



Environmental Protection Operations Directorate  
Prairie and Northern Region (PNR)  
5019 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 2310  
Yellowknife NT X1A 2P7

June 27, 2013

EC file: 4703 004 031  
NIRB file: 13YN021

Kelli Gillard, Technical Advisor  
Nunavut Impact Review Board  
P.O. Box 1360  
Cambridge Bay NU X0B 0C0

Via e-mail: [info@nirb.ca](mailto:info@nirb.ca)

Attention: Ms. Gillard

**RE: NIRB 13YN021: Notice of Part 4 Screening for Natural Resources Canada's "Natural Hazards in Baffin Bay" project proposal**

Environment Canada (EC) has reviewed the information submitted to the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) regarding the above-mentioned project proposal and is submitting comments on mitigation measures as well as other matters of importance to the project proposal as requested by the NIRB. EC's specialist advice is provided pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act 1999*, the pollution prevention provisions of the *Fisheries Act*, the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, and the *Species at Risk Act*.

Natural Resources Canada (the proponent) is proposing to conduct research in the North Baffin Region, based offshore onboard the Canadian Coast Guard (CCG) vessel Hudson, with field activities to be conducted in Baffin Bay and Davis Straight. The program is proposed to take place from August 2013 to September 2013, with community followup visits in the fall of 2013 or winter of 2014. The proposed project activities and components include use of a piston sediment corer, seabed camera system, CTD and Niskin water sampler, CCGS Hudson, 3.5 kHz echosounder, and multibeam echosounder.

Based on a review of the license application and supporting materials, EC provides the following comments for the NIRB's consideration:

**General**

1. Subsection 36(3) of the Fisheries Act specifies that, unless authorized by federal regulation, no person shall deposit or permit the deposit of deleterious substances of any type in water frequented by fish, or in any place under any conditions where the deleterious substance, or any other deleterious substance that results from the

deposit of the deleterious substance, may enter any such water. The definition of a deleterious substance (Subsection 34(1) of the Fisheries Act) includes “any water that contains a substance in such quantity or concentration, or that has been so treated, processed or changed, by heat or other means, from a natural state that it would, if added to any other water, degrade or alter or form part of a process of degradation or alteration of the quality of that water so that it is rendered or is likely to be rendered deleterious to fish or fish habitat or to the use by man of fish that frequent that water.” Subsection 36(3) makes no allowance for a mixing or dilution zone at the point of deposit.

### Spill Contingency Planning

2. EC recommends that a Spill Contingency Plan be in place for any fuel storage or transfer location, outlining a clear path of response in the event of a spill and address the key areas of prevention, preparedness, response and recovery.
3. Please note that according to the Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada’s (AANDC) “Guidelines for Spill Contingency Planning” (April 2007), available at <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100024236/1100100024253>, all releases of harmful substances, **regardless of quantity** are to be reported to the NWT / NU 24-hour Spill Line, (867) 920-8130 if the release is near or into a water body, is near or into a designated sensitive environment or sensitive wildlife habitat, poses imminent threat to human health or safety, poses imminent threat to a listed species at risk or its critical habitat, or is uncontrollable.
4. A spill kit including shovels, barrels, absorbents, pumps, etc. should be consistently maintained and readily available at all locations where fuel is being stored or transferred and accompany boats/zodiacs in order to provide immediate response in the event of a spill and should accommodate 110% of the capacity of the largest fuel storage container.

### Wildlife and Species at Risk

5. Paragraph 6(a) of the *Migratory Birds Regulations* states that no one shall disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of migratory birds. If active nests are encountered during project activities, the nesting area should be avoided until nesting is complete (i.e., the young have left the vicinity of the nest). The proponent should consult the fact sheet “Planning Ahead to Reduce Risks to Migratory Bird Nests” available at: <http://www.ec.gc.ca/paom-itmb/>
6. Section 5.1 of the *Migratory Birds Convention Act* prohibits persons from depositing substances harmful to migratory birds in waters or areas frequented by migratory birds or in a place from which the substance may enter such waters or such an area.
7. Marine birds are vulnerable to oil spills and to pollution of their feeding areas. EC recommends that the proponent consider what steps would be taken to protect wildlife (including marine birds) in the event of a spill. This information could be incorporated into an existing emergency response and/or spill response plan. This could include specific measures to keep wildlife out of a contaminated area, equipment available to do this, what measures would be taken if animals do come

in contact with the spill, and when such procedures should be used. Having this information outlined not only benefits wildlife, but also gives clear direction to the field crew on what to do in a spill situation if wildlife is nearby.

8. The following comments are pursuant to the *Species at Risk Act (SARA)*. Subsection 79 (2) of SARA, states that during an assessment of effects of a project, the adverse effects of the project on listed wildlife species and its critical habitat must be identified, that measures are taken to avoid or lessen those effects, and that the effects need to be monitored. This section applies to all species listed on Schedule 1 of SARA. However, as a matter of best practice, EC suggests that species on other Schedules of SARA and under consideration for listing on SARA, including those designated as at risk by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), be considered during an environmental assessment in a similar manner. The Table below lists species that may be encountered in the project area that have been assessed by COSEWIC as well as their current listing on Schedules 1-3 of SARA (and designation if different from that of COSEWIC). Project impacts could include species disturbance.

Terrestrial Species at Risk potentially within project area <sup>1</sup>	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility <sup>2</sup>
Ivory Gull	Endangered	Schedule 1	EC
Ross's Gull	Threatened	Schedule 1	EC
Red Knot ( <i>rufa</i> subspecies)	Endangered	Schedule 1	EC
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Wolverine (Western population)	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut

<sup>1</sup> The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has responsibility for aquatic species.

<sup>2</sup> EC has a national role to play in the conservation and recovery of Species at Risk in Canada, as well as responsibility for management of birds described in the *Migratory Birds Convention Act (MBCA)*. Day-to-day management of terrestrial species not covered in the MBCA is the responsibility of the Territorial Government. Thus, for species within their responsibility, the Territorial Government is best suited to provide detailed advice and information on potential adverse effects, mitigation measures, and monitoring.

- For any Species at Risk that could be encountered or affected by the project, the proponent should note any potential adverse effects of the project to the 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 [www.sararegistry.gc.ca](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca) for information on specific species.
- 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.
- 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 taken in a way that is consistent with applicable species at risk recovery strategies and action/management plans.
9. All mitigation measures identified by the proponent, and the additional measures suggested herein, should be strictly adhered to in conducting project activities. This will require awareness on the part of the proponents' representatives (including contractors) conducting operations in the field. EC recommends that all field operations staff be made aware of the proponents' commitments to these mitigation measures and provided with appropriate advice / training on how to implement these measures.
10. Implementation of these measures may help to reduce or eliminate some effects of the project on migratory birds and Species at Risk, but will not necessarily ensure that the proponent remains in compliance with the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, *Migratory Birds Regulations*, and the *Species at Risk Act*. The proponent must ensure they remain in compliance during all phases and in all undertakings related to the project.

Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 867-669-4746 or [jane.fitzgerald@ec.gc.ca](mailto:jane.fitzgerald@ec.gc.ca).

Sincerely,



Jane Fitzgerald  
Environmental Assessment Coordinator

cc: Yongshu Fan, Senior EA Coordinator, Environmental Assessment and Marine Programs(EAMP)-PNR, EC  
Lindsay Howes, EA Officer, EAMP-PNR, EC