Appendix B

NPC and NIRB Records of Decision

June 3, 2026
NPC File No. 151218

Calvin Ehaloak
A/Manager, Public Registry
Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB)
Cambridge Bay, Nunavut
By email: cehaloak@nirb.ca; info@nirb.ca; kgillard@nirb.ca

Richard Dwyer
Manager, Licensing
Nunavut Water Board (NWB)
Gjoa Haven, Nunavut
By email: richard.dwyer@nwb-oen.ca; licensing@nwb-oen.ca

Tracey McCaie
Manager, Land Administration
Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)
Iqaluit, Nunavut
By email: tracey.mccaie@canada.ca; aadnc.landsmining.aandc@canada.ca; isa.qamaniq-mason@canada.ca; spencer.dewar@canada.ca; jeff.hart@canada.ca; richard.bingley2@rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca

Jared Ottenhof
Director, Qikiqtani Nunalirijikkut (Lands and Resource Management)
Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA)
Iqaluit, Nunavut
By email: jottenhof@qia.ca; jnakoolak@qia.ca; JSimic@qia.ca

Owen Wade
Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)
Gatineau, Quebec
By email: owen.wade@ec.gc.ca

Dear Calvin Ehaloak, Richard Dwyer, Tracey McCaie, Jared Ottenhof, and Owen Wade:

RE: **NPC File # 151218 [Remediation of the Former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS)]**

The following works and activities have been proposed in the above-noted project proposal:

1. **Primary Land Use:** Remediation
2. **Project summary description**: Contituation of the decommissioning and environmental remediation of the former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS), located on Ellef Ringnes Island, Nunavut. The site, which has been inactive since 1978, contains approximately 22 abandoned structures, fuel storage systems, waste disposal areas, and scattered debris across a 4.5 km². The purpose of the project is to address historical contamination and site hazards through the removal, treatment, and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous materials.
3. **Summary of modifications:** The proponent is planning a full-scale remediation of the site. The project also includes the development of supporting infrastructure, such as a borrow pit for aggregate production, temporary work camps, and transportation logistics. Existing waste disposal areas will be capped and stabilized to prevent environmental impacts.

4. **Associated NPC File Nos**.: 148587, 148718, 149785, 150017, and 150699; **Associated NIRB File No**.: 25UN029
5. **Location:** Qikiqtani Region; [Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station]

A complete description of the project proposal reviewed by the NPC can be accessed online using the link below.

The Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) has completed its review of the above noted project proposal. The NPC previously reviewed works and activities associated with the proposal, including fuel incineration (conformity determination issued April 11, 2025). This conformity determination still applies. In addition, associated activities were previously screened by the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB FILE NO.: 25UN029).

The NPC has determined that the above-noted project proposal is a significant modification to the project because of the inclusion full scale decommission and remediation activities as well as the addition of a quarry development component. It conforms to the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan (NBRLUP). The proponent has undertaken to comply with the applicable conformity requirements of Appendix C, H, and I of the NBRLUP.

The above-noted project proposal requires screening by the NIRB under section 12.4.3 of the *Nunavut Agreement* as amended because it is for a component or activity that was not part of the original or previously amended proposal, and its inclusion is a significant modification of the project.

By way of this letter, the NPC is forwarding the project proposal with this determination to the NIRB for screening. Project materials, including the applicable conformity requirements, are available at the following address: https://lupit.nunavut.ca/portal/registry/registry.aspx?appid=151218

The regulatory authorities to which this letter is addressed are responsible under the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* (*NuPPAA*) to implement any of the applicable requirements by incorporating the requirements directly, or otherwise ensuring that they must be met, in the terms and conditions of any authorizations issued.

This conformity determination applies only to the above noted project proposal as submitted. Proponents may not carry out projects and regulatory authorities may not issue licenses, permits and other authorizations in respect of projects if a review by the NPC is required. Regulatory authorities may consult with the NPC to obtain recommendations on their duties to implement the existing land use plans prior to issuing licenses, permits and other authorizations under subsection 69(6) of the *NuPPAA*.

My office would be pleased to discuss how best to implement the applicable requirements and to review any draft authorizations that regulatory authorities wish to provide for that purpose. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (867) 979-3444.

Sincerely,

Goump Djalogue, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning and Implementation,

Jurisdictional Note:

This conformity determination applies only to the components of the proposed project located within the Nunavut Settlement Area and under the Nunavut Planning Commission's statutory jurisdiction as defined in the Nunavut Agreement and the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act (NuPPAA). Activities outside the NPC's jurisdiction remain subject to the review and regulatory processes of the relevant authorities. Proponents are responsible for identifying, contacting, and obtaining all required approvals from the appropriate regulators in every applicable jurisdiction to ensure compliance with all legislation, policies, and licensing requirements.

NIRB File No.: 25UN029
NIRB Public Registry link: www.nirb/ca/project/126476
NPC File No.: 151218
Related to NPC File No.: 150699

August 28, 2026

To: The Honourable Rebecca Chartrand
Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Sent via email: Rebecca.chartrand@parl.gc.ca

Re: Screening Decision for Environment and Climate Change Canada's "Remediation of the Former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS)" Project Proposal, Qikiqtani (North Baffin) Region

---

Dear Honourable Minister:


On June 3, 2026, the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board) received a referral pursuant to the Nunavut Agreement and *NuPPAA* to conduct a screening[1] of Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) "Remediation of the Former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS)" project proposal and after completing the required process, the NIRB determined[2] that **a review of the project is not required** and recommended specific terms and conditions[3].

The attached Screening Decision Report provides the regulatory framework, scope of proposal and Board's assessment process, public engagement, factors relevant for the determining significance of impacts, and recommended project-specific terms and conditions. Additional information on the project can be viewed on the NIRB's public registry at the link at the top of this letter.

The NIRB look forward to receiving a response from the Minister, and any questions on the Board's assessment process or the Screening Decision Report can be directed to the NIRB's Director, Operations, Tara Arko at 1-866-233-3033 EXT. 500 or tarko@nirb.ca.

1 Pursuant to Article 12, Sections 12.4.1 and 12.4.4 of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada* (*Nunavut Agreement*) and section 87 of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* (*NuPPAA*)
2 Pursuant to s. 92(1)(a) of the *NuPPAA*
3 Pursuant to s. 92(2)(a) of the *NuPPAA*

Sincerely,



Albert Ehaloak
Chairperson
Nunavut Impact Review Board

Enclosure (1): Screening Decision Report, NIRB File No.: 25UN029 (August 28, 2026)

cc: Regulators
Lootie Toomasie, Chairperson of Nunavut Water Board
Olayuk Akeesuk, President of Qikiqtani Inuit Association
Richard Dwyer, Nunavut Water Board
Jared Ottenhof, Qikiqtani Inuit Association
Chris Spencer, Qikiqtani Inuit Association
Conor Goddard, Qikiqtani Inuit Association
Assol Kubesinova, Qikiqtani Inuit Association
Tracey McCaie, Crown – Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada
Marcus Bermann, Crown – Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada
Owen Wade, Proponent
Distribution List

SCREENING DECISION REPORT
NIRB FILE No.: 25UN029

NPC File No.: 151218
Related to NPC File No.: 150699

August 28, 2026

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board's (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) "Remediation of the Former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS)" 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

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK 2

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS 2

ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF *NUPPAA* 6

VIEWS OF THE BOARD 8

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS 11

MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS 15

OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 16

CONCLUSION 18

TABLES

TABLE 1: NIRB'S ASSESSMENT PROCESS 2
TABLE 2: COMMENTS RECEIVED 4
TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF THE BOARD'S ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS S. 90 *NUPPAA* 6

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT 19
APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS 21

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 June 3, 2026, the NIRB received a referral to screen Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) "Remediation of the Former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS)" project proposal from the Nunavut Planning Commission (Commission), with an accompanying positive conformity determination with the North Baffin Regional 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/126476.

- Project Name: Remediation of the Former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS)
- NIRB File No.: 25UN029
- NIRB Application No.: 126476

Table 1: NIRB's Assessment Process

Date	Stage
June 3, 2026	Receipt of project proposal and positive conformity determination (North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan) from the Commission
Jue 8, 2026	Pursuant to s. 144(1) of the *NuPPAA* the NIRB requested the Proponent complete an online application to address information required for Screening
July 8, 2026	Receipt of online application from Proponent
July 14 & 15, 2026	Request(s) to Proponent for additional information in order to carry out screening pursuant to s. s. 144(1) of the *NuPPAA*
July 16, 2026	Proponent responded to information request(s) and provided additional information
July 16, 2026	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the *NuPPAA*
July 20, 2026	Public engagement and comment request (which included draft terms and conditions) was issued in English with translations provided once available
August 10, 2026	Receipt of public comments
August 11, 2026	Proponent provided with an opportunity to address comments/concerns raised by public

Date	Stage
August 24, 2026	Proponent responded to comments/concerns raised by public
August 28, 2026	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

1. Project Scope

Location	Qikiqtani (North Baffin) Region, approximately 500 kilometres northwest of the communities of Resolute Bay and Grise Fiord
Objective	The Proponent intends to conduct a full-scale remediation of the former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station (HAWS).
Timeline	November 2026 to October 2031

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

- Mobilization of heavy equipment, camp, and supplies to site by sealift to Resolute Bay, followed by aircraft mobilization from Resolute Bay to Isachsen HAWS.
- Use of heavy equipment for remediation, demolition activities, aggregate production, waste handling, hauling, grading, and site-restoration activities;
- Abatement and demolition of twenty-two (22) buildings and structures containing Asbestos, Mercury and Ozone-Depleting Substances. Non-hazardous waste would be disposed of in the new on-site landfill; hazardous waste would be transported to an approved off-site licensed facility.
- Decommissioning of fifty (50) Above-Ground Storage Tanks by a qualified petroleum technician, followed by processing and disposal in the new on-site landfill.
- Decommissioning of fourteen (14) pieces of non-operational heavy equipment and six (6) pieces of operational equipment prior to disposal. Approximately 760m^3 of non-hazardous waste associated with the heavy equipment would be disposed of in new on-site landfill.
- Cleaning, crushing, and consolidation of approximately 3,800 waste-fuel drums, generating approximately 950 m^3 of crushed material for disposal in the new on-site landfill; Collection and consolidation of approximately 100m^3 of miscellaneous non-hazardous waste debris, including metal and wood, for disposal in the new on-site landfill.
- Removal of approximately 13,000 L of remaining waste fuel and oily-water mixture for transportation to an approved off-site disposal facility;
- Construction and operation of a borrow pit to produce up to an estimated 100,000m^3 of aggregate for airstrip upgrades and road upgrades, construction of a new engineered on-site landfill, capping of the existing Waste Disposal Areas (WDAs), construction of a camp pad and temporary waste storage area and general site grading.
- Placement of approximately 36,000 m^2 of coarse aggregate cover over the existing Waste Disposal Areas, including contouring to promote drainage and reduce erosion and installation of natural or geosynthetic liner material where required; Construction and use of a new engineered landfill consisting of an approximately 50 m x 50 m lined cell with an aggregate cover, designed to accommodate approximately 4,500 m^3 to 6,200 m^3 of consolidated non-hazardous inert waste; Establishment and operation of temporary camp

facilities and associated water, sewage, greywater, power-generation, and waste-management activities;
- Use and storage of up to 10,000L of aviation fuel, 12,000L of gasoline fuel, 5,000L of propane and 630,000L of diesel to support aircraft, camp and equipment operations;
- Demobilization of temporary equipment and infrastructure, final grading and stabilization of disturbed areas, and post-remediation monitoring;
- The camp pad will be decommissioned and removed, the roads decommissioned by grading to match the adjacent ground surface, and the airstrip will be left in place; and
- The new on-site landfill will be capped, and it will be subject to a long-term monitoring program.

2. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

The NIRB has identified that waste-fuel incineration activities associated with the previously screened "Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station Waste Fuel Reduction Program" project proposal (25UN029), for which a Screening Decision Report was issued on June 19, 2025, were previously assessed. These incineration activities will not be reconsidered in detail as part of the current assessment, except where relevant to cumulative effects, changed circumstances, or ongoing project activities. The current screening will otherwise proceed based on the amended project scope identified 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 August 10, 2026, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

Table 2: Comments Received

Commenting Party	NIRB Doc ID No.
Government of Nunavut (GN)	362696
Crown – Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)	362577
Transport Canada	362426

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 "Remediation of the Former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station" project proposal:

Government of Nunavut (GN)

- Requests that the Proponent:
  - Clarify how contaminations listed on the Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory are going to be managed.
  - Clarify if the soil will be removed during this phase or another phase in the future.
  - State the methods of disposal and containment that will be employed by ECCC regarding contaminated soils.

Crown – Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)

- Has no comments at this time.

Transport Canada (TC)

- As the Proponent has identified in their application, the transport of hazardous wastes from the site for off-site disposal must be done in accordance with the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations. This includes that the shipper preparing the dangerous goods shipment for air transportation must have International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) training for dangerous goods. The shipper must meet the requirements set out in Part 12 of the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations, which includes the ICAO training requirements.

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:

In response to the concerns raised by the Government of Nunavut, the Proponent provided information to clarify the use of the Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory (FCSI) database and the Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan (FCSAP) which guides all work to address contamination on Federal Sites.

The Decision-Making Framework is based on A Federal Approach to Contaminated Sites which describes a 10-step process used to characterize, classify and prioritize contaminated sites and to ensure remediation occurs in a cost-effective manner. Each step was designed to stand alone and to outline key components for investigating, managing and remediating contaminated sites.

The 10 steps are:

1. Identify Suspect Sites
2. Historical Review
3. Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment
4. Classify Contaminated Site Using the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) National Classification System for Contaminated Sites (NCSCS)
5. Phase 3 Environmental Site Assessment
6. Reclassify the Site Using the CCME NCSCS
7. Develop a Remediation/Risk Management Strategy - Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment (HHERA), and Develop Remedial Action Plan (RAP)
8. Implement Remediation/Risk Management (R/RM) Strategy
9. Confirmatory Sampling and Final Reporting (if required)
10. Long Term Monitoring (if required)

According to FCSI, the Isachsen HAWS site has completed step 7 and states that "a Remedial Action Plan was completed, and Remediation/Risk Management is underway". A risk assessment approach was adopted for the site. The findings of the HHERA indicated that there were no unacceptable risks to Human Health or Ecological receptors from the identified contamination and that soil remediation was not necessary. As such, no soil is planned for removal, and no disposal or containment of contaminated soil is required.

The Proponent is currently at Step 8 of the FCSAP DMF which involves implementation the R/RM strategy selected in Step 7, including completing the actions required to undertake the decommissioning activities described in the Remedial Action Plan.

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*

Factor	Comment
The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.	▪ The physical footprint of the proposed project is within the former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station on Ellef Ringnes Island. ▪ The proposed project would take place within habitats of far-ranging wildlife species such as migratory and non-migratory birds, Arctic fox, Arctic hare and Species at Risk such as Polar Bears.
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project.

Factor	Comment
The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.	▪ No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified by the Proponent within the physical footprint of the proposed project.
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	▪ The proposed project is unlikely to result in significant population-level effects on local human and animal populations.
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.	▪ A zone of influence of up to 20 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.	▪ The NIRB has not identified any past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects at this time; however, the Board has recommended terms and conditions along with mitigation measures designed with consideration for the potential for cumulative effects in the Board Views section.
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	▪ Notes that the clean-up activities would contribute to restoring the previously disturbed areas and remove sources of possible contamination.

Regulatory Requirements

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

Acts and Regulations

1. The *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act* (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/n-28.8/).
2. The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/), the *Migratory Birds Regulations* (https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,_c._1035/index.html) and the *Migratory Bird Sanctuary Regulations* (https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,_c._1036/index.html).
3. The *Species at Risk Act* (https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/s-15.3/.). Attached in **Appendix A** is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut.
4. 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).
5. 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**.

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

Other Applicable Guidelines

8. Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Contaminated Sites, Department of the Environment, Government of Nunavut, Revised December 2014 (https://www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/contaminated_sites_remediation_2014.pdf).
9. Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Hazardous Waste, Government of Nunavut, Revised October 2010 (https://www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/Guideline%20-%20General%20Management%20of%20Hazardous%20Waste%20%28revised%20Oct%202010%29_0.pdf).

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:

Valued Component	Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat (including migratory and non-migratory birds, Arctic fox, Arctic hare, and Species at Risk such as polar bears)
Potential effects:	Project activities including various aircraft use, truck and ATV travel, temporary camp operations, construction activities, and full-scale remediation and decommissioning activities may result in temporary noise and visual disturbance to terrestrial wildlife and wildlife habitat.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be limited due to remediation and stabilization of the disturbed areas activities.
Mitigating Factors:	Proponent proposes to ensure temporary camp is established with minimal impact to wildlife. The Board notes that the clean-up activities would contribute to restoring the previously disturbed areas to a natural state and remove sources of possible contamination.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Waste Management – 10 Wildlife General – 21 through 23 Migratory Birds and Raptor Disturbance – 24 and 25

Valued Component	Land, terrestrial vegetation, and ground stability

Potential effects:	Potential adverse impacts to the ground stability, vegetation quality, and terrain due to remediation operations, storage and use of fuel, moving of equipment and personnel and the construction and use of a temporary camp and associated facilities.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be limited if regulations and best practices for remediation operations are followed. The potential for disturbance due to other activities is considered to be minimal due to the localized and temporary nature of the activities.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent noted that waste generated by the project would be appropriately managed and disposed of. The Board notes that the clean-up activities would assist in restoring the previously disturbed areas as much as possible and remove sources of possible contamination, noting that these are major remediation activities and it is unlikely that the land will be fully restored.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Water courses/Water bodies (including fresh and marine waters) – 6 through 9 Waste Management – 10 Fuel and Chemical Storage – 11 through 19 Noise – 20 Aircraft Flight Restrictions – 26 through 30 Road and Ground Disturbance – 31 Aggregate Removal within Existing and New Quarries – 33 through 36 Drilling – General – 37 through 39 Drilling on Land – 40 through 44 Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas – 45 through 49 Camps – 50 and 51

Valued Component	Public and traditional land use activities
Potential effects:	No specific concerns or impacts to public and traditional land use activities in the area have been identified, however, the Board is recommending terms and conditions 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.
Nature of Impacts:	Potential for impacts is considered to be minimal due to the location of the project, and the limited spatial footprint.
Mitigating Factors:	The Proponent has committed to conducting project activities in a manner that minimizes disturbance to wildlife and the surrounding environment, which may help reduce potential effects on wildlife harvesting and traditional land use activities.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Other – 55 and 56

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Valued Component	Historical and archeological sites
Potential effects:	The Proponent conducted an archeological impact assessment and found no archeological sites within the project area. If any unknown historical or archeological sites are found, the Proponent should contact the Government of Nunavut – Department of Culture and Heritage to discuss next steps.
Nature of Impacts:	The potential for impacts is considered to be limited to remediation and restoration activities. The Board is also recommending terms and conditions that ensure that the potential adverse impacts to archaeological resources are avoided or appropriately mitigated.
Mitigating Factors:	Recommended Terms and Conditions
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Heritage Sites – 52 through 54

Significant public concern:

Valued Component	Public concern.
Potential effects:	The Project has the potential to raise public concern related to environmental disturbance and remediation activities in the region.
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 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:	Other – 55 through 57

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.

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

General

1. Environment and Climate Change Canada (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.: 151218) and the NIRB (Online Application Form, July 16, 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 extract water from any fish-bearing water body unless the water intake hose is equipped with a screen of appropriate mesh size to ensure that there is no entrapment of fish. Small lakes or streams should not be used for water withdrawal unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate authorizing agency.
7. The Proponent shall ensure that no disturbance of the stream bed, lakebed or the banks of any definable watercourse be permitted, except where deemed necessary for maintaining project-specific operational commitments or approved by a responsible authority in cases of spill management.
8. The Proponent shall implement erosion and sediment suppression measures on all areas during all project activities in order to prevent sediment or fugitive dust from entering any water body or surrounding environment. Erosion prevention measures may include berms or silt fences.
9. 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

10. 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

11. The Proponent shall locate all fuel and other hazardous materials a minimum distance away from the high-water mark of any water body and environmentally sensitive areas as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies. The materials shall be stored in such a manner as to prevent their release into the environment.
12. The Proponent shall use adequate secondary containment or a surface liner (e.g., self-supporting insta-berms and fold-a-tanks) when storing barreled fuel and chemicals at all locations.
13. 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.
14. Fuel and hazardous material storage areas and fuel lines should be clearly marked with signs or flagging to avoid accidental breaks and punctures, and to ensure areas remain visible during the winter months.
15. The Proponent shall routinely inspect and document the conditions of fuel and hazardous material storage containers and containment areas as required by the appropriate authorizing agencies. Fuel containment areas shall be kept clear of debris, water and snow to facilitate inspections for leaks.
16. 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.
17. The Proponent shall follow the authorizing agencies' direction for management and removal of hazardous materials and wastes (e.g., contaminated soils, sediment and waste oil).
18. The Proponent shall ensure that wildlife deterrent systems are utilized at the time of a spill incident in order to avoid wildlife (terrestrial or marine) and migratory birds from being contaminated.
19. 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.

Noise

20. All construction and road vehicles must be fitted with standard and well-maintained noise suppression devices.

Wildlife – General

21. 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.
22. 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.

23. The Proponent shall ensure that all wildlife have the right-of-way on any roads or trails. Vehicles are required to slow down or stop and wait to permit the free and unrestricted movement of wildlife across roads or trails at any location.

Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance

24. 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*.

25. The Proponent shall not disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of any birds. If active nests of any birds are discovered or located (i.e., with eggs or young), the Proponent shall avoid these areas until nesting is complete and the young have naturally left the vicinity of the nest by establishing a protection buffer zone[1] appropriate for the species and the surrounding habitat.

Aircraft Flight Restrictions

26. The Proponent shall not alter flight paths to approach wildlife and avoid flying directly over animals.

27. The Proponent shall plan flight paths that minimize flights over known habitat likely to have birds or concentrations of wildlife. Aircraft should avoid critical and sensitive wildlife areas at all times by choosing alternate flight corridors.

28. The Proponent shall restrict aircraft/helicopter activity related to the project to a minimum flight altitude of 610 metres (2,100 ft) above ground level except during landing, take-off or if there is a specific requirement for low-level flying, which does not disturb wildlife or migratory birds.

29. The Proponent shall avoid known concentrations of birds (e.g., bird colonies, moulting areas) by a lateral distance of 1.5 kilometre. If avoidance is not possible maintain a minimum flight altitude of 1,100 metres (3,500 feet) over these areas.

30. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft/helicopter do not, unless for emergency, touch-down in areas where wildlife is present.

Road and Ground Disturbance

31. 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.

Aggregate Removal within Existing and New Quarries

32. The Proponent shall not remove any material from below the ordinary highwater mark of any lake or stream and shall maintain an undisturbed buffer zone as required by the

1 Recommended setback distances to define buffer zones have been established by Environment and Climate Change Canada for different bird groups nesting in tundra habitat and can be found at www.ec.gc.ca/paom-itmb.

appropriate authorizing agencies between quarry site and any high-water mark of any water body to ensure erosion control.

33. The Proponent shall install silt fences/curtains down stream of any quarry activities.
34. The Proponent shall ensure there is no obstruction of natural drainage, flooding or channel diversion from quarry/pit access, stockpiles, or other structures or facilities.
35. The Proponent shall locate screening and crushing equipment on stable ground, at a location with ready access to stockpiles.
36. The Proponent shall clearly stake and flag pit and quarry boundaries, so they remain visible to other land users.

Drilling – General

37. The Proponent shall not allow any drilling wastes to spread to the surrounding lands or water bodies.
38. The Proponent shall ensure that that any deleterious substances (as defined in the *Fisheries Act*) resulting from its activities do not enter into any water bodies frequented by fish.
39. The Proponent shall ensure that all drill areas are constructed to facilitate minimizing the environmental footprint of the project area.

Drilling on Land

40. The Proponent shall not conduct any land-based drilling or mechanized clearing activities a minimum distance of the normal high-water mark of any water body as required by an authorizing agency.
41. If an artesian flow is encountered, the Proponent shall ensure the drill hole is immediately plugged and permanently sealed.
42. The Proponent shall ensure that all sump/depression capacities are sufficient to accommodate the volume of wastewater and any fines that are produced. The sumps shall only be used for inert drilling fluids, and not any other materials or substances.
43. The Proponent shall not locate any sumps within a minimum distance of the normal high-water mark of any water body as required by an authorizing agency.
44. The Proponent shall ensure all drill holes are backfilled or capped prior to the end of each field season. All sumps must be backfilled and restored to original or stable profile prior to the end of each field season.

Land Use and Restoration of Disturbed Areas

45. The Proponent shall use existing trails where possible during project activities on the land.
46. The Proponent shall ensure that the land use area is kept clean and tidy at all times.
47. The Proponent shall avoid disturbance on slopes prone to natural erosion, and alternative locations shall be utilized.
48. The Proponent shall remove all garbage, fuel and equipment at the end of each field season and/or upon completion of work and/or upon abandonment.

49. The Proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are restored to a stable or pre-disturbed state using Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BATEA) upon completion of work and/or abandonment.

Camps

50. The Proponent shall ensure that all camps are located durable surfaces, such as gravel or sand that is consolidated and can withstand repeated, heavy use. Measures shall be put in place to prevent erosion, trail formation and damage to the ground.
51. The Proponent shall not erect camps or store materials on the surface ice of lakes or streams, except that which is for immediate use.

Heritage Sites

52. 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.
53. 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.
54. 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

55. 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.
56. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
57. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and access local services where possible.

MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

In addition, the Board is recommending the following:

Annual Report

1. The Proponent shall submit a comprehensive annual report with copies provided to the Nunavut Impact Review Board, by March 31st of each year of permitted activities beginning March 31, 2028. The annual report must contain at least the following information:
    a) A summary of activities undertaken for the year, including:
        - a map showing the approximate location of drill sites;

- a map showing the location of the fuel cache;
- a description of local hires, contracting opportunities and initiatives;
- flight altitudes, frequency of flights and anticipated flight routes;
- site photos;

b) A work plan for the following year, including any progressive reclamation work undertaken;

c) A brief summary of WMMP results as well as any mitigation actions that were undertaken. In addition, the Proponent shall maintain a record of wildlife observations while operating within the project area and include it as part of the summary report. The summary report based on wildlife observations should include the following:

1. Locations (i.e., latitude and longitude), species, number of animals, a description of the animal activity, and a description of the gender and age of animals if possible.
2. Prior to conducting project activities, the Proponent should map the location of any sensitive wildlife sites such as denning sites, calving areas, and raptor nests in the project area, and identify the timing of critical life history events (i.e., calving, mating, denning and nesting).
3. Additionally, the Proponent should indicate potential impacts from the project and ensure that operational activities are managed and modified to avoid impacts on wildlife and sensitive sites.

d) An analysis of the effectiveness of mitigation measures for wildlife;

e) Summary of any heritage sites encountered during the remediation activities, any follow-up action or reporting required as a result and how project activities were modified to mitigate impacts on the heritage sites;

f) Summary of its knowledge of Inuit land use in/near the project area and explain how project activities were modified to mitigate impacts on Inuit land use; and

g) A summary of how the Proponent has complied with conditions contained within this Screening Decision, and all conditions as required by other authorizations associated with the project proposal.

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 or upload a copy to the NIRB's online registry at 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 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.

Bear and Carnivore Safety

4. 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: https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/resources/safety_in_grizzly_and_black_bear_country_english.pdf.

5. 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.

6. Any problem wildlife or any interaction with carnivores should be reported immediately to the local Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment Conservation Office (Conservation Officer of Resolute Bay, phone: (867) 252-3879).

Species at Risk

7. The Proponent review Environment and Climate Change Canada's "Environment Assessment Best Practice Guide for Wildlife at Risk in Canada", available at the following link: http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/policies/EA%20Best%20Practices%202004.pdf. The guide provides information to the Proponent on what is required when Wildlife at Risk, including *Species at Risk*, are encountered or affected by the project.

Migratory Birds

8. 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.

9. 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.

Transport of Dangerous Goods and Waste Management

10. Environment and Climate Change Canada recommend that all hazardous wastes, including waste oil, receive proper treatment and disposal at an approved facility.

11. 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.

12. 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 the Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) "Remediation of the former Isachsen High Arctic Weather Station". The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated August 28, 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) to get the current status of a species.

Updated: September 2024

Terrestrial Species at Risk[2]	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of *SARA*	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility[3]
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

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.

APPENDIX B: ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALAEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR LAND USE PERMIT HOLDERS

INTRODUCTION

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

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

	Types of Development (See Guidelines below)	**Function** (See Guidelines below)
a)	Large scale prospecting	Archaeological/Palaeontological Overview Assessment
b)	Diamond drilling for exploration or geotechnical purpose or planning of linear disturbances	Archaeological/Palaeontological 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*[4] to issue such permits.

[4] 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*[5], 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*[6], it is illegal to alter or disturb any palaeontological or archaeological site in Nunavut unless permission is first granted through the permitting process.

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

> *"archaeological site" means a place where an archaeological artifact is found.*
>
> *"archaeological artifact" means any tangible evidence of human activity that is more than 50 years old and in respect of which an unbroken chain of possession or regular pattern of usage cannot be demonstrated, and includes a Denesuline archaeological specimen referred to in section 40.4.9 of the Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement).*
>
> *"palaeontological site" means a site where a fossil is found.*
>
> *"fossil" includes:*
> *Fossil means the hardened or preserved remains or impression of previously living organisms or vegetation and includes:*
> *(a) natural casts;*
> *(b) preserved tracks, coprolites and plant remains; and*
> *(c) the preserved shells and exoskeletons of invertebrates and the preserved eggs, teeth and bones of vertebrates.*

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

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

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

[5] s. 51(1)
[6] 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.