



Sahtu Land Use Planning Board

Box 235, Fort Good Hope, NT, X0E 0H0
Phone: (867) 598-2055 Fax: (867) 598-2545
Email: info@sahtulanduseplan.org; Website: www.sahtulanduseplan.org

Zone 65 PCI Background Report Engagement Summary – Public Sessions

September 24th, 2020, 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM (Via Zoom)

SLUPB Staff

Heidi Wiebe, Project Manager
Justin Stoyko, GIS Analyst/Planner

Participants

David Stinson, Incite Planning
Adam Kroeker, HTFC
Elly Bonny, HTFC
Claudia Haas, ENR/GNWT
Lisa Smith, ENR (Forestry), GNWT
Sam Wallingham, Selwyn Chihong
Anita Ogaa, GNWT, Lands
Cassandra Kalyniuk, CIRNAC

Meeting Summary

Lisa: What comments have been received so far?

Response: The only comments received are from a meeting in Fort Good Hope, where there was some recommended zoning.

Sam: Have the Kaska Dena have been directly consulted through this process?

Response: They are on the SLUPB's distribution list and would have received both the Background Report and the invitation to these sessions, but there has been no targeted communications or engagement with them. Staff double checked that the area of Zone 65 PCI does not overlap with the Kaska Dena's traditional territory.

Elly: How were the boundaries of the Protected Area chosen?

Claudia Hass (ENR) indicated that it was to exclude areas of high mineral potential and oil & gas potential, while protecting sensitive areas.



September 25th, 2020, 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM (Via Zoom)

SLUPB Staff

Heidi Wiebe, Project Manager
Justin Stoyko, GIS Analyst/Planner

Participants

Mandy Sammurtok, DOJ (Canada)
Alana Vigna, CIRNAC
Kelsey Stewart, ENR/GNWT
Kirsten Jensen, SRRB
William Andrew, SRRB
Maurice Albert, Selwyn Chihong
Tom Hoefer, NWT Chamber of Mines
Nathalie Lowry, CWS, ECCC (Yukon)

Meeting Summary

Maurice: Why were the areas to be rezoned left out of the protected area?

Heidi: For high mineral potential.

Tom: Have you looked at tourism?

Justin: No, it was not a land use considered by the TTWG in the assessments completed but good point. We will look into that.

Tom: Are your maps accurate? They show few ecological and cultural values in the areas to be rezoned.

Heidi: This is what we have. It may be that some sites aren't documented but we work with what is available. There may be other information out there that we're missing. For instance, our meeting with Fort Good Hope indicated a presence of caribou that we didn't show in our mapping. The scarcity of burial sites, archaeological sites, cabins etc in the area to be rezoned also makes sense as the areas most commonly used would be closer to the communities and trails, and the protected area boundaries were set to encompass the majority of these values. Areas further out may not be as accessible or commonly used, and therefore there are fewer values out there.

Maurice: While the mineral potential mapping may be older, the mineral potential doesn't change so its ok.

Justin agreed but also asked NTGO if there are any new studies or those with a finer scale of data, just to make sure we have the most up to date information. We were



informed by NTGO that this is still the best available data available and will suffice for our purposes.

Tom: Is this amendment tied in some way to the pending amendments (5-Year Review, Nááts'įhch'oh)? Do they have to be approved in order?

Response: No, each amendment is separate and can proceed on its own (no need for one to be approved before the other). She did mention that there may be some minor "rub points" between the various amendments we'll have to work out to ensure that later amendments aren't over-riding specific changes made in earlier approved amendments. But those are minor process issues that the Board will reconcile with the approving parties.

Nathalie: The approved plan shows boreal caribou range on Map 3 over the northern half of Zone 65 but it isn't shown on the maps in the Background Report.

Response: Staff checked and recognises that the range was omitted, and should have been included. This coincides with what Fort Good Hope was telling us about woodland caribou being in that area. We will be sure to consider that in our mapping.

Tom: Are you expecting something to come up in Crown Consultation due to overlapping traditional territories similar to what happened in the SLUP Nááts'įhch'oh Amendment process?

Response: Heidi responded that all adjacent First Nations are on the SLUPB distribution list and have received this information. Given what happened with the Nááts'įhch'oh Amendment, GNWT and Canada are doing Crown Consultation on every amendment application. Alana confirmed that they will indeed need to do Crown Consultations on Zone 65. It depends if any issues are raised or not. Heidi added that the Board is specifically targeting engagement with Nacho Nyak Dun First Nation in Mayo because of the overlap of their traditional territory and we will do our best to engage them directly through our process, rather than having them engaged later through Crown Consultation.