



SCREENING DECISION REPORT

NIRB FILE No.: 20UN005

May 4, 2020

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board’s (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Parks Canada’s “Douglas Harbour Shelter” is not required pursuant to Article 12, Section 12.4.4(a) of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and s. 92(1)(a) of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (*NuPPAA*).

Subject to the Proponent’s compliance with the terms and conditions as set out in below, the NIRB is of the view that the project proposal is not likely to cause significant public concerns, and it is unlikely to result in significant adverse environmental and social impacts. The NIRB therefore recommends that the responsible Minister(s) accepts this Screening Decision Report.

OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....	2
PROJECT REFERRAL.....	3
PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	3
ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF <i>NUPPAA</i>.....	6
VIEWS OF THE BOARD	8
RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS	12
OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
CONCLUSION	15

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT	17
---	-----------

The primary objectives of the NIRB are set out in Article 12, Section 12.2.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and are confirmed by s. 23 of the *NuPPAA*:

Nunavut Agreement, Article 12, Section 12.2.5: In carrying out its functions, the primary objectives of NIRB shall be at all times to protect and promote the existing and future well-being of the residents and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, and to protect the ecosystemic integrity of the Nunavut Settlement Area. NIRB shall take into account the well-being of the residents of Canada outside the Nunavut Settlement Area.

The purpose of screening is provided for under Article 12, Section 12.4.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 88 of the *NuPPAA* which states:

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

To determine whether a review of a project is required, the NIRB is guided by the considerations as set out under Article 12, Section 12.4.2(a) and (b) of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 89(1) of *NuPPAA* which states:

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

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

It is noted that under Article 12, Section 12.4.2(c) and s. 89(2) of the *NuPPAA* provides that the considerations set out in s.89(1)(a) prevail over the considerations set out in s. 89(1)(b) of the *NuPPAA*.

As set out under Article 12, Section 12.4.4 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(1) of the *NuPPAA*, upon conclusion of the screening process, the Board must provide its written report the Minister. The contents of the NIRB's report are specified under *NuPPAA*:

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

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

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

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

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

PROJECT REFERRAL

On February 25, 2020 the NIRB received a referral to screen Parks Canada's "Douglas Harbour Shelter" project proposal directly from Parks Canada pursuant to s. 167 of the *NuPPAA*. The NIRB noted that the proposed project would be located within the Ukkusiksalik National Park and pursuant to s. 70(1) of the *NuPPAA*, the Nunavut Planning Commission conformity determination process does not apply.¹ As a result, pursuant to Article 12, Sections 12.4.1 and 12.4.4 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 87 of the *NuPPAA*, the NIRB commenced screening this project proposal and assigned it file number **20UN005**.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Screening Process Timelines

The following key stages were completed for the screening process:

Date	Stage
February 25, 2020	Receipt of project proposal from Parks Canada
February 25, 2020	Request to complete public registry online and provide information pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
March 5, 2020	Receipt of online application from Proponent
March 5, 2020	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
March 20, 2020	Public engagement and comment request

¹ Subsection 70(1) states of the *NuPPAA*: 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.

Date	Stage
April 6, 2020	Receipt of public comments
April 14, 2020	Ministerial extension requested from the Minister of Environment and Climate Change
May 4, 2020	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

2. Project Scope

All documents received and pertaining to this project proposal can be accessed from the NIRB's online public registry at www.nirb.ca/project/125509.

Project:	Douglas Harbour Shelter				
Region:	Kivalliq				
Location:	Ukkusiksalik National Park				
Closest Community:	Naujaat	Distance (approximate)	140 kilometres (km)	Direction	Southwest
Summary of Project Description:	The Proponent intends to conduct clean-up and removal of a destroyed Government of Nunavut (GN) cabin, and construction of a new hard-sided shelter for park staff, visitors and community members to use for operational, visitation, harvesting or emergency purposes.				
Project Proposed Timeline:	April 2020 to May 2020.				

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

- Use of snowmobiles and qamutiks for transporting of personnel and equipment to and from the temporary camp site;
- Establishment of a temporary camp in the vicinity of the destroyed GN cabin:
 - Capacity of up to 12 people;
 - To include sleeping tents, canvas kitchen tent, outhouse tent and encompassing electric bear fence;
 - Use of camp while conducting removal of GN cabin and construction of new shelter;
- Clean-up and removal of GN cabin materials:
 - Breakdown and removal of all material related to the destroyed cabin;
 - Transport all materials to Naujaat for disposal in municipal landfill;
 - Hazardous materials to be sealifted south for disposal in an appropriate facility;
- Construction of 12'x16' hard-sided shelter and outhouse approximately four (4) kilometres west of the previous GN cabin location:
 - Potential for snow removal around base of structure;
 - Placement of above-ground timber footings;
 - Outhouse to use 45 gallon drum to collect waste once shelter is built with wastes to be removed and disposed of at capacity in Naujaat;

- Transport, storage and use of gasoline for snowmobiles and generator;
- Use of snow, ice and water from nearby lake for domestic purposes;
- Production of greywater and human waste; and;
- Removal of wastes for proper disposal.

3. 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.

4. Public Comments and Concerns

Notice regarding the NIRB's screening of this project proposal was distributed on was distributed on March 20, 2020 to community organizations in Naujaat, Chesterfield Inlet, and Baker Lake, 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 April 6, 2020 regarding:

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

On or before April 6, 2020 the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

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

a. Summary of Public Comments and Concerns Received during the Public comment period of this file

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

CIRNAC

- Recommended standard mitigation measures for potential impacts, as recommended in the draft suggested Terms and Conditions provided by the Board.
- Recommended open communication and engagement with surrounding communities (Naujaat, Coral Harbour, Rankin Inlet, Chesterfield Inlet, and Baker Lake), and Hunters and Trappers Organizations to ensure local awareness and protection of wildlife resources.

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

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

5. Time of Report Extension

As a result of the time required to allow for affected communities and interested parties to address potential operational challenges associated with the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the NIRB was not able to provide its screening decision report to the responsible Minister within 45 days as required by Article 12, Section 12.4.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(3) of the *NuPPAA*. Therefore, on April 14, 2020 the NIRB wrote to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Government of Canada, seeking an extension to the 45-day timeline for the provision of the Board's Report.

ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF *NuPPAA*

In determining whether a review of the project is required, the Board considered whether the project proposal had potential to result in significant ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts.

Accordingly, the assessment of impact significance was based on the analysis of those factors that are set out under s. 90 of the *NuPPAA*. The Board took particular care to take into account Inuit Qaujimaningit, traditional and community knowledge in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

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

Factor	Comment
The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The physical footprint of the proposed project components is approximately 2 square kilometres (km²) with a transportation route that would extend approximately 250 km from the Hamlet of Naujaat to the temporary camp site, along Roes Welcome Sound.▪ The proposed activities would take place within habitats of far-ranging wildlife species such as caribou (Wager Bay and Lorillard herds), muskox, wolves, arctic fox, arctic hare, migratory and non-migratory birds, and Species at Risk such as Polar Bears.
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of

Factor	Comment
	the proposed project; however this area has been identified as having value and priority to the local community for terrestrial wildlife such as caribou, fish and fish habitat, and Polar Bears.
The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project. ▪ Known archaeological and cultural sites are present within the Ukkusiksalik National Park.
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed project may take place within the habitat of a number of species identified above and as such, may potentially affect wildlife, their habitat and their migratory patterns. ▪ Human population and/or traditional land-use activities are likely to be affected by components of the proposed project occurring within the community of Nauyasat, and within the vicinity of traditional harvesting areas.
The nature, magnitude and complexity of the impacts; the probability of the impacts occurring; the frequency and duration of the impacts; and the reversibility or irreversibility of the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A zone of influence of up to 10 km from the most potentially-disruptive project activities was selected for the NIRB's assessment. ▪ With adherence to the relevant regulatory requirements and application of the mitigation measures recommended by the NIRB, no significant residual effects are expected to occur.
The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The NIRB has not identified any past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects at this time; however, the mitigation measures recommended by the NIRB have been designed to reduce cumulative effects should projects occur in the area in the future.
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The clean-up and removal of GN cabin materials will improve the local ecosystemic environment with the removal of hazardous material.

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.

The NIRB has listed specific Acts and Regulations below that may be applicable to the project proposal but this list should not be considered as a complete list and the Proponent is responsible to ensure that it follows all Acts and Regulations that may be applicable to the project proposal.

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:

Valued Component	Terrestrial wildlife including caribou, muskox, wolves, arctic fox, arctic hare, migratory and non-migratory birds, and Species at Risk such as Polar Bears.
Potential effects:	Potential adverse effects resulting from noise and visual disturbance generated from the transportation of personnel and equipment via snowmobile to and from the proposed site, establishment of temporary camp, associated camp activities, and construction of the new shelter. Potential attraction of wildlife to the site due to establishment of temporary camp.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is applicable to a small geographic area within Ukkusiksalik National Park, and is limited due to the temporary and low-impact nature of the activities.
Mitigating Factors:	Proponent proposes to ensure the camp is established with minimal impact to wildlife. Waste would be stored in animal proof containers until it can be transported to Nauyasat for proper disposal. The Proponent also intends to erect an electric bear fence around the temporary camp as a deterrence to wildlife.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	4, 5, and 10 through 17
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act</i> and <i>Migratory Birds Regulations</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/). 2. The <i>Species at Risk Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/S-15.3/index.html). Attached in Appendix A is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut. 3. The <i>Canada National Parks Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-14.01/).

Valued Component	Surface water quality, fish and fish habitat, and the aquatic environment.
-------------------------	--

Potential effects:	Potential adverse effects resulting from establishment of the temporary camp, fuel transport, storage and re-fuelling activities, water use for domestic purposes, and waste disposal. Potential positive benefit to the local ecosystem resulting from removal of hazardous GN cabin materials.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is applicable to a small geographic area within Ukkusiksalik National Park, and is limited due to the temporary and low-impact nature of the activities.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has committed to make spill kits available during all transport and storage of fuel. In addition, the Proponent has provided a comprehensive Fuel Cache Protocol and Spill Response Plan, which includes storage measures, spill response measures, equipment requirements and handling procedures for the management of fuel and chemicals within National Parks. The Proponent intends to use biodegradable soaps, and screen and remove food particles from greywater, prior to disposing at least 50 metres from watercourses. Proposed project activities would include the containment of hazardous materials prior to transporting to Naujaat and eventually south for disposal at an appropriate waste facility.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	6 through 9, and 21
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The <i>Fisheries Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/F-14/index.html). 2. The <i>Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations</i> (http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/clear-tofc-211.htm), <i>Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/t-19.01/), and the <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/).

Valued Component	Vegetation, land, soils, and terrain stability.
Potential effects:	Potential adverse effects resulting from the compaction of soil and/or terrain around the new shelter location and temporary camp. Disturbance of terrain and vegetation resulting from establishment of temporary camp, construction of the footings for the new shelter and overland transport of equipment and personnel to and from the site.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be minimal due to the temporary and low-impact nature of the activities and any resulting impacts would be expected to be reversible.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has provided a comprehensive Fuel Cache Protocol and Spill Response Plan, which includes storage measures, spill response measures, equipment requirements and handling procedures for the management of fuel and chemicals within National Parks.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	8, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23

Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations</i> (http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/clear-tofc-211.htm), <i>Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/t-19.01/), and the <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/).
---	--

Valued Component	Inuit harvesting and traditional land use activities.
Potential effects:	Potential adverse impacts to the public and traditional land-use activities resulting from transportation of personnel and equipment, and construction activities. Proposed project activities would be located in close proximity to seasonal ranges and migration routes of caribou, with the potential to cause wildlife avoidance and change distribution. As a result, harvesting activities and personal enjoyment of the land could be negatively affected.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is applicable to a small geographic area within Ukkusiksalik National Park, and is limited due to the low-impact nature of the activities.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has consulted with the Ukkusiksalik Park Management Committee on the proposed location of the new shelter, which includes Inuit members from each adjacent community. Recommended terms and conditions should mitigate the potential adverse impacts.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	24, 25
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Canada National Parks Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-14.01/).

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Valued Component	Archaeological and Historical Sites.
Potential effects:	No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project, however there are known archaeological sites present in the area near the proposed project activities.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be minimal due to the nature of the activities and due care of the Proponent to avoid disturbance of sites.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has indicated that all visitors to the site will receive mandatory orientation which includes information on archaeological sites and avoiding disturbance. Recommended terms and conditions.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	24
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	1. The <i>Canada National Parks Act</i> (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-14.01/).

Valued Component	Local hiring, contracting and economic impacts.
Potential effects:	The proposed project will be based out of Naujaat and may provide economic benefits through local hiring and purchasing. Establishment of the permanent shelter could encourage increased visitor access to the Ukkusiksalik National Park and local community, which could have economic benefits.
Nature of Impacts:	Positive potential impacts to the community of Naujaat.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent intends to contract approximately six (6) Inuit from Naujaat with snowmobiles and qamutiiks, and approximately three (3) local bear guards for the duration of the project. The Board is also recommending terms and conditions to ensure that the Proponent to the extent possible hire local people and access local services where possible, and to ensure planned activities in the area utilize available Inuit Qaujimaningit.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	26
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	n/a

Significant public concern:

Valued Component	Public concern.
Potential effects:	No significant public concern was expressed during the public commenting period for this file.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be minimal as long as the Proponent follows the recommended terms and conditions.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has consulted with the Ukkusiksalik Park Management Committee on the proposed location of the new shelter, which includes Inuit members from each adjacent community. In addition, the Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities, to the extent possible hire local people and access local services where possible, and to ensure planned activities in the area utilize available Inuit Qaujimaningit.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	24, 25, 26
Related Acts and/or Regulations:	n/a

Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:

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

Administrative Conditions:

To encourage compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and assist the Board and responsible authorities with compliance and effects monitoring for project activities, the following project-specific terms and conditions have been recommended: 1-3.

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. 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 operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the NIRB (Online Application Form, March 5, 2020; Supporting Documents, March 5, 2020).
3. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.

Waste Disposal

4. 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

5. The Proponent shall store all fuel and chemicals in such a manner that they are inaccessible to wildlife.
6. The Proponent shall locate all fuel and other hazardous materials a minimum of thirty-one (31) metres away from the high water mark of any water body and in such a manner as to prevent their release into the environment unless otherwise authorized by the Nunavut Water Board.
7. The Proponent shall ensure that re-fueling of all equipment occurs a minimum of thirty-one (31) metres away from the high water mark of any water body, unless otherwise authorized by the Nunavut Water Board.
8. The Proponent shall ensure that appropriate spill response equipment and clean-up materials (e.g., shovels, pumps, barrels, drip pans, and absorbents) are readily available during any

transfer of fuel or hazardous substances, at all fuel storage sites and when refuelling equipment.

9. 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

10. The Proponent shall ensure that there is no damage to wildlife habitat in conducting this operation.
11. 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.
12. 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.

Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance

15. The Proponent shall avoid interfering with any paths or crossings known to be frequented by caribou during periods of migration.
16. The Proponent shall cease activities that may interfere with the migration or calving of caribou or muskox, until the caribou or muskox have passed or left the area.
17. The Proponent shall not block or cause any diversion to caribou migration, and shall cease activities likely to interfere with migration such as movement of equipment or personnel until such time as the caribou have passed.

Ground Disturbance and Land Use

18. 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.
19. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.

Temporary Camps

20. The Proponent shall ensure that all camps are located on gravel, sand or other durable land.
21. The Proponent shall not erect camps or store material on the surface ice of lakes or streams.

Restoration of Disturbed Areas

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

Other

24. The Proponent should consult with local residents regarding their activities in the area and solicit available Inuit Qaujimaningit and information that can inform project activities.
25. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
26. 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/or Parks Canada as appropriate, and the NIRB of any changes in operating plans or conditions, including phase advancement, associated with this project prior to any such change.

Bear and Carnivore Safety

2. 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.
3. 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.

Species at Risk

4. 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%20200

[4.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 and Climate Change Canada’s Incidental Take web page and the fact sheet “Planning Ahead to Reduce the Risk of Detrimental Effects to Migratory Birds, and their Nests and Eggs” available at: http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/ec/CW66-324-2013-eng.pdf.

Heritage Resources

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

Transport of Dangerous Goods and Waste Management

8. Environment and Climate Change Canada recommends that all hazardous wastes, including waste oil, receive proper treatment and disposal at an approved facility.
9. The Proponent shall ensure that proper shipping documents (waste manifests, transportation of dangerous goods, etc.) accompany all movements of dangerous goods. Further, the Proponent shall ensure that the shipment of all dangerous goods is registered with the Government of Nunavut Department of Environment, Department of Environment Manager. Contact the Manager (867) 975-7748 to obtain a manifest if dangerous goods including hazardous wastes will be transported.
10. The Proponent shall provide an authorization or letter of conformation of disposal be obtained from the owner/operator of the landfill to be used for disposal of project-related wastes.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board’s screening decision with respect to Parks Canada’s “Douglas Harbour Shelter”. The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated May 4, 2020 at Baker Lake, NU.

M. Kaviq Kaluraq

Kaviq Kaluraq, Chairperson

Attachments: Appendix A: Species at Risk in Nunavut

APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Updated: September 2019

Terrestrial Species at Risk²	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility³
Migratory Birds			
Buff-breasted Sandpiper	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)
Common Nighthawk	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Eskimo Curlew	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harlequin Duck	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harris's Sparrow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Horned Grebe	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ivory Gull	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Olive-sided Flycatcher	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peregrine Falcon	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red Knot Islandica Subspecies	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red-necked Phalarope	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ross's Gull	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Rusty Blackbird	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Vegetation			
Porsild's Bryum	Threatened	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut (GN)
Arthropods			
Transverse Lady Beetle	Special Concern	No Schedule	GN
Terrestrial Wildlife			
Caribou (Dolphin and Union Population)	Endangered	Schedule 1	GN
Caribou (Barren-ground Population)	Threatened	No Schedule	GN
Caribou (Torngat Mountains Population)	Endangered	No Schedule	GN
Grizzly Bear (Western Population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peary Caribou	Endangered	Schedule 1	GN
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Wolverine	Special Concern	Schedule 1	GN
Marine Wildlife			
Atlantic Walrus (High Arctic Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)
Atlantic Walrus (Central/Low Arctic Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound Population)	Threatened	Schedule 1	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern Hudson Bay Population)	Endangered	No Schedule	DFO

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

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

Terrestrial Species at Risk²	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility³
Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic-Baffin Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Fish			
Atlantic Cod (Arctic Lakes Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Fourhorn Sculpin (Freshwater Form)	Data Deficient	Schedule 3	DFO
Lumpfish	Threatened	No Schedule	DFO
Thorny Skate	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO