



Environment
Canada

Environnement
Canada

Environmental Protection Operations
Prairie and Northern
5019 52nd Street, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 2310
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P7

August 28, 2009

Our File No.: 4517 000 033
Your File No.: 3BC-FOH0409

Richard Dwyer
Licensing Administrator
Nunavut Water Board
P.O. Box 119
Gjoa Haven, NU, X0B 1J0

Via Email at licensingadmin@nunavutwaterboard.org

Dear Richard Dwyer,

**RE: NWB 3BC-FOH0409 – Department of National Defence – FOX-M Hall Beach Project
Renewal Type “B”**

Environment Canada (EC) has reviewed the information submitted with the above-mentioned application. The following requested specialist advice has been provided pursuant to EC's mandated responsibilities arising from the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (CEPA), Section 36(3) of the *Fisheries Act*, the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, and the *Species at Risk Act*.

It is our understanding that the North Warning System Office, National Defence Headquarters (Department of National Defence) (the proponent) is applying to the Nunavut Water Board (NWB) to renew their water license (3BC-FOH0409 – Type “B” NWB) (herein known as “the water license”) for water use and water disposal associated activities at the FOX-M Hall Beach North Warning System Long Range Radar Station.

Brief Summary of the Project:

FOX-M is situated in Nunavut, on the Melville Peninsula, approximately 3 km south of Hall Beach. FOX-M is a Long Range Radar Site (LRR) and a Logistics Support Site (LSS) for the North Warning System. It acts as a dispatch center for the unmanned LRR FOX-3 site and eight short range radar sites. During the month of May to September the site may have an average of 18 to 22 personnel on-site, with increased numbers in the summer due for seasonal project activity and occasional Third Party visitors (Summary of Project, 2009).

FOX-M's facilities include site buildings with their integral mechanical and electrical systems, power generation system, fuel tanks, radar, antennas, satellite ground terminals, weather equipment, and roads (Exploration/Remote Camp Supplementary Questionnaire, 2009).

This review is of the documents submitted to the NWB for the renewal of the water license, as found on the NWB's ftp website (website address was provided with application received from NWB).

On October 24, 2003 EC reviewed the Nasittuq Corporation's application for a land use permit for the Hall Beach Radar Station (NIRB 03DN121), and on March 2, 2009 for a water license (3BC-FOH). As a result of these reviews, EC proposed several recommendations. As such, the comments below largely stem from our previous letters. EC believes they are important to

stress again in order to ensure our mandated responsibilities as outlined above are met, and the environment protected.

Comments and Recommendations:

General

1. 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. EC 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.
2. Meeting the requirements of the *Fisheries Act* is mandatory, irrespective of any other regulatory or permitting system. Section 36(3) of the *Fisheries Act* specifies that unless authorized by federal regulation, no person shall deposit or permit the deposit of deleterious substances of any type in water frequented by fish, or in any place under any conditions where the deleterious substance, or any other deleterious substance that results from the deposit of the deleterious substance, may enter any such water. The legal definition of deleterious substance provided in section 34(1) of the *Fisheries Act*, in conjunction with court rulings, provides a very broad interpretation of deleterious and includes any substance with a potentially harmful chemical, physical or biological effect on fish or fish habitat.

Fuel / Spill Contingency

3. EC would like to take this opportunity to remind DND of the new regulations for Storage Tank System for Petroleum and Allied Petroleum Products which came into force on June 12, 2008. These regulations apply to all outside aboveground, underground and partially buried storage tank systems containing petroleum and allied petroleum products, except above-ground storage tank systems that have a capacity of 2,500 L or less and that are connected to a heating appliance or emergency generator. Further information on these regulations can be found at www.ec.gc.ca/st-rs.
4. Given the large amount of fuel to be stored on site, EC recommends the use of secondary containment with an impervious liner, such as self-supporting insta-berms, for storage of all barreled fuel rather than relying on natural depressions to contain spills.
5. All fuel storage areas should be located above the high water mark and in such a manner as to prevent the contents from entering any waterbody frequented by fish.
6. A supply of spill kits, shovels, barrels, sorbents, pumps, etc. should be consistently maintained and readily available at sites where fuel is being stored or transferred.
7. Any substances listed on schedule 1 of CEPA (List of Toxic Substances) are required to have an Environmental Emergency Plan (EEP). If the proponent has identified that any of these substances will be a part of the project, then it is suggested that an EEP be submitted for review. Note that an EEP, if applicable, should include reporting contacts in the case of an emergency or spill. The phone number for EC – Environmental Protections, Emergencies is (866) 845-6057.

8. Secondary containment or a surface liner (drip pans, fold-a-tanks, etc.) should be placed under all containers or vehicle fuel tank inlet and outlet points, hose connections and hose ends during fuel or hazardous substance transfers. Secondary containment should be of adequate size and volume to contain and hold fluids for the purpose of preventing spills (the worst-case scenario).
9. Please note that any spill of fuel or hazardous/deleterious materials, adjacent to or into a water body, **regardless of quantity** must be reported immediately to the NWT/NU 24-hour Spill Line, **(867) 920-8130**. EC will be notified through this process.

Waste Treatment & Disposal

10. The proponent intends to discharge sewage up to the grey water outfall area (supplementary questionnaire). All sumps are to be located above the high water mark and in such a manner as to prevent the contents from entering any waterbody frequented by fish. Further, all sumps should be backfilled and contoured to match the existing landscape upon completion of the project.
11. The proponent indicates in the supplementary questionnaire that nonhazardous, noncombustible waste will be disposed of in an approved landfill. The proponent should provide proof that the designated facility is able to accept any waste generated from the normal operations of this project.
12. Bulky items / scrap metal and waste oil / hazardous waste, according to the supplementary questionnaire, will be stored on a palet line and retrograded for disposal outside of Nunavut as required. The proponent should provide proof that the designated facility is able to accept any waste generated from the normal operations of this project.

Wildlife

13. Section 6 (a) of the *Migratory Birds Regulations* states that no one shall disturb or destroy the nests or eggs of migratory birds. If active nests of migratory birds are discovered, the proponent should halt all activities until nesting is completed (i.e. the young have left the vicinity of the nest).
14. CWS recommends that camp waste be made inaccessible to wildlife at all times. Camp waste can attract predators of migratory birds (e.g., foxes and ravens) to an area if not disposed of properly.
15. 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.
16. 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, EC 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.

Table 2: SARA Listed Species for Project Area

Terrestrial Species at Risk ¹	COSEWIC Designation	Schedule of SARA	Government Organization with Lead Management Responsibility ²
Peregrine Falcon (<i>anatum-tundris</i> complex) ³	Threatened	Schedule 1 (<i>anatum</i>) Schedule 3 (<i>tundrius</i>)	Government of Nunavut
Red Knot (<i>rufa</i> subspecies)	Endangered	Pending	EC
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 3	Government of Nunavut
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut
Wolverine (Western Population)	Special Concern	Pending	Government of Nunavut

¹ The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has responsibility for aquatic species.

² 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.

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

Impacts could be disturbance and attraction to operations.

EC recommends:

- Species at Risk that could be encountered or affected by the project should be identified and any potential adverse effects of the project to the species, its habitat, and/or its residence noted. 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 for information on specific species as well as the booklet "Species at Risk in the Northwest Territories" available at www.enr.gov.nt.ca.
- 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 or the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), the Territorial Government or DFO 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.

17. 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 SARA. The proponent must ensure they remain in compliance during all phases and in all undertakings related to the project.

If there are any changes in the application or the supporting documents, EC should be notified, as further review may be necessary. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (867) 669-4748 or Stacey.Lambert@ec.gc.ca with any questions concerning the above points.

Yours truly,

Original signed by

Stacey Lambert
Environmental Assessment Coordinator, EPO

cc: Carey Ogilvie (Head, Environmental Assessment North, EPO)
Lisa Perry (Sr. Environmental Assessment Coordinator, EPO)