areas
- Work camp construction, operation, and decommissioning:
 - two work seasons totaling 2,975 person days
 - burning combustible wastes in enclosed containers
 - collecting, sorting, and containerizing hazardous materials, non-combustibles and overburden for offsite disposal
 - treating greywater onsite and managing sewage through onsite treatment or offsite disposal
 - pumping and treating lake water for onsite use: up to 6 cubic metres daily
- Onsite quarries development, operation and reclamation:
 - excavating, stockpiling, backfilling and grading
- Transportation and onsite access:

- using charter flights (refueling offsite) and sealift for transporting personnel, materials, and equipment to and from the site
- upgrading existing access roads and airstrip
- Use of equipment and vehicles onsite:
 - bulldozer (x2), tractor (tbd), loader (x3), pickup trucks (x2), grader (tbd), excavator (x2), all-terrain vehicles (x4)
- Transportation, use, and storage of fuel and chemicals:
 - diesel (301,600 Liters) and gasoline (410 Liters)
 - shop supplies of hazardous materials and chemicals

3. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

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

4. Public Comments and Concerns

Notice regarding the NIRB's screening of this project proposal was distributed on November 18, 2024, to community organizations in Kugluktuk, as well as to relevant federal and territorial government agencies, Inuit organizations and other parties. The NIRB requested that interested parties review the proposal and provide the Board with any comments or concerns by December 9, 2024, 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 including if a Review is required any additional factors that should be considered as part of that process.

On or before December 9, 2024, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

- **Government of Nunavut (GN)**
- **Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)**
- **Transport Canada (TC)**

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

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

GN:

- No comments and did not identify any concerns.

CIRNAC:

- No comments.

TC:

- Identified acts and regulations regarding marine safety and security, and the transportation of dangerous goods which the proposed project is subject to.
- Did not identify any concerns or provide further comments.

b. 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. However, Inuit Qaujimaningit and traditional 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.

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

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

Factor	Comment
The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The physical footprint of the proposed project components is the Bernard Harbour DEW Line site covering an area of about 3.3 square kilometres.▪ The proposed project would take place within habitats of far-ranging wildlife species such as migratory and non-migratory birds, Arctic fox, Arctic hares, and Species at Risk such as Dolphin and Union Caribou and polar bears.
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project.
The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified

Factor	Comment
	by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project.
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project is unlikely to result in significant adverse impacts to local human and animal population sizes.
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"> Two zones of influences for different phases of the project were selected in the NIRB's assessment: a buffer of 5 km around the project site during the first working season, and a buffer of 14 km during the second season. With adherence to the relevant regulatory requirements and application of the mitigation measures recommended by the NIRB, no significant residual effects are expected to occur.
The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mitigation measures recommended by the NIRB have been designed with consideration for the potential for cumulative effects to result from the impacts of the project combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects.
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other relevant factors were identified.

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

NIRB Number	Project	Project Title	Project Type
<i>Proposed Developments – undergoing assessment</i>			
24YN049		Field Research Program for the Grays Bay Road and Port Project	Research
<i>Present Projects – approved or in operation</i>			
23KN072		Cape Krusenstein Remediation Project	Remediation
<i>Past Projects</i>			
08DN081		Cleanup of the PIN-2, Cape Young DEW Line site	Remediation
07YN054		PIN-B (Clifton Point) Environmental Site Investigation	Research
04YN074		Fish Habitat Study	Research

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.

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

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:

Valued Component	Terrestrial wildlife including migratory and non-migratory birds and other small terrestrial wildlife, and Species at Risk
Potential effects:	The project area may provide for habitat, migration stopovers, and food for wildlife, such as caribou, muskox, wolverine, Arctic hares, ground squirrel, Arctic fox, grizzly bear and polar bear; and the presence of migratory and non-migratory birds have been observed in the area, including falcon, horned larks, savannah sparrows, seabirds and water birds.
Nature of Impacts:	Negative impacts on wildlife and their habitat will be likely, low in magnitude, restricted to the zone of influence of 14 km around the project area, reoccurring for two summers, and reversible. Project activities may affect wildlife behaviour, mating and calving, nesting and foraging activities, and may influence habitat use or cause nest abandonment. The impacts can be effectively mitigated or avoided with the implementation of the Proponent’s proposed measures and the Board’s terms and conditions.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent proposes the following mitigative measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conduct migratory bird sweep during sensitive times before work starts • avoid or create a setback from colonies of birds and their nest • execute Wildlife Management Plan
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Waste Management – 10 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 20 Noise – 24 Wildlife – General – 27 through 30 Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance – 31, 32 Aircraft Flight Restrictions – 33 through 38 Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance – 39 through 43 Marine-Based Activities - 61
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994 and Migratory Birds Regulations, 2022</i> • <i>Species at Risk Act.</i> Attached in Appendix A is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wildlife Act</i>, SNu 2003, c 26 • <i>The Aeronautic Act</i> and the <i>Canadian Aviation Regulations</i>
--	---

Valued Component	Marine Mammals
Potential effects:	Bernard Harbour provides habitat and feeding grounds for capelin and important marine mammals: bowhead whales, beluga whales, narwhal, ringed seals. Project sealift activities may affect use of habitat in the strait:
Nature of Impacts:	Negative impacts on the marine mammals and their habitat are expected to be low in magnitude, infrequent, and reversible. Impacts can be effectively avoided or reduced with the implementation of the Proponent’s proposed measures and the Board’s terms and conditions.
Mitigating Factors:	<p>The nature of the project sealift activity is not expected to generate a significant impact.</p> <p>The Proponent proposes mitigative measures as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish safe distance from marine mammals during encounters • Execute Spill Prevention Plan
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	<p>Water courses/Water bodies – 6 through 9</p> <p>Fuel and Chemical Storage – 20</p> <p>Marine-Based Activities – 58 through 62 Error! Reference source not found.</p>
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act</i> and the <i>Arctic Shipping Safety and Pollution Prevention Regulations</i> • <i>The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992</i> and the <i>Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations</i>

Valued Component	Surface water quality, fish and fish habitat, and aquatic environment
Potential effects:	Potential negative impacts to surface water quality, fish and fish habitat, and the aquatic environment, due to project activities, are expected to be limited and reversible with proper mitigation measures put in place.
Nature of Impacts:	Negative impacts on the freshwater, fish and fish habitat will be likely, low in magnitude, restricted to freshwater bodies or existing hydrological connectivity, infrequent but irreversible.
Mitigating Factors:	Impacts can be effectively avoided or reduced with the implementation of the Proponent’s proposed measures and the Board’s terms and conditions.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	<p>Water courses/Water bodies – 6 through 9</p> <p>Fuel and Chemical Storage – 12 through 21</p> <p>Aggregate Removal – 45 through 47</p> <p>Camps - 57</p>
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Nunavut Act</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Fisheries Act</i> • <i>The Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act</i> • <i>The Migratory Birds Convention Act and Migratory Birds Regulations</i> • <i>The Canadian Environmental Protection Act and the Storage Tank System for Petroleum Products and Allied Petroleum Products Regulations.</i>
--	--

Valued Component	Vegetation, Soils, and Permafrost
Potential effects:	<p>The whole project is primarily on continuous permafrost and involves mostly earthmoving activities in the summer months—excavating, backfilling, grading, and compacting for access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • excavation of buried debris and contaminated soils will remove vegetation and topsoil in some areas on site. • excavation in Beach Area may decrease land stability and exacerbate erosion. • soil compaction from using pick-up trucks and ATVs, and other heavy equipment on site. • landfarming low-level contaminants (PCB and PHCs) will be left in situ covering an area of around 250m² • quarrying may increase sediment to nearby water bodies and reduce ground stability
Nature of Impacts:	<p>Negative impacts on vegetation, soil and permafrost will be highly likely, low in magnitude, restricted to the zone of influence of 1 km around the project area, reoccurring for two summers, and reversible. Impacts can be effectively mitigated or avoided with the implementation of the Proponent’s proposed measures and the Board’s terms and conditions.</p>
Mitigating Factors:	<p>The Proponent proposes to use the Remedial Action Plan and the Waste Management Plan.</p> <p>The Board suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid using location 2 as the landfarm for bioremediation of soils with PCB and PHC contaminants given its proximity to a lake. • avoid disturbance to Drummond Bluebell, a globally rare plant with a known distribution within 60 km of the Site along the shoreline.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	<p>Waste Management – 10 and 11 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 13 through 19, 21 Landfarm Operations – 25 and 26 Road and Ground Disturbance – 44 Aggregate Removal – 48 Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas – 51 through 55 Camps – 56</p>

Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Waste Management for Northern and Remote Communities (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2017) • The <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999</i> and the Federal Guidelines for Landfarming Petroleum Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soils • The <i>Territorial Lands Act</i> and the <i>Territorial Quarrying Regulations</i> • Environmental Guideline for the Management of Contaminated Sites, Government of Nunavut, revised December 2014 • Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Hazardous Waste, Government of Nunavut, revised October 2010
---	--

Valued Component	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Potential effects:	<p>Project activities that may reduce ambient air quality include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dusting from quarrying activities, regrading and compacting the road, and spreading granular fills on the landfarm • release of carcinogenic compounds from burning of waste materials <p>Project activities that contribute to GHG emission include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • moving goods and personnel by air and ship • use of vehicle and equipment, and heating at camp with fuels.
Nature of Impacts:	Negative impacts on ambient air quality will be moderately likely, negligible, restricted to the zone of influence of 5 km around the project area, reoccurring for two summers. The impacts can be effectively mitigated or avoided with the implementation of the Proponent's proposed measures and the Board's terms and conditions.
Mitigating Factors:	The Board suggests dust suppression measures be used where appropriate, follow industry best practices, and conform to the terms and conditions when carrying out these activities.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Air Quality – 22 and 23
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999</i> • Environmental Guideline for the Burning and Incineration of Solid Waste, Government of Nunavut, revised January 2012 • The Guidance Document for Canadian Jurisdictions on Open-Air Burning

Valued Component	Inuit harvesting and traditional land use activities
Potential effects:	The Bernard Harbour area is a common camping location when Kugluktuk residents are caribou hunting or fishing. Modern tenting materials are also found within the project footprint. During project

	construction and operation, there may be reduced access to the site for public safety reasons. The completion of the project will improve the viewscape of the area for enjoyment and remove safety hazards on site. No specific concerns or impacts to public and traditional land use activities in the area have been identified.
Nature of Impacts:	Negative impacts on recreational and traditional land use of the project area will be likely, low in magnitude, restricted to the project footprint, reoccurring for two summers, reversible. The impacts can be effectively mitigated or avoided with the implementation of the Proponent's proposed measures and the Board's terms and conditions.
Mitigating Factors:	<p>The Proponent proposed to put out signage where appropriate to alert the public of work areas, restrict access where necessary for safety, and engage with the residents of Kugluktuk to coordinate timing and to accommodate traditional land use of the project area.</p> <p>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.</p>
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	<p>Quarries – 49 and 50</p> <p>Other – 66, 67</p>
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Nunavut Act</i>

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Valued Component	Archaeological and Historical Sites
Potential effects:	The recorded archaeology sites are outside the project footprint, 10 of which are within 10km of the project boundary.
Nature of Impacts:	Due to the location of known sites, impacts are unlikely.
Mitigating Factors:	<p>In the Proponent's submission on their community meeting dated Feb 28, 2023, it reiterates the need to have archaeological assessment done for the wood cabins for their values as heritage resources.</p> <p>The Board suggest the Proponent should consult with the Government of Nunavut Department of Culture and Heritage regarding the need to do a field assessment of the cabins in SDA 8 and SDA-9 for their values as heritage resources during the first year of operations. The results from the assessment should be shared with the community of Kugluktuk.</p>
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Heritage Sites – 63 through 64
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	The <i>Nunavut Act</i> . The Proponent must comply with the proposed terms and conditions listed in the attached Appendix B .

Valued Component	Local hiring, contracting and economic impact
Potential effects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential local employment opportunities and economic benefits through use of local business and services • Proposed project activities may draw works away from local communities and consequently impacting services availability
Nature of Impacts:	Local hiring is likely to result in positive economic impacts.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has proposed to hire locally where possible.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Other – 68
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	Not applicable.

Significant public concern:

Valued Component	Public Concern
Potential effects:	No significant public concern was identified or unresolved during the Proponent’s engagement activities with the Hamlet of Kugluktuk, and during the NIRB’s public comment period for this project.
Mitigating Factors:	The Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities, to the extent possible hire local people, and to ensure planned activities in the area utilize available Inuit Qaujimaningit.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Others – 66, 68
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	Not applicable.

Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:

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

Administrative Conditions:

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

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

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

General

1. Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (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.: 150257), and the NIRB (Online Application Form, November 5, 2024; Remedial Action Plan, November 15, 2024). This information should be accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
3. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.
4. The Proponent shall ensure that it meets the standards and/or limits as set out in the authorizing agencies' permits or licences as required for this project.
5. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel, staff and contractors are adequately trained prior to commencement of all project activities, and shall be made aware of all operational plans, management plans, guidelines and Proponent commitments relating to the project.

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

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

Waste Management

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

Fuel and Chemical Storage

12. The Proponent shall locate all fuel and other hazardous materials a minimum distance away from the high-water mark of any water body and environmentally sensitive areas as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies. The materials shall be stored in such a manner as to prevent their release into the environment.
13. The Proponent shall use adequate secondary containment or a surface liner (e.g., self-supporting insta-berms and fold-a-tanks) when storing barreled fuel and chemicals at all locations.
14. The Proponent shall ensure that re-fuelling of all equipment occurs a minimum distance away from the high-water mark of any water body as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies.
15. Fuel and hazardous material storage areas and fuel lines should be clearly marked with signs or flagging to avoid accidental breaks and punctures, and to ensure areas remain visible during the winter months.
16. All fuel and chemical storage containers must be clearly marked with the Proponent's name for ease of identification.
17. The Proponent shall routinely inspect and document the conditions of fuel and hazardous material storage containers and containment areas as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies. Fuel containment areas shall be kept clear of debris, water and snow to facilitate inspections for leaks.
18. The Proponent shall have a Spill Contingency Plan in place at all fuel storage or transfer locations and shall ensure that appropriate spill response equipment and clean-up materials (e.g., shovels, pumps, barrels, drip pans, and absorbents) are readily available.
19. The Proponent shall follow the authorizing agencies' direction for management and removal of hazardous materials and wastes (e.g., contaminated soils, sediment and waste oil).
20. The Proponent shall ensure that wildlife deterrent systems are utilized at the time of a spill incident in order to avoid wildlife (terrestrial or marine) and migratory birds from being contaminated.
21. The Proponent shall ensure that all spills of fuel or other deleterious materials of 100 litres or more must be reported immediately to the 24-hour Spill Line at (867) 920-8130.

Air Quality

22. The Proponent shall take appropriate dust suppression measures in conducting all activities for this Project including using approved dust suppression additives and techniques as necessary to maintain ambient air quality.
23. The Proponent shall eliminate unnecessary idling to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as much as possible.

Noise

24. All construction and road vehicles must be fitted with standard and well-maintained noise suppression devices.

Landfarm Operations

25. The Proponent shall treat only petroleum and hydrocarbon contaminated soils at the landfarm facility. Materials contaminated with other substances such as glycol and heavy metals are not to be stored at the landfarm and must be disposed of at an authorized facility.
26. The Proponent shall ensure that the equipment used for aeration in the landfarm operation have been cleaned off within the landfarm facilities prior to exiting.

Wildlife – General

27. 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.
28. 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.
29. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.
30. 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.

Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance

31. 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*.
32. The Proponent shall not disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of any birds. If active nests of any birds are discovered or located (i.e., with eggs or young), the Proponent shall avoid these areas until nesting is complete and the young have naturally left the vicinity of the nest by establishing a protection buffer zone¹ appropriate for the species and the surrounding habitat.

Aircraft Flight Restrictions

33. The Proponent shall not alter flight paths to approach wildlife and avoid flying directly over animals.
34. The Proponent shall plan flight paths that minimize flights over known habitat likely to have birds or concentrations of wildlife. Aircraft should avoid critical and sensitive wildlife areas at all times by choosing alternate flight corridors.
35. The Proponent shall restrict aircraft/helicopter activity related to the project to a minimum flight altitude of 610 metres (2,100 ft) above ground level except during landing, take-off or if

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

there is a specific requirement for low-level flying, which does not disturb wildlife or migratory birds.

36. The Proponent shall avoid known concentrations of birds (e.g., bird colonies, moulting areas) by a lateral distance of 1.5 kilometre. If avoidance is not possible maintain a minimum flight altitude of 1,100 metres (3,500 feet) over these areas.
37. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft/helicopter do not, unless for emergency, touch-down in areas where wildlife are present.
38. The Proponent shall advise all pilots of relevant flight restrictions and enforce their application over the project area, including flight paths to/from the project area.

Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance

39. The Proponent shall avoid interfering with any paths or crossings known to be frequented by caribou during periods of migration as identified by current land use plans in place and/or by Inuit Qaujimaningit.
40. The Proponent shall not locate any operation or undertake activities that could block or cause any diversion to migration of caribou or muskoxen.
41. The Proponent shall implement mobile caribou conservation measures and immediately cease activities that may interfere with the migration or calving of caribou or muskoxen, until the caribou or muskox have passed.
42. Should pregnant caribou cows, cows with young calves, or groups of 50 or more caribou be observed within one (1) kilometer of project operations at any time, the Proponent shall suspend all operations in the vicinity, including low level overflights, drilling, blasting/trenching, and use of snowmobiles and all terrain vehicles outside the immediate vicinity of the camp, until caribou are no longer in the immediate area.
43. During the period of April 14 to June 1 when muskoxen are present, the Proponent shall not approach muskoxen closer than one (1) kilometer. This includes all operations, including low-level over flights, blasting, and use of snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles outside the immediate vicinity of the camps.

Road and Ground Disturbance

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

Aggregate Removal within Existing and New Quarries

45. The Proponent shall not remove any material from below the ordinary highwater mark of any lake or stream and shall maintain an undisturbed buffer zone as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies between quarry site and any high water mark of any water body to ensure erosion control.
46. The Proponent shall install silt fences/curtains down stream of any quarry activities.

47. The Proponent shall ensure there is no obstruction of natural drainage, flooding or channel diversion from quarry/pit access, stockpiles, or other structures or facilities.
48. The Proponent shall locate screening and crushing equipment on stable ground, at a location with ready access to stockpiles.
49. The Proponent shall clearly stake and flag pit and quarry boundaries, so they remain visible to other land users.
50. The Proponent shall locate quarry/pit facilities so as to avoid all recreational sites and public use areas, and to protect unique geographical features and natural aesthetics.

Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas

51. The Proponent shall use existing trails where possible during project activities on the land.
52. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.
53. The Proponent shall avoid disturbance on slopes prone to natural erosion, and alternative locations shall be utilized.
54. 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.
55. The Proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are restored to a stable or pre-disturbed state using Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BATEA) upon completion of work and/or abandonment.

Camps

56. The Proponent shall ensure that all camps are located durable surfaces, such as gravel or sand that is consolidated and can withstand repeated, heavy use. Measures shall be put in place to prevent erosion, trail formation and damage to the ground.
57. The Proponent shall not erect camps or store materials on the surface ice of lakes or streams, except that which is for immediate use.

Marine-Based Activities

58. The Proponent shall ensure that noise be kept to a minimum and shall refrain from making sharp or loud noises, blowing horns or whistles and shall maintain constant engine noise levels.
59. The Proponent shall not attempt to intersect or interfere with the movements of marine mammals. This includes ensuring that there are no wake zones within 250 metres and a minimum of 100 metre no go zone around marine mammals. Strategic positioning of vessels ahead of the path being traveled by mobile mammals and waiting for the mammals to pass is also prohibited.
60. When marine mammals appear to be trapped or disturbed by vessel movements, the Proponent shall implement appropriate measures to mitigate disturbance, including stoppage of movement until wildlife have moved away from the immediate area.

61. The Proponent shall maintain a distance of 100 metres if a Polar Bear is encountered on land or ice while conducting activities from a zodiac or other small craft; all interaction with Polar Bears should be avoided if possible.
62. The Proponent shall report all incidents, injuries or sightings of marine mammals to the appropriate authorizing agencies.

Heritage Sites

63. The Proponent shall ensure that archaeological and paleontological sites are not purposely or inadvertently disturbed by clients or staff as a result of project activities.
64. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel are aware of the Proponent's responsibilities and requirements regarding archaeological or palaeontological sites that are encountered during land-based activities. This should include briefings explaining the prohibitions regarding removal of artifacts, and defacing or writing on rocks and infrastructure.
65. No activities shall be conducted in the vicinity (50 metres buffer zone) of any archaeological/historical sites. If archaeological sites or features are encountered, activities shall immediately be interrupted and moved away from this location. Each site encountered needs to be recorded and reported to the Government of Nunavut—Department of Culture and Heritage.

Other

66. 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.
67. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
68. 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, permits and authorizations to the Board and Commission

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

Transport of Dangerous Goods and Waste Management

3. Environment and Climate Change Canada recommends that all hazardous wastes, including waste oil, receive proper treatment and disposal at an approved facility.
4. The Proponent shall ensure that proper shipping documents (waste manifests, transportation of dangerous goods, etc.) accompany all movements of dangerous goods. Further, the Proponent shall ensure that the shipment of all dangerous goods is registered with the Government of Nunavut Department of Environment, Department of Environment Manager. Contact the Manager (867) 975-7748 to obtain a manifest if dangerous goods including hazardous wastes will be transported.
5. The Proponent shall provide an authorization or letter of conformation of disposal be obtained from the owner/operator of the landfill to be used for disposal of project-related wastes.

Incineration of Wastes

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

Use of Inuit Qaujimaningit

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

Bear and Carnivore Safety

8. The Proponent should review the Government of Nunavut’s booklet on Bear Safety, which can be downloaded from this link: http://gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/bear_safety_-_reducing_bear-people_conflicts_in_nunavut.pdf. Further information on bear/carnivore detection and deterrent techniques can be found in the “*Safety in Grizzly and Black Bear Country*” pamphlet, which can be downloaded from this link: https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/resources/safety_in_grizzly_and_black_bear_country_english.pdf.
9. 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.

10. Any problem wildlife or any interaction with carnivores should be reported immediately to the Government of Nunavut, Wildlife Management Office, local Conservation Officer of Kugluktuk, phone: (867)982-7440.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to the Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada's "Bernard Harbour PIN-C Contaminated Site Remediation Project". The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated December 20, 2024 at Baker Lake, NU.



Kaviq Kaluraq, 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 2019

Terrestrial Species at Risk²	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility³
Migratory Birds			
Buff-breasted Sandpiper	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)
Common Nighthawk	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Eskimo Curlew	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harlequin Duck	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harris's Sparrow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Horned Grebe	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ivory Gull	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Olive-sided Flycatcher	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peregrine Falcon	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red Knot Islandica Subspecies	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red-necked Phalarope	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ross's Gull	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Rusty Blackbird	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Vegetation			
Porsild's Bryum	Threatened	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut (GN)
Arthropods			
Transverse Lady Beetle	Special Concern	No Schedule	GN
Terrestrial Wildlife			
Caribou (Dolphin and Union Population)	Endangered	Schedule 1	GN
Caribou (Barren-ground Population)	Threatened	No Schedule	GN
Caribou (Torngat Mountains Population)	Endangered	No Schedule	GN
Grizzly Bear (Western Population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peary Caribou	Endangered	Schedule 1	GN
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Wolverine	Special Concern	Schedule 1	GN
Marine Wildlife			
Atlantic Walrus (High Arctic Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)
Atlantic Walrus (Central/Low Arctic Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound Population)	Threatened	Schedule 1	DFO

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

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

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

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



INTRODUCTION

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

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

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

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

⁴P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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

Legal Framework

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

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

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

Palaeontology and Archaeology

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

Definitions

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

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

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

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

“fossil” includes:

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

(a) natural casts;

(b) preserved tracks, coprolites and plant remains; and

(c) the preserved shells and exoskeletons of invertebrates and the preserved eggs, teeth and bones of vertebrates.

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

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

Introduction

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

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

⁵ s. 51(1)

⁶ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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

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

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

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

Types of Development

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

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

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

Types of Studies Undertaken to Preserve Heritage Resources

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

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

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

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

- 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.