



Northwest  
Territories Environment and Natural Resources

NOV 02 2005

Mr. Alan Ehrlich  
Senior Environmental Assessment Officer  
Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board  
PO BOX 938, 5102 - 50TH AVE  
YELLOWKNIFE NT X1A 2N7

Dear Mr. Ehrlich:

**Round One Information Request - EA0506-005 Consolidated Goldwin Ventures**

Enclosed is the Government of the Northwest Territories response to Information Requests 1.9 issued by the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board.

Should you have further questions or requests please contact Mr. Paul Cobban, Environmental Assessment Analyst, Policy, Legislation and Communications at (867) 920-6106 or paul\_cobban@gov.nt.ca.

Sincerely,

R.P. Bailey  
Deputy Minister

Enclosure



**IR Number:** 1.9

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

**To:** Government of the Northwest Territories

**Subject:** Archaeological Sites

**Preamble:**

Some of the past potential cultural impacts of exploration drilling in the general area of this project have been related to disturbance of heritage resources. During the Board's Nov. 26, 2003 hearings on Consolidated Goldwin Venture's proposed development in this area, PWNHC identified a likelihood that a large proportion of archaeological sites in the vicinity were probably not yet identified. Possible mitigation for impacts of the present development may depend on the presence or absence of archaeological sites.

**Request:**

For each of the following areas, please describe 1) the density of known archaeological sites, 2) how thoroughly each area has been archaeologically surveyed, and 3) whether or not it is, in your expert opinion, likely that there are unidentified archaeological sites in the area.

Where you indicate that there is a likelihood of unidentified archaeological sites in an area, please describe, using your subjective informed expert opinion, what proportion of sites have likely been identified to date.

- a. The shoreline between Moose Bay and Drybones Bay
- b. The northern end of Moose Bay
- c. Moose Lake and the inland area immediately north of Moose Lake (shown as the Moose Claim on CGV maps)
- d. JJ Claim area
- e. Cleft Claim area
- f. The northeast arm of Zigzag Lake

*Note: To assist in your response, please see attached maps by the Review Board. Additional maps by the developer are available on the Review Board's web site, at:*

[http://www.mveirb.nt.ca/files/Registry/EA0506\\_005/EA\\_Start\\_Up/CGV%2005%20maps.pdf](http://www.mveirb.nt.ca/files/Registry/EA0506_005/EA_Start_Up/CGV%2005%20maps.pdf)

**Response:**

Recent archaeological investigations between Wool Bay and Matonabee Point on the north shore of Great Slave Lake indicate that the potential for finding archaeological sites along the shoreline of this area is very high. In areas that have been surveyed intensively, such as Drybones Bay, high densities of archaeological sites – evidence of intensive use of this landscape over several thousand years – have been documented. Far less archaeological work has been conducted inland from the shore of Great Slave Lake. Yet, based on the record of traditional land use known through oral histories of the Yellowknife Dene First Nation, it is evident that inland areas also have a long history of human activity, and thus, we expect, many archaeological sites, though in densities less than that found along the more frequently utilized shoreline.

**a. The shoreline between Moose Bay and Drybones Bay**

1. There are no recorded archaeological sites on this segment of shoreline.
2. This area has not been surveyed for archaeological sites to the best of the GNWT's knowledge.
3. There is high potential for the presence of unidentified sites in the area.
4. No sites have been documented to date.

**b. The northern end of Moose Bay**

1. There are three recorded archaeological sites in Moose Bay.
2. The archaeologist who recorded these sites made only a brief reconnaissance of Moose Bay. He recommended that the shore of Moose Bay and its islands be more thoroughly surveyed for evidence of previous occupation.
3. There is high potential for the presence of unidentified archaeological sites in the area.
4. The GNWT's knowledge of the archaeological record of the region is insufficient to make a quantitative assessment of the density of archaeological sites in Moose Bay. It is suspected that only a small proportion of the sites at the northern end of Moose Bay have been documented to date.

**c. Moose Lake and the inland area immediately north of Moose Lake (shown as the Moose Claim on CGV maps)**

1. There are no recorded archaeological sites in the vicinity of Moose Lake or in the inland area to the north. Maps provided by the proponent indicate that the Moose Claim encompasses the north end of Jackfish Cove. There are three recorded archaeological sites in this area.

2. No archaeological survey work has been conducted in the vicinity of Moose Lake and associated inland areas. A detailed survey of Jackfish Cove has not been conducted.
3. There is high potential for the presence of unidentified archaeological sites in the Moose Claim area.
4. The three sites documented at the north end of Jackfish Cove represent an unknown proportion of the archaeological sites in the Moose Claim area.

**d. JJ Claim Area**

1. There are no recorded archaeological sites in the JJ Claim Area.
2. This area has not been surveyed for archaeological sites to the best of the GNWT's knowledge.
3. There is moderate potential for the presence of unidentified sites in the area.
4. No sites have been documented to date.

**e. Cleft Claim Area**

1. There are no recorded archaeological sites in the Cleft Claim Area.
2. This area has not been surveyed for archaeological sites to the best of the GNWT's knowledge.
3. There is moderate potential for the presence of unidentified sites in the area.
4. No sites have been documented to date.

**f. The northeast arm of Zigzag Lake**

1. There are no recorded archaeological sites in this area.
2. This area has not been surveyed for archaeological sites to the best of the GNWT's knowledge.
3. There is moderate potential for the presence of unidentified sites in the area.
4. No sites have been documented to date.