

| Organization      | Amendment #                   | Comment   | Preliminary SLUPB Response   | Revision Required? |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| GNWT              | Notice of Amendment           | Please clarify how the Board will proceed with this amendment application should the 5-year review amendment application remain unapproved at the time that the Board adopts this amendment application.  | Response: This application must build on the 5-year review amendment application, rather than the originally approved 2013 Plan, because it builds on changes to the definitions of protected areas as requested by the GNWT. Since the GNWT is an approving party of both amendments, the SLUPB suggests that the GNWT control the order of approval to ensure they are approved in the correct order. <b>Discuss at TPM.</b> | N                  |
| GNWT              | 3                             | Footnote #3 should be moved to S. 3.2 instead.  | Partially accepted. It can be removed from S. 2.7 but S. 3.2 is already sufficiently clear and doesn't require the footnote.   | Y                  |
| GNWT              | 7                             | The current SLUP states that the total area for the SSA is 283,988, whereas Table 2 of the amendment application states the total area as 282,773. The reason for the discrepancy is unclear.   | Response: This amendment application builds on the 5-year review amendment, which included considerable refinement of spatial data and associated methodologies for area calculations. The change in total area of the SSA occurred in the 5-year review amendment.  | N                  |
| GNWT              | #29, 30 and 34 (Maps 6, 8 14) | It is unclear, and may be due to scale of the maps, whether the 5 specific Sahtu Settlement land parcels are reflected in the EPA, especially on map 14, which includes an inset map. Show/add the settlement lands located within the EPA on applicable maps.  | These parcels do not show up at the scale of these maps, even in the inset on Map 14. These parcels are related to cabins which are very small and not visible at this map scale.  | N                  |
| GNWT              | 43, 44                        | The paragraph regarding the reports <i>Rakekée Gok'é Godi: Places We Take Care Of</i> and <i>Mapping Our Future, Report on Community Surveys and Workshops April-May 2001</i> currently appears under the heading 'Values to be Protected'. It should be moved to the "Reason for Establishment" section. | Accepted   | Y                  |
| GNWT              | 43                            | In the 'Reasons for Establishment' section, "Established Protected Area" and "Important Wildlife Area" are written out in full with the acronyms used afterwards. For consistency, only the acronyms should be used here.   | Accepted   | Y                  |
| GNWT              | Throughout                    | Document references both "Ts'udé Njíné Tuyeta Established Protected Area" and "Ts'udé Njíné Tuyeta Protected Area". For consistency, reference "Ts'udé Njíné Tuyeta Protected Area" throughout the document.  | Response: When speaking about the zone, we need to use the zone designation label of "Established Protected Area". When speaking about the area outside a specific zoning context, we use the "protected area" label only. We will do a final check to ensure we use the correct label throughout the document.  | CHECK              |
| FGH Leadership    | Zoning                        | Chief Masuzumi emphasized the importance of having a buffer around the protected area to make sure nothing happens within the EPA   | Response: CR 21 takes care of this by requiring engagement with the TNTMB on any applications within 5 km of the protected area. This provides an engagement buffer. We will add a map to CR 21 to show the spatial extent of this engagement buffer.  | Y                  |
| Tulita Leadership | 20 (CR 21)                    | Need to clarify in CR 21 that the 5 km buffer only applies within the SSA   | Accepted   | Y                  |

| Organization             | Amendment #                           | Comment  | Preliminary SLUPB Response  | Revision Required? |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| Colville Lake Leadership | Zoning                                | The northern part should have a SMZ buffer around the protected area to transition between the GUZ and the EPA. It should extend up the west side, across the top, and down by the Mountain River to the south. Don't take away from Mackenzie River zone though, or Zone 1.   | <b>Not Accepted.</b> We understand how SMZ may be perceived as a transition between GUZ and EPA. However, that is not how SMZ are defined in the plan. They are defined based on the values lying within them. If we defined a 5 km wide SMZ, by definition in the plan, it would be established to protect the values lying within that 5 km strip. CR 21 provides the transition we believe our planning partners are asking for by requiring proponents to engage the TNTMB on all applications for land use within 5 km of the protected area. We will add an illustrative map showing this 5 km engagement buffer to CR 21, rather than creating a new SMZ here. CRs 5 and 7 provide some protection for watershed and wildlife values in the GUZ. | N                  |
| CPAWS                    | Zoning                                | SMZ would be the most practical and effective designation for all excluded areas. This approach would be more compatible with supporting the management objectives of the protected area and would function as a buffer and transition to areas of General Use while still allowing for development interests to proceed. There is a significant area of the Ramparts watershed and headwaters that is proposed for General Use. We strongly recommend that this area be designated as Special Management using a delineation along the periphery of the drainage within the Sahtu region. | <b>Not Accepted.</b> Fort Good Hope had previously identified that it wanted the core wetland area protected, with General Use zoning on either side of it. The GNWT also previously stated a desire to see General Use zoning in the northern excluded area, though it has stated it is satisfied with the zoning put forward by the SLUPB in the Draft Amendment Application. CRs 5 and 7 will provide additional protection for the watershed and wildlife values in the region, whether it is a SMZ or GUZ. The Board does not see merit in further increasing SMZ zoning in the northern area, given the current values documented in the area, and the General CRs that provide a degree of protection to lands and values within GUZ.            | N                  |
| SRRB                     | 43, 44, (Zone 65 and 67 Descriptions) | The EPA and excluded areas are special as an integrated landscape where all 3 caribou ecotypes may live and interact.  | <b>Not accepted.</b> No zone description is provided in the amendment for the Ts'udé Njłjné Tuyeta Established Protected Area. Zone descriptions are provided for new Zone 65 and 67. Genetic studies and traditional knowledge have shown that barren-ground caribou mixed with northern mountain woodland caribou west of the Mackenzie River, although it is not possible to confirm where they are based on available data (if they are within zone 65 and/or 67, or other areas).  | N                  |
| SRRB                     | 18 (Map 4)                            | Map 4 doesn't indicate barren-ground caribou presence, but it is covered by a barren-ground caribou hunting area (S/BC/02) under the NWT Big Game Hunting Regulation   | <b>Not Accepted.</b> ENR biologist confirmed that S/BC/02 is a reflection of hunting regulations and not wildlife distribution, and should not be displayed on Map 4. While Barren-ground caribou presence has been documented in the area through both scientific means and traditional knowledge, Barren-ground caribou range mapping has not been extended west of the Mackenzie River. The SLUPB welcomes better range data in future amendments.   | N                  |
| SLUPB                    | 43, 44 (Zone 65 and 67 Descriptions)  |  | We note that the first sentence under 'Values to Take Into Account' duplicates, what is currently listed under 'Values to be Protected' and will be moved/integrated with existing information there.   | Y                  |