



SCREENING DECISION REPORT NIRB FILE No.: 16YN002

NPC File No.: 148191

March 24, 2016

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board's (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of University of Toronto's (U of T) "Lake Ice in the Canadian High Arctic" is not required pursuant to paragraph 92(1)(a) of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* (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

- 1) REGULATORY FRAMEWORK
- 2) PROJECT OVERVIEW & NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS
- 3) FACTORS FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACTS
- 4) RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS
- 5) MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
- 6) OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
- 7) REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS
- 8) CONCLUSION

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The primary objectives of the NIRB are set out in Section 12.2.5 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) as follows:

"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."

These objectives are confirmed under section 23 of the NuPPAA.

The purpose of screening is provided for under section 88 of the NuPPAA:

“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 subsection 89(1) of NuPPAA:

“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 subsection 89(2) provides that the considerations set out in paragraph 89(1)(a) prevail over those set out in paragraph 89(1)(b).

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. Specifically, paragraph 92(2)(a) of NuPPAA provides:

“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 OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Project Description

The proposed “Lake Ice in the Canadian High Arctic” project is located within the North Baffin Region, within 10 kilometres (km) of Resolute Bay, in addition to locations on Bathurst Island within Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area. The Proponent intends to monitor lake ice through deployment and operation of ice logging sensors, and drilling holes in lake ice to measure thickness and examine ice structures. The program is proposed to take place annually from May to September, 2016 through 2018.

According to the project proposal, the scope of the project includes the following works or activities:

- Set-up, operation and decommissioning of ice sensors in lakes near Resolute Bay in Small Lake, Char Lake and Resolute Lake, as well as in Hunting Camp Lake within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area;
- Use of ice-augers for drilling small holes in lake ice to measure the thickness, and examine the ice structures;
- Retrieval of data from an established long-term automatic weather station at Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area;
- Use of snowmobiles to travel to the lakes around Resolute Bay, and subsequent use of helicopter to travel to Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area for sampling;
- Involvement of community members in local sampling;
- Use of 60 litre (L) of gasoline, and 700L of aviation fuel, which would be stored at Polar Continental Shelf Program (PCSP) in Resolute Bay, with small amounts to be used at the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area;
- Use and storage of 400 L of Jet B fuel, which would be cached near the airstrip at Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area and later removed by PCSP at the end of the season;
- Use of propane for cooking, and battery to power a digital camera;
- Wastes generated at sampling sites to be transported to Resolute Bay for proper disposal, with used batteries disposed of at PCSP or shipped back to the university for environmentally safe disposal; and
- Utilize existing cabin at Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area, as well as other infrastructure and logistical support through PCSP.

2. Scoping

The NIRB has identified no additional works or activities in relation to the project proposal.

3. Key Stages of the Screening Process

The following key stages were completed:

Date	Stage
January 27, 2016	Receipt of project proposal from the NPC
January 27, 2016	Scoping pursuant to subsection 86(1) of the NuPPAA
February 10, 2016	Public engagement and comment request
February 23, 2016	Receipt of public comments
February 29, 2016	Ministerial extension requested

4. Public Comments and Concerns

From February 10 to 19, 2016 the NIRB provided opportunity for the public to provide comments and concerns regarding the project proposal. The following is a summary of the comments and concerns received:

Government of Nunavut (GN)

- Identified the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area and adjacent area as a unique ecosystem supporting high densities of Peary caribou and muskoxen, and expressed concerns that:
 - Project-related activities such as low-level flights, ground activities, and noise could potentially disturb caribou and muskox especially during their calving, post-calving periods and early-rut periods, and may subsequently affect their access to habitat, feeding cycles, reproduction and ultimately their survival.
 - Peary caribou are noted on the Species at Risk Act as being endangered, therefore “no person shall kill, harm, harass, capture or take an individual”, therefore low level flights should be minimized.
- Recommended a minimum flight elevation of 300 metres be observed when flying in order to minimize disturbance to wildlife; and that aircraft does not approach muskox groups.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)

- Had no comments or concerns regarding the project proposal.

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)

- Recommended that the proponent conduct information session(s) and/or consultation prior to commencing the research project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND CONCERNS WITH RESPECT TO INUIT QAUJIMANINGIT

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

FACTORS FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACTS

In determining whether a review of the project is required, the Board considered whether the project proposal had a 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 section 90 of NuPPAA. The Board took particular attention to take into account traditional knowledge and Inuit Qaujimaningit in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

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

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

The size of the geographic area for the project proposal includes several lakes within 10 kilometres (km) of Resolute Bay, specifically Small Lake, Char Lake and Resolute Lake, as well as localized to Hunting Camp Lake within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area. The proposed activities take place within a productive ecosystem supporting high densities of caribou and muskox, as identified by parties during the public consultation period, and which

may also overlap areas important for Polar bear movement. In addition, the proposed project would include the use of snowmobiles to travel to the lakes near Resolute Bay, and subsequent use of helicopter to travel to Polar Bear Pass area for sampling.

2. *The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.*

The proposed project would occur in an area with no particular identified ecosystemic sensitivity, with the exception of the sampling location at the Hunting Camp Lake within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area, though research activities in the area would be based out of a pre-existing cabin for one night.

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

The Government of Nunavut specifically identified the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area and adjacent areas as a uniquely productive High Arctic ecosystem supporting high densities of Peary caribou and muskoxen; however neither project area was flagged with any special significance for archaeological resources. Research activities would occur on lakes and ice surfaces, which creates low potential for disruption of any archeological sites in the area. Overland travel to the lakes in proximity to Resolute Bay could result in the Proponent coming into contact with archeological sites.

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

The proposed project would occur in three lake ice locations within 10 km of Resolute Bay, and additionally the Hunting Camp Lake within Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area which is over 160 km away from Resolute Bay; as such no human populations are likely to be significantly affected by project impacts. Caribou and muskoxen have been identified as potentially foraging within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area and may be impacted by the project proposal.

5. *The nature, magnitude and complexity of the impacts; the probability of the impacts occurring; the frequency and duration of the impacts; and the reversibility or irreversibility of the impacts.*

As the “Lake Ice in the Canadian High Arctic” project is a proposed scientific research project, the nature of potential impacts is considered to be well-known, with potential for infrequent, localized impacts to the biophysical environment, including lake ice that are temporary in nature, reversible and mitigable with due care.

6. *The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out.*

No cumulative impacts have been identified as potentially resulting from this proposed project in association with any projects that have been carried out, are being carried out or are likely to be carried out.

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

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

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

Administrative Conditions:

To encourage compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and assist the Board and responsible authorities with compliance and effects monitoring for project activities, the following project-specific terms and conditions have been recommended: 1-4.

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:

Issue 1: Potential negative impacts to Peary caribou, muskox, migratory birds, and their habitat due to increased noise from transportation of personnel by snow machine, or by helicopter within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area for two days per season within the sampling period.

Board views: As discussed above in the assessment of factors relevant to this project proposal, the potential for impact(s) is applicable to a small geographic area encompassing three lakes proximal to Resolute Bay and additionally the Hunting Camp Lake within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area, and is limited due to infrequent activities anticipated to last a few hours over a one week period, and would be expected to be temporary only. As noted by the GN, Peary caribou are particularly sensitive to disturbance during their calving and post-calving periods (late May to late June) whereas muskoxen are most sensitive to over-flight disturbance during their calving (late March into May, depending on the year and population) and early-rut (August) periods. Some of the project activities, including potential ground disturbance due to transport of personnel and equipment could occur within the critical calving and post-calving times for caribou and muskox; however, the Proponent has committed to complying with the Code of Good Conduct for Land Users and further, it is unlikely that the specific lake areas identified by the Proponent for ice sampling would be actively used by caribou, muskox or migratory birds. Minimum flight altitudes and operational restrictions regarding overland travel are expected to mitigate potential adverse impacts to caribou, muskox, migratory birds and ground disturbance.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: It is recommended that the potential negative impacts be mitigated by measures such as requiring the Proponent to comply with recommended minimum flight altitudes, operational restrictions, and responsible use of vehicles for overland travel. The following terms and conditions are recommended to mitigate the potential adverse impacts: 13 through 20.

Issue 2: Potential negative impacts to lake ice cover biodiversity such as, populations of microorganisms and invertebrates actively utilizing frozen freshwater environments.

Board views: The potential for impacts is applicable to three lake ice areas proximal to Resolute Bay and additionally within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area and the probability of impacts occurring is considered to be low in magnitude and it is unlikely that the proposed activities would interact significantly with frozen freshwater habitats in the area. The Proponent has indicated that activities will not disrupt any natural habitats or require restoration efforts when complete. However, specific and general measures have been recommended to mitigate any potential negative impacts.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: It is recommended that the potential negative impacts may be mitigated by measures limiting or regulating water use. The following term and condition is recommended to mitigate the potential adverse impacts: 5.

Issue 3: Potential negative impacts to lake ice quality and quantity due to drilling holes through the ice, and deployment of ice sensors to bottom of lake. This includes potential impacts from accidental disposal of garbage and debris on lake ice, including mechanical disturbance and alterations of lake ice surface and snow due to use of ice-augers for drilling small holes in lake ice to measure the thickness, and examine the ice structures.

Board views: The magnitude of impacts resulting from drilling on ice and deployment of ice sensor to the bottom of lakes could affect quality and quantity of lake ice within and around the selected lakes, and subsequently surface water during ice break and spring thaw. The Proponent has committed to ensuring that activities do not disrupt any natural habitats or require restoration efforts when complete.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: It is recommended that the potential negative impacts be mitigated by measures such as requiring the Proponent to ensure that the proponent removes all waste materials and debris, including equipment upon abandonment or cessation of research activities. The following terms and conditions are recommended to mitigate the potential adverse impacts: 6, 21-22.

Issue 4: Potential negative effects on lake ice quality due to hydrocarbon contamination from use of fuels onsite.

Board views: The magnitude of impacts resulting from hydrocarbon contamination would be limited due to the relatively small amount of fuel anticipated to be used onsite, specifically within the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area. The proponent has indicated that larger volumes of fuels to be used during the research would either be cached near the airstrip at Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area, or stored at PCSP, and later removed at the end of the season.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Operational procedures for storing and transfer of materials, use of secondary containment, and spill response equipment would reduce the risk of uncontrolled releases of fuel or hazardous materials resulting in negative impacts

to lake ice quality including surface water. In addition, the following terms and conditions are recommended to mitigate the potential adverse impacts to surrounding lakes or waterbodies from drilling activities: 7 through 12.

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Issue 5: Potential negative impacts to historical, cultural and archaeological sites from overland travel to sample sites.

Board Views: As previously noted, due to overland travel to the lake sites in proximity to Resolute Bay the Proponent may come into contact with archaeological sites, however, the probability of impacts occurring is considered to be low in magnitude and it is unlikely that the proposed activities would interact significantly with any known archaeological and palaeontological resources in the area.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: It is recommended that the potential negative impacts would be mitigated by the Proponent implementing measures required by the *Nunavut Act* (Appendix B). Terms and conditions 23 and 24 are recommended to ensure that available Inuit Qaujimaningit can inform project activities, and reduce the potential for negative impacts occurring due to a lack of information.

Issue 6: Potential positive socio-economic effect on northerners from employment opportunities as the Proponent has committed to involve local students in summer research at Polar Bear Pass.

Board Views: It is noted that the Proponent will continue to consult with local community members, which is considered a continued positive impact.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Term and condition 23 has been recommended to ensure the Proponent continues to keep the community informed of the research undertaking and results, and potentially prepare the community members to take best advantage of hiring of local people if opportunities arise.

Significant public concern:

Issue 7: No significant public concern was expressed during the public commenting period for this file.

Board Views: Follow up consultation and involvement of local community members is expected to mitigate any potential for public concern resulting from project activities.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Term and condition 24 is recommended to ensure that the affected community and organizations are informed about the project proposal and to mitigate any concerns that may arise from the project activities.

Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:

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

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

1. University of Toronto (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times.
2. The Proponent shall forward copies of all permits obtained and required for this project to the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) prior to the commencement of the project.
3. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (Application to Determine Conformity, January 17, 2016).
4. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.

Water

5. The Proponent shall not use water, including constructing or disturbing any stream, lakebed or the banks of any definable water course unless approved by the Nunavut Water Board.

Waste Disposal/Incineration

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

Fuel and Chemical Storage

7. Unless otherwise authorized by the Nunavut Water Board, the Proponent shall locate all fuel and other hazardous materials a minimum of thirty-one (31) metres away from the high water mark of any water body and in such a manner as to prevent their release into the environment.
8. The Proponent shall ensure that re-fueling of all equipment occurs a minimum of thirty-one (31) metres away from the high water mark of any water body, unless otherwise authorized by the Nunavut Water Board.
9. The Proponent shall store all fuel and chemicals in such a manner that they are inaccessible to wildlife.
10. 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.
11. The Proponent shall ensure that appropriate spill response equipment and clean-up materials (e.g., shovels, pumps, barrels, drip pans, and absorbents) are readily available during any transfer of fuel or hazardous substances, and at all fuel storage sites.
12. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel are properly trained in fuel and hazardous waste handling procedures, as well as spill response procedures. All spills of fuel or other

deleterious materials of any amount must be reported immediately to the 24 hour Spill Line at (867) 920-8130.

Wildlife - General

13. The Proponent shall ensure that there is no damage to wildlife habitat in conducting this operation.
14. The Proponent shall not harass wildlife. This includes persistently worrying or chasing animals, or disturbing large groups of animals. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.
15. The Proponent shall ensure that all project personnel are made aware of the measures to protect wildlife and are provided with training and/or advice on how to implement these measures.

Aircraft Flight Restrictions

16. The Proponent shall restrict aircraft/helicopter activity related to the project to a minimum altitude of 610 metres above ground level unless there is a specific requirement for low-level flying, which does not disturb wildlife and migratory birds.
17. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft maintain a vertical distance of 1000 metres and a horizontal distance of 1500 metres from any observed groups (colonies) of migratory birds. Aircraft should avoid critical and sensitive wildlife areas at all times by choosing alternate flight corridors.
18. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft/helicopter do not, unless for emergency, touch-down in areas where wildlife are present.

Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance

19. The Proponent shall cease activities that may interfere with the migration or calving of caribou or muskox, until the caribou or muskox have passed or left the area.

Ground Disturbance

20. 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.

Restoration of Disturbed Areas

21. The Proponent shall remove all garbage, fuel and equipment upon abandonment.
22. The Proponent shall complete all clean-up and restoration of the lands used prior to the end of each field season and/or upon abandonment of site.

Other

23. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and to consult with local residents regarding their activities in the region.
24. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.

OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is also recommended that:

Change in Project Scope

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

Bear and Carnivore Safety

2. The Proponent review the bear/carnivore detection and deterrent techniques outlined in “Safety in Grizzly and Black Bear Country” which can be downloaded from this link: http://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/default/files/web_pdf_wd_bear_safety_brochure_1_may_2015.pdf. There are polar bear and grizzly bear safety resources available from the Government of Nunavut at the following link: <http://env.gov.nu.ca/wildlife/resources/polarbearsafety> and a “You are in Polar Bear Country” pamphlet from Parks Canada at the following link <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/lhn-nhs/mb/prince/securite-safety/ours-bear.asp> following link <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nu/auyuittuq/visit/visit6/d/i.aspx>.

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 Resolute Bay, phone: 867-252-3879).

Species at Risk

3. The Proponent review Environment Canada’s “Environment Assessment Best Practice Guide for Wildlife at Risk in Canada”, available at the following link: http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/environment_can/cws-scf/environmental_assessment-ef/ea_best_practices_2004_e.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.

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The Proponent has applied for, or will require, the following authorizations for this project:

- Scientific Research Licence-Nunavut Research Institute (*application in progress*)
- National Wildlife Area Permit-Canadian Wildlife Service (*application in progress*)
- Water Use Without a Licence-Nunavut Water Board

In addition, the following legislation and guidelines may apply to the project:

Acts and Regulations

1. The Proponent is advised that the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* The *Fisheries Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/F-14/index.html>).
2. The *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act* (<http://www.canlii.org/ca/sta/n-28.8/whole.html>).
3. The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* and *Migratory Birds Regulations* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/>).

4. The *Species at Risk Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/S-15.3/index.html>). Attached in **Appendix A** is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut.
5. The *Wildlife Act* (<http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html>) which contains provisions to protect and conserve wildlife and wildlife habitat, including specific protection measures for wildlife habitat and species at risk.
6. The *Nunavut Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-28.6/>). The Proponent must comply with the proposed terms and conditions listed in the attached **Appendix B**.
7. The *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations*, *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act* (<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/safety-menu.htm>), and the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/>). The Proponent must ensure that proper shipping documents accompany all movements of dangerous goods. The Proponent must register with the Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment Manager of Pollution Control and Air Quality at 867-975-7748.
8. The *Aeronautics Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-2/>).

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to the University of Toronto "Lake Ice in the Canadian High Arctic"

Dated March 24, 2016 at Arviat, NU.



Elizabeth Copland, Chairperson

Attachments: Appendix A: Species at Risk in Nunavut
 Appendix B: Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources Terms and Conditions for Land Use
 Permit Holders

Appendix A: **Species at Risk in Nunavut**

Due to the requirements of Section 79(2) of the Species At Risk Act (SARA), and the potential for project-specific adverse effects on listed wildlife species and its critical habitat, measures should be taken as appropriate to avoid or lessen those effects, and the effects need to be monitored. Project effects could include species disturbance, attraction to operations and destruction of habitat. This section applies to all species listed on Schedule 1 of SARA, as listed in the table below, or have been assessed by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), which may be encountered in the project area. This list may not include all species identified as at risk by the Territorial Government. The following points provide clarification on the applicability of the species outlined in the table.

- Schedule 1 is the official legal list of Species at Risk for SARA. SARA applies to all species on Schedule 1. The term “listed” species refers to species on Schedule 1.
- Schedule 2 and 3 of SARA identify species that were designated at risk by the COSEWIC prior to October 1999 and must be reassessed using revised criteria before they can be considered for addition to Schedule 1.
- Some species identified at risk by COSEWIC are “pending” addition to Schedule 1 of SARA. These species are under consideration for addition to Schedule 1, subject to further consultation or assessment.

If species at risk are encountered or affected, the primary mitigation measure should be avoidance. The Proponent should avoid contact with or disturbance to each species, its habitat and/or its residence. All direct, indirect, and cumulative effects should be considered. Refer to species status reports and other information on the species at risk Registry at <http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca> for information on specific species.

Monitoring should be undertaken by the Proponent to determine the effectiveness of mitigation and/or identify where further mitigation is required. As a minimum, this monitoring should include recording the locations and dates of any observations of species at risk, behaviour or actions taken by the animals when project activities were encountered, and any actions taken by the proponent to avoid contact or disturbance to the species, its habitat, and/or its residence. This information should be submitted to the appropriate regulators and organizations with management responsibility for that species, as requested.

For species primarily managed by the Territorial Government, the Territorial Government should be consulted to identify other appropriate mitigation and/or monitoring measures to minimize effects to these species from the project.

Mitigation and monitoring measures must be undertaken in a way that is consistent with applicable recovery strategies and action/management plans.

Schedules of SARA are amended on a regular basis so it is important to check the SARA registry (www.sararegistry.gc.ca) to get the current status of a species.

Updated: June 2015

Species at Risk ¹	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility ²
Eskimo Curlew	Endangered	Schedule 1	Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)
Ivory Gull	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ross's Gull	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harlequin Duck (Eastern population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Rusty Blackbird	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut (GN)
Peregrine Falcon	Special Concern (<i>anatum-tundrius</i> complex ³)	Schedule 1 - Threatened (<i>anatum</i>) Schedule 3 – Special Concern (<i>tundrius</i>)	GN
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 3	GN
Red Knot (<i>rufa</i> subspecies)	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red Knot (<i>islandica</i> subspecies)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Horned Grebe (Western population)	Special Concern	Pending	ECCC
Red-necked Phalarope	Special concern	Pending	ECCC
Buff-breasted Sandpiper	Special concern	Pending	ECCC
Felt-leaf Willow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	GN
Porsild's Bryum	Threatened	Schedule 1	GN
Peary Caribou	Endangered	Schedule 1	GN
Barren-ground Caribou (Dolphin and Union population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	GN
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Schedule 1	GN/Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)
Grizzly Bear	Special Concern	Pending	GN
Wolverine	Special Concern	Pending	GN
Atlantic Cod, Arctic Lakes	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Atlantic Walrus	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound population)	Threatened	Schedule 2	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern Hudson Bay population)	Endangered	Pending	DFO
Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic – Baffin Bay population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Bowhead Whale (Eastern Canada – West Greenland population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Bowhead Whale (Eastern Arctic population)		Schedule 2	DFO

Species at Risk ¹	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility ²
Killer Whale (Northwest Atlantic / Eastern Arctic populations)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Narwhal	Special Concern	Pending	DFO

¹ The Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) has responsibility for aquatic species.

² 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.

³ The *anatum* subspecies of Peregrine Falcon is listed on Schedule 1 of SARA as threatened. The *anatum* and *tundrius* subspecies of Peregrine Falcon were reassessed by COSEWIC in 2007 and combined into one subpopulation complex. This subpopulation complex was assessed by COSEWIC as Special Concern.

Appendix B: Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources Terms and Conditions for Land Use Permit Holders



INTRODUCTION

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

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

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

Note that the above-mentioned functions require either a Nunavut Archaeologist Permit or a Nunavut Palaeontologist Permit. CH is authorized by way of the *Nunavut and Archaeological and Palaeontological Site Regulations*¹ to issue such permits.

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

¹ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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

Legal Framework

As stated in Article 33 of the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*:

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

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

Palaeontology and Archaeology

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

² s. 51(1)

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

Definitions

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

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

“archaeological artifact” means any tangible evidence of human activity that is more than 50 years old and in respect of which an unbroken chain of possession or regular pattern of usage cannot be demonstrated, and includes a Denesuline archaeological specimen referred to in section 40.4.9 of the Nunavut Land Claims 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.*

³ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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, Language, Elders and Youth (CH), and the contract archaeologist(s) will ensure proper preservation of heritage resources in the Nunavut Territory. The roles of each are briefly described.

CH is the Nunavut Government agency which oversees the protection and management of heritage resources in Nunavut, in partnership with land claim authorities, regulatory agencies, and the federal government. Its role in mitigating impacts of developments on heritage resources is as follows: to identify the need for an impact assessment and make recommendations to the appropriate regulatory agency; set the terms of reference for the study depending upon the scope of the development; suggest the names of qualified individuals 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 Nunavut Land Claims 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*

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.