



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW BOARD

By Email

March 8, 2012

Darrel Nasogaluak
Chair, Tuktoyaktuk HTC
Tuktoyaktuk, NT

Dear Darrel Nasogaluak

Re: Information Requests related to the Proposed Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk Highway Project

Please find attached Information Requests (IRs) that have been directed to the Tuktoyaktuk HTC from the Environmental Impact Review Board seeking information related to the proposed Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk Highway project. These IRs have been generated as part of the environmental impact review of the proposed development being undertaken by the Environmental Impact Review Board (EIRB) to fulfill the requirements of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement and the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.

Please complete a separate response to each IR, and clearly reference the IR number, topic and the Party that generated the IR (i.e., the source). Please complete your responses and submit them to the EIRB by March 30, 2012.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Eli Nasogaluak
EIR Coordinator
Environmental Impact Review Board
Phone: (867) 777-2828 Fax: (867) 777-2610
eirb@jointsec.nt.ca



INFORMATION REQUESTS

(Round 2)

DATE OF RELEASE: March 8, 2012

DISTRIBUTION: Tuktoyaktuk HTC and the Electronic On-line Registry (EOR).

PURPOSE: Information Requests (IRs) issued by the EIRB to the Tuktoyaktuk Hunters and Trappers Committee (Tuktoyaktuk HTC) related to the Review of the proposed Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk Highway Project.

**DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION
OF RESPONSES:** March 30, 2012

Information Request (IR) Numbers: 87, 88

IR Number: *Number is assigned by EIRB*

Source: 1 EIRB

**To: WMAC
FJMC
Inuvialuit Game Council (IGC)
Inuvik HTC
Tuktoyaktuk HTC**

87

Subject: **Harvesting** (EIS, Section 4.3.5, p.593; EIS, Section 4.3.7, p. 595; Developer Response to 2b and 2c, Section 15.0, pp. 118-125)

Preamble

The EIS (Human Health and Community Wellness, Section 4.3.5, p. 593) states that “the presence of the highway may increase access to harvesting areas that were previously more difficult to access. The effects from increased access to harvesting areas include increased food security and reduced reliance on store-bought food.” The EIS (Harvesting, Section 4.3.7, p. 595) repeats the statement that “increased access could result in increased harvesting activities, which may provide increased access to country foods, increased food security, and reduced cost of living through less reliance on store-bought food.”

In describing the residual effects of the project, the Developer notes, again, that the Highway will increase access to harvesting areas, and states that while harvesting patterns may be disturbed during Highway construction, harvesting patterns are expected “...to return to normal upon Project completion, except in the vicinity of the Highway, where hunting may be discouraged. With effective Highway user practices, residual indirect effects related to harvesting wildlife and fish populations are expected to be minimal” (Developer Response to 2b and 2c, p. 120).

The Developer acknowledges that residents of Tuktoyaktuk have expressed concerns that the Highway may directly result in hunting pressure on caribou and other wildlife, and states that “responsible management organizations and government agencies will continue to work together to develop strategies for sustainable harvesting in the region, after the Highway is constructed. The success of this approach will require a high level of voluntary compliance from the users of the proposed Highway,” (Developer Response to 2b and 2c, p. 119).

Request

1. Please describe the role of your organization in monitoring and mitigating project-related effects on harvesting.
2. Please describe any measures that could be taken by your organization to encourage voluntary compliance from the users of the proposed Highway.

IR Number: *Number is assigned by EIRB*

Source: EIRB

**To: WMAC
FJMC
IGC
Inuvik HTC
Tuktoyaktuk HTC**

88

Subject: IFA and Community Conservation Plan (CCP) Goals – Land Use (EIS Section 4.3, p. 568, 598; IR Responses Round 1, IR #46)

Preamble

The EIS describes the effects of the Highway on “Land Designation Areas (as per the IFA and CCPs)” as adverse (EIS, p. 568), given that the Highway is located within lands that are designated by the CCPs as Management Category E, and therefore “...where cultural or renewable resources are of extreme significance and sensitivity. There shall be no development on these areas...” (EIS, p. 598).

In IR #46, the Developer was asked to indicate whether any meetings had been held, or will be held, with the Inuvialuit organizations that drafted and approved the CCPs in order to discuss and reconcile the Project’s proposed use of Management Category E. The Developer responded that during previous meetings (some of which occurred prior to the 2008 CCPs in which Management Category E was designated), there were no references to Management Category E, but that there were repeated requests to respect the 1 km setback from Husky Lakes.

Request

1. Please describe the position of your organization with respect to the proposed Highway and its use of Management Category E.
2. Please describe what efforts must taken by the Developer to reconcile the Project’s proposed use of Management Category E.