

TECHNICAL SESSIONS
For the REVIEW of the Proposed
INUVIK to TUKTOYAKTUK HIGHWAY PROJECT

INGAMO HALL FRIENDSHIP CENTRE
20 MacKenzie Road
Inuvik, NT

Wednesday, August 22, 2012 and Thursday, August 23, 2012
9:00 am to 5:00 pm

AGENDA

Wednesday, August 22, 2012

1. Call to Order
2. Round table introductions
3. Opening remarks by EIRB Staff
4. Review of procedures for the Technical Sessions
5. Air Quality
 - a. Issue raised by EIRB (linked to # 20)
 - i. Dust suppression program and Wildlife Management Plan (WMP)
6. Noise
 - a. Issue raised by EIRB (linked to # 20)
 - i. Mitigation of noise impacts on wildlife and humans
7. Water Quality
 - a. Issue raised by EIRB (linked to # 20)
 - i. Mitigation of water quality impacts
8. Hydrology (including water crossings)
 - a. Issue raised by EIRB (linked to # 20)
 - i. Mitigation of water quantity impacts
 - b. Issues raised by DFO (linked to # 9)
 - i. Final list of all crossings, and inclusion of latest fisheries information
 - ii. Timing for the construction of crossings
 - c. Issue raised by NRCan (linked to # 15)
 - i. Design values utilized for stream crossing design[s]
 - d. Issue raised by Transport Canada
 - i. Timing of NWPA Applications and required supporting information

- 9. Fish and Fish Habitat
 - a. Issue raised by EIRB (linked to # 20)
 - i. Mitigation of impacts to fish and fish habitat
 - b. Issues raised by DFO (linked to # 8, 16, 19, 20, 21)
- 10. Birds and Habitat
 - a. Issues raised by Environment Canada
 - i. Birds and habitat baseline information, habitat suitability mapping for species at risk, and habitat loss
- 11. Vegetation
 - a. Issues raised by EIRB (linked to # 20)
 - i. Mitigation of impacts to vegetation communities and rare plants
 - ii. Baseline information contribution to measuring effectiveness of mitigation

Thursday, August 23, 2012

- 12. Recap of Wednesday session
- 13. Reports from Wednesday evening sessions (if applicable)
- 14. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat
 - a. Issues raised by EIRB (linked to # 20)
 - i. Mitigation of impacts to wildlife, species at risk and caribou
 - ii. Baseline information contribution to measuring effectiveness of mitigation
 - b. Issues raised by Environment Canada
 - i. Wildlife and habitat baseline information, habitat suitability mapping for species at risk, and habitat loss
 - c. Issues raised by WMAC (NWT) (linked to # 18, 19)
 - i. Existing and proposed human developments within CEA
 - ii. Temporal and spatial boundaries of CEA
 - iii. Indirect effects on caribou, grizzly bear and Husky Lakes
- 15. Climate (including climate change)
 - a. Issues raised by NRCan
 - i. See NRCan issue in # 8
- 16. Terrain, Geology, Soils, Permafrost
 - a. Issues raised by EIRB (linked to # 19)
 - i. Aggregate extractions over 50 years
 - ii. Aggregate use on Dempster Highway
 - iii. Additional field investigations
 - b. Issue raised by NRCan
 - i. Use of clay-rich till in road construction
 - ii. Terrain conditions along ITH corridor
 - iii. Surficial geology and ground ice conditions
 - iv. Frozen ground
 - v. Borrow materials
 - c. Issues raised by EIRB and DFO
 - i. Lessons learned from Tuktoyaktuk to Source 177 development
 - d. Issues raised by DFO
 - i. Borrow sources and use of explosives

- e. Issues raised by WMAC (NWT) (linked to # 19)
 - i. Borrow sites
 - ii. Borrow sites and associated infrastructure and cumulative effects on caribou and grizzly bear and their habitat over 50-years
 - iii. Borrow sources and cumulative effects of other developments
- 17. Human environment
 - a. Issues raised by EIRB (linked to # 18)
 - i. Demographics
 - ii. Regional and local economies
 - iii. Education, training and skills
 - iv. Infrastructure and institutional capacity
 - v. Human health and community wellness
 - vi. Harvesting
 - vii. Land use
 - viii. Archaeological resources
 - b. Issues raised by Transport Canada and EIRB
 - i. Socio-cultural patterns
- 18. Human environment and biophysical impacts linkages
 - a. Issues raised by EIRB
 - i. See EIRB Issue in # 17
 - b. Issues raised by WMAC (NWT) (linked to # 14)
 - i. ITH and other developments long-term effects on harvesting of grizzly bear and caribou
- 19. Cumulative Effects
 - a. Issues raised by EIRB (linked to # 14, 16)
 - i. Integration of 2012 field studies into CEA
 - b. Issues raised by WMAC (NWT), DFO and EIRB (linked to # 14, 20)
 - i. Conduct new CEA
- 20. Mitigation Measures (includes Plans)
 - a. Issues raised by WMAC (NWT)
 - i. Effectiveness of mitigation measures to address cumulative effects on caribou, grizzly bear and harvesting
 - b. Issues raised by DFO (linked to # 9, 19)
 - i. Fisheries Authorizations and development plan to offset losses
 - ii. Increased access to fisheries resources
 - c. Issues raised by EIRB
 - i. See EIRB Issues in # 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14
- 21. Follow-up and Monitoring
 - a. Issues raised by DFO
 - i. Fish passage monitoring
 - ii. Training of environmental monitors
 - b. Issues raised by NRCan
 - i. Monitoring and management plans
 - c. Issues raised by WMAC (NWT)
 - i. Revise post-construction monitoring scheme

22. Worst Case Scenario

a. Issues raised by WMAC (NWT)

i. Re-assessment of Worst Case Scenario based on new CEA

23. Developer's outstanding submission requirements

a. Issues raised by EIRB (May 25, 2012 Directives letter and July 16, 2012 Ruling letter)

i. As of August 16, 2012, submission of several biophysical baseline reports, including:

1. Vegetation
2. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat
3. Hydrological Assessments
4. Water Source Studies

ii. Based on the new information provided in the baseline reports, identify and explain how proposed mitigation measures have changed, or any new mitigation measures have been developed, based on the new information. Where impact predictions have changed based on the new information, the Developer will identify and explain how the mitigation measures may have changed. To be provided for biophysical and socio-economic predictions.

iii. For each proposed Plan identified in Table 2 (of the May 25th letter), provide sufficient information on the Plan details to enable the Review Panel, in conducting its review of the Plans, to understand and evaluate the effectiveness of their contribution to the mitigation of impacts predicted in the EIS.

iv. .Developer consultations specifically related to the use of Category E lands.

v. Provide a cross reference of the existing Draft EIS and all supplementary information filed to date, and any new information filed in response to May 25th Directive, with the requirements of the Terms of Reference for the EIS, and also clearly demonstrate/justify how the Terms of Reference have been satisfied by the information.

24. Undertakings and Commitments

25. Next Steps

26. Close of Technical Sessions