

Part 2 - Other Issues

The Review Board identified a number of areas where additional information would be helpful in assessing the likelihood of significant impacts on the environment. The Developer should provide any additional information that is available on the items listed below. The remainder of this section provides the relevant sections of the terms of reference and the Review Board's questions in relation to those sections.

IR Number: 1-2-8

Source: Mackenzie Valley Review Board
To: Tyhee
Issue: Removing Vegetation

Terms of Reference – Section --3.3.54 Vegetation

- 1. The impacts of removing vegetation, for any project purpose, on the various species that depend on vegetation for food, shelter or other reason.*

Request

- 1. The DAR concordance table indicates that this information is included in section 6.5.1, but the information does not appear in that section.*

Tyhee NWT Corp Response

1) The table provided below is a modified presentation of the data in Table 6.5-2, Section 6.5.1 of the DAR. The table shows the Ecosystem Types that have the potential to provide species' life requisites (wildlife habitat), and the potential area (ha) of each Ecosystem Type to be affected by the Project. The combined total area of all potential habitat types that could occur in the YGP footprint is 780.8 ha, which represents 5.4% of their total areal extent in the YGP Regional Study Area (RSA).

As stated in Section 6.6 of the DAR, the habitat to be disturbed is not unique to the regional area and not critical to the life cycle of any wildlife species identified in the YGP study area.

Section 6.6 of the DAR discusses potential effects to the species selected as valuable ecosystem components (VECs) and includes discussions on potential effects to individual species' habitats.

		YGP Footprint						
General Ecosystem Type	Ecosystem Type	Nicholas (ha)	Ormsby (ha)	Haul Road (ha)	Perimeter Buffer (ha)	Total YGP Footprint (ha)	Total YGP Area (ha)	Footprint Proportion of YGP Area (%)
Graminoid	Graminoid		0.2		2.9	3.1	88.5	3.5

		YGP Footprint						
General Ecosystem Type	Ecosystem Type	Nicholas (ha)	Ormsby (ha)	Haul Road (ha)	Perimeter Buffer (ha)	Total YGP Footprint (ha)	Total YGP Area (ha)	Footprint Proportion of YGP Area (%)
Wetland	water sedge – horsetail shallow shore marsh							
	Graminoid sheathed cottongrass – bog rosemary sedge fen		0.2	0.2	1.4	1.7	31.7	5.5
	Graminoid round fruited sedge – Chamisso's cottongrass fen						16.5	0.0
	Graminoid water sedge – narrow leaved cottongrass fen		3.6		0.1	3.7	3.9	93.2
Open Water Wetland	Floating aquatic shallow open water						40.8	0.0
Riparian	Riparian wetland, forest spruce – willow forest	1.4	0.1	1.1	17.8	20.5	257.0	8.0
Shrub Wetland	Non-treed willow – sedge low shrub fen			0.7	8.6	9.3	234.3	4.0
	Non-treed scrub birch cloudberry low shrub bog				0.1	0.1	89.2	0.1
Treed Wetland	Treed spruce – cloudberry treed bog	0.3	18.4	2.3	56.1	77.2	1,515.4	5.1
	Treed tamarack – blueberry treed fen		34.5	0.3	7.6	42.4	461.8	9.2

		YGP Footprint						
General Ecosystem Type	Ecosystem Type	Nicholas (ha)	Ormsby (ha)	Haul Road (ha)	Perimeter Buffer (ha)	Total YGP Footprint (ha)	Total YGP Area (ha)	Footprint Proportion of YGP Area (%)
Upland Forest/Woodland	Upland spruce – lichen woodland	1.9	75.9	12.4	213.1	303.3	5,250.6	5.8
	Upland jack pine – lichen woodland	0.3	68.4	4.9	116.8	190.4	2,810.9	6.8
	Upland spruce – moss forest		18.9	0.2	27.5	46.7	479.2	9.7
Water	Waterbody >50 ha	0.0	69.1		8.3	77.4	2,764.2	2.8
	Waterbody <50 ha		0.7		4.2	4.9	294.5	1.7
	Open water <2 m depth				0.1	0.1	30.8	0.4
Total		3.9	290.0	22.1	464.6	780.8	14,369.3	5.4

NOTE: Table is a subset of the original DAR Table 6.5-2 in Section 6.5.1.