

Environmental Assessment North  
Environmental Protection Operations (EPO)  
Qimugjuk Building 969  
PO Box 1870  
Iqaluit, NU X0A 0H0  
Tel: (867) 975-4631  
Fax: (867) 975-4645

30 May 2012

EC file: 4703 001 140  
NWB file: 1BR-HLR----

Phyllis Beaulieu  
Manager of Licensing  
Nunavut Water Board  
PO Box 119  
Gjoa Haven, NU X0B 1J0

Via email: [licensing@nunavutwaterboard.org](mailto:licensing@nunavutwaterboard.org)

**RE: 120430 1BR-HLR---- New Application – Hope Lake Remediation Project -  
Kitikmeot Region**

Environment Canada (EC) has reviewed the above-mentioned new water license application submitted to the Nunavut Water Board (NWB). The following specialist advice has been provided pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, Section 36(3) of the *Fisheries Act*, the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, and the *Species at Risk Act*.

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, Contaminated Sites Division is applying for a new Type B water license in support of the Hope Lake Remediation Project. This project includes five individual sites, the largest is the Hope Lake site while the others are satellite sites, and the nearest community is Kugluktuk, located 75 km to the northeast of Hope Lake. The 2012 field program is scheduled to occur over 20 days in July. A crew of up to ten people will access the sites daily from Kugluktuk and the planned work includes: drum sampling and consolidation, debris collection and incineration of untreated/unpainted wood, excavation and containerization of contaminated soil at the Husky Creek and Willow Creek sites, and transportation of consolidated materials from Husky Creek and Willow Creek to the Hope Lake site via helicopter. Work to be completed beyond 2012 will be permitted under a separate application.

Based on a review of the water license application, EC provides the following comments for the NWB's consideration:

**General**

- The proponent shall not deposit, nor permit the deposit of chemicals, sediment, wastes, or fuels associated with the project into any water body. According to the *Fisheries Act*, Section 36 (3), the deposition of deleterious substances of any type in water frequented by fish, or in any place under any conditions where the deleterious substance, or any deleterious substance that results from the deposit of the deleterious substance, may enter any such water, is prohibited.

## Waste Disposal

- The burning of waste products releases numerous contaminants to the air, many of them persistent, bio-accumulative and toxic (e.g. polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons - PAH's - heavy metals, chlorinated organics – dioxins and furans). These contaminants can result in harmful impacts to human and wildlife health through direct inhalation and they can also be deposited to land and water, where they bio-accumulate through food chains affecting wildlife and country foods. Therefore, burning should only be considered after all other alternatives for waste disposal have been explored and the devices used for incineration meet the emission limits established under the CCME Canada-wide Standards (CWS) for Dioxins and Furans and the CWS for Mercury Emissions. The Government of Canada, the Governments of the Northwest Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon are signatories to these standards and are required to implement them according to their respective jurisdictional responsibilities.
- In principal, EC does not encourage the open burning of combustible waste as a means of disposal. Before employing open burning for disposal of any wastes EC recommends the proponent heed the following guidance:
  - Solid wastes that are conditionally suitable for open burning are paper products, paperboard packaging and untreated wood. Plywood, painted wood or other treated wood should not be disposed of in this manner. For reference, below is a link to the Nunavut Municipal Open Burning Policy:  
<http://www.gov.nu.ca/env/Open%20burning.pdf>  
and below is a link to information from EC regarding open burning:  
[http://www.ec.gc.ca/gdd-mw/684B44DD-5780-4F73-BC58-A97E31A19EDC/COM1170\\_Open\\_Burning\\_Brochure\\_e\\_v6\\_for%20web.pdf](http://www.ec.gc.ca/gdd-mw/684B44DD-5780-4F73-BC58-A97E31A19EDC/COM1170_Open_Burning_Brochure_e_v6_for%20web.pdf)
- The proponent states that non-combustible and hazardous waste will be shipped off-site for disposal. EC suggests that confirmation and authorization be obtained from the intended community landfill (i.e. Kugluktuk) prior to shipment.

## Spill Contingency Plan

- EC recommends that a map of the camp with marked locations of fuel storage sites and spill kits should be attached to the Spill Contingency Plan and be posted in an area visible and accessible to camp occupants.
- EC recommends that a 24 Hour NWT/NU Spill Response Form be attached to the Plan.
- Refueling shall not take place below the high water mark of any water body and shall be done in such a manner as to prevent any hydrocarbons from entering any water body frequented by fish. EC recommends that drip pans, or other similar preventative measures, should be used when refuelling equipment.
- Spills are to be documented and reported to the NWT/NU 24 hour Spill Line at (867)920-8130. EC recommends that all releases of harmful substances, regardless of quantity, are immediately reported where the release:
  - is near or into a water body;
  - is near or into a designated sensitive environment or sensitive wildlife habitat;
  - poses an imminent threat to human health or safety; or,
  - poses an imminent threat to a listed species at risk or its critical habitat.

## Wildlife and Species at Risk

- Section 6 (a) of the *Migratory Birds Regulations* states that no one shall disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of migratory birds. The best mitigation measure to ensure compliance is to conduct activities with a risk of disturbing or destroying nests or eggs outside of the migratory bird nesting season. High risk activities include disturbance of large amounts of habitat during the nesting season or conducting activities in areas with large concentrations of nesting birds.

- EC recommends that food, domestic wastes, and petroleum-based chemicals (e.g., greases, gasoline, glycol-based antifreeze) be made inaccessible to wildlife at all times. Such items can attract predators of migratory birds such as foxes, ravens, gulls, and bears. Although these animals may initially be attracted to the novel food sources, they often will also eat eggs and young birds in the area. These predators can have significant negative effects on the local bird populations.
- Section 5.1 of the *Migratory Birds Convention Act* prohibits persons from depositing substances harmful to migratory birds in waters or areas frequented by migratory birds or in a place from which the substance may enter such waters or such an area.
- In order to reduce aircraft disturbance to migratory birds, Environment Canada recommends the following:
  - Fly at times when few birds are present (e.g., early spring, late fall, winter)
  - If flights cannot be scheduled when few birds are present, plan flight paths that minimize flights over habitat likely to have birds and maintain a minimum flight altitude of 650 m (2100 feet).
  - Minimize flights during periods when birds are particularly sensitive to disturbance such as migration, nesting, and moulting.
  - Plan flight paths to avoid known concentrations of birds (e.g., bird colonies, moulting areas) by a lateral distance of at least 1.5 km. If avoidance is not possible, maintain a minimum flight altitude of 1100 m (3500 feet) over areas where birds are known to concentrate.
  - Avoid the seaward side of seabird colonies and areas used by flocks of migrating waterfowl by 3 km.
  - Avoid excessive hovering or circling over areas likely to have birds.
  - Inform pilots of these recommendations and areas known to have birds.
- The following comments are pursuant to the *Species at Risk Act* (SARA), which came into full effect on June 1, 2004. Section 79 (2) of SARA, states that during an assessment of effects of a project, the adverse effects of the project on listed wildlife species and its critical habitat must be identified, that measures are taken to avoid or lessen those effects, and that the effects need to be monitored. This section applies to all species listed on Schedule 1 of SARA. However, as a matter of best practice, Environment Canada suggests that species on other Schedules of SARA and under consideration for listing on SARA, including those designated as at risk by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), be considered during an environmental assessment in a similar manner. The Table below lists species that may be encountered in the project area that have been assessed by COSEWIC as well as their current listing on Schedules 1-3 of SARA (and designation if different from that of COSEWIC). Project impacts could include species disturbance, attraction to operations, and destruction of habitat.

Terrestrial Species at Risk potentially within project area <sup>1</sup>	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility <sup>2</sup>
Peregrine Falcon	Special Concern ( <i>anatum-tundrius</i> complex <sup>3</sup> )	Schedule 3 – Special Concern ( <i>tundrius</i> )	Government of Nunavut
Wolverine (Western population)	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 3	Government of Nunavut
Grizzly Bear	Special Concern	Pending	Government

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

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

<sup>3</sup> The *anatum* subspecies of Peregrine Falcon is listed on Schedule 1 of SARA as threatened. The *anatum* and *tundruis* subspecies of Peregrine Falcon were reassessed by COSEWIC in 2007 and combined into one subpopulation complex. This subpopulation complex was listed by COSEWIC as Special Concern.

- For any Species at Risk that could be encountered or affected by the project, the proponent should note any potential adverse effects of the project to the 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 [www.sararegistry.gc.ca](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca) for information on specific species.
- 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.
- 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 taken in a way that is consistent with applicable recovery strategies and action/management plans.
- All mitigation measures identified by the proponent, and the additional measures suggested herein, should be strictly adhered to in conducting project activities. This will require awareness on the part of the proponents' representatives (including contractors) conducting operations in the field. Environment Canada recommends that all field operations staff be made aware of the proponents' commitments to these mitigation measures and provided with appropriate advice / training on how to implement these measures.
- Implementation of these measures may help to reduce or eliminate some effects of the project on migratory birds and Species at Risk, but will not necessarily ensure that the proponent remains in compliance with the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, *Migratory Birds Regulations*, and the *Species at Risk Act*. The proponent must ensure they remain in compliance during all phases and in all undertakings related to the project.

If there are any additional changes in the proposed project, EC should be notified, as further review may be necessary. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned with any questions or comments with regards to the foregoing at (867) 975-4631 or by email at [Paula.C.Smith@ec.gc.ca](mailto:Paula.C.Smith@ec.gc.ca).

Yours truly,



Paula C. Smith

## Environmental Assessment Coordinator

cc: Carey Ogilvie (Head, Environmental Assessment-North, EPO, Yellowknife, NT)  
Allison Dunn (Sr. Environmental Assessment Coordinator, EPO, Iqaluit, NU)  
Ron Bujold (Environmental Assessment Officer, EPO, Yellowknife, NT)