



Fisheries and Oceans  
Canada

Pêches et Océans  
Canada

PO Box 1871  
Inuvik, NT  
X0E 0T0

Environmental Impact Review Board  
PO Box 2120  
Inuvik, NT  
X0E 0T0

Sent via email: [eirb@jointsec.nt.ca](mailto:eirb@jointsec.nt.ca)

October 15, 2012

Dear Mr. Nasogaluak,

**Subject: Fisheries and Oceans Canada's Information Request #2**

Please find attached Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)'s Information Request based on our review of the information provided by the proponent on October 5, 2012.

As noted during the DFO presentation at the Inuvik Public Hearing, the requested information will be required prior to the issuance of any regulatory approvals DFO may consider. However, it is noted that provision of this information in the environmental assessment phase would further enable DFO to provide advice to the Board respecting the impacts to fish and fish habitat within its final technical submission.

If you require any clarification or have questions regarding DFO's comments, please contact Sarah Olivier at [Sarah.Olivier@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:Sarah.Olivier@dfo-mpo.gc.ca) or by phone at (867) 669-4919.

Sincerely,

Amanda Joynt  
A/District Manager, Inuvik District, Western Arctic Area  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

cc. Sarah Olivier – DFO  
Bev Ross – DFO  
Julie Dahl – DFO  
Kate Witherly – NPMO  
Larry Dow – DFO

## **Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk Road Fisheries and Oceans Information Request**

**IR Number: 1**

**Subject: Lessons Learned – Tuktoyaktuk – Source 177 Road**

### **Preamble:**

In its response to DFO Hearing Undertaking #1 (Sept. 20, 2012), DFO stated that a “lessons learned” analysis was requested and confirmed that the proponent would provide this as an appendix to the Hydrotechnical Report. This undertaking, the Inuvik technical session transcripts, as well as past requests (DFO IR #1 – March 1, 2012) detail the topics that should be considered:

- High-flow design considerations
- culvert embedding
- providing fish passage
- beaver dam management
- culvert ice management/road blowout avoidance
- riprap management (cleanliness and size)
- sediment and erosion control fencing management
- placement of overflow culverts
- including biological and subsistence harvesting into crossing selection criteria
- monitoring and monitor training
- communications between regulators, proponents and contractors

A ‘lessons learned’ document was provided as Appendix K to the Hydrotechnical Report. Winter construction efficiency, embankment construction, blasting, pit selection, and road shaping and stability were outlined. It was acknowledged that issues pertaining to culverts and riprap needed to be solved prior to construction, and that the sediment and erosion control measures had been successful.

---

### **Request:**

The information for this request remains outstanding.

**IR Number: 2**  
**Subject: Fish Habitat Assessment**

**Preamble:**

In its response to DFO Hearing Undertaking #1 (Sept. 20, 2012), DFO identified gaps within the Master Watercourse Crossing Table with regards to the fish habitat assessment. A previous request (DFO IR #1 – March 1, 2012) outlined the requirements of the table:

- a. total number of crossings for the entire route and consistent names/ID;
- b. Crossing type/design with a discussion on how each crossing design will meet the objectives at each location including ensuring no impacts to fish passage or habitat, maintaining flow, etc...
- c. Stream type with description of up and downstream connections;
- d. Flow data including at freshet;
- e. Bank-full or wetted width; and
- f. Details on habitat condition and suitability

Both the Hydrotechnical Report and the Fish Habitat Assessments previously provided include some of the information listed above. DFO notes that some of the crossings are noted in the table to be either moved from the original location or to have another crossing added near to the original crossing. Both of these changes may affect the fish habitat assessment at that location.

**Request:**

Please provide DFO with the information on the crossings that are data deficient within the crossing table.

---

Please provide DFO with a response regarding DFO's recommendation that a winter survey of fish habitat be completed on crossings that have potential overwintering habitat and are planned as culvert crossings.

**IR Number: 3**

**Subject: Crossing Scenarios and Subsequent Impact Assessment**

**Preamble:**

The 'scenario' description has been discussed at previous meetings, the Inuvik technical session, and the Inuvik public hearing. In its response to DFO Hearing Undertaking #1 (Sept. 20, 2012), DFO outlined the details expected for those scenarios: the types of crossings that will be employed along the highway route, the number of each of those crossings, the mitigations to be used at each of those types of crossings, and the residual impacts that remain after mitigation.

The Hydrotechnical Report provided the numbers of each of the following categories of crossing (minor, intermediate, major) as well as provided approximate numbers for each type of crossing. It also outlined many options for mitigation for erosion, scour, and sediment control that could be used at the sites, however did not specify which mitigations would be used or are practical for the crossings that will be installed.

**Request:**

DFO requests that information be provided on the scenarios (general construction techniques, season of construction, general mitigation), as well as provide an assessment on the impacts to fish and fish habitat.

---

**IR Number: 4**

**Subject: Water Crossings – Summer Installations**

**Preamble:**

In its response to DFO Hearing Undertaking #1 (Sept. 20, 2012), DFO stated that clarification is required on whether the practice of open water crossing installation will be used for the project.

**Request:**

Please provide DFO with clarification on whether crossing installations will occur in the open water season. If open water installation is being considered for this project, please provide a description of the likely scenario of installation with recommended mitigation measures. An assessment of the impacts of the installation of these crossings should be completed and included in the environmental impact assessment.

---