



SCREENING DECISION REPORT NIRB FILE No.: 24YN049

NPC File No.: 150523

February 18, 2025

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board's (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of West Kitikmeot Resources Corp.'s (WKRC) "Field Research Program for the Grays Bay Road and Port 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.....	8
VIEWS OF THE BOARD	10
RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS	13
MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.....	20
OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22
CONCLUSION	24

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT	25
APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS	28

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 September 20, 2024, the NIRB received a referral to screen West Kitikmeot Resources Corp.'s (WKRC) "Field Research Program for the Grays Bay Road and Port 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.

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 **24YN049**.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Screening Process Timelines

The following key stages were completed for the screening process:

Date	Stage
September 20, 2024	Receipt of project proposal and referral from the Commission.
October 3, 2024	Request to complete public registry online and provide information pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
November 29, 2024	Receipt of online application from Proponent
November 29, 2024	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
December 16, 2024	Public engagement and comment request
January 22, 2025, later extended to January 31, 2025	Receipt of public comments
January 15, 2025	Ministerial extension requested from the Minister of Northern Affairs
February 18, 2025	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 www.nirb.ca/project/126002.

Project:	Field Research Program for the Grays Bay Road and Port Project				
Region:	Kitikmeot				
Location:	Grays Bay				
Closest Community:	Kugluktuk	Distance (approximate)	180 kilometres (km)	Direction	East
Summary of Project Description:	The Proponent intends to conduct field research within the Project Area accessing land and waters collecting environmental data, maintaining existing and installing new scientific instrumentation required to support environmental data collection, and undertake design-related studies including geotechnical drilling.				
Project Proposed Timeline:	2025 to 2030				

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

- Use of temporary camps as needed;
- Use of helicopters for aerial track and surveys;
- Use of fixed-wing aircraft for surveys and crew;
- Use of boats for research activities;
- Design related studies to support Project planning advancement including:
 - Marine and land based geotechnical drilling focused in the Port area;
 - Geochemical assessment of proposed quarries along the road corridor;
 - Terrain stability and permafrost assessments; and
 - Terrestrial wildlife surveys to inform the environmental baseline and related impact assessment such as ground nest searches and shoreline bird surveys, use of motion activated cameras.
- Marine mammal studies including aerial, acoustic, and vessel surveys, marine and freshwater aquatic life surveys to inform the environmental baseline and related impact assessment including:
 - Intertidal and subtidal habitat and aquatic life surveys using transects, quadrats and a remote operated vehicle; and
 - Aquatic life and habitat sampling.
- Marine and freshwater sediment and water quality sampling;
- Vegetation and rare plant surveys;
- Use of up to eight (8) snowmobiles for accessing locations;
- Use of survey equipment such as cameras, data loggers, and remote operated vehicles for data collection;

- Use of up to six (6) various drills for geotechnical, geochemical, terrain, and permafrost data collection;
- Use of up to 14 generators and pumps to support drill and research;
- Archaeology studies to survey and document Archaeological and Paleontological Sites;
- Use of 5,000 pounds (lbs) of propane in 50 containers;
- Use of 61,500 liters of diesel fuel for drilling support;
- Use of 61,500 litres of aviation fuel for ariel support;
- Use of 30,750 liters of gasoline for boat, snowmobiles, generators and other equipment;
- Daily use of up to 299 cubic meters (m³) of suitable fresh water or marine source adjacent to drill/or camp;
- Combustible waste to be incinerated and backhauled;
- Hazardous waste to be backhauled to an approved facility;
- Non-combustible waste to be backhauled to an approved facility; and
- Overburden to be disposed in a sump.

3. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

At this time, the NIRB has identified no additional works or activities in relation to the project proposal, and any potential project-specific impacts of industrial users of the road or port are not considered as part of this application, but would be considered as part of the third parties' project-specific impact assessment for the Grays Bay Road and Port (NIRB File No. 24XN038).

4. Public Comments and Concerns

Notice regarding the NIRB's screening of this project proposal was distributed on December 16, 2024, to community organizations in Kugluktuk, Cambridge Bay, Gjoa Haven, Taloyoak, Kugaaruk 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 January 22, 2025, later extended to January 31, 2025 regarding:

- Whether the project proposal is likely to arouse significant public concern; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse eco-systemic or socio-economic effects; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is of a type where the potential adverse effects are highly predictable and mitigable with known technology, (and providing any recommended mitigation measures); and
- Any matter of importance to the Party related to the project proposal.

On or before January 31, 2025, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

- **Kitikmeot Inuit Association (KIA)**
- **Government of Nunavut (GN)**
- **Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)**
- **Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)**
- **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:

KIA

- Recommended that KIA and the Board conduct periodic inspections of drill sites, and waste storage areas to evaluate the implementation of spill and waste management plans.
- Recommended that fuel storage and drill sites have maximum distance to ensure that accidental spills do not negatively impact fragile water bodies and ecosystems.
- Recommended that the Proponent provide the KIA and the Board with criteria and locations where effluent will be discharged for review prior to proceeding with effluent discharges.
- Recommended that KIA be provided with a plan detailing proposed drilling methods, including sampling, locations and associated instrumentation and monitoring.
- Recommended that KIA be provided an overview of proposed remote sensing techniques and how they will be used to complement drilling.
- Recommended that the Proponent conduct proper seasonal closure practices to ensure environmental impacts will be mitigated.
- Recommended that best practices be implemented in relation to camps to minimize attractiveness to wildlife.
- Recommended that monitoring plans be robust and accurately describe the predevelopment geographic and changes overtime of the aquatic environment and development of infrastructure.
- Recommended that the short and long-term effects of the Research Program on water, land, and wildlife be monitored and mitigated.
- Noted that prior to submission to the regulator, KIA recommended that KIA be provided for review and comment, all monitoring plans, protocols or programs that are developed for permits and approvals provided a description of the monitoring protocols including: methods of monitoring, adaptive management strategies and reporting obligations. Recommended that KIA and the Board receive all monitoring results as they become available.
- Noted that KIA conditionally supports the Research Program.
- Recommended that use of snowmobiles, helicopters and heavy machinery should be halted during periods of caribou migration areas where there could be an interaction between field study activity and migration or when unexpected interactions with large numbers of caribou occur.
- Recommended that the Proponent avoid field surveys within areas and time periods that are highly sensitive to wildlife (e.g. calving and post-calving).

GN

- Noted that they did not have any comments or concerns about the Project proposal at this time.

CIRNAC

- Noted that the Proponent did not describe potential impacts from, or proposed mitigation measures associated with, drilling on groundwater in its management plans or application to the NIRB. CIRNAC recommended that the Proponent update applicable management plans to clearly describe potential impacts of drilling on groundwater and proposed mitigation measures, including how it intends to manage any artesian flows that may be encountered during drilling.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

- Noted the potential impacts of some of the proposed project activities such as entrapment of fish in screens when withdrawing water for drilling and excessive water withdrawal from waterbodies.
- Observed that marine mammal surveys could disturb a number of species such as Bowhead Whale (2 subspecies), Ringed Seal and Beluga (2 subspecies)
- Determined that there may be impacts to fish, fish habitat, aquatic species at risk and their habitat, introduction of aquatic invasive species, and disturbance of marine mammals
- The following Acts and/or regulations shall apply and measures that shall be implemented. Please refer to the Comment form for a full list of measures and their associated website links
 - *Fisheries Act*
 - *Marine Mammals Regulations*
 - *Species at Risk Act*
 - *Aquatic Invasive Species Regulations*
- And included other measures and contact information to be included in the planning and implementation of the project proposal including contact information.

Transport Canada

- Noted that the waters where marine-based research is proposed are part of the Arctic Ocean. The Arctic Ocean is a scheduled navigable waterway listed in the *Canadian Navigable Waters Act*, the works, being drilling, placement of research equipment on the sea floor, and the use of ropes, buoys may require an approval under the CNWA from Transport Canada.
- Noted that any vessel activity needed to support the project must comply with Canada's maritime laws.

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.

5. Time of Report Extension

The Kitikmeot Inuit Association requested an extension until January 31, 2025, due to the Christmas and New Year holiday period and requiring time to complete their comments. Therefore, the NIRB is unable to provide its written report for the screening of this project proposal within the 45 days as required by Article 12, Section 12.4.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(3) of the *NuPPAA*. Therefore, on January 15, 2025, the NIRB wrote to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous and Northern Affairs, 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:

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 located within the proposed project 24XN038 - "Grays Bay Road and Port" project encompassing an area of 660 square kilometres (km²) between Grays Bay and the Nunavut/Northwest Territories Border.▪ The proposed project would take place within habitats of far-ranging wildlife species such as migratory and non-migratory birds, Arctic fox, Arctic hare and Species at Risk such as polar bears and caribou.
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity was 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">▪ There are known sites of historical, cultural, and archaeological significance identified by the Proponent which are associated with the proposed project area and are likely to be affected by the Project, with a reasonable potential for the presence of currently undocumented sites. The Proponent has committed to undertaking an archeological survey of the proposed project area and to having a certified archaeologist on

Factor	Comment
	site to supervise construction when near identified heritage resources.
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the location of the proposed project and generally minimal current land use by Kitikmeot population in the West Kitikmeot interior, direct impacts on human populations or activities may be impacted by the proposed project. Wildlife habitat (including caribou habitat), marine habitat, marine mammals, fish habitat (marine and freshwater), and bird nesting grounds identified within and adjacent to, the project area may be impacted by proposed activities.
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"> A zone of influence of up to 100 km from the most potentially-disruptive project activities was selected for the NIRB's assessment. 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 #	Project Title	Project type
<i>Proposed Developments – undergoing Assessment</i>		
24EN047	Rae Copper Exploration Port	Exploration
<i>Active Projects</i>		
12MN036	Back River Project Energy Center	Mine
12MN043	Izok Corridor Project	Mine
16UN058	Jericho Site Stabilization	Care and Maintenance
17YN061	Kitikmeot Region Marine Science Study	Research (ongoing)
17EN059	Arcadia Bay Project	Mineral Exploration
24XN038	Grays Bay Road and Port	Infrastructure

<i>Past Projects</i>		
99WR053	Lupin Mine	Care and Maintenance
00MN059	Jericho Diamond Mine Project	Care and Maintenance
06EN066	Izok and Hood Project	Exploration
08EN067	High Lake East	Exploration
14YN001	CROW - Canadian Ranger Ocean Watch	Research
17AN031	Canada C3 led by Students on Ice Foundation	Research/Tourism
17YN041	A Coastal, Pan-Canadian Collection of plants, microalgae and marine invertebrates for the Canadian Museum of Nature...	Research
19EA019	Blue Star Corp.	Exploration
20EN001	Ulu Gold Project	Exploration
21EN013	Pistol Lake Project	Exploration
22EN057	South Kitikmeot Gold Project	Exploration
23EN001	The Muskox Nickel Property	Exploration
24EN073	Epworth	Exploration

IEWS 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, Arctic fox, Arctic hare, and Species at Risk such as polar bears.
Potential effects:	Potential adverse effects to migratory and non-migratory birds, and their migratory routes and Species at Risk such as polar bears and Ivory Gull from noise and visual disturbance generated from the transportation of personnel and equipment via aircraft to the proposed research sites, establishment of temporary camp, associated camp activities, boating activities and the installation of data collection equipment.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be limited due to infrequent and temporary activities and the limited area of the individual project activities and any resulting impacts would be expected to be reversible.
Mitigating Factors:	Proponent proposes to ensure camp and research activities is established with minimal impact to wildlife.

Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Waste Management – 10 and 11 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 12 through 21 Wildlife – General – 25 through 30 Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance – 31 through 34 Aircraft Flight Restrictions – 35 through 39 Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance – 41 through 46
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act</i> and <i>Migratory Birds Regulations</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/). 2. The <i>Species at Risk Act</i> (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. 3. The <i>Wildlife Act (Nunavut)</i> and its corresponding regulations (http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html).

Valued Component	Marine environment including water quality, marine mammals, marine fish and fish habitat, and other aquatic organisms
Potential effects:	Potential adverse impacts to the marine environment including water quality, marine mammals, marine fish and fish habitat, and other aquatic organisms as a result of the research activities and drilling activities.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be limited due to infrequent and temporary activities and any resulting impacts would be expected to be reversible.
Mitigating Factors:	
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Water courses/Water bodies (including fresh and marine waters) – 6 through 9 Drilling – General – 51 and 52 Marine-Based Activities – 68 through 74
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Fisheries Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/F-14/index.html). 2. The <i>Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-28.8/). 3. The <i>Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act</i> (https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-7.3/FullText.html).

Valued Component	Potential adverse effects on land, terrain stability, permafrost, and air quality.
Potential effects:	Potential adverse effects to land, terrain stability, permafrost, and air quality due to research activities
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be minimal due to the limited and temporary nature of the activities and any resulting impacts would be expected to be minimal and reversible.

Mitigating Factors:	The localized area and nature of the individual project activities make it unlikely any significant impacts will occur.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Air Quality – 22 and 23 Noise – 24 Road and Ground Disturbance – 47 through 50
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-28.8/).

Valued Component	Potential adverse affects to public and traditional land use activities in the area from the research activities
Potential effects:	No specific concerns or impacts to public and traditional land use activities in the area have been identified, however, the Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure project activities are informed by available Inuit Qaujimaningit and that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
Nature of Impacts:	The localized area, the location of the activities and nature of the project activities make it unlikely that any significant impacts will occur.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent should engage with local residents regarding planned activities in the area and should consider Inuit Qaujimaningit and traditional knowledge.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Other – 78 and 79
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Nunavut Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-28.6/).

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Valued Component	Historical, cultural, and archaeological sites
Potential effects:	The Proponent is proposing to work in areas of known historical and cultural significance.
Nature of Impacts:	These sites were considered in Project planning, and the Proponent plans to conduct an archaeological survey and to develop appropriate mitigation measures when avoidance is impossible.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has committed to develop a plan to reduce impacts through site investigation and documentation.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Heritage Sites – 75, 76, 77
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Nunavut Act</i> (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 .

Significant public concern:

Valued Component	Public Concern
Potential effects:	No significant public concern was expressed during the public commenting period for this file; however, the Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure that to the extent possible hire local people and access local services where possible, and to ensure planned activities in the area utilizes available Inuit Qaujimaningit.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be minimal as long as the Proponent follow the recommended terms and conditions.
Mitigating Factors:	Recommended terms and conditions
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Other – 78 through 80
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	N/A

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. West Kitikmeot Resources Corp. (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times and make it accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
2. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC File No.: 150523), and the NIRB (Online Application Form, November 29, 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.

Wildlife – General

25. 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.
26. 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.
27. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.

28. 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.
29. The Proponent shall enforce safe speed limits for vehicles travelling along the road to ensure drivers have sufficient time to react in a safe manner if wildlife are encountered on or adjacent to the road or trail.
30. The Proponent shall ensure that drivers maintain spacing appropriate for driving and road conditions, and speed limits, to ensure drivers have time to safely react to any wildlife on the road.

Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance

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.
33. The Proponent shall avoid the seaward site of seabird colonies and areas used by flocks of migrating waterfowl, a minimum distance away on the recommendation of the appropriate authorizing agencies.
34. The Proponent shall not pursue seabirds or waterbirds swimming on the water surface and shall avoid concentrations of these birds if encountered on the water.

Aircraft Flight Restrictions

35. The Proponent shall not alter flight paths to approach wildlife and avoid flying directly over animals.
36. 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.
37. The Proponent shall restrict aircraft/helicopter activity related to the project to a minimum flight altitude of 610 metres (2,100 ft) above ground level except during landing, take-off or if there is a specific requirement for low-level flying, which does not disturb wildlife or migratory birds.

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.

38. 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.
39. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft/helicopter do not, unless for emergency, touch-down in areas where wildlife are present.
40. 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

41. 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.
42. The Proponent shall not locate any operation or undertake activities that could block or cause any diversion to migration of caribou or muskoxen.
43. The Proponent shall implement mobile caribou conservation measures and immediately cease activities that may interfere with the migration or calving of caribou or muskox, until the caribou or muskox have passed
44. During the period of May 15 to July 15, the Proponent shall suspend all operations and activities outside the immediate vicinity of the camps. Restricted activities include, but are not limited to, air and vehicle traffic, loud or repetitive noise or vibration disturbances, low-level over flights, blasting, and use of mobile equipment including snowmobiles and all terrain vehicles, and personnel walking within sight of the caribou group(s), until the caribou are no longer in the immediate area. Should the results of localized monitoring satisfy the land use inspector the project operations may resume without disturbing pregnant caribou cows or cows with young calves the suspension may be lifted for the periods specified.
45. 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.
46. 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

47. 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.
48. The Proponent shall select a winter route that maximizes the use of frozen water bodies.

49. The Proponent shall not move any equipment or vehicles without prior testing the thickness of the ice to ensure the lake, river or stream is in a state capable of fully supporting the equipment or vehicles.
50. The Proponent shall ensure that stream crossings and/or temporary crossings constructed from ice and snow, which may cause jams, flooding or impede fish passage and or water flow, are removed or notched prior to spring break-up.

Drilling – General

51. The Proponent shall not allow any drilling wastes to spread to the surrounding lands or water bodies.
52. The Proponent shall ensure that that any deleterious substances (as defined in the *Fisheries Act*) resulting from its activities do not enter into any water bodies frequented by fish.
53. The Proponent shall ensure that all drill areas are constructed to facilitate minimizing the environmental footprint of the project area.

Drilling on Land

54. The Proponent shall not conduct any land-based drilling or mechanized clearing activities a minimum distance of the normal high-water mark of any water body as required by an authorizing agency.
55. If an artesian flow is encountered, the Proponent shall ensure the drill hole is immediately plugged and permanently sealed.
56. The Proponent shall ensure that all sump/depression capacities are sufficient to accommodate the volume of wastewater and any fines that are produced. The sumps shall only be used for inert drilling fluids, and not any other materials or substances.
57. The Proponent shall not locate any sumps within a minimum distance of the normal high-water mark of any water body as required by an authorizing agency.
58. The Proponent shall ensure all drill holes are backfilled or capped prior to the end of each field season. All sumps must be backfilled and restored to original or stable profile prior to the end of each field season.

Drilling on Ice

59. The Proponent shall ensure that drill muds and additives are not used in connection with holes drilled through lake ice unless they are re-circulated or contained such that they do not enter the water body, or are demonstrated to be non-toxic.
60. Unless otherwise directed by authorizing agencies, the Proponent shall ensure that all drill cuttings are removed from ice surfaces daily.

Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas

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

64. 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.
65. 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

66. 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.
67. 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

68. The Proponent shall, where practicable, coordinate with other vessels to minimize simultaneous vessel traffic in critical wildlife habitat areas allowing the wildlife to continue to use the habitat undisturbed (e.g. Navy Board Inlet, Lancaster Sound, Milne Inlet, Bellot Strait).
69. 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.
70. 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.
71. 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.
72. The Proponent shall suspend all project activities should any dead fish or wildlife (both marine and terrestrial), or any injured wildlife be observed during any works or activities in and around the marine waters. Activities may only be resumed on the recommendation of the authorizing agencies.
73. The Proponent shall report all incidents, injuries or sightings of marine mammals to the appropriate authorizing agencies.
74. The Proponent shall implement measures designed to minimize disturbance to seabed sediments and benthic communities and marine wildlife when carrying out project activities within the marine environment.

Heritage Sites

75. 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.
76. The Proponent shall ensure that all clients and staff 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.

77. 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

78. 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.
79. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
80. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and access local services where possible.

MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

In addition, the Board is recommending the following:

Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan

1. Prior to the start of project activities, the Proponent shall submit an updated Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (WMMP) to the Nunavut Impact Review Board, Government of Nunavut Department of Environment and. At a minimum, this plan should include proposed template for a wildlife log/record of observations and proposed mitigation measures for caribou, migratory birds, grizzly bear and other sensitive species that may be encountered within the project area. The Proponent is encouraged to consult with the Government of Nunavut's Regional, regarding project schedule and timelines so as to ensure adequate mitigation of potential wildlife impacts.

Annual Report

2. The Proponent shall submit a comprehensive annual report with copies provided to the Nunavut Impact Review Board, Kitikmeot Inuit Association, by March 31st of each year of permitted activities beginning March 31, 2026. The annual report must contain at least the following information:
 - a) A summary of activities undertaken for the year, including:
 - a map showing the approximate location of drill sites;
 - a map showing the location of the fuel cache;
 - a description of local hires, contracting opportunities and initiatives;
 - flight altitudes, frequency of flights and anticipated flight routes;
 - site photos;
 - b) A work plan for the following year, including any progressive reclamation work undertaken;

- c) A summary of community consultations undertaken throughout the year, providing copy of materials presented to community members, a description of issues and concerns raised, discussions with community members and advice offered to the company as well as any follow-up actions that were required or taken to resolve any concerns expressed about the project proposal;
- d) A log of instances in which community residents occupy or transit through the project area for the purpose of traditional land use or harvesting. This log should include the location and number of people encountered, activity being undertaken (e.g., berry picking, fishing, hunting, camping, etc.), date and time; and any mitigation measures or adaptive management undertaken to prevent disturbance;
- e) A discussion of issues related to wildlife and environmental monitoring, including the number of cease-work orders required as a result of proximity to caribou and any other wildlife;
- f) A brief summary of WMMP results as well as any mitigation actions that were undertaken. In addition, the Proponent shall maintain a record of wildlife observations while operating within the project area and include it as part of the summary report. The summary report based on wildlife observations should include the following:
 - 1. Locations (i.e., latitude and longitude), species, number of animals, a description of the animal activity, and a description of the gender and age of animals if possible.
 - 2. Prior to conducting project activities, the Proponent should map the location of any sensitive wildlife sites such as denning sites, calving areas, caribou crossing sites, and raptor nests in the project area, and identify the timing of critical life history events (i.e., calving, mating, denning and nesting).
 - 3. Additionally, the Proponent should indicate potential impacts from the project, and ensure that operational activities are managed and modified to avoid impacts on wildlife and sensitive sites.
- g) An analysis of the effectiveness of mitigation measures for wildlife;
- h) Summary of any heritage sites encountered during the exploration activities, any follow-up action or reporting required as a result and how project activities were modified to mitigate impacts on the heritage sites;
- i) Summary of its knowledge of Inuit land use in/near the project area and explain how project activities were modified to mitigate impacts on Inuit land use; and
- j) A summary of how the Proponent has complied with conditions contained within this Screening Decision, and all conditions as required by other authorizations associated with the project proposal.

Spill Contingency Plan

- 3. The Proponent shall update its Spill Contingency Plan to include the up to date emergency contact numbers for the Government of Nunavut-Department of Environment, Manager of

Environmental Protection (867-975-7748) and Environment and Climate Change Canada, Enforcement Branch (867-975-4644).

OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the project-specific terms and conditions, the Board is recommending the following:

Change in Project Scope

1. Responsible authorities or Proponent shall notify the Nunavut Planning Commission and/or Parks Canada as appropriate, and the NIRB of any changes in operating plans or conditions, including phase advancement, associated with this project prior to any such change.

Copy of licences, etc. to the Board and Commission

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

Use of Inuit Qaujimaningit

3. The Proponent is encouraged to work with local communities and knowledge holders to inform project design, to carry out the project, and to confirm or validate the perspectives represented in publications, and reports 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

4. The Proponent should review the Government of Nunavut's booklet on Bear Safety, which can be downloaded from this link: http://gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/bear_safety_-_reducing_bear-people_conflicts_in_nunavut.pdf. Further information on bear/carnivore detection and deterrent techniques can be found in the "*Safety in Grizzly and Black Bear Country*" pamphlet, which can be downloaded from this link: https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/resources/safety_in_grizzly_and_black_bear_country_english.pdf.
5. There are polar bear and grizzly bear safety resources available from the Bear Smart Society with videos on polar bear safety available in English, French and Inuktitut at <http://www.bearsmart.com/play/safety-in-polar-bear-country/>. Information can also be obtained from Parks Canada's website on bear safety at the following link: <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nu/quttinirpaaq/visit/visit6/d.aspx> or in reviewing the "*Safety in Polar Bear Country*" pamphlet, which can be downloaded from the following link: http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nu/quttinirpaaq/visit/visit6/~media/pn-np/nu/auyuittuq/pdf/shared/PolarBearSafety_English.ashx.

6. Any problem wildlife or any interaction with carnivores should be reported immediately to the local Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment Conservation Office (Conservation Officer of Kugluktuk, phone: (867) 982-7450.

Species at Risk

7. The Proponent review Environment and Climate Change Canada's "Environment Assessment Best Practice Guide for Wildlife at Risk in Canada", available at the following link: http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/policies/EA%20Best%20Practices%202004.pdf. The guide provides information to the Proponent on what is required when Wildlife at Risk, including *Species at Risk*, are encountered or affected by the project.

Migratory Birds

8. The Proponent review Canadian Wildlife Services' "Key migratory bird terrestrial habitat sites in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut", available at the following link: <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/317630/publication.html> and "Key marine habitat sites for migratory birds in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories", available at the following link: <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/392824/publication.html>. The guide provides information to the Proponent on key terrestrial and marine habitat areas that are essential to the welfare of various migratory bird species in Canada.
9. For further information on how to protect migratory birds, their nests and eggs when planning or carrying out project activities, consult Environment and Climate Change Canada's Incidental Take web page and the fact sheet "Planning Ahead to Reduce the Risk of Detrimental Effects to Migratory Birds, and their Nests and Eggs" available at: http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/ec/CW66-324-2013-eng.pdf.

Heritage Resources

10. During the assessment, the NIRB has identified that no archaeology surveys have been conducted in the proposed project areas and that potential for the presence of archaeological resources is likely, therefore the Proponent shall contact the Department of Culture and Heritage to initiate a field archaeology assessment program prior to undertaking any land disturbance activities.

Incineration of Wastes

11. 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.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to the West Kitikmeot Resources Corp.'s (WKRC) "Field Research Program for the Grays Bay Road and Port Project". The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated February 18, 2025 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
Beluga Whale (Eastern Hudson Bay Population)	Endangered	No Schedule	DFO

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

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

Terrestrial Species at Risk²	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility³
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 PALAEOONTOLOGICAL 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.