



**SCREENING DECISION REPORT**  
**NIRB FILE No.: 26YN007**

NPC File No.: 151002

June 24, 2026

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board’s (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Canadian Museum of Nature’s “Arctic Kelp Forests and Seaweed Biodiversity in Cambridge Bay” 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, issued in accordance with s. 92(2)(a) of *NuPPAA*, 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 accepts this Screening Decision Report.

**OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT**

<b>REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROJECT OVERVIEW &amp; THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF NUPPAA.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VIEWS OF THE BOARD .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b><u>TABLES</u></b>	
<b>TABLE 1: NIRB’S ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TABLE 2: COMMENTS RECEIVED .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS s. 90 NUPPAA .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>TABLE 4: PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS CONSIDERED.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b><u>APPENDICES</u></b>	
<b>APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS .....</b>	<b>18</b>

## REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

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*. The purpose of screening is provided for under Article 12, Section 12.4.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 88 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 indicating one of three options:

- (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.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS.

On January 21, 2026, the NIRB received a referral to screen Canadian Museum of Nature’s “Arctic Kelp Forests and Seaweed Biodiversity in Cambridge Bay” project proposal (NIRB File No: 26YN007) from the Nunavut Planning Commission (Commission), which noted that the project proposal is outside the area of an applicable land use plan. All documents received and pertaining to this project proposal can be accessed from the NIRB’s Public Registry by using any of the following search criteria or [www.nirb.ca/project/126433](http://www.nirb.ca/project/126433).

- Project Name: Arctic Kelp Forests and Seaweed Biodiversity in Cambridge Bay
- NIRB File No.: 26YN007
- NIRB Application No.: 126433

**Table 1: NIRB’s Assessment Process**

Date	Stage
January 21, 2026	Receipt of project proposal and referral from the Commission
January 21, 2026	Pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> the NIRB requested the Proponent complete an online application to address information required for Screening
May 7, 2026	Receipt of online application from Proponent
May 7, 2026	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
May 12, 2026	Translated Public engagement and comment request (which included terms and conditions) was issued to the following communities
June 3, 2026	Receipt of public comments
June 4, 2026	Proponent provided with an opportunity to address comments/concerns raised by public
June 16, 2026	Proponent responded to comments/concerns raised by public
June 17, 2026	Pursuant to Article 12 s 12.4.5 of the <i>Nunavut Agreement</i> and s. 92(3) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> , an extension to the 45-day timeline for the provision of the Board’s Report was requested from the Minister of Fisheries.
June 24, 2026	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

## 1. Project Scope

<b>Location</b>	Kitikmeot region, marine waters surrounding Cambridge Bay, Dease Strait and Queen Maud Gulf.
<b>Objective</b>	The Proponent intends to conduct marine-based scientific research to map and monitor seaweed and kelp forests within the marine areas of Cambridge Bay and assess associated invertebrate and fish communities.
<b>Timeline</b>	July 2026 to September 2030 (Seasonal each year within this period)

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

- **Transportation:** Hiring of a local boat operator to guide personnel to research sites, and the Arctic Research Foundation vessel to help with sampling and SCUBA diving.
- **Activities:**
  - Collecting small amounts of seaweed and benthic invertebrate with SCUBA diving.
  - Conducting underwater video transects to map the location, size, and extent of kelp.
  - Fish monitoring by using baited cameras to compare the types of fish living inside kelp forests vs bare seafloor areas.
  - Installing small monitoring sensors to record salinity, temperature, light, nutrients, pH, and dissolved oxygen.
  - Monitoring the potential impacts of increased ship traffic on the coastal ecosystem.
- **Fuel:** Use and transport of approximately 1,100 L of gasoline for fueling boating activities.

## 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 will proceed with screening the project based on the scope as described above.

## 3. Public Comments and Concerns

As outlined in Table 1 above, notices regarding the NIRB's screening of this project proposal were distributed to community organizations as well as to relevant federal and territorial government agencies, Inuit organizations and other parties with a request for interested parties to provide the Board with any comments or concerns 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 June 3, 2026, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

**Table 2: Comments Received**

<b>Commenting Party</b>	<b>NIRB Doc ID No.</b>
Government of Nunavut (GN)	361677
Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)	361644
Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)	361607
Transport Canada (TC)	361503

***a. Summary of Comments and Concerns Received***

The following provides a summary of the comments and concerns received by the NIRB in relation to the Arctic Kelp Forests and Seaweed Biodiversity in Cambridge Bay project proposal:

**Government of Nunavut**

- Noted that they have reviewed the proposed project and related documents and had no comments or concerns at this time.

**Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada**

- Recommended that the Proponent submits a site-specific spill contingency plan outlining fuel transfer protocols, identify the staging and storage locations for fuel containers, and maintaining spill response kits and using drip trays or secondary containment during fuel storage and transfers.
- Recommends that the Proponent clarify whether any such substances would be used, provide quantities/container types if applicable, maintaining Safety Data Sheets on site, and describe containment, storage, and backhaul/disposal procedures for any chemical products and waste.
- Recommends that the Proponent identify anticipated domestic and project-related waste streams, including packaging and scientific consumables, and confirm how all wastes will be handled, stored and disposed of through CHARS and /or municipal waste management systems.
- Recommended that the Proponent to continue engagement with the Hamlet of Cambridge Bay, the Ekaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization, and any other relevant organizations and individuals regarding its project proposal. As part of these consultation activities, several issues should be considered, including but not limited to:
  - Incorporation of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and community knowledge in project activities;
  - Mitigation measures to prevent any disturbance to wildlife and the environment;
  - Mitigation measures to prevent disturbance to sites of cultural, archaeological, and/or environmental significance;
  - The experience of community members who may participate in traditional harvesting activities within or in close proximity to the project area;
  - Training and employment opportunities for Inuit and community members;
  - Procurement opportunities for local and Inuit-owned businesses; and
  - Regular updates on the status of project activities.

## **Fisheries and Oceans Canada**

- Recommends that the Proponent review the Guidelines for a Licence to Fish for Scientific Purposes and, if required, send the application to the Arctic Region Permitting at [DFO.ArcticLicensing-PermisArctique.MPO@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:DFO.ArcticLicensing-PermisArctique.MPO@dfo-mpo.gc.ca).

## **Transport Canada**

- Noted that the Proponent was advised to self-assess using the Navigation Protection Program (NPP) Project Review Tool and the Canadian Navigable Waters Act Minor Works Order and determine that the Section 39 of the CNWA Minor Works Order applies. Therefore, no approval from TC is required for the project to take place.

## **4. b. Comments and Concerns with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge**

No concerns or comments were received with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit or Indigenous and Community knowledge in relation to the proposed project. However, Inuit Qaujimaningit and Indigenous and community knowledge is incorporated into the terms and conditions recommended below based on information collected from prior and similar projects, data collected and mapped by the Commission, and other available sources.

## **5. Proponent's Response to Public Comments and Concerns**

Due to the comments, and questions received from parties, the NIRB provided an opportunity for the Proponent to respond. The following is a summary of the Proponent's response to concerns:

- The Proponent clarified that the requested 1,100 L of gasoline is the estimated maximum total consumption for the entire season, not an amount stored on-site. To minimize environmental risks, fuel will be obtained daily from the Qillaq Gas Station in Cambridge Bay, eliminating the need for shoreline storage or a site-specific bulk fuel spill plan.
- The Proponent clarified that seaweed specimens will be pressed, dried, or preserved in silica gel without any chemical reagents. However, they acknowledged the omitted use of up to 2 L of 85% ethanol by a collaborator for benthic invertebrate preservation inside the Canadian High Arctic Research Station (CHARS) teaching laboratory.
- The project will involve four personnel conducting daily marine operations for approximately 21 days, generating only non-hazardous domestic waste and project consumables. No hazardous waste will be generated during this field campaign. To manage these waste streams, the Proponent committed to the following procedures:
  - Disposing of domestic and project-related waste through the Canadian High Arctic Research Station (CHARS) via the Cambridge Bay municipal system.
  - Storing used scientific supplies at CHARS or returning them to the Canadian Museum of Nature for proper disposal.
  - Donating unused seaweed collections to the CHARS greenhouses to be used as compost.
  - Retaining all field and boat waste on board to be brought back to CHARS daily, ensuring no waste is left at sea or on land.
- The Proponent noted that it has maintained an ongoing relationship with the Ekaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization and has incorporated local knowledge into project planning and site selection. The Proponent also committed to minimizing disturbance to

wildlife and the environment, respecting traditional harvesting activities, prioritizing local employment and procurement opportunities where feasible, and sharing project results with the community through presentations in Cambridge Bay.

**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. Table 3. The Board took particular care to consider Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

**Table 3: Summary of the Board’s Assessment of Factors s. 90 *NuPPAA***

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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"> <li>▪ The physical footprint of the proposed project is located in the marine waters surrounding Cambridge Bay, on the nearshore coastal waters of Dease Strait and Queen Maud Gulf.</li> <li>▪ The proposed project would occur within marine habitats used by migratory and non-migratory birds, marine mammals such as seals, and fish species including Arctic char, Arctic cod, and sculpins. Potential interactions are expected to be localized, temporary, and limited in duration.</li> </ul>
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project. However, the broader Cambridge Bay, Queen Maud Gulf and Dease Strait environment is inherently ecologically sensitive, and that potential interactions are minimal due to the small, temporary, and non-invasive nature of the project activities.</li> </ul>
The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project. However, the broader Cambridge Bay and Dease Strait area has high cultural and historical significance and archaeological potential due to long-standing Inuit land use, and that activities should be undertaken with appropriate community coordination to avoid disturbance to known or previously unrecorded cultural resources.</li> </ul>
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed project is unlikely to result in impacts to local human and animal populations. Any potential interactions with humans or animals would be limited to small numbers of individuals in the immediate vicinity of sampling sites, would be temporary,</li> </ul>

Factor	Comment
	localized, and not expected to result in population-level effects.
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"> <li>▪ The proposed project may result in localized, short-term disturbances to the marine areas of the project sites through boating activities and the collection of seaweeds and benthic invertebrates. These interactions are limited in scale, infrequent, and reversible, and occur only for the duration of the field campaign. Given the temporary and non-invasive nature of the project, the activities are not expected to cause lasting changes to the environment.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>▪ When considered alongside past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities in the region, including scientific research, infrastructure maintenance, and resource monitoring programs, the Arctic Kelp Forests and Seaweed Biodiversity in Cambridge Bay is unlikely to contribute meaningfully to cumulative effects. Its small physical footprint, short duration, and localized nature mean that interactions with other activities are minimal, and any combined effects with other regional projects are expected to be negligible.</li> <li>▪ Table 4 identifies the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects considered by the Board in its assessment of cumulative effects.</li> </ul>
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No other relevant factors were identified; however, see below for Regulatory Requirements mandating mitigation and/or reporting.</li> </ul>

## 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 *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>).
4. 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**.
5. The *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/t-19.01/>) and the *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations* (<http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/tdg/clear-tofc-211.htm>).

6. The Canadian Environmental Protection Act (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.31/>).

7. The *Canadian Navigable Waters Act* (<https://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-22/>).

**Table 4: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects Considered**

<b>NIRB Project Number</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Project Type</b>
<b><i>Proposed Developments – undergoing assessment</i></b>		
25XN022	Cambridge Bay Solar + Storage	Power Plant
25YN081	Copernicus Expansion Missions Sea Ice Experiment (CEMSIE)	Research
25TN031	Eagle Eye Tours Wildlife Tours	Tourism
<b><i>Present Projects – approved or in operation</i></b>		
25YN037	Assessment of population dynamics of waterfowl in the central Arctic	Research
24YN033	Cambridge Bay Air Quality	Research
25YN044	Characterization of Shoreline Litter in the Canadian Arctic	Research
25YN003	Ice Bird Winter 2025	Research
24YN040	Inuit Qaujisarnirmut Pilirijjutit on Arctic Shipping Risks in Inuit Nunangat	Research
25YN043	Monitoring the movement, habitat use, and overall health and function of Arctic fishes across freshwater and marine ecosystems in the Cambridge Bay area	Research
<b><i>Past Projects</i></b>		
23YN029	Arctic Expedition – Sailing the Northwest Passage	Research
25YN039	Assessing the ecological risk associated with critical mineral extraction and low-sulfur fuels in Northern ecosystems	Research

#### VIEWS OF THE BOARD

In considering the above factors, the Board has identified the following and respectfully provides its views regarding whether or not the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts. The NIRB has also proposed terms and conditions that would mitigate the potential adverse impacts identified.

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

<b>Valued Component</b>	Migratory and non-migratory birds, wildlife and Species at Risk
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential adverse effects to migratory and non-migratory birds, Species at Risk wildlife, and their migratory routes from noise and visual disturbance associated with daily transportation of personnel and equipment via all-terrain vehicles, SCUBA diving activities, boats and snowmobiles to the proposed research sites to conduct research activities.

<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for impact(s) is considered to be limited due to the temporary, seasonal, and small-scale nature of the proposed research activities. Vessel operations, SCUBA diving, and research activities may temporarily disturb wildlife and migratory birds in the vicinity of project activities; however, any resulting effects are expected to be localized, temporary, and reversible. The project is not expected to result in habitat alteration or population-level effects.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Board is recommending terms and conditions to minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts to wildlife and migratory birds, and Species at Risk.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Waste Management – 7 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 8, 9, 10 Wildlife – General – 12, 13, 14 Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance – 15, 16, 17

<b>Valued Component</b>	Marine mammals and marine habitat
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential adverse impacts to marine mammals and marine habitat, including fish and benthic populations, resulting from noise and/or physical disturbance associated with the boat operations and research activities conducted within the marine environment.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for impacts is applicable to small areas within and around Cambridge Bay, Queen Maud Gulf and Dease Strait, 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. Given the small scale and seasonal nature of the project, significant impacts to marine mammals or marine habitat are not expected.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	Measures should be taken to be aware of vessel operations including speed, awareness, and to avoid unnecessary disturbance to marine wildlife, particularly in critical habitat, calving areas, and narrow migration corridors. The Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure the project activities do not negatively affect marine wildlife and habitat.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Water Courses/Water bodies (including fresh and marine waters) – 6 Air Quality – 11 Marine-Based Activities – 18, 19, 20

<b>Valued Component</b>	Surface water quality, fish and fish habitat
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential adverse impacts to surface water quality, fish, and fish habitat resulting from vessel operations, fuel handling, installation of monitoring equipment, and research activities including the collection of small quantities of seaweed and benthic invertebrates.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential impacts are applicable to the areas being research 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.

<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Board is recommending terms and conditions to protect surface water quality, fish, fish habitat, benthic communities, and the broader aquatic environment. The sampling of seaweeds and benthic invertebrates is small in scale and is only taking samples when they are necessary for identification of the organisms.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Water Courses/Water bodies (including fresh and marine waters) – 6 Marine-Based Activities – 18, 19, 20

<b>Valued Component</b>	Public and Traditional Land Use Activities
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Project activities (boating to research sites, installation of data loggers, collection of seaweeds and invertebrates) may temporarily overlap with areas of Inuit travel and harvesting.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	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.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Board is recommending the Proponent engage with local residents and harvesters if possible and practical, regarding planned activities in the area to ensure project activities are informed by available Inuit Qaujimaningit and that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities, and to ensure safety to the public.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other – 24, 25, and 26

### **Socio-economic effects on northerners:**

<b>Valued Component</b>	Historical, Cultural and Archaeological Sites
<b>Potential effects:</b>	No historical sites were identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for impacts is considered minimal due to the nature of the activities.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Proponent is required to contact the Culture and Heritage Department when encountering any historical sites. The Board is also recommending terms and conditions to ensure that project activities do not negatively affect historical or heritage sites.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Heritage Sites – 21, 22, 23

<b>Valued Component</b>	Economic impact, local business, employment and hiring
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Potential positive impacts to the community of Cambridge Bay through local hiring, and use of community infrastructure. Transportation, accommodation, and logistical support will require local resources, potentially benefiting businesses and individuals in Cambridge Bay.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for economic benefits is expected to be moderate and seasonal, concentrated during field seasons. The project will generate

	short-term employment opportunities and service contracts, particularly through collaboration with the EHTO.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	Proponent proposes to prioritize local hiring and procurement, contract boats, guides, and logistical support. Community outreach and collaboration will ensure transparent communication about opportunities.  The Board is recommending the Proponent continues to inform the communities of the research activities and ensure potential local hiring opportunities.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other - 26

**Significant public concern:**

<b>Valued Component</b>	<b>Public Concerns</b>
<b>Potential effects:</b>	No significant public concern was expressed during the public commenting period for this file, however, the Board recommends 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 utilizes available Inuit Qaujimaningit.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	The potential for impacts is considered to be minimal if the Proponent follows the recommended terms and conditions.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Board is recommending terms and conditions to ensure that to the extent possible, the Proponent hire locally and access local services where possible, and to ensure planned activities in the area utilizes available Inuit Qaujimaningit.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other – 24 and 25

**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: 1-5.

In considering the above factors and subject to the Proponent’s compliance with regulatory requirements and 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. Canadian Museum of Nature (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times and make it accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
2. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC File No.: 151101), and the NIRB (Online Application Form, May 6, 2026). This information should be accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
3. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.
4. The Proponent shall ensure that it meets the standards and/or limits as set out in the authorizing agencies' permits or licences as required for this project.
5. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel, staff and contractors are adequately trained prior to commencement of all project activities, and shall be made aware of all operational plans, management plans, guidelines and Proponent commitments relating to the project.

### **Water courses/Water bodies (including fresh and marine waters)**

6. The Proponent shall not deposit, nor permit the deposit of any fuel, chemicals, wastes (including wastewater) or sediment into any water body. The Proponent should have in place an Emergency Spill Response Plan that is approved by the appropriate authorizing agency(ies).

### **Waste Management**

7. The Proponent shall manage all hazardous and non-hazardous waste including food, domestic wastes, debris and petroleum-based chemicals (e.g., greases, gasoline, glycol-based antifreeze) in such a manner to avoid release into the environment and access to wildlife at all times until disposed of appropriately or at an approved facility.

### **Fuel and Chemical Storage**

8. The Proponent shall ensure that re-fuelling of all equipment occurs a minimum distance away from the high-water mark of any water body as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies.
9. The Proponent shall have a Spill Contingency Plan in place at all fuel storage or transfer locations and shall ensure that appropriate spill response equipment and clean-up materials (e.g., shovels, pumps, barrels, drip pans, and absorbents) are readily available.
10. The Proponent shall ensure that all spills of fuel or other deleterious materials of 100 litres or more must be reported immediately to the 24-hour Spill Line at (867) 920-8130.

## **Air Quality**

11. The Proponent shall eliminate unnecessary idling to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as much as possible.

## **Wildlife – General**

12. The Proponent shall not substantially alter or damage or destroy any wildlife habitat in conducting this operation unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate authorizing agencies.
13. The Proponent shall not chase, weary, harass or molest wildlife. This includes persistently circling, chasing, hovering over, pursuing or in any other way harass wildlife, or disturbing large groups of animals.
14. The Proponent shall not hunt or fish, unless proper Nunavut authorizations have been acquired.

## **Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance**

15. The Proponent shall carry out all phases of the project in a manner that protects migratory birds and avoids harming, killing or disturbing migratory birds or destroying, disturbing or taking their nests or eggs. In this regard, the Proponent shall take into account Environment and Climate Change Canada's *Avoidance Guidelines*. The Proponent's actions in applying the *Avoidance Guidelines* shall be in compliance with the *Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994* and with the *Species at Risk Act*.
16. The Proponent shall avoid the seaward site of seabird colonies and areas used by flocks of migrating waterfowl, a minimum distance away on the recommendation of the appropriate authorizing agencies.
17. The Proponent shall not pursue seabirds or waterbirds swimming on the water surface and shall avoid concentrations of these birds if encountered on the water.

## **Marine-Based Activities**

18. The Proponent shall suspend all project activities should any dead fish or wildlife (both marine and terrestrial), or any injured wildlife be observed during any works or activities in and around the marine waters. Activities may only be resumed on the recommendation of the authorizing agencies.
19. The Proponent shall report all incidents, injuries or sightings of marine mammals to the appropriate authorizing agencies.
20. The Proponent shall implement measures designed to minimize disturbance to seabed sediments and benthic communities and marine wildlife when carrying out project activities within the marine environment.

## **Heritage Sites**

21. The Proponent shall ensure that archaeological and paleontological sites are not purposely or inadvertently disturbed by clients or staff as a result of project activities.
22. The Proponent shall ensure that all clients and staff are aware of the Proponent's responsibilities and requirements regarding archaeological or palaeontological sites that are encountered during land-based activities. This should include briefings explaining the

prohibitions regarding removal of artifacts, and defacing or writing on rocks and infrastructure.

23. No activities shall be conducted in the vicinity (50 metres buffer zone) of any archaeological/historical sites. If archaeological sites or features are encountered, activities shall immediately be interrupted and moved away from this location. Each site encountered needs to be recorded and reported to the Government of Nunavut-Department of Culture and Heritage.

### **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.

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

2. The NIRB respectfully requests that responsible authorities submit a copy of each licence, permit or other authorization issued for the Project to the NIRB to assist in enabling possible project monitoring that may be required. 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).

### **Use of Inuit Qaujimaningit**

3. The Proponent is encouraged to work with local communities and knowledge holders to inform project design, to carry out the project, and to confirm or validate the perspectives represented in publications and reports produced as part of the project. Care should be taken to ensure that Inuit Qaujimaningit and local knowledge collected for the project is used with permission and is accurately represented.

### **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](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](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/ec/CW66-324-2013-eng.pdf).

### CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board’s screening decision with respect to the Canadian Museum of Nature’s “Arctic Kelp Forests and Seaweed Biodiversity in Cambridge Bay”. The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated June 24, 2026 at Iqaluit, NU.



Albert Ehaloak, 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*, S.C. 2002, c. 29 (*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 2024

<b>Terrestrial Species at Risk<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>COSEWIC Designation</b>	<b>Schedule of SARA</b>	<b>Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility<sup>2</sup></b>
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
Porsild's Bryum	Threatened	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut (GN)
Transverse Lady Beetle	Special Concern	No Schedule	GN
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
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
Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic-Baffin Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
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

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

**APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOLOGICAL 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 Overview Assessment and/or Inventory and Documentation and/or Mitigation
c)	Construction of linear disturbances, Extractive disturbances, Impounding disturbances and other land disturbance activities	Archaeological/Palaeontological Overview Assessment and/or Inventory and Documentation and/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>3</sup> to issue such permits.

<sup>3</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>4</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>5</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.

---

<sup>4</sup> s. 51(1)

<sup>5</sup> P.C. 2001-1111 14 June, 2001

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

The primary regulatory agencies that CH provides information and assistance to are the Nunavut Impact Review Board, for development activities proposed for Inuit Owned Lands (as defined in Section 1.1.1 of the *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.