

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 REFERRAL

On July 4, 2017 the NIRB received a referral to screen Parks Canada’s (PC) “HMS Erebus Wreck Site Archaeological Investigation” project proposal directly from Parks Canada pursuant to section 167 of the NuPPAA. On July 17, 2017 the NIRB received correspondence from the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC or Commission) related to PC’s “HMS Erebus Wreck Site Archaeological Investigation” project proposal noting that the project occurred outside of an area with an applicable regional land use plan for the establishment of a temporary camp outside of the national historic site (under NPC’s jurisdiction).

In addition, on July 12, 2017 the NIRB received a referral to screen PC's "Visitor Experience at the Erebus Wreck Site" project proposal from Parks Canada pursuant to section 167 of the NuPPAA. The NIRB noted that the proposed project would be located within the HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site and pursuant to subsection 70(1) of the NuPPAA, the NPC conformity determination process does not apply.¹

As a result of these projects being related but not integrally linked, the NIRB assessed both projects and provided the proposals for parties to comment together, but considered each proposal separately. Due to the proposals containing activities that are sufficiently related to previously assessed activities under NIRB file number **15YN037**; the NIRB viewed these project proposals as an amendment to the previously screened project and has assigned this proposal with this previous file number. A summary of the previously screened project activities can be found in **Appendix A**. Pursuant to Article 12, Sections 12.4.1 and 12.4.4 of the Nunavut Agreement and section 87 of the NuPPAA, the NIRB commenced screening of these projects. The following concerns the project proposal submitted on July 4, 2017.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Project Scope

The proposed "HMS Erebus Wreck Site Archaeological Investigation" project (formerly "Underwater Archaeology and Biology Study of the Wreck of HMS Erebus") is located within the Kitikmeot region, approximately 125 kilometres (km) southwest of Gjoa Haven and 250 km southeast of Cambridge Bay at the Wrecks of HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site of Canada. The Proponent intends to conduct archaeological and research activities that continue to document the HMS Erebus to understand the story of the Franklin expedition and its relationship with Inuit history for the area. The program is proposed to take place from August to September 2017. The scope of activities previously approved for the ongoing archeological and research activities (NIRB File No. 15YN037) has been included within **Appendix A**.

As required under subsection 86(1) of the NuPPAA, the Board accepts the scope of the HMS Erebus wreck site archaeological investigation project as set out by Parks Canada in the proposal. The scope of the project proposal includes the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- Select, construct, and decommission a temporary camp site from three (3) possible sites required to support ongoing dive and archaeological assessment operations;
- Personnel, water, and supplies transported to and from site via twin otter with tundra tires from either Cambridge Bay and/or Gjoa Haven;
- Use of zodiacs to transport project staff to and from the dive site as well as functioning as a diving platform;
- Transport, temporary storage, and use of up to 400 litres of gasoline, stored within fuel containment berm;

¹ Subsection 70(1) states: This Part and the broad planning policies, priorities and objectives, the specific planning objectives and any land use plan, established under this Part, do not apply in respect of a park that has been established or to a historic place that has been designated under the *Historic Sites and Monuments Act* and is administered by the Parks Canada Agency.

- Sewage, combustible, and non-combustible wastes stored in sealed plastic drums for appropriate disposal in Gjoa Haven or Cambridge Bay;
- Continue development of video and photo documentation of the site including 3D photogrammetric modelling and recording;
- Continue mapping of artefacts and features of the HMS *Erebus*:
 - Complete cleaning of Upper Deck
 - Select test excavations including artefacts mapping and collection;
 - Partial disassembly and/or consolidation of upper deck structure of the HMS *Erebus*;
 - Continuation of use of ROV and inspection cameras to explore interior spaces;
- Establishment of 3D reference points and baselines system consolidation and extension;
- Establish a reburial site for artefacts being recorded and reburied; and
- Ongoing hiring of local community members to assist on project site and in communities.

2. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

The NIRB has identified no additional works or activities in relation to the project proposal. The NIRB noted that the proposed “Visitor Experience at the Erebus Wreck Site” is being screened concurrently with this project; however, it is not considered as part of this project. As a result, the NIRB proceeded with screening the current proposal based on the scope as described above.

3. Key Stages of the Screening Process

The following key stages were completed:

| Date | Stage |
|-----------------|--|
| July 4, 2017 | Receipt of project proposal from Parks Canada |
| July 17, 2017 | Receipt of project proposal (from the NPC |
| July 17, 2017 | Information request(s) |
| July 28, 2017 | Proponent responded to information request(s) |
| July 28, 2017 | Scoping pursuant to subsection 86(1) of the NuPPAA |
| August 2, 2017 | Public engagement and comment request |
| August 14, 2017 | Receipt of public comments |

4. Public Comments and Concerns

Notice regarding the NIRB’s screening of this project proposal was distributed on August 2, 2017 to community organizations in Cambridge Bay and Gjoa Haven, 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 August 14, 2017 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; if so, why;

- Whether the project proposal is of a type where the potential adverse effects are highly predictable and mitigable with known technology, (please provide any recommended mitigation measures); and
- Any matter of importance to the Party related to the project proposal.

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

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

- Noted concern with respect to marine mammals and their habitat.
- Noted the Marine Mammal Regulations are to be found in Section 7 of the *Fisheries Act* and that disturbance is interpreted as disruption to an animal's normal life processes which could include intentional human activities including divers, kayaks, motor boats and aircrafts.
- Recommended that the watercraft should survey the area for marine mammals and efforts made to avoid disturbing them by rerouting, slowly navigating around their location at a reduced speed and maintaining their distance.
- Stated that watercraft should not accelerate within 400 metres (m) of the marine mammals and should not be approached closer than 100 m at any time.

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada

- No comments or additional terms and conditions to offer at this time.

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

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

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 section 90 of the NuPPAA. The Board took particular care to take into account Inuit Qaujimaningit, traditional and community knowledge in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

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

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

The "HMS Erebus Wreck Site Archaeological Investigation" project proposal is the continuation of archaeological activities previously assessed in 2015 which primarily occurred within the marine environment and has since been modified to include a terrestrial

component along the shoreline adjacent to the National Historic Site. The proposed camp may be located within habitat for muskox, Arctic fox, Arctic hare, migratory and non-migratory birds, and Species at Risk such as Polar Bear. However, the minimal size and duration of the camp (six (6) persons for eight (8) days) and low-level of land-based activity is unlikely to create significant disturbance beyond what was previously assessed.

2. *The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.*

The proposed project would occur in an area with no particular identified ecosystemic sensitivity. However, this area has been identified as having value and priority to the local community for:

- i. fish, and,
- ii. muskox.

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

The proposed activities are both within and adjacent to the Wrecks of HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site. The proposed camp would function as a base for archeological survey of the HMS *Erebus*, and thus may have artifacts associated with the ship as well as traditional Inuit artifacts or archeological sites. Should the project amendment be approved to proceed, the Proponent would be required to contact the Government of Nunavut-Department of Culture and Heritage if any sites of historical, cultural or archaeological significance are encountered outside of the National Historic Site and continuing activities within the Wrecks of HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site would be managed by Parks Canada.

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

The proposed project would occur at a location approximately 125 kilometres from Gjoa Haven, the nearest community; as such, no human populations are likely to be affected by project impacts.

Although no significant public concerns were raised during the public commenting period, the NIRB notes that a term and condition has been recommended to direct engagement with the community, hunters and trappers organization and interested parties, as well as the posting of public notices to ensure residents are aware of the research activities being or to be conducted.

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

As the “HMS Erebus Wreck Site Archaeological Investigation” project would involve underwater archeological work within the Wrecks of HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site with the camp providing logistical support with no other land-based activities, impacts are expected to be minimal. Based on past evidence of similar scope of activities,

the potential adverse impacts will be short in duration and may be of low magnitude, reversible and mitigable with due care.

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

The proposed project would take place with one (1) other project currently undergoing screening by the Board, the Parks Canada “Visitor Experience at the Erebus Wreck Site” project; however, it is noted that this project is not likely to result in residual or cumulative impacts as the project proposal is short in duration one (1) day and are limited in geographic area. The potential for cumulative impacts resulting from the research activities and other projects occurring in the region has been identified and considered in the development of the NIRB’s recommendations. Terms and conditions recommended for each of these projects are expected to reduce any residual impacts, and as such would limit or eliminate the potential for cumulative effects to occur.

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.

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.

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 Board has previously recommended terms and conditions 1 through 4, and 21 which continue to apply to the current project proposal. The Board is also recommending term and condition 22 to ensure complete reference to applicable regulatory requirements.

The Board would also note that, as justified in its previous decision (NIRB File No. 15YN037 dated August 20, 2015), terms and conditions remain applicable to the project and its archaeological activities, while the additional impacts identified for the new terrestrial camp warrant mitigation measures as justified below.

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:

Issue 1: Potential adverse impacts to birds, and marine and terrestrial wildlife as a result of the noise generated by human activity in the area, and transport of supplies and personnel to site via aircraft and marine vessel.

Board views: As discussed above in the assessment of factors relevant to this project proposal, the potential for adverse impacts is applicable to a small geographic area and is limited due to the short length of the proposed project. Any resulting impacts would be expected to be temporary only.

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

Recommended Mitigation Measures: The Board has previously recommended terms and conditions to mitigate potential adverse impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitats, specifically: 5, 8, 11 through 15, and 18.

Issue 2: Potential adverse impacts to surface water quality and quantity, and fish and fish habitat from the continuation of archaeological activities and the camp include storage and use of fuel and chemicals, waste storage and disposal, and transportation of equipment and personnel to and from the communities of Cambridge Bay and Gjoa Haven.

Board views: There is the potential for the project to adversely impact surface water quality, fish and fish habitat from fuel spills during establishment and/or operation of the archaeological activities previously screened and specifically the camp, fuel, and supplies, and transport by aircraft. In addition, there is potential for impacts from waste material generated by the camp to affect the terrestrial environment in addition to the marine environment as assessed when project staff were previously housed on a boat. The potential for impacts is applicable to a small geographic area and the probability of impacts occurring is considered to be low, with potential adverse effects anticipated to be low in magnitude, infrequent in occurrence and reversible in nature.

It is expected that standard operational considerations would mitigate any potential adverse impacts to the surface water quality and quantity, and fish and fish habitat in the direct project area and areas adjacent to the proposed project.

The Proponent would also be required to follow the *Fisheries Act*, the *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations*, *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act*, the *Aeronautics Act*, the *Canadian Aviation Regulations*, and the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (see Regulatory Requirements section).

Recommended Mitigation Measures: The Board previously issued terms and conditions to reduce adverse impacts from equipment and fuel/chemical spill hazards by issuing terms and conditions 6, 8 through 11, and 17 which continue to apply to the project. In

addition, the following terms and conditions are recommended to mitigate the potential adverse impacts from the camp: 23 through 25.

Issue 3: Potential adverse impacts to ground stability, vegetation health, soil quality, and terrain, from camp establishment and use, storage and use of fuel and chemicals, waste storage and disposal, and transportation of equipment and personnel to and from the communities of Cambridge Bay and Gjoa Haven.

Board Views: There is potential for adverse impacts to ground stability, vegetation health and soil quality from the establishment and operation of the camp as well as the continuation of archaeological activities. In addition, fuel spills may result in soil contamination as would have previously been assessed as part of a marine program. Further, there is potential for impacts to vegetation health and soil quality from the camp activities.

However, given the short duration of the planned activities and small number of personnel on site the potential adverse impacts to ground stability, vegetation health, soil quality, and terrain, are considered to be of low magnitude, temporary, and reversible.

The Proponent would also be required to follow the *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations*, *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act*, and the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: The Proponent has committed to removing all waste from the camp site to landfills in Cambridge Bay and/or Gjoa Haven the same as it was previously doing. It is recommended that the potential adverse impacts to the terrestrial environment, particularly for ground stability, vegetation and surface soils would be mitigated by measures requiring the Proponent to follow appropriate refueling procedures, remove all garbage, undertake restoration of the site to a stable state upon completion of project activities, and implementing erosion prevention measures prior to land disturbance. The Board has previously recommended the following term and condition to ensure the land use area is restored: 16, and 18 through 20, which continue to apply to the current project proposal. In addition, the Board recommends terms and conditions 22 through 25 to mitigate potential adverse impacts to ground stability, vegetation health and soil quality.

Issue 4: Potential adverse impacts to public and traditional land use activities in the area due to transportation of personnel and equipment to project area and camping activities.

Board Views: The proposed project camp location is located on an island unlikely to be used for harvesting or recreational activities; however, the area is within a region indicated as being used from time to time for hunting and fishing by residents of Gjoa Haven. The possibility of disturbance is low given the minimal size of the camp and period of operation.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: The Board has previously recommended the following terms and conditions to ensure minimal impacts to traditional land use activities: 19 and 20.

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Issue 5: Potential adverse impacts to historical, cultural, and archaeological sites from research activities.

Board Views: The Proponent is proposing to work adjacent to an area of known historical significance which may cause potential negative impacts; however, the amendment is in order to support the further study of one (1) of the ships from the Franklin Expedition. For the terrestrial component of the project, the Proponent is required to contact the Government of Nunavut – Department of Culture and Heritage when encountering historical sites outside the boundaries of the National Historic Site and is required to follow the *Nunavut Act* (as recommended in Regulatory Requirements section).

Recommended Mitigation Measures: In addition to the requirements of the *Nunavut Act*, previously issued condition 19 is recommended to ensure that available Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit can inform project activities, and reduce the potential for negative impacts occurring to any additional historical sites.

Issue 6: Potential positive impacts to the local community from the sourcing of accommodations for personnel within the community, purchasing of local goods and services, the hiring of local guides and the use of wildlife monitors.

Board Views: It is noted that the Proponent has committed to work with the communities of Gjoa Haven and Cambridge Bay as it has done so for the last two (2) years. The Proponent will be based logistically in Cambridge Bay and Gjoa Haven, and has committed to employing four (4) Nunavut Inuit directly for this project as well as two (2) others for community outreach. This project will provide information which should be applied toward Parks Canada planning to build infrastructure in Gjoa Haven for interpretation of the site and the Franklin Expedition.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Terms and condition 19 has been recommended to ensure the Proponent continues to inform the community of the research activities and findings as well as provide community members with information to ensure a successful local hiring opportunity.

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. Further it is noted that the Proponent has hiring four (4) Inuit from the local communities to participate in the field work as well as two (2) others to support community outreach.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Term and condition 19 is recommended to ensure that the affected community and organizations are informed about the project proposal, and to provide the Proponent with an opportunity to proactively address or mitigate any concerns that may arise from the project activities findings as well as ensure that the Proponent provide community members with information to ensure a successful local hiring opportunity.

Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:

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

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

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The following terms and conditions were previously issued by the NIRB in the August 20, 2015 Screening Decision Report(s) for File No. **15YN037**, **and continue to apply to the HMS Erebus Wreck Site Archaeological Investigation project:**

General

1. Parks Canada (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 NIRB (NIRB Part 1 Form, July 2, 2015) and Parks Canada (Parks Canada Permit Application, July 2, 2015).
4. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.

Water Use

5. The Proponent shall not extract water from any fish-bearing waterbody 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 approved by the Nunavut Water Board.
6. 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

7. 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

8. The Proponent shall store all fuel and chemicals in such a manner that they are inaccessible to wildlife.
9. The Proponent shall use drip pans or other equivalent device when refuelling equipment on-site. Appropriate spill response equipment and clean-up materials (e.g., shovels, pumps, barrels, drip pans, and absorbents) must be readily available during any transfer of fuel or hazardous substances.
10. 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

11. The Proponent shall ensure that there is no damage to wildlife habitat in conducting this operation.
12. 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.
13. The Proponent shall ensure that all project personnel are made aware of the measures to protect wildlife and are provided with training and/or advice on how to implement these measures.

Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance

14. The Proponent shall minimize activities during periods when birds are particularly sensitive to disturbance such as migration, nesting and moulting.
15. The Proponent shall avoid the seaward site of seabird colonies and areas used by flocks of migrating waterfowl by 3 kilometres.

Restoration of Disturbed Areas

16. The Proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are restored to a stable or pre-disturbed state as practical as possible upon completion of field work.

Ship-based Activities

17. The Proponent shall not deposit, nor permit the deposit of any fuel, chemicals, wastes (including waste water) or sediment into any marine waters, and shall manage wastes on board the vessel prior to final disposal at approved port facilities.

Marine Transportation

18. The Proponent shall not attempt to intersect or interfere with the movements of marine mammals. Strategic positioning of vessels ahead of the path being traveled by mobile whales and waiting for the whales to pass is also prohibited.

Other

19. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and consult with local residents regarding their activities in the area and available Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit that can inform project activities.

20. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.

21. (*updated*) 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.

In addition to the previously issued terms and conditions, the Board recommends the following project-specific terms and conditions:

General

22. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to Parks Canada (July 4, 2017) and the Nunavut Planning Commission (Application to Determine Conformity, July 17, 2017), and the NIRB (Online Application Form, July 28, 2017).

Temporary Camps

23. The Proponent shall ensure that all camps are located on gravel, sand or other durable land.

24. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.

Restoration of Disturbed Areas

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Board has previously recommended the following on August 20, 2015:

Final Report

1. The Proponent shall submit a final report to the Nunavut Impact Review Board upon completion of permitted activities or by January 31, 2016. If subsequent undertakings of the project are permitted, this reporting shall be completed at the end of each operational season.

The report must contain, but not be limited to the following information:

- a) A summary of activities undertaken for the year, and if applicable, a work plan for the following year.
- b) A summary of community consultations undertaken throughout the year, specifically:
 - Copies of materials presented to community members,
 - A description of issues discussed and concerns raised,

- Advice offered by community members to the Proponent,
 - Details on how the advice was incorporated into the project planning, and
 - Any follow-up actions that were required or taken to resolve any concerns expressed about the project proposal.
- c) A summary of encounters with other land users, including local residents or tourists, noting the date and location of the observation, the number of people encountered, the activity being undertaken (e.g. cruise ship/tourism activities, fishing, hunting, etc.), and any actions taken to prevent disturbance.
- d) A summary of how the Proponent has complied with conditions contained within the Screening Decision Report.

OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the project-specific terms and conditions, the Board has previously recommended the following on August 20, 2015:

Other Applicable Guidelines

Bear and Carnivore Safety

1. (*updated*) The Proponent should review the Government of Nunavut’s booklet on Bear Safety, which can be downloaded from this link: http://gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/bear_safety_-_reducing_bear-people_conflicts_in_nunavut.pdf. Further information on bear/carnivore detection and deterrent techniques can be found in the “*Safety in Grizzly and Black Bear Country*” pamphlet, which can be downloaded from this link: http://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/default/files/web_pdf_wd_bear_safety_brochure_1_may_2015.pdf.
2. (*updated*) 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.
3. 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 - Cambridge Bay, phone: (867) 983-4167).

Species at Risk

4. (*updated*) 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

5. 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.
6. For further information on how to protect migratory birds, their nests and eggs when planning or carrying out project activities, consult Environment Canada's Incidental Take web page and the fact sheet "Planning Ahead to Reduce the Risk of Detrimental Effects to Migratory Birds, and their Nests and Eggs" available at <http://www.ec.gc.ca/paom-itmb/>.

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The Board previously recommended in the August 20, 2015 Screening Decision Report(s) for the "Underwater Archaeology and Biology Study of the Wreck of HMS Erebus" project the following legislation, which continues to apply to the current proposal:

Acts and Regulations

1. The *Canada National Parks Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-14.01/>).
2. The *Fisheries Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/F-14/index.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 B** is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut.
5. (updated) The *Wildlife Act (Nunavut)* and its corresponding regulations (<http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html>) contains provisions to protect and conserve wildlife and wildlife habitat, including specific protection measures for wildlife habitat and species at risk.
6. The *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-12/>).
7. The *Canada Shipping Act, 2001* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-10.15/>).
8. The *Marine Liability Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-0.7/>).
9. The *Navigation Protection Act (NPA)* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-22/index.html>).

In addition, the Proponent is also advised that the following legislation may apply to the project:

Acts and Regulations

10. The *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations* (<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/clear-tofc-211.htm>), *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/t-19.01/>), and the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/>).
11. The *Aeronautics Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-2/>).
12. The *Canadian Aviation Regulations* (<https://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/acts-regulations/regulations-sor96-433.htm>).

Acts and Regulations – activities occurring outside of the National Historic Site

13. The *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act* (<http://www.canlii.org/ca/sta/n-28.8/whole.html>).
14. 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 C**.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to the Parks Canada's "HMS Erebus Wreck Site Archaeological Investigation". The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated August 31, 2017 at Whale Cove, NU.



Elizabeth Copland, Chairperson

Attachments: Appendix A: Previously-Screened Project Proposals
Appendix B: Species at Risk in Nunavut
Appendix C: Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources Terms and Conditions for Land Use Permit Holders

APPENDIX A: PREVIOUSLY-SCREENED PROJECT PROPOSALS

The original project proposal NIRB (File No. 15YN037), was received by the NIRB from Parks Canada on July 2, 2015 and was screened by the Board in accordance with Part 4, Article 12 of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada* (Nunavut Agreement). On August 20, 2015 the NIRB issued a Nunavut Agreement 12.4.4(a) screening decision to the Minister of Environment, Government of Canada (now Minister of Environment and Climate Change) which indicated that the proposed project could proceed subject to the NIRB's recommended project-specific terms and conditions.

Parks Canada's (the Proponent) original "Underwater Archaeology and Biology Study of the Wreck of HMS Erebus" project was located in the Kitikmeot region, approximately 125 kilometres (km) southwest of Gjoa Haven and 250 km southeast of Cambridge Bay in the recently established Wrecks of HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site of Canada. The Proponent indicated that it intended to conduct an underwater archaeology exploration program from August to September 2015.

According to the previously screened project proposal, the scope of the project included the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- Transportation to the project site and accommodation for up to 19 personnel aboard the Arctic Research Foundation's (ARF) 35 foot motor vessel (MV) and 65 foot MV *Martin Bergmann*;
- Untethered SCUBA and surface-supplied diving operations conducted from Parks Canada's research vessel (RV) *Investigator* (33 feet) and two (2) rigid hull inflatable boats;
- Use of species sampling equipment and underwater cameras for benthic characterization study and photo documentation of project site;
- Deployment of underwater probe for water data collection with recovery after one (1) year;
- Use of aluminum grid references, water pump activated dredges and remotely operated underwater vehicles (ROV) for archaeological study and artefact recovery operations;
- Periodic resupply and waste disposal trips to Cambridge Bay;
 - All sewage, combustible and non-combustible wastes to be stored aboard the MV *Martin Bergmann* for appropriate disposal in Cambridge Bay or treatment through onboard septic systems;
- Hiring of three (3) Inuit community members to assist on project site and in communities.

Appendix B

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: October 2016

| Species at Risk ¹ | COSEWIC Designation | Schedule of SARA | Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility ² |
|--|---|---|---|
| Migratory Birds | | | |
| Eskimo Curlew | Endangered | Schedule 1 | ECCC |
| Buff-breasted Sandpiper | Special concern | Pending | 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 | 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 1 | 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 |
| Vegetation | | | |
| Felt-leaf Willow | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Blanket-leaved Willow | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Porsild's Bryum (Moss) | Threatened | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Terrestrial Wildlife | | | |
| Peary Caribou | Endangered | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Peary Caribou (High Arctic Population) | Endangered | Schedule 2 | GN |
| Peary Caribou (Low Arctic Population) | Threatened | Schedule 2 | GN |
| Dolphin and Union Caribou | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | GN |
| Grizzly Bear (Western Population) | Special Concern | Pending | GN |
| Wolverine | Special Concern | Pending | GN |
| Marine Wildlife | | | |
| Polar Bear | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | GN/DFO |
| Atlantic Walrus | Special Concern | Pending | DFO |
| Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound population) | Threatened | Pending | 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) | Endangered | Schedule 2 | DFO |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------|-----|
| Killer Whale (Northwest Atlantic / Eastern Arctic populations) | Special Concern | Pending | DFO |
| Grey Whale (Eastern North Pacific population) | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | DFO |
| Humpback Whale (Western North Atlantic population) | Special Concern | Schedule 3 | DFO |
| Narwhal | Special Concern | Pending | DFO |
| Fish | | | |
| Northern Wolffish | Threatened | Schedule 1 | DFO |
| Atlantic Wolffish | Special Concern | Schedule 1 | DFO |
| Bering Wolffish | Special Concern | Schedule 3 | DFO |
| Fourhorn Sculpin | Special Concern | Schedule 3 | DFO |
| Roundnose Grenadier | Endangered | Pending | DFO |
| Spotted Wolffish | Threatened | Schedule 1 | DFO |
| Thorny Skate | Special Concern | Pending | DFO |
| Atlantic Cod, Arctic Lakes | Special Concern | Pending | DFO |
| Blackline Prickleback | Special Concern | Schedule 3 | DFO |

Notes: DFO: Fisheries and Oceans Canada; ECCC: Environment and Climate Change Canada; GN: Government of Nunavut

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

²Environment and Climate Change Canada 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.

³The *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 C
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*² to issue such permits.

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

² P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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

Legal Framework

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

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

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

Palaeontology and Archaeology

Under the *Nunavut Act*³, the federal government can make regulations for the protection, care and preservation of palaeontological and archaeological sites and specimens in Nunavut. Under

³ s. 51(1)

the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*⁴, it is illegal to alter or disturb any palaeontological or archaeological site in Nunavut unless permission is first granted through the permitting process.

Definitions

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

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

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

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

“fossil” includes:

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

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

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

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

Introduction

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

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

⁴ P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

prepared to undertake the study to the developer; issue an archaeologist or palaeontologist permit authorizing field work; assess the completeness of the study and its recommendations; and ensure that the developer complies with the recommendations.

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

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

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

Types of Development

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

- *Linear disturbances: including the construction of highways, roads, winter roads, transmission lines, and pipelines;*
- *Extractive disturbances: including mining, gravel removal, quarrying, and land filling;*
- *Impoundment disturbances: including dams, reservoirs, and tailings ponds;*
- *Intensive land use disturbances: including industrial, residential, commercial, recreational, and land reclamation work, and use of heritage resources as tourist developments.*

- *Mineral, oil and gas exploration: establishment of camps, temporary airstrips, access routes, well sites, or quarries all have potential for impacting heritage resources.*

Types of Studies Undertaken to Preserve Heritage Resources

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

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

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

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

- allow the identification of research and conservation opportunities;
- enable the developer to make planning decisions and recognize their likely effects on the known or predicted resources; and
- make the developer aware of the expenditures, which may be required for subsequent studies and mitigation. A Class 1 or 2 permit is required.

Assessment: At this stage, sufficient information concerning the numbers and locations of heritage resources will be available, as well as data to predict the forms and magnitude of impacts. Assessments provide information on the size, volume, complexity and content of a

heritage resource, which is used to rank the values of different sites or site types given current archaeological knowledge. As this information will shape subsequent mitigation program(s), great care is necessary during this phase.

Mitigation: This refers to the amelioration of adverse impacts to heritage resources and involves the avoidance of impact through the redesign or relocation of a development or its components; the protection of the resource by constructing physical facilities; or, the scientific investigation and recovery of information from the resource by excavation or other method. The type(s) of appropriate mitigative measures are dictated by their viability in the context of the development project. Mitigation strategies must be developed in consultation with, and approved by, the Department of Culture and Heritage. It is important to note that mitigation activities should be initiated as far in advance of the construction of the development as possible.

Surveillance and monitoring: These may be required as part of the mitigation program.

Surveillance may be conducted during the construction phase of a project to ensure that the developer has complied with the recommendations.

Monitoring involves identification and inspection of residual and long-term impacts of a development (i.e. shoreline stability of a reservoir); or the use of impacts to disclose the presence of heritage resources, for example, the uncovering of buried sites during the construction of a pipeline.