



The purpose of screening is provided for under s. 88 of the *NuPPAA*:

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

To determine whether a review of a project is required, the NIRB is guided by the considerations as set out under s. 89(1) of *NuPPAA*:

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

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

It is noted that s. 89(2) of the *NuPPAA* provides that the considerations set out in paragraph 89(1)(a) prevail over those set out in paragraph 89(1)(b) of the *NuPPAA*.

As set out under s. 92(1) of the *NuPPAA*, upon conclusion of the screening process, the Board must provide its written report the Minister:

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

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

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

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

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

## PROJECT REFERRAL

On August 16, 2018 the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) received a referral to screen Nunami Stantec Consulting Ltd.'s "Concept Advancement for a Raw Water Intake" project proposal from the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC or Commission), which noted that the project is outside the area of an applicable regional land use plan. Pursuant to Article 12, Sections 12.4.1 and 12.4.4 of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and s. 87 of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (*NuPPAA*), the NIRB has commenced screening this project proposal and has assigned it file number **18YN046**.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

### 1. Project Scope

The proposed "Concept Advancement for a Raw Water Intake" project is located within the Qikiqtani (South Baffin) region, up to five (5) kilometres (km) west from Iqaluit. The Proponent intends to conduct a field study to identify a water intake location in the Sylvia Grinnell River to supply drinking water to the City of Iqaluit. The program is proposed to take place in September 2018.

As required under s. 86(1) of the *NuPPAA*, the Board accepts the scope of the "Concept Advancement for a Raw Water Intake" project as set out by Nunami Stantec Consulting Ltd. in the proposal. The scope of the project proposal includes the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- Use of accommodations and facilities in Iqaluit;
- Travel to and from sites via all-terrain vehicle (ATV) and/or truck using existing trails and/or roads and fuel to be sourced from Iqaluit;
- Use of a small battery operated remote-controlled boat to measure depth of water across in the Sylvia Grinnell River at two (2) sites;
- Conduct a geotechnical survey of the bedrock at each site in a 100 square metre area along the shore of the Sylvia Grinnell River using low-speed blast charges along cables and geophones; and
- Disposal of domestic waste such as inert blast caps in the Iqaluit landfill as appropriate.

### 2. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

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

### 3. Key Stages of the Screening Process

The following key stages were completed:

Date	Stage
August 16, 2018	Receipt of project proposal and referral from the NPC
August 16, 2018	Information request
August 17, 2018	Proponent responded to information request

August 17, 2018	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
August 22, 2018	Public engagement and comment request
September 4, 2018	Receipt of public comments

#### 4. Public Comments and Concerns

Notice regarding the NIRB's screening of this project proposal was distributed on August 22, 2018 to community organizations in Iqaluit, 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 the NIRB's *proposed* project-specific terms and conditions, and provide the Board with any comments or concerns by September 4, 2018 regarding:

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

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

#### **Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)**

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

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

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

The proposed project would occur up to five (5) kilometres (km) west from Iqaluit, along the Sylvia Grinnell River. The project footprint all includes the transportation routes overland from Iqaluit to the research sites via all-terrain vehicle (ATV) and truck. The proposed project activities may take place in habitat for Arctic char, migratory and non-migratory birds, Arctic fox, Arctic hare, caribou, wolves and Species at Risk such as Polar Bear, as identified by mapping sources and expert knowledge.

2. *The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.*

The proposed project would occur in an area with no particular identified ecosystemic sensitivity with the exception that the proposed activities would occur outside, but in close proximity to, the Sylvia Grinnell Territorial Park. The area where the research would be conducted has been identified through mapping sources and expert knowledge as having value and priority to the local community for:

- i. Traditional land use activities,
- ii. Arctic Char;
- iii. Caribou; and
- iv. Polar Bear

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

This project is in an area of known historical, cultural and archeological sites of significance that have been identified through expert knowledge. Should the project 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.

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

Although no significant public concerns were raised during the public commenting period, the NIRB notes that the close proximity of the proposed activities to the City of Iqaluit and an area used by residents for recreational/traditional pursuits could potentially contribute to public concern developing. 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.

No specific animal populations have been identified as likely to be affected by potential project impacts.

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.*

The “Concept Advancement for a Raw Water Intake” project is a research project with a small geographic scope (three (3) sample locations) and limited to the month of September. Based on evidence from other projects involving bathymetric and geotechnical surveys, the potential adverse impacts are likely to be localized, 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 within a 100 kilometre (km) radius to a number of other projects that are currently or recently active, in addition to other projects proposed and currently undergoing assessment by the Board as listed in Table 1 below. The potential for cumulative impacts to water, fish and wildlife 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. However, it is noted that this project is not likely to result in residual or cumulative impacts. 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.

**Table 1: Project List**

<b>NIRB Number</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Project Type</b>
<b><i>Proposed Developments – undergoing assessment</i></b>			
18YN042		University of Manitoba – Contaminants in Shellfish, Water and Sediment in Frobisher Bay	Research
<b><i>Active Projects</i></b>			
17XN021		Iqaluit Marine Infrastructure – Deep Sea Port	Infrastructure
17XN022		Iqaluit Marine Infrastructure – Small Craft Harbour	Infrastructure
18XN001		Bridge to Nowhere-Repair Abutments	Community Infrastructure
18YN015		Arctic Driftwood as a proxy record of environmental change: a pilot study	Research
18YN029		URI Northwest Passage Project 2018	Research
18YN041		University of Manitoba – Characterizing Iqaluit’s baseline municipal wastewater contaminant loadings to the marine environment	Research
<b><i>Past Projects</i></b>			
17UN006		Iqaluit Airport – Approach Lighting Replacement	Infrastructure

<b>NIRB Number</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Project Type</b>
17YN019		Iqaluit MET mast	Research
17XN070		Iqaluit Bulk Fuel Storage Tank Farm Upgrade	Fuel
17UN025		Former Iqaluit Metal Dump Remediation	Remediation
17AN031		Canada C3 – Students on Ice	Research
17YN041		A Coastal, Pan-Canadian Collection of plants, microalgae and marine invertebrates for the Canadian Museum of Nature	Research

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.

#### Views of the Board

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

#### **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: 1-3.

#### **Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:**

**Issue 1:** Potential adverse impacts to migratory and non-migratory birds, and terrestrial wildlife from noise associated with the transportation of personal and equipment to research sites by ATV and from the low-speed blast charges during the geotechnical survey.

**Board views:** There is the potential for the project to adversely impact terrestrial wildlife including birds and bird habitat due to noise and disturbance from the use of ATVs and from the low-speed blast charges during the geotechnical survey. Further, the proposed activities may take place within areas that overlap for many far-ranging wildlife species and may potentially affect migratory patterns. However, as discussed above, the potential for impacts is applicable to small geographic area and over a short time period using a small size of the crew (2 persons). In addition, it is expected that standard operational considerations would mitigate any potential adverse impacts to wildlife and migratory and non-migratory birds. Potential adverse impacts related to noise and disturbance are anticipated to be low in magnitude and infrequent in occurrence.

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

**Recommended Mitigation Measures:** It is recommended that the potential adverse impacts may be mitigated by requiring the Proponent to avoid and not interfere with wildlife and birds. The NIRB recommends the following terms and conditions to mitigate the potential adverse impacts due to research activities 5 through 10.

**Issue 2:** Potential adverse impacts to freshwater water quality, fish and fish habitat, from use of battery powered small boat for bathymetric survey and noise and disturbance from the use of low-speed blast charges during the geotechnical survey.

**Board views:** There is the potential for the project to adversely impact freshwater ecosystems and fish from the noise and disturbance from the use of from use of battery powered small boat and from the low-speed blast charges during the geotechnical survey. The potential for impacts is applicable to small geographic areas within the project footprint 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.

The Proponent would be required to follow the *Fisheries Act* and the *Guidelines for the use of Explosives in or near Canadian Fisheries Waters*.

**Recommended Mitigation Measures:** It is recommended that the potential adverse impacts to the freshwater environment may be mitigated by requiring the Proponent to operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines. The NIRB recommends the following terms and conditions: 4 and 5.

**Issue 3:** Potential adverse impacts to ground stability, vegetation health, soil quality, terrain, and permafrost from overland use of ATV or truck to transport equipment and personnel to and from the research sites.

**Board Views:** There is potential for adverse impacts to ground stability, vegetation health, and soil quality from the use of an ATV and trucks as well as due to potential fuel spills. Specifically, the use of an ATV on exposed soil could result in soil compaction or rutting, which could contribute to soil erosion. However, the Proponent has committed to drive on existing trails and roads and ATV's and would be equipped with small spill kits to manage any spills or leaks that may occur. Further, given the ATV would be used infrequently for only a short time period and within a limited geographic area, potential adverse impacts would be of low magnitude and reversible.

**Recommended Mitigation Measures:** It is recommended that the potential adverse impacts to the terrestrial environment be mitigated by requiring the Proponent to ensure the land is kept tidy of as per term and conditions 5 and 12 and that the Proponent would suspend the use of the ATV if any rutting or gouging is observed, as per term and condition 11.



**Issue 4:** Potential adverse impacts to public and traditional land use activities in the area due to research activities.

**Board Views:** The proposed research would occur in close proximity to the City of Iqaluit, and researchers may interact with local residents while they are working. Further, there is potential for the proposed project activities to disrupt traditional and recreational land use activities due to the transportation of personnel and equipment to the research sites and noise generated from research activities, which may result in disruption of wildlife in the area resulting in a reduction in hunting success or harvesting activities. The project activities are short term in nature and the impacts are expected to be temporary in nature, reversible, and mitigable with due care. If situations arise where the project may interfere with traditional land use, a term and condition has been recommended to ensure minimal impacts to traditional land use activities.

**Recommended Mitigation Measures:** Term and condition 13 is recommended to ensure that the affected communities and organizations are informed about the project proposal and term and condition 14 has been recommended to ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities in the area. In addition terms and conditions 6 through 10 have been recommended to minimize interference with wildlife and birds.

**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 in an area of known historical significance which may cause potential negative impacts. Although no specific historical, cultural, or archaeological sites were identified by the Proponent or parties as occurring within the area of proposed research activities the Proponent would be required to contact the Government of Nunavut-Department of Culture and Heritage when encountering historical sites and is required to follow the *Nunavut Act* (as recommended in Regulatory Requirements section).

**Recommended Mitigation Measures:** Term and condition 13 is recommended to ensure that available Inuit Qaujimaningit can inform project activities, and reduce the potential for negative impacts occurring to any additional historical sites.

**Issue 6:** Potential positive benefits to the City of Iqaluit from identifying and new drinking water source and from the use of local accommodations, purchasing of local goods and services.

**Board Views:** The Proponent is conducting a survey to identify a new source of drinking water for the City of Iqaluit. The results of the research would help with the engineering and design of a water intake at the Sylvia Grinnell River and would be shared with the City of Iqaluit and likely through a public meeting. The Proponent would be staying in the City of Iqaluit for the duration of the research, and thus would be contributing to the local economy through the purchase of some local goods and services and staying at the local hotels.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Term and condition 15 has been recommended to ensure the Proponent access local services whenever possible.

**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 committed to consult with local community members on the results of the research activities.

Recommended Mitigation Measures: Term and condition 13 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.

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

**General**

1. Nunami Stantec (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times.
2. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC File No.: 148928 and the NIRB (Online Application Form, August 17, 2018).
3. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations, and Guidelines.

**Water Use**

4. The Proponent shall not disturb any stream, lakebed or the banks of any definable water course unless approved by the Nunavut Water Board.

## **Waste Disposal**

5. 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.

## **Wildlife - General**

6. The Proponent shall ensure that there is no damage to wildlife habitat in conducting this operation.
7. The Proponent shall not harass wildlife. This includes persistently circling, chasing, hovering over pursuing or in any other way harass wildlife, or disturbing large groups of animals.
8. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been
9. 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**

10. The Proponent shall minimize activities during periods when birds are particularly sensitive to disturbance such as migration, nesting and moulting.

## **Ground Disturbance**

11. 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**

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

## **Other**

13. The Proponent should engage with local residents regarding planned activities in the area and should solicit available Inuit Qaujimaningit and information regarding current recreational and traditional usage of the project area which may inform project activities. Posting of translated public notices and direct engagement with potentially interested groups and individuals prior to undertaking project activities is strongly encouraged.
14. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
15. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and access local services where possible.

## **OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

### **Change in Project Scope**

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

### **Copy of licences, etc. to the Board and Commission**

2. As per s. 137(4) of the *NuPPAA*, responsible authorities are required to submit a copy of each licence, permit or other authorization issued for the Project to the Nunavut Planning Commission and the NIRB. Please forward a copy of the licences, permits and/or other authorizations to the NIRB directly at [info@nirb.ca](mailto:info@nirb.ca) or upload a copy to the NIRB's online registry at [www.nirb.ca](http://www.nirb.ca).

### **Bear and Carnivore Safety**

3. 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](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](http://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/default/files/web_pdf_wd_bear_safety_brochure_1_may_2015.pdf).
4. 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](http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/nu/quttinirpaaq/visit/visit6/~media/pn-np/nu/auyuittuq/pdf/shared/PolarBearSafety_English.ashx).
5. 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 Iqaluit , phone (867) 975-7780).

### **Species at Risk**

6. 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](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**

7. 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.

## **REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS**

The Proponent is also advised that the following legislation may apply to the project:

## **Acts and Regulations**

1. 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://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-28.8/>).
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 (Nunavut)* and its corresponding regulations (<http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html>).
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**.

## **Other Applicable Guidelines**

7. The *Guidelines for the use of Explosives in or near Canadian Fisheries Waters* (<http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/82558/publication.html>).

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to the Nunami Stantec Consulting Ltd.'s "Concept Advancement for a Raw Water Intake" project proposal. The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated September 11, 2018 at Whale Cove, 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](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca)) to get the current status of a species.

Updated: September 2017

Terrestrial Species at Risk <sup>1</sup>	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility <sup>2</sup>
Migratory Birds			
Buff-breasted Sandpiper	Special concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Eskimo Curlew	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harlequin Duck (Eastern population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harris's Sparrow	Special Concern	Pending	ECCC
Horned Grebe (Western population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ivory Gull	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peregrine Falcon	Special Concern ( <i>anatum-tundrius</i> complex <sup>3</sup> )	Schedule 1 - Schedule 3	ECCC
Red Knot ( <i>islandica</i> subspecies)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red Knot ( <i>rufa</i> subspecies)	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red-necked Phalarope	Special concern	Pending	ECCC
Ross's Gull	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Rusty Blackbird	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Vegetation			
Blanket-leaved Willow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Felt-leaf Willow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Porsild's Bryum (Moss)	Threatened	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Arthropods			
Traverse Lady Beetle	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Terrestrial Wildlife			
Caribou (Barren-Ground population)	Threatened	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Dolphin and Union Caribou	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Grizzly Bear (Western Population)	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Peary Caribou	Endangered	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut
Peary Caribou (High Arctic Population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	Government of Nunavut
Peary Caribou (Low Arctic Population)	Threatened	Schedule 2	Government of Nunavut
Wolverine	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Wolverine (Western population)	Non-active	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Marine Wildlife			
Atlantic Walrus	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic – Baffin Bay population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern Hudson Bay population)	Endangered	Pending	DFO

Beluga Whale (Southeast Baffin Island – Cumberland Sound population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	DFO
Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Bowhead Whale (Eastern Arctic population)	Endangered	Schedule 2	DFO
Bowhead Whale (Eastern Canada – West Greenland population)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Killer Whale (Northwest Atlantic / Eastern Arctic populations)	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Narwhal	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut/DFO
Fish			
Atlantic Cod, Arctic Lakes	Special Concern	Pending	DFO
Atlantic Wolffish	Special Concern	Schedule 1	DFO
Bering Wolffish	Special Concern	Schedule 3	DFO
Blackline Prickleback	Special Concern	Schedule 3	DFO
Fourhorn Sculpin	Special Concern	Schedule 3	DFO
Fourhorn Sculpin (Freshwater form)	Data Deficient	Schedule 3	DFO
Northern Wolffish	Threatened	Schedule 1	DFO
Roundnose Grenadier	Endangered	Pending	DFO
Spotted Whitefish	Threatened	Schedule 1	DFO
Thorny Skate	Special Concern	Pending	DFO

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

<sup>2</sup> Environment Canada (EC) has a national role to play in the conservation and recovery of Species at Risk in Canada, as well as responsibility for management of birds described in the Migratory Birds Convention Act (MBCA). Day-to-day management of terrestrial species not covered in the MBCA is the responsibility of the Territorial Government. Populations that exist in National Parks are also managed under the authority of the Parks Canada Agency.



## 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:

	<b>Types of Development</b> (See Guidelines below)	<b>Function</b> (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*<sup>1</sup> to issue such permits.

---

<sup>1</sup> P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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

### **Legal Framework**

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

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

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

## Palaeontology and Archaeology

Under the *Nunavut Act*<sup>2</sup>, the federal government can make regulations for the protection, care and preservation of palaeontological and archaeological sites and specimens in Nunavut. Under the *Nunavut Archaeological and Palaeontological Sites Regulations*<sup>3</sup>, 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](http://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

---

<sup>2</sup> s. 51(1)

<sup>3</sup> P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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

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

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

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

### **Types of Development**

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

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

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

### **Types of Studies Undertaken to Preserve Heritage Resources**

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

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

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

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

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

**Assessment:** At this stage, sufficient information concerning the numbers and locations of heritage resources will be available, as well as data to predict the forms and magnitude of impacts. Assessments provide information on the size, volume, complexity and content of a heritage resource, which is used to rank the values of different sites or site types given current archaeological knowledge. As this information will shape subsequent mitigation program(s), great care is necessary during this phase.

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

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

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

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