

### Review Comment Table

<b>Board:</b>	GLWB
<b>Review Item:</b>	G15L8-001 and G15L8-002 - Licence Amendment Application
<b>File(s):</b>	<a href="#">G15L8-001</a> <a href="#">G15L8-002</a>
<b>Proponent:</b>	GNWT - DOT
<b>Document(s):</b>	<a href="#">WL Ammendment Application - Mackenzie and Peel Ferry Landings</a> (1 MB)
<b>Item For Review Distributed On:</b>	
<b>Reviewer Comments Due By:</b>	Apr 14, 2016
<b>Proponent Responses Due By:</b>	May 5, 2016
<b>Item Description:</b>	The GNWT Department of Transportation has submitted an application to amend Water Licences G15L8-001 and G15L8-002. These Type "B" Licences allow for watercourse training and the deposit of waste associated with the construction and maintenance of the landings at the Peel River and Mackenzie River ferry crossings. Each Licence was issued on November 30, 2015 and expires on November 30, 2020. The DOT requests changes to Part B, Sections 5,6,7 and 8 - These General Conditions pertain to requirements for reporting and community meetings.
<b>General Reviewer Information:</b>	The Board encourages reviewers to submit questions and/or recommendations to our office through the Online Review System, no later than Tuesday April 12, 2016. If you require assistance with this process, please contact AlecSandra Macdonald at the Gwich'in Land and Water Board.
<b>Contact Information:</b>	AlecSandra Macdonald 867-777-6622

### Comment Summary

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response
1	DFO Comments	<p><b>Comment</b> The Fisheries Protection Program of Fisheries and Oceans Canada reviewed the ammendment appliciation and has no comments.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b></p> <p>DOT notes that the Federal Regulator responsible for managing the fisheries has reviewed the application and has not provided a comment.</p>
2	General File	<p><b>Comment</b> (<a href="#">doc</a>) ENR Letter with Comments and Recommendations</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	
1	Topic 1: Sediment and Erosion Control	<p><b>Comment</b> DOT has requested that the requirement for the submission of a report pertaining to sedimentation and sediment control methods be removed from the Water Licence. The rationale for this request includes the comment that clean material is used at the ferry landings, the Mackenzie River and Peele River both have high sediment loads, and that any material that DOT used on the landing is insignificant compared with the amount of naturally occurring sediment already present in the rivers. DOT also reference previous monitoring activities associated with the crossing. While DOT makes reference to inspection reports in various places, it is not clear how water quality monitoring for turbidity and or total suspended solids (TSS) occurs upstream and downstream of the ferry landings. ENR notes that is it best management practice to incorporate erosion and sedimentation control methods for any construction or maintenance activities conducted in or next to water. ENR understands that natural suspended solid concentrations within the Mackenzie and Peel Rivers are elevated. It is</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> DOT has employed erosion and sediment controls using the BATEA (Best Available Technology Economically Achievable) method to identify what can be done at the site. DOT understands that aquatic organisms can be sensitive to additional sediment to their habitat, which is why we employ erosion and sedimentation control techniques that are effective for the ferry landings based on decades of experience. The material used on our landings is local and other natural inclusions to the river ecosystem are occurring on a much grander and more regular basis through processes such as permafrost thaw, landslides, erosion and meandering, flooding, and the raising and lowering of the water table amongst a multitude of others. DOT staff have noted much floatsam in and around the rivers including greater than 100 foot trees, logs, and brush, and the collapsing of a river bank as a result of natural processes which cannot be ignored during the review of this licence and the consideration of sediment deposition. The river environment is dynamic and always changing; this applies to all aspects of the environment including sedimentation, fishing eddies, and landing locations. DOT has stated that as part of upcoming changes to our monitoring program we plan to re-focus our resources and look at Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and Turbidity monitoring and how this information can be used to further expand the narrative of the ferry landings within the river environment</p>

		<p>because of this that the addition of sediment could be detrimental to aquatic organism in the local area. ENR commends DOT on the monitoring and community sessions it has held over the years, as well as, the commitment to continue appropriately scaled monitoring at these sites. ENR notes that if DOT has evidence (i.e. monitoring data) that suggests that suspended solid concentrations downstream of the crossing are similar to upstream concentrations, during and following DOT activities (e.g. maintenance), they should provide this information to the GLWB for its consideration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> 1) ENR recommends that best management practices for erosion and sedimentation control be utilized for the project, to the extent possible. If the proposed monitoring at some point indicates impacts to water, appropriate mitigations should be implemented. It is for this reason that ENR is of the opinion that the condition related to planned sediment control options be kept in the Water Licence.</p>	<p>and what mitigations, if any, will be required going forward. Sediment and its relation to both water quality and habitat impacts is identified as a stakeholder priority concern and DOT is in favour of using adaptive management to re-focus resources to more effectively and meaningfully target this priority concern.</p>
<b>ID</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reviewer Comment/Recommendation</b>	<b>Proponent Response</b>
9	General File	<b>Comment</b> ( <a href="#">doc</a> ) GRRB Response Letter <b>Recommendation</b>	
1	LAMP Report “ Part B Section 6	<b>Comment</b> Staff note that the LAMP program was established in 2011 according to the Terms and Conditions of the water licences issued in 2010 (G99L8-002 Part B. 3.c ). The LAMP 2011 Summary (Section 1) defines the Purpose and Scope (Section 1.1) of the program which includes communicating an annual assessment of: i)river morphology, in addition to; ii) fish harvesting, and; iii) physical extent of ferry landings into the Mackenzie and Peel Rivers) at the beginning and end of the ferry seasons. Therefore; staff do not see how analysis of bathymetric maps and a discussion of changes in river morphology and	<b>May 5:</b> The original LAMP document indicates that there are three components to the LAMP that are "designed to capture indicators of impact through the collection of fish harvesting data, bathymetric morphology measurement and placement of ferry landings." While morphology is described within the document, the information collected within the LAMP does not lend itself to a discussion of river morphology. River Morphology can be defined as the change to the shape and direction of river channels over time using fluvial processes such as erosion, transportation and sedimentation. Bathymetry can be said to be the study of underwater depth of lake or ocean floors. DOT has been able to capture the depth of the water at two points during the year, which can be used to show high water and low water events, a "snapshot" of

		<p>comparison to changes in upstream control sites as per Terms and Conditions of the 2015 licence renewal falls outside the scope of the original LAMP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>	<p>conditions at that time. The information gathered cannot be used to describe the fluvial processes as noted above, DOT would only be able to discuss river morphology in general terms, but not as they apply to the Peel or Mackenzie River. If this is the information being sought by the GRRB, DOT suggests they apply to Cumulative Impacts Monitoring Program (CIMP) to receive funding for a more in depth study. DOT notes that the GRRB was established to "play a leadership role in ensuring the fish, forests and wildlife of the Gwich'in Settlement Area remain healthy and sustainable." according to their website. This could include applying to CIMP to lead a study into the information they seek. Likewise, DOT's mandate is for the safe and reliable transportation of people and goods across the NWT.</p>
2	LAMP Report " Part B Section 6	<p><b>Comment</b> The current LAMP harvest monitoring program provides limited information on current environmental conditions at the landings and no information on sites upstream or downstream of the landings. This information can form the basis for comparison of changes in environmental conditions over time and is necessary for assessing potential effects of the ferry landing operations on the health of fish and fish habitat compared to other cumulative effects within the context of a changing climate.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> As indicated in the original approved LAMP, the best area of study was identified to be "immediately downstream of the Ferry Landings." The current LAMP was not intended to provide the information the GRRB references. The Fishing Harvest Survey relies on community driven information sharing and reporting regarding fish health around the ferry landings, and in this endeavour it has been successful. DOT suggests that the GRRB apply to CIMP for funding to study the information they are seeking. As sediment has been identified as a stakeholder priority concern, DOT will be looking at including TSS and Turbidity monitoring in next year's LAMP in order to focus our limited resources at that priority.</p>
3	LAMP Report " Part B Section 7	<p><b>Comment</b> None</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> We again recommend that the Licencee implement the recommendations of the Aquatic Effects Study of 2001-2002 commissioned by the Dept of Transport including; using the approach of the Aquatic Effects Study as a model for an ongoing environmental monitoring program that will effectively incorporate scientific knowledge and Traditional Knowledge (Aquatic Effects Study 2002-2003, Chap 7- conclusions and recommendations).</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> The current LAMP was approved by Community members, Board members, and other stakeholders within the region. The LAMP included recommendations made in the 2001-2002 study commissioned by DOT and referenced by the GRRB. Including this report DOT has produced a number of reports over the course of 16 years, using Scientific and Traditional Knowledge, showing that the landings are not having an effect on the local fishery.</p>

4	LAMP Report â€“ Part B Section 7	<p><b>Comment</b> None</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Staff support comments and recommendations made by the Gwich'ân in Social and Cultural Institute (GSCI), and the Gwich'ân and Tetlit Renewable Resources Councils that there be continuing monitoring of water quality, water flow, fish health and sustainability of the fishery as part of the Terms and Conditions of this and future water licenses.</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> The preliminary review of the bathymetry data shows no discernable changes which serves either to confirm the ferry landing activities have no effect, or possibly to indicate that this methodology is not able to provide us with what possible sediment impacts are happening. DOT will be looking to move away from the bathymetry data collection which shows no impacts and focus on TSS and Turbidity monitoring in next year's LAMP as sediment has been identified as a stakeholder priority. By focusing on the sediment question specifically, we are hoping to determine if the rivers are reacting to activities at the ferry landings. DOT will continue to work with the communities through the gathering of important traditional knowledge via the fishing surveys. DOT encourages communities to work with the Fisheries and Oceans Canada regarding fisheries management concerns.</p>
5	LAMP Report â€“ Part B Section 7	<p><b>Comment</b> None</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> We recommend that the GSCI be consulted about the development of an appropriate Traditional Knowledge survey.</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> Regulatory processes ensure that the GSCI is included in the review of the LAMP, which has been repeatedly approved by the GLWB . The requirement in the LAMP for twice annual interviews of local fisherpersons, who are also traditional users of the fisheries in the area of the ferry landings provides regular opportunities for concerns to be voiced and documented. DOT would further note that the interviewers are not DOT staff, but persons contracted through the community RRC office.</p>
6	Sediment Control - Part B Section 8	<p><b>Comment</b> None</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> We recommend that alternative sediment control measures be explored and their use implemented. If the current methods used are adequate, then the methods used and their efficacy must be explained to communities at the in-person meeting. If it is not possible or feasible to adopt sediment control measures, then this must also be explained.</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> Alternative sediment control measures have been explored by DOT in the past and an explanation has been given, as recently as the review process for this water licence renewal. DOT will continue to be a part of the annual meeting with the RRCs and the production of a newsletter, as indicated in the Licence.</p>
7	Communication	<p><b>Comment</b> We support the Licencee's commitment to continuing to improve community participation in, and communication about, ferry landing operations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> We encourage the Licencee to meaningfully consult with the communities before the beginning of the ferry operations season to explain operations procedures in order to address any concerns</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> DOT will continue to be a part of the annual meeting with the RRCs and the production of a newsletter, as indicated in the Licence.</p>

		that may arise in advance, and again after the operations season, to review the season activities. Efforts should also be made to communicate mid-season changes in the use of ferry landings or location of landings to be used in advance of the change.	
8	Communication	<p><b>Comment</b> In person meetings and, to a lesser extent, the use of newsletters, will permit the Licencee to respond to community concerns; adapt to changes in technology and apply best management practices in ferry landing operations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> a. In particular, we recommend that DOT continue to engage affected communities directly in face to face meetings in order to address community and stakeholder concerns, and; b. continue to provide annual reports to the Board as directed in Part B “General Conditions”</p>	<b>May 5:</b> DOT will continue to be a part of the annual meeting with the RRCs and the production of a newsletter, as indicated in the Licence.
<b>ID</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reviewer Comment/Recommendation</b>	<b>Proponent Response</b>
2	General File	<p><b>Comment</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> GSCI Response Letter</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> GENERALFILE</p>	
1	Re: Amendment-G15L8 001and 002 Water Licenses	<p><b>Comment</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> We have reviewed the above application against our heritage databases. For the amendment to Section 7 (Re: the LAMP timelines), the GSCI has no concerns with the extended deadline as long as the previous data collection activities will continue while planning for the new LAMP. Additionally, the GSCI would like to review the new LAMP research outline to ensure basic standards of anthropological data collection are used.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> As with any application, if archaeological or heritage materials are encountered during development within the Gwich'in Settlement Area, all work must cease immediately as required by law, and the GSCI and the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre in Yellowknife must then be contacted.</p>	<b>May 5:</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> Agreed

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response
13	General File	<b>Comment</b> ( <a href="#">doc</a> ) GGRC Response letter <b>Recommendation</b>	
1	Studies	<b>Comment</b> We support the response letter from Janet Boxwell, Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board, dated April 13, 2016. They have the technical expertise to understand the various types of studies for the analysis of bathymetric maps and the changes to river morphology and other types of studies that should be conducted throughout the life of the ferry operations every 10 years. <b>Recommendation</b> None	<b>May 5:</b> DOT suggests that the GRRB and the GRRRC explore funding opportunities from the Cumulative Impacts Monitoring Program (CIMP) to develop a community based monitoring program which would gather information pertaining to River Morphology and other elements of interest/concern upstream and downstream of the ferry landings.
2	Lamp Report (Part B, 6 & 7)	<b>Comment</b> The GRRRC agree that increased communication is very important to the community of Tsiigehtchic. We are interested in face to face meetings before the ferry is launched in the spring to give us an overview of ferry operations for the season. <b>Recommendation</b> We can accept a newsletter in place of the meeting if a detailed newsletter provides information on the schedule, and other relevant information of interest to local residents who fish from early June to Late October or early November. In addition we request a face to face meeting at the end of the ferry season.	<b>May 5:</b> DOT will continue to be a part of the annual meeting with the RRCs and the production of a newsletter, as indicated in the Licence.
3	Lamp Report (Part B, 6 & 7)	<b>Comment</b> None <b>Recommendation</b> The GRRRC requests that the LAMP program include traditional knowledge studies jointly carried out with the Gwich'In Social and Cultural Institute who have the professional expertise to formulate the surveys to achieve expanded results as we are aware of instances where people have to move their nets away from the route of the ferry to avoid having their nets run over.	<b>May 5:</b> Regulatory processes will ensure that the GRRRC is included in the review of the LAMP . The requirement in the LAMP for twice annual interviews of local fisherpersons, who are also traditional users of the fisheries in the area of the ferry landings provides regular opportunities for concerns to be voiced and documented. DOT would further note that the interviewers are not DOT staff, but persons contracted through the community RRC office.

4	Lamp Report (Part B, 6 & 7)	<p><b>Comment</b> The sediment issues are not only at the ferry landings, there is a very detrimental effect of sediment accumulation downstream of the landings which interferes with the fishing eddies at all four landings, two at the Inuvik landing, one at the McPherson landing and one at the Tsiigehtchic landing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> DOT has produced information pertaining to concerns that have been expressed about the ferry landings. This information has been submitted to the GLWB on a number of occasions related to the Ferry Landing Licences, including most recently for the Ferry Landing Water Licence Renewal and subsequent amendments. The information DOT has collected and reported on can be retrieved from the GLWB registry or from their offices. Going forward, DOT will be focusing on TSS and Turbidity monitoring as a part of the uodated and refined LAMP to focus on sediment, a stakeholder priority concern. This information will be submitted along with the annual report as per licence requirements.</p>
5	Section 6, A	<p><b>Comment</b> a) The GRRRC understands that the Dept, of Transportation made a commitment in the original 2010 Application for Renewal of their Water Licence to provide information on their bathymetry maps produced for the LAMP report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> We request all the relevant information that will help the community to better understand all the impacts on each landing. If the present LAMP program does not accommodate the inclusion of this information, the GRRRC requests it be included as we are looking for a fully detailed report which includes all aspects of the studies conducted.</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> DOT has produced information pertaining to concerns around the ferry landings. This information has been submitted to the GLWB on a number of occasions related to the Ferry Landing Licences, including most recently for the Ferry Landing Water Licence Renewal and subsequent amendments. The information DOT has collected and reported on can be retrieved from the GLWB registry or from their offices. After five years of gathering information DOT has determined that certain aspects of the LAMP produced better data than others. DOT has determined the Bathymetric monitoring does not bring the type of useful information to the discussion as had been previously thought since the measurement of river depths really only suggests whether it is a "high water" or "low water" event at the moment of measurement. DOT will therefore be looking at replacing bathymetric monitoring with alternative measures such as TSS and Turbidity to determine whether ferry landing operations are having an effect on the natural sedimentation processes taking place on these dynamic river environments. This adaptive management, in response to stakeholder concerns and the LAMP preliminary findings, will focus resources on the stakeholder priority concern of sediment changes as a result of ferry landing activities. Going forward, DOT will be focusing on TSS and Turbidity monitoring as a part of the uodated and refined LAMP to focus on sediment, a stakeholder priority concern. This information will be submitted along with the annual report as per licence requirements.</p>
6	Section 6, C	<p><b>Comment</b> The GRRRC agrees to December 2016 to acquire aerial imagery of the landings.</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> DOT is unable to produce 3D models since the data that was captured under the LAMP was only related to river depths and not</p>

		<b>Recommendation</b> We request that DOT expand their LAMP program to include 3D models as per the 2010 LAMP proposal.	substrate levels which would also be required in order to have the 3D images being sought. DOT recommends the GGRRC in conjunction with the GRRB consider funding through CIMP to produce a monitoring program that will gather the information being sought.
7	Section 7	<b>Comment</b> None <b>Recommendation</b> The GGRRC agrees with the offer to expand the scope of the LAMP program, we suggest that bathymetry stay in the scope in addition to evaluating the sediment movement as well as measuring and monitoring of total suspended solids or turbidity.	<b>May 5:</b> After five years of gathering information DOT has determined that certain aspects of the LAMP produced better data than others. DOT has determined the Bathymetric monitoring does not bring the type of useful information to the discussion as had been previously thought since the measurement of river depths really only suggests whether it is a "high water" or "low water" event at the moment of measurement. DOT will therefore be looking at replacing bathymetric monitoring with alternative measures such as TSS and Turbidity to determine whether ferry landing operations are having an effect on the natural sedimentation processes taking place on these dynamic river environments. This adaptive management, in response to stakeholder concerns and the LAMP preliminary findings, will focus resources on the stakeholder priority concern of sediment changes as a result of ferry landing activities.
8	Section 7	<b>Comment</b> None <b>Recommendation</b> We agree to extend the one year extension to March 31, 2017 as long as the LAMP activities are expanded to include a wider scope as per the 2010 LAMP proposal.	<b>May 5:</b> As discussed previously, DOT will be looking at including an expanded monitoring program that is different than the original LAMP.
9	Section 8	<b>Comment</b> None <b>Recommendation</b> a) The GGRRC agrees with the Gwich'än in Land and Water Board request to DOT to produce a report on sedimentation and sediment control methods on the river and at the ferry landings. The March 31, 2016 deadline has passed and the report should be provided at a later date.	<b>May 5:</b> DOT suggests that the GRRB and the GGRRC should look into receiving funding from the Cumulative Impacts Monitoring Program (CIMP) to develop a community based monitoring program which would gather information pertaining to River Morphology and other elements of interest/concern upstream and downstream of the ferry landings.
10	Section 8	<b>Comment</b> b) We are interested to know who conducts the sediment control inspection. <b>Recommendation</b> None	<b>May 5:</b> The ferry landings are inspected by the GNWT - Department of Lands.
11	Section 8	<b>Comment</b> The GGRRC disagrees with DOT's position that the accumulation of sediment is a natural	<b>May 5:</b> The river environment is dynamic and always-changing. DOT has produced reports over the last 16 years discussing the perceived impacts

		<p>occurrence. In Tsiigethchic, the people contribute the large sandbars cutting off the fishing eddies and inability of the local people to access their traditional fishing spot to set up a camp for the summer season below the Fort McPherson landing to sediment flowing and being settled downstream of each landing. The people used to rush to set their nets under the ice in the fall all the way into the bay past that landing. They are unable to conduct this traditional practice to this day in that area. At the Inuvik landing, there is so much sediment accumulating in the water downstream past the point, as a result, those travelling by boat and motor have to travel in the middle of the river or on the opposite side of the river to avoid the sandbars that are not visible</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>	<p>and can find no evidence that the ferry landings are the cause of the changes mentioned by the reviewer. DOT staff, along with scientific community, have noted melting permafrost, river walls eroding into the water, trees, scouring, high water events, low water events and a host of other conditions which should absolutely be considered as the main contributors to changing river conditions. This is the reason that DOT seeks to refocus efforts on measurements that will provide clarity on this matter. Rivers are dynamic and ever changing. Rivers move water, sediment, bedload as well as flora and fauna. It is well recognized that the Mackenzie and Peel Rivers naturally has many shifting sand bars. Studies have indicated that the Peel River contributes approximately 25% of the 126 million tonnes per year of sediment that flow into the Mackenzie Delta. An Environment and Climate Change Canada website identifies the Mackenzie River as moving 100 million tonnes of sediment every year, the most of any Canadian river. "With snowmelt and the break-up of ice in spring and summer, the Mackenzie River becomes laden with suspended sediments and dissolved solids. Year-round the river carries a greater load of such materials than any other circumpolar river. Most of these solids originate in the mountain ranges that drain into the Mackenzie from the west including the Mackenzie Mountains, and the Pelly and Rocky Mountains in the Liard sub-basin. By contrast, the waters that flow into the Mackenzie from the Great Bear River to the east are clear." (www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca). A Wikipedia article on fisheries and climate change recognize how ecosystems alter and therefore modify fish distribution. NTCL barge captains have noted that the rivers change constantly in regards to sand bars forming, moving and disappearing.</p>
12	Gwich'ın™ Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement	<p><b>Comment</b> On page 6, there is a statement that DOT recognizes and respects the Gwich'ın Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement, however DOT does not see any rationale to discuss Chapter 19.1.12 of the land claim agreement with the Gwich'ın Tribal Council at this time. The GRRRC draws attention to Chapter 19.1.8 of the GCLCA 1992, which says: a) The Gwich'ın have the right to have waters which are on or flow through or are adjacent to Gwich'ın lands remain substantially unaltered as to quality, quantity and rate</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> DOT notes once more that a river system the size of that moving through the subject area is dynamic and always-changing. DOT maintains that its operations are not responsible for any changes in flow or quantity of water. DOT continues to show through various reporting avenues over the course of the last 16 years that ferry landing operations are not responsible for changes in the river like the ones described by the resident when meeting with the GRRRC. While concerns with water quality, specifically, have not been communicated to the DOT, the DOT has heard through the LAMP's interviews of local fisherpersons that fish health and fish numbers are good which indicate that water quality is not an issue.</p>

		<p>of flow when such waters are on or flow through or are adjacent to Gwich'in lands The landings may not be directly on Gwich'in lands or flowing through or adjacent to Gwich'in Lands but the landings are located in the Gwich'in Settlement area. The GRRRC were approached last year from one resident Gwichya Gwich'in requesting help to seek compensation for his loss of traditional activities in the bay downstream from Fort McPherson ferry landing. The matter was brought to the Gwich'in Tribal Council Annual Assembly for support and action. The matter is still being considered to be actioned by the resident. This indicates the seriousness of traditional harvesters and their dissatisfaction of how their concerns are not understood and accommodated by DOT. Consultation is a very important element of the monitoring program but DOT has to work with key parties in a team approach to arrive at the best outcome for all those involved. The GRRRC is very thankful for this process which allows us to provide our traditional knowledge and input but our concerns must be taken to heart and actioned to our satisfaction. Some information we provided in our first response was not captured in any of the studies cited by DOT.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> None</p>	
<b>ID</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reviewer Comment/Recommendation</b>	<b>Proponent Response</b>
1	Comments (Via email)	<p><b>Comment</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> I don't have time to go through the process online and I don't have a technical expert on staff, but the aerial photography seems like a moot point, DoT can get drones photos anytime or better yet put a live cam at the landings or on the ferry. Technology is there rather than saying can't find pictures. I don't see where they are amending deposit of waste other than dumping in the river. If it pertains to using the Hamlet of Fort McPherson municipal solid</p>	<p><b>May 5:</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> DOT will continue to dispose of waste appropriately and according to applicable legislation and regulations.</p>

		waste site, we will have tipping fees and rules with the operations of that site, especially when it involves hazardous waste such as fuel spills. DoT needs to follow and inform the Hamlet of Fort McPherson if and when such tipplings may occur. They have not always done so in the past when they use contractors to dump materials. <b>Recommendation</b> none	
<b>ID</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reviewer Comment/Recommendation</b>	<b>Proponent Response</b>
1	Comments (Via email)	<b>Comment</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> No conflict <b>Recommendation</b> none	<b>May 5:</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> Noted. DOT has no comment here.
<b>ID</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reviewer Comment/Recommendation</b>	<b>Proponent Response</b>
3	General File	<b>Comment</b> <a href="#">(doc)</a> TGRRC Response Letter <b>Recommendation</b>	
1	Part B Section 7	<b>Comment</b> None <b>Recommendation</b> Extension for one year to Part B section 7 of the License, from March 31, 2016 to March 31, 2017.	<b>May 5:</b> Noted. DOT has no comment here.
2	Part B Section 8	<b>Comment</b> None <b>Recommendation</b> The TGRRC does not approve of the amendment to remove this requirement of Sedimentation and Sediment Control Report for Part B, section 8. Furthermore, the council feels that it is important that this stays in the license so that communities are aware of how much granular material is being put in and taken out each year. The council requested that a monitor is present when material is being put in an taken out from the ferry landings.	<b>May 5:</b> Quantities of granular material that the reviewer references is submitted within the Annual Report as per the Water Licence and is not a part of the the sedimentation and sediment control report. The TGRRC will still be able to review granular material quantities from the Annual Report submitted to the GLWB. Given that the granular information is provided in an annual report, DOT does not see a need to place a monitor when material is being put in an taken out. If the council wishes to place someone of their own accord, the Council should be aware that it is an operating site and appropriate safety measures, including Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) should be worn by the monitor.