



Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board

Box 938 , 5102-50th Avenue, Yellowknife, NT X1A 2N7  
[www.mveirb.nt.ca](http://www.mveirb.nt.ca)

From: Sherry Sian Fax: 867-766-7074  
EAO Phone: 867-766-7063  
Date: November 4, 2003 Pages: 22 including this page  
To: Distribution Fax:  
CC:  
Subject: Final Version of SDC Round I  
IRs (EA-03-006)

**NOTES:**

Please be advised that the Review Board has made one change to the draft Information Requests that were distributed yesterday. Item I.I.18 has been revised.

Responses to the Information Requests are required by the **end of day, November 14, 2003**. Please call me if you require clarification.

Sherry  
Environmental Assessment Officer

86

**IR Number: 1.1.1**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: C. Development (Exploration Program) Description  
C-2 Access Roads, Camps and Drill Sites**

**Terms of Reference Section: C. Development Description**

**C-2** *Location and Design of Operations* "An operations map should also be provided to include access routes, known drill targets, survey areas where future drill targets may be identified, camp, storage, and sump."

### **Preamble**

The maps provided and the access routes identified are unclear. It is difficult to see from one map to the next what access routes are already in existence and what access routes are being proposed as new ones for the various claim areas.

In the amendment to the Snowfield Developer's Assessment Report, SDC was requested to clarify: "*How will Snowfield Development Corp access each drill location on the claims designated for exploration? Include maps containing sufficient detail to depict access to all drill locations.*" The response provided by SDC referred to Gartner Lee 2003 Table 12. However, Table 12 in the Gartner Lee 2003 study, found on page 41, is entitled Heritage Resources and does not appear to support any answer regarding access routes. A map depicting access by air or land to all drill locations is still lacking.

### **Request**

Provide the following information:

- a On a single map, clearly depict the proposed access routes to each of the SDC claim areas and proposed drilling locations. Include an appropriate legend.
- b On this same map, clearly identify which sections of the proposed access routes are already in existence as known travel corridors. Number each section.
- c Of these sections of proposed access routes that are already in existence as travel corridors, will any work, such as brushing or clearing, be required to render these roads usable by SDC? If so, please specify what will be required and on which sections.
- d In a concise table, indicate when each section of proposed access route was last used as a travel corridor of comparable use.

**IR Number: 1.1.2**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: C. Development (Exploration Program) Description  
C-4 Waste Management**

**ToR Section: C. Development Description**

C-4 *Waste Management* "Provide a detailed description of waste management plans including the types and quantities of waste generated by each activity."

**Preamble**

"No kitchen waste will be allowed to report to greywater settling sump" p14 DAR.  
It is unclear how kitchen waste will be eliminated from sump.

"Sanitary sewage will be contained in outhouse pits..."p14 DAR. It is unclear what the capacity of outhouse pits is, how much waste is predicted and how outhouse pit locations are selected.

**Request**

Provide the following information:

- a How does SDC propose to eliminate solid kitchen waste from greywater going to sump? Please describe method in detail.
- b How many outhouse pits does SDC foresee?
- c What is maximum capacity of each outhouse pit?
- d How will outhouse pit sites be selected?
- e Will outhouse pits be dug before ground freezes?

**IR Number: 1.1.3**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: J. Fish and Wildlife Resources  
J-3 Direct and Indirect Impacts**

**ToR Section: J. Fish and Wildlife Resources**

J-3 *Direct and Indirect Impacts* "Describe the potential direct and indirect effects of this undertaking (i.e., surveys, clearing, drilling, camp activities, etc.) on fish and wildlife, and the mitigation measures that will be taken to reduce or avoid these impacts. The mitigation measures should specifically describe measures taken to avoid harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat."

**Preamble**

The DAR states that the only possible effect on fish throughout the SDC proposed exploration project is the possibility of water contamination via fuel spillage. Although exploration activities are land-based in nature, water sourced from local area lakes is to be used in drilling procedures and camp activities. The concern is the effects of draw down on some of the local source lakes, as not enough information has been provided regarding the physiological parameters of the lakes and the reasoning for their selection. In particular, on page 5 of the DAR amendment, the water source for the Mud Lake Kimberlite Work Area is the Mud Lake wetland. SDC states that draw down will be monitored daily and then goes on to state that Mud Lake is likely to freeze to bottom.

**Request**

Provide the following information:

- a What factors were considered in the selection of the proposed source lakes for all claim areas?
- b How will SDC determine whether Mud Lake is frozen to the bottom?
- c In the event Mud Lake is not frozen to the bottom, how will SDC determine whether draw down will be significant or not?
- d For all claim areas, what volume is adequate for a source lake?
- e For all claim areas, what depth is adequate for a source lake?
- f For all claim areas, how are draw down thresholds determined?
- g For all claim areas, how will fish bearing status of source lakes be determined?

**IR Number: 1.1.4**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: G. Public Consultation, G-1 Consultation  
I. Subsistence and Traditional Land Use, I-1 Compatibility**

**ToR Section: G. Public Consultation, I. Subsistence and Traditional Land Use**

- G-1 *Consultation* "Provide a table of all consultation undertaken with the public, Aboriginal organizations, land owners, federal, territorial and municipal governments, and others."
- I-1 *Compatibility* "Provide a table depicting the schedule of subsistence and traditional use within the vicinity of the proposed undertaking, [...] discuss any subsistence or traditional land uses that will occur at the same time as the proposed undertaking. Discuss potential land use conflicts that may arise and any actions taken to address these concerns."

#### **Preamble**

The DAR presents a summary of consultation undertaken with respect to the SDC's preliminary exploration program in the Drybones Bay area (Table 5, p17). On page 3 of the DAR, SDC also invites the sharing of "...information from local sources regarding the nature and location of any specific archaeological, cultural, or historical sites that may be located on the land area covered by the Ticho project". On page 18 the DAR says: "It is Snowfield's intention to continue communicating with the YKDFN prior to the commencement of any exploration activities in the area".

Public concern over traditional areas has been noted repeatedly in the Public Registry. The Board recognizes that SDC has written to seek dialogue with the Aboriginal parties but more active attempts at consultation, such as key questions, personal interviews with land users or public forums, do not appear to have been undertaken. Evidence on public registry also contradicts the DAR claims that no areas of importance to traditional users (relative to SDC area) were identified by local community residents.

#### **Request**

Provide the following information:

- a A detailed consultation plan for the duration of operations to identify and respond to concerns about traditional use areas in the Drybones Bay and surrounds. The consultation plan should describe parties to be consulted, consultation methods, and the frequency of interaction anticipated.
- b A list of key questions that SDC will use to identify important traditional use areas before operations start.

**IR Number: 1.1.5**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: C. Development (Exploration Program) Design  
C-3 Operations**

**ToR Section: C. Development Description**

**C-3** *Development Description* "The rationale for the selection of the access route and camp location should be provided."

**Preamble**

The DAR does not provide detailed rationale for camp site selection, as outlined in section C-3 in the Terms of Reference: "The rationale for the selection of the access route and camp location should be provided". Use of this site may conflict with the needs of recreational and local area users.

**Request**

Provide the rationale for selecting Pebble Beach semi-permanent campsite as long term base of operations.

**IR Number: 1.1.6**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada**

**DAR Section: I. Subsistence and Traditional Land Use  
I-1 Compatibility**

**ToR Section: I. Subsistence and Traditional Land Use**

- I-1 *Compatibility* "Provide a table depicting the schedule of subsistence and traditional use within the vicinity of the proposed undertaking, [...] discuss any subsistence or traditional land uses that will occur at the same time as the proposed undertaking. Discuss potential land use conflicts that may arise and any actions taken to address these concerns."

**Preamble**

Inconsistencies in information and interpretation have been noted with respect to subsistence and traditional use activities in the proposed exploration areas. The developer has indicated on page 20 of the DAR that there is no apparent traditional or subsistence use by local people in the work areas proposed for exploration activities, which implies there are no land use conflicts. However, on page 18 of the DAR, the developer states: "As a result of that meeting, Snowfield became apprised of the cultural, spiritual and historical significance of the Drybones and Wool Bay areas to local First Nations members".

**Request**

Please provide any available record of traditional or subsistence land use in SDC's proposed exploration program area.

**IR Number: 1.1.7**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: All Aboriginal Parties**

**DAR Section: I. Subsistence and Traditional Land Use  
I-2 Timing**

**ToR Section: I. Subsistence and Traditional Land Use**

I-2 *Timing* “Provide a table depicting the schedule of subsistence and traditional land use within the vicinity of the proposed undertaking. Specifically, discuss any subsistence or traditional land uses that may arise and any actions taken to address these concerns.”

**Preamble**

The developer does not provide a table but does indicate, based on past experience, that conflicts or encounters with either boaters or snowmobilers are not expected. The Board is looking for verification of the developer’s evaluation of possible conflicts in the scheduling of activities.

**Request**

Provide the following information:

- a What types of land and water use activities may be in conflict with the proposed **work schedule**, found on page 7 of the DAR? Please explain.
- b What types of land and water activities may be in conflict with the proposed locations of **work areas**, described on page 7 of the DAR? Please explain.

**IR Number: 1.1.8**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: C-3 Development Description, J-2 Habitat Use**

**ToR Section:**

C-3 *Development Description* "A timeline should be used to show when these activities would be expected to occur. [...] The anticipated traffic volumes (i.e., for ground and air support) should be described. The aircraft type and altitude for flights should also be noted."

J-2 *Habitat Use* "Identify any important habitat for fish and wildlife species in the Drybones Bay area, and describe the timing and nature of habitat use by fish or wildlife."

#### **Preamble**

The DAR lists several species that are found in SDC's proposed program area. SDC's Amendments and Additions to the DAR provide a timeline that clearly shows when ice road use and overflights may be anticipated. The frequency of access to the site and between drill locations remains unclear.

Areas near the access routes may accommodate sensitive life history phases for some species (i.e. nesting areas for Peregrine Falcons, bald eagles and waterfowl, and moose calving areas). Several studies suggest change to habitat quality and sensitivity thresholds for wildlife relative to the frequency of access (via ice road, helicopter or fixed wing aircraft).

#### **Request**

Please provide answers to the following:

- a What frequency of access is anticipated by road and air by season?
- b Based on these frequencies of use, what is the zone of influence for access relative to the wildlife Valued Ecosystem Components chosen? How does this alter the estimate of the disturbance footprint of the operation?
- c What behavioural effects may be predicted for wildlife Valued Ecosystem Components?
- d What sensitivity thresholds for different life history phases relative to operations have been used to predict no wildlife impacts?
- e How has the operation been designed to avoid access related effects on wildlife?

- f What is the cumulative effect of access on the wildlife habitat given the apparently concurrent activities of New Shoshoni Ventures, Consolidated Goldwin Ventures, traditional land use and recreational use of the area by season?
- g What is the relative magnitude of cumulative effects, if any, by season?

**IR Number: 1.1.9**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: C Development Description  
K Cultural and Heritage Resources**

**ToR Section:**

C-3 *Development Description* "A timeline should be used to show when these activities would be expected to occur. [...] The anticipated traffic volumes (i.e., for ground and air support) should be described. The aircraft type and altitude for flights should also be noted."

K-2 *Direct and Indirect Impacts* "Describe potential direct and indirect impacts of this undertaking on [cultural or heritage] sites or areas identified."

**Preamble**

SDC's Amendments and Additions to the DAR note few cultural or heritage resources within their region. Other evidence suggests that information available is incomplete due to no previous heritage survey work throughout the proposed development.

Some heritage sites are noted proximal to access routes en route to SDC's proposed development. Heritage sites may be affected not only directly by the presence of physical infrastructure but also by proximity of access.

**Request**

Answer the following:

- a What information is known about the level of current use of the ice road to the proposed on land junction to access the SDC camp and work sites?
- b What, if anything, is known about the purpose of travel for those using the ice road?
- c What mitigations, if any does SDC propose to avoid potential cumulative effects of access to heritage sites?

**IR Number:** 1.1.10

**Source:** Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board

**To:** Snowfield Development Corporation

**DAR Section:** H Assessment Boundaries

**ToR Section:**

H-1 *Spatial*: “provide a rationale for setting the spatial boundaries for the impacts described”

H-2 *Temporal*: “provide a rationale for setting the temporal boundaries for the impacts described”

**Preamble**

The regional study area defined for the assessment of cumulative effects is based on SDC’s claim blocks. This analysis also refers to forest fires. It is unclear as to whether forest fires cycles are intended to serve as the basis for the temporal bounding of the cumulative effects assessment. Clarity about the rationale for the delineation of the regional study area is required.

**Request**

Respond to the following, to the extent possible:

- a What effects, if any, were used as a basis for delineating the spatial extent of the regional study area?
- b If forest fire frequency is the basis for establishing temporal boundaries for the regional study area, please describe the forest fire interval in the vicinity of SDC’s development.

**IR Number:** 1.1.11

**Source:** Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board

**To:** (1) Snowfield Development Corporation and  
(2) INAC, EC, GNWT-RWED and DFO  
(3) GNWT-RWED and DFO

**DAR Section:** L Cumulative Effects

**ToR Section:**

L *Cumulative Effects* “identify other human activities that can affect those same Valued Components; [...] describe the potential combined impact of the proposed undertaking in conjunction with previous, present and reasonably foreseeable human activities”

#### **Preamble**

SDC's contribution to a more complete recording of historical land uses throughout the Drybones/Wool Bay area is noted. The current and reasonably foreseeable land uses appears less complete. This lack of information may be reflective of the definition of the regional study area used for this analysis.

SDC has indicated in its DAR and subsequent submissions that some preparatory work was undertaken in the Drybones/Wool Bay area. Some of this work was done under permit in conjunction with Diamonds North. Other preliminary work included hand-cutting lines to get to proposed drill targets at a scale below permitting requirements. These activities, although not requiring a permit, may contribute to cumulative effects. Other projects currently in EA are proposed to occur within the vicinity of SDC's development and concurrent with this project should all proceed to licensing and permitting this winter.

Other traditional as well as recreational land uses have been identified by other parties. The extent of non-permit requiring activity in the Drybones/Wool Bay is unclear.

Similarly, the extent of other commercial land uses such as tourism and fishing is unclear.

#### **Request**

(1) SDC is requested to respond to the following, to the extent possible:

- a Has non-permitted exploration activity been incorporated into your analysis of cumulative effects?
- b How would the inclusion of other nearby and concurrent reasonably foreseeable development into your cumulative effects assessment change your conclusions if at all?

- c Are traditional and recreational activities reflected in your analysis to get an accurate representation of the current land use pressure?

(2) INAC, EC, GNWT-RWED and DFO may be familiar with the land and water use pressures in different regions due to their mandated responsibilities. These departments are to respond to the following, to the extent possible:

- a Please list all non-permit requiring activities in the area of Drybones Bay and along the shoreline of Great Slave Lake along the proposed main winter access road, including SDC's proposed project area.
- b Please list all known recreational use in the area of Drybones Bay and along the shoreline of Great Slave Lake along the proposed main winter access road, including SDC's proposed project area.
- c Please list all known traditional or subsistence use in the area of Drybones Bay and along the shoreline of Great Slave Lake along the proposed main winter access road, including SDC's proposed project area.
- d How, if at all, are these activities being tracked by your department?
- e What level of use is noted in the Drybones/Wool Bay area? Please use indicators (i.e., fish harvested per year or person days of use), if available.
- f What trends in use levels, if any, have been noted for the activities identified in questions non-permit requiring activities and recreational and traditional land uses?

(3) GNWT-RWED and DFO may be familiar with the commercial land and water use pressures due to their mandated responsibilities. These departments are to respond to the following, to the extent possible:

- a Please provide an inventory and forecast of commercial fishing and tourism in the area of Drybones Bay and along the shoreline of Great Slave Lake along the proposed main winter access road, including SDC's proposed project area.

**IR Number:** 1.1.12

**Source:** Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board

**To:** RWED, All Aboriginal Parties

**DAR Section:** G Public Consultation

**ToR Section:**

- G-1 *Consultation:* "Provide a table of all consultation undertaken with the public, Aboriginal organizations, land owners, federal, territorial and municipal governments, and others. [...] Any consultation since preliminary screening should be included."
- G-2 *Issues Resolution Table:* "Provide a summary table of all issues raised, resolution (including cross-reference to the portion of the development description where it is explicitly addressed) and outstanding issues."

#### **Preamble**

The DAR suggests that little traditional land use is expected to coincide with the project and if it does, the overlap will be of short duration. Based on this, the DAR concludes that there will be no effect on traditional land use. However, SDC's DAR also shows no consultation with Aboriginal peoples and little with government agencies since the referral to EA. Other evidence on the Public Registry indicates concerns about impacts to traditional land use. In order for the Review Board to determine the significance of any potential adverse impact to traditional land use, baseline information is needed. The Review Board is aware of some traditional land use information collected by RWED for trapping and other traditional land use. Some information may also be compiled by Aboriginal parties to this EA, including DKFN, NSMA, NWT Métis Nation, and YKDFN about gathering, hunting, trapping and/or fishing.

#### **Request**

- a GNWT-RWED is requested to supply any available statistics for trapping and harvest levels in the North Slave region for the past 5-10 years. In addition to statistics on the level of trapping and harvesting, information on the total income from trapping and the value of the harvest will be of interest. This would include value as food source.
- b YKDFN, NSMA, NWT Métis Nation, DKFN and LKFN are requested to respond to the following based on existing studies, to the extent possible:
  - o What, if any, traditional land use studies has your organization conducted that overlap with SDC's claim areas?
  - o What, if any, monitoring programs has your organization implemented that may overlap with SDC's claim areas?
  - o Based on the previous response,

- how much has been harvested of each species (i.e., # of caribou/year, # moose/year, etc.) by community in the vicinity of SDC's claim areas since monitoring began?
- have the harvesting levels of each species increased or decreased in the vicinity of SDC's claim areas?
- how well does the harvest study reflect actual harvest?
- Please specify the times of year used for gathering (i.e., medicinal plants or berries), hunting, trapping and/or fishing, if at all, in SDC's claim areas.

**IR Number: 1.1.13**

**Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation and**

**DAR Section: Socio-Economic Benefits**

**ToR Section: Not applicable**

The Scope of the EA previously did not include bulk sampling due to the expectation that the bulk sampling would be depend on favourable results and would be subject to a land use permit amendment. SDC has received favourable indications from previous exploration drilling in the Mud Lake claim and asked that bulk sampling be included in the Scope of EA. This request was granted by the Review Board with the provision that impact predictions be included in IRs. This IR is derived from the Review Board's understanding of the details of the scope of the development presented by SDC in their DAR and subsequent submission entitled *Amendments and Additions to DAR*.

**Preamble**

The Board notes that SDC has hired individuals from Dettah to help with operations from the summer of 2003. More information on the socio-economic benefits of the program is required by the Review Board.

**Request**

Respond to the following, to the extent possible:

- a What business has SDC provided or anticipate providing to companies and individuals in Yellowknife, Ndilo and Dettah and the region generally?
- b What would the process of bulk (kimberlite) samples in Yellowknife (as noted in correspondence dated October 17 , 2003) involve? What NWT resources would be required to support such an initiative?

**IR #: 1.1.14**

**Source: MVEIRB**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: Bulk Sampling (Added to Scope of EA as per Review Board Motion)**

**ToR Section: Not applicable**

The Scope of the EA previously did not include bulk sampling due to the expectation that the bulk sampling would be depend on favourable results and would be subject to a land use permit amendment. SDC has received favourable indications from previous exploration drilling in the Mud Lake claim and asked that bulk sampling be included in the Scope of EA. This request was granted by the Review Board with the provision that impact predictions be included in IRs. This IR is derived from the Review Board's understanding of the details of the bulk sampling, as proposed and presented by SDC in their document entitled *Amendments and Additions to DAR*.

**Preamble:**

The bulk sampling for the Mud Lake claim is estimated to consist of a 500 tonne sample to be acquired through the developer's preferred method of trenching. Overburden and top soil would be collected and replaced after taking the bulk sample so that the vegetation may naturally regenerate. SDC refers to an alternative means for collecting this sample by using a large-diameter borehole drill. These alternatives are not discussed in a systematic way that compares alternative methods and potential associated environmental impacts (i.e. erosion and sedimentation of nearby wetlands).

**Request:**

- a Provide a succinct evaluation of bulk sampling alternatives, namely trenching and large diameter borehole drilling, which compares and contrasts the potential environmental impacts of each.
  - o The discussion should address the following elements: equipment, fuels and/or other chemical additives, water requirements (if any) and staff requirements.
  - o Potential environmental impacts on hydrology and water quality, ambient noise levels, fish and wildlife and the vegetation recovery should be discussed with consideration of: (i) the physical footprint and (ii) the extended footprint that reflects, at minimum, noise transmission, wildlife avoidance and hydrological effects, if any. Estimates of time to return to pre-disturbance conditions should also be provided for the avoidance by wildlife, re-growth of vegetation, etc. Discussions should include an indication of the direction, magnitude, duration, frequency, probability, reversibility and significance (with clear descriptions of criteria used)
  - o Mitigation or control measures to minimize potential adverse environmental effects.

**IR #: 1.1.15**

**Source: MVEIRB**

**To: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada**

**DAR Section: Claim Staking**

**ToR Section: Not applicable**

**Preamble:**

Part of the public concern for the Drybones Bay/Wool Bay developments appears to be related to graves and burial sites. The graves and burial sites are not always well marked. One of the concerns identified on the public registry has been the staking of claims and preliminary work in areas known to contain graves or burial sites. The Canada Mining Regulation s.11(1)(b) notes that subject to any regulations made under the Territorial Lands Act, a licensee may enter, prospect for minerals and locate claims on lands other than lands "used as a cemetery or burial ground".

It is unclear to the Review Board which aspect(s) of the prospecting process would allow one staking a claim to avoid burial grounds in traditional territories of Aboriginal peoples in the Northwest Territories not yet ratified through a Treaty or Land Claim. More clarity around the responsibilities of different parties relative to the staking, exploration and development of claims is needed.

**Request:**

Respond to the following questions:

- a What measures does the Mining Recorder at DIAND take to determine whether a claim contains grave sites or burial grounds?
- b What actions are prescribed to a licensee to avoid potential staking of burial grounds?
- c Given that traditional burial grounds may not be marked in an obvious way, how are Aboriginal people in known traditional land use areas consulted to ensure that burial sites are avoided by staking? Please explain in detail the roles and responsibilities of DIAND and the licensee in this process.

**IR #: 1.1.16**

**Source: MVEIRB**

**To: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada**

**DAR Section: Impact of Development on Negotiation of Land Claims/Treaties**

**ToR Section: Not applicable**

**Preamble:**

A change in land use may cause socioeconomic effects if the value of traditional lands during Treaty or Land Claim negotiations is changed. In order for the Board to determine the significance of the socioeconomic effect, there is a need to understand how the value and validity of claims to traditional lands are interpreted when part of these lands are used in a development, as defined under the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act*, while they are the subject of ongoing negotiations. The Review Board needs more information to better understand this concern.

**Request:**

In areas where Treaty or Land Claims negotiations are ongoing, is the perceived traditional value of land changed when some portion of traditional lands is subject to exploration and development? Please explain in detail the nature of this change, if any.

**IR #: 1.1.17**

**Source: MVEIRB**

**To: Snowfield Development Corporation**

**DAR Section: Access Roads, Camps and Drill Sites**

**ToR Section:**

*C-2 Access Road, Camps and Drill Sites:* "Provide a locational map of the proposed development that includes place names (i.e., nearest communities, islands, lakes, bays, etc.) to assist with orientation. An operational map should include access route, drill locations, camp, storage, and sump. The operational map should include a north arrow, longitude, latitude, scale (at 1:50 000), claim delineations and a legend. Given that precise drilling locations may not be known, clearly depict a local project area reflective of the likely drilling location(s)."

**Preamble:**

Although the DAR textually describes proposed access routes, campsites and existing travel corridors in the claim areas, it is difficult to get an overall sense of the current spatial outlook of the areas in question.

**Request:**

Provide recent air photos or satellite imagery of the five Snowfield Development Corporation claim areas.

**IR #: 1.1.18**

**Source: MVEIRB**

**To:** (1) Coast Guard  
(2) City of Yellowknife  
(3) NWT Bureau of Statistics

**DAR Section: L Cumulative Effects**

**ToR Section:**

*L Cumulative Effects:* "identify other human activities that can affect those same Values Components...describe the potential combined impact of proposed undertaking in conjunction with previous, present and reasonably foreseeable human activities..."

**Preamble:**

The Review Board would find information relating to the potential and existing current use of the Drybones Bay. Information already on the public registry suggests increasing land use pressures. More information is needed about commercial and private boats/vessels, snowmobiles and population trends given the proximity of Drybones/Wool Bay area to the City of Yellowknife.

**Request:**

- (1) The Coast Guard is requested to provide the number of registered commercial and private vessels in Yellowknife for 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000.
- (2) The City of Yellowknife is requested to provide the number of snowmobiles in Yellowknife for 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000.
- (3) The NWT Bureau of Statistics is requested to provide information on population trends for Yellowknife, Detah, Ndilo, Fort Resolution and Lutsel K'e between 1970 and 2000.