

***Disclaimer**

These summary notes were recorded by SLUP staff and have not been proofed or vetted by meeting participants. They are subject to errors of interpretation or omission. This document presents a summary of key discussion points. It is not intended to serve as transcripts of the meetings.

Requested changes documented in these notes do not mean that the Board will make these changes. Some requests are beyond the Board's mandate or jurisdiction to address. The Board must consider all comments and requests and balance the interests of multiple parties. The Board will revise the Plan as it deems appropriate to achieve the right balance.

Fort Good Hope Draft 2 Follow-up Community Consultation Summary Notes

Monday, October 26, 2009

Participants:

Sahtu Land Use Planning Board

Bob Overvold, SLUPB

Heidi Wiebe, SLUPB

Ida Mak, SLUPB

Leadership

Arthur Tobac, Chief, K'ahsho Got'ine Charter Community

Edwin Erutse, President, Yamoga Land Corporation

George Barnaby, Board Member, Yamoga Land Corporation

Isidore Manuel, Yamoga Land Corporation

James Caesar, Self-Government Secretariat

Leianna McNeely, Métis Land Corporation

Community members

Aady Tobac

Alphonsine McNeely, Elder

Aron Elton

Barthi Kotchilly

Dan Masuzumi

Florence Barnaby, Elder

Gabriel Tobac
George Grandjambe
George Wanderke, Elder
Jacinta Grandjambe, Yamoga Land Corporation
Jim Pierrot, Elder
John Grandjambe
John Tobac
Kenny Shae
Lucy Jackson
Marcella Ellton
Melanie Tobac
Norman Pierrot
Thelma Tobac

Translator: Dora Grandjambe

Meeting start: 10:00am

Opening prayer by George Barnaby

Opening address: Edwin Ertuse, President of Yamoga and District Land Corporation
Spoke about the importance of completing the SLUP.

Meeting Chair: George Grandjambe

Opening address: Arthur Tobac, Chief, Fort Good Hope
Spoke to the importance of protecting the Ramparts area. It is one of the big concerns and if it does not go through PAS, it should be protected as a CZ in the LUP.

James Caesar: Can you speak to the LUP and whether or not it has any authority to compel a developer to follow certain terms and conditions?

Heidi: The land use plan provides high level regulation and does not give on the ground direction to developers. The land and water boards will give developers terms, conditions and direction with the land and water permits or authorizations. Once the plan is approved, the land and water board will be bound to follow the higher level direction (eg. does this area allow development or not, if so, what are some of the special features of the area that need to be protected). The SLUP will not provide specific terms and conditions for development because that is the job of the land and water boards.

George G.: Could we continue to practice our traditional practices in parks?

Heidi: These issues usually get outlined in the Parks management plans. In Nahanni National Park the Chief has equal veto rights as Canada. Under their management plan, traditional rights will continue in the park. There will be nothing in the Plan that will take away from traditional treaty rights.

Edwin Erutse: Let's put it this way, the Plan is not to diminish our traditional rights in any way.

James Caesar: Can you speak to overlap issues with other land use plans?

Heidi: I have been talking with other planners in the Gwich'in and Dehcho about how our zoning areas line up. For example, if the Sahtu has a CZ that sits next to a GUZ in the Gwich'in, we want to make sure that they are aware of the values that we want to protect and that they take them into consideration.

James: Wildlife does not recognize borders so it is important that we make sure that we design all our land use plans to work together and respect the needs of the wildlife.

Break: 11:00am

Resume from break: 11:30am

Edwin: It would be helpful if you held a meeting specifically for the elders because they have a lot to say.

George B.: RE: SSI as an approving body - Concentrate on the Districts because SSI is just a forum where we get together and work. Listening and consulting with the communities will allow you to best represent our interests.

Alphonsine: I do not see any protection of lands solely for beneficiaries within community boundaries for harvesting such as berry picking.

Heidi: The LUP cannot do anything within community boundaries.

Edwin: We have to deal with some of these issues and address harvesting within community areas on our lands. GNWT currently gives permits for log harvesting on commissioner's lands but aside from that we don't have many measures for overseeing other types of harvesting.

James: On a certain occasion, individuals harvesting in municipal boundaries were told that we did not have the right to do so. When companies have oil and gas licences or mining leases on the land, we are not allowed to harvest in those areas. This affects our traditional practices. The Plan should speak to this.

Danny: It's important to protect the Mackenzie River and its health. I've seen oil spills. These situations should be addressed.

George B.: The River is very important and it should have special protection. Land on both sides of the river should be protected. We should protect all the land and just create a development corridor (eg. for highway).

John G.: In Fort Liard and in other areas they have strict regulations for development. Up here there are rules but they are not as strict and when they are broken nothing gets done about it.

Heidi: This perhaps talks to a need for more inspection.

George B.: We have monitors but they lack training and this is a big issue. We need to be tough on monitoring.

George B.: Deline did a lot of work on the GBLW and as a result the whole area is a SMZ. In our area everything is wide open and there is nothing for caribou migration protection. We should have a corridor for it. We also have a number of fish lakes and they should be SMZs. We need to change the map so that there is more protection for wildlife and the Mackenzie River.

Heidi: That will be a major discussion this afternoon. A number of discussions in the past resulted in the map looking the way it does. Some of the zoning changes come from Colville Lake.

Meeting break for lunch: 12:15pm

Meeting resumed: 1:07pm

James: Going back to what we were talking about this morning, we wanted to know if we had used up all of the percentages that we are allotted for CZ.

Heidi: My perspective is that there is no right number. We have the right balance when we have met the needs of the communities. Government on the other hand will sometimes have a fixed number in mind. The written feedback from GNWT and INAC indicates that we are in the right range. If we need to add more CZ, we will need to justify our decisions. We will also need to address the need for economic development.

James: What percentage of each zones is in each district so we can see how the conservation areas are parceled across the region?

Heidi: I don't know. We don't have a breakdown by district. I would say that Tulita has the highest concentration of CZ because of Naats'ihch'oh and Shuhtagot'ine Nene. Deline also has Edailla and Saouyo ?Ehdacho. The K'ahso Got'ine District has the least conservation right now

but our goal is not to make all Districts equal because we recognize that each District has its own interests.

An important consideration in identifying more CZ in the north will be to make sure that we are leaving some areas open for economic development. There are areas of high potential that we will be asked to leave open for economic activities.

James: Could we trade lands with other Districts to ensure that we stay in the right percentages while increasing conservation in K'asho Got'ine?

Heidi: I don't agree with the numbers game. If there are areas that need to be conservation then they need to be zoned so and we would make a case for it. I wouldn't want to take areas out just to satisfy the percentages.

George B.: I don't agree with the way the area is zoned. We need to protect caribou migration routes. We would be interested in protecting everything and then letting industry come into specific areas. Maybe we need to add a new type of zoning.

Rather than planning for the whole Sahtu, planning should be done by District. People can only speak to their own district. They cannot speak for another area.

Heidi: I think that you are referring to SMZ if you are looking to protect caribou or wildlife areas. Each District does zone its own lands.

George B.: I think we should zone things the way we would like to see them and then if government does not agree, we can negotiate. Right now we should consider all of the community comments. I'm really surprised that there are no protected areas for caribou in our district.

Arthur: The plan has changed significantly over the course of time and there are areas that have been taken out of conservation. Does the Species at Risk Act affect the LUP in any way when it comes to "critical habitat"? And in relation to the river, is there any way to limit or regulate downstream effects?

Heidi: The Plan will need to be in line with other legislation. Regarding Species at Risk, it might be 3-4 years before critical habitat can be identified so there will not be anything to be consistent with until the Plan is done. We have been working with ENR to get the Important Wildlife Areas report. We will be looking to get more maps on wildlife and trying to harmonize the terms across boundaries (Dehcho, Gwich'in and Sahtu).

George B.: Who will have the authority to implement these rules and see to it that they are followed?

George G.: I agree with George. The area should have been zoned on a District level and not regionally.

George B: We should be protecting the Mackenzie and all the lakes that feed into it. We need a wider buffer around the Mackenzie. We can have a narrow corridor to accommodate development (eg. pipeline and highway).

James: Could you let us know what the MGP means for the LUP? Can you tell them that we want something completely different? Speak to both the highway and the pipeline.

Heidi: Canada's comments told us that the JRP report is due in December. They asked us to make sure that the Plan is consistent with the report even though it doesn't exist yet. Canada does not want the plan to create any conflict with the pipeline. We don't speak to the MGP much because a completely different process has been created to negotiate the pipeline. So it makes sense that the Plan does not have the right to impose new conditions on the pipeline because a number of organizations and processes have been created to resolve issues.

Is there something that you want the Plan to say about the highway? The Plan would comment on it in its Economic Pillar re: development for access and infrastructure.

James: Can you speak to the Bear River dam? How can we address it even though it is not in our district?

Heidi: GNWT has told us that there will be a new report on the Hydro Strategy in the fall. We haven't seen it yet but when we get it we will be including it.

George: We need a Plan for the highway. Do you need a motion or other for the community to identify that you do something about the highway? We would like the highway and the pipeline to share one corridor.

Arthur: I wanted to clarify some issues re: highway. GNWT is waiting for FGH to develop a project description. Right now nobody knows where the highway will go. Even at the leadership level we could not give you that information. Does the SLUPB have an idea of what government is willing to work with, how close are we to a Plan that the government is willing to agree to?

Heidi: We can include a term in the Plan that asks that the pipeline and highway share the same corridor. We would likely not want the term to say that they "must" share the same corridor because there might be engineering or safety reasons that they would not.

Regarding whether or not we are close to approvability, we still have a number of terms that we have been told are too prescriptive or that repeat legislation. We have been told to

completely remove repeat terms. We will go back and work on re-structuring them so that they provide more value without being too prescriptive.

James: There are a number of quarry sites that have been identified that are ours but the LUP gives us rules about how to use it.

Heidi: My understanding of the SLCA is that any granular sites that are on Settlement Lands would be yours. Any other sites that are on land where subsurface rights exist then you would still be allowed to quarry but someone with subsurface rights would be also be allowed to do work there. We should follow the SLCA.

Barthy: I don't think that the pipeline or the highway will benefit the people. It will cost a lot of money but we will not benefit from it. They don't even come here to meet with us. We will lose all our young people with the highway.

George B.: As I mentioned earlier, SSI is just a forum where we get together and discuss. We need to have someone negotiate for the K'asho Got'ine District. It seems that Deline and Tulita have their interests represented in their protected areas and SMZ but we don't have anyone representing our interests.

Heidi: The reason I keep mentioning SSI is because it is the body that has approving power. There is no negotiation right now. That will come after the Board completes the Plan and makes its suggestion to SSI, GNWT and INAC. When it comes time for approval, SSI will be at the table with GNWT and INAC and will need to be strong to negotiate for its interests.

Arthur: Whether or not the land is owned by us, I would like the Plan to say that all lands in use. We have been using them and continue to use them.

ZONING

George B.: I would like to some protection of the caribou migration routes. This does not have to be year-long but can be seasonal. The buffer along the Mackenzie River should be made into a SMZ. We're not so concerned with what's already there but we are concerned with what else will come in the future with the development corridor. A development corridor could concentrate infrastructure in one area.

We should also protect all the big fish lakes. There is a lot of historical traditional use. There might be archaeological sites too.

Heidi: When you talk about protection, are you talking SMZ or CZ?

George B.: I would be talking CZ. We initially wanted to protect the areas in the land claim. We would like the fish lakes to be CZ.

George G.: We should be thinking of how to address the issue of inconsistencies between the group trapping area and the land claim. I think the land use plan should be carried out on a district level and not a regional level because different communities do have different opinions.

Edwin: I would like to see the intent and spirit of the group trapping area be represented in the land claim. If the land claim does not respect the group trapping area as much as the original document, we need to correct that. But we should not open a can of worms. Can you go through the terms so that we understand what we can and can't do in the respective zones?

Heidi: We were going to go through the terms tomorrow but I can go through those quickly today. Would you like to go through the terms today or go through the mapping today?

[The community agreed to go to terms and do mapping the next day.]

Danny: I don't agree with the idea of GUZs. When I'm on the land I try to conserve as much as possible. So I don't get why there would be GUZs.

Heidi: The zoning is done more wrt the developer so CZ would be areas where developers are not allowed in, SMZ they would be allowed to develop but under specific conditions. In CZ, developers are not allowed in at all.

George B.: I think there should only be 2 zone types, CZ and SMZ. There is no such thing as wide open, do what you want. Industry need to agree on abandonment and reclamation, ABAs, etc. We should consider ways to protect our lands and consider things like caribou migration paths.

James: The original intent of this meeting was the differences in opinions between FGH and Colville Lake. FGH wanted the district as a SMZ and Colville wanted the area to be a GUZ so maybe we should consider this.

Break: 3:00pm

Resume from break: 3:32pm

Lucy Jackson: The whole community should understand the group trapping area as what it is. It is not law. We should all meet together as a District and discuss the zoning of the group trapping area if we disagree on the zoning. We need to ensure that our rights are protected in the land use plan.

TERMS

Transportation and Infrastructure

James: Transportation and infrastructure are allowed in all zones. Protected areas are designated for a reason and should remain that way. There should be no infrastructure or transportation routes allowed them. We should consider such developments on a case-by-case basis in conservation areas.

Heidi: [Went through the term.] In previous drafts there was a blanket disallowance of entry in CZ which is contrary to the land claim. In the claim, if you are a rights holder you are granted access which includes building roads to get to your interest. Because we can't block access we put this term in and asked developers to try to avoid going into CZ. If it is unavoidable then they are given the right to go into CZ to access their resources.

Kenny: If this is the case, there is no protection in CZs. If it has to be that way, you have to make sure to use all local businesses to resources. This will stimulate the economy. If there is nothing to ensure that people will be protected by the land claim and if we cannot protect our special places then the community should reap the economic benefits of development.

James: What kind of mitigation measures are you thinking will be developed?

Heidi: The SLUPB does not prescribe or provide mitigating measures. When an application comes into the SLWB for let's say, a road in a CZ, the developer has to show how they have done their due diligence to follow the terms and mitigate any negative effects.

Other organizations will also be able to give feedback. So the regulatory process that is already there kicks in. The Plan gives a goal and the SLWB will work to satisfy that goal.

James: We would need to have a say in the development. For eg: if a road was to be built through the Ramparts we would want to know what kind of materials get used. We would need to have a say in the rules that apply to development on a case-by-case basis.

Arthur: Every time there are applications that come in we look at them and mention any areas that are of concern. The companies then have to identify ways that they will mitigate the impacts.

George B.: We would have more control under SMZ. How do you protect against the negative consequences of development?

Arthur: We need to complete our PAS areas asap and in conjunction w/ the SLUP so that our areas get conserved. We should concentrate on the lands that we want to put forward as CZs. Then we'll work on SMZ and GUZ.

Governments come and go and the economy plays a major role in decisions that governments make in changing policy re: industrial activity and infrastructure. We were just in NW and

Minister Chuck Strahl brought up the McCrank report. Do we have the right to change zones or can Canada overturn the zones?

Heidi: INAC or GWNT will refuse to approve the plan if they're not happy with it. We are near the right balance now so we can tweak some more but if we were to make a large switch to only have SMZ and CZ in this district, we would hear lots of disagreement and would not likely get anywhere.

George G.: Are there provisions to change or modify the plan in the future? And if GNWT and INAC do not agree with us, what do we do?

Heidi: Every 5 years the Plan is reviewed. The SLUPB will also consider exceptions and amendments. There are situations where exceptions may be justifiable (such as allowing a developer to skip one term or two) and in situations where the changes are larger, they would apply for an amendment.

George B.: I think we should have some protection for our areas even if we don't go to all SMZ in the district. There will also be a lot of Induced development. We should address that.

Arthur: What provisions could be included for the future? In the claims there were a number of issues that we did not foresee happening in the future and that as a result, were not dealt with. We should try to do our best to address issues that may come up in the future.

We are always asked to present evidence but it takes money to investigate these impacts. Will we be able to put something in the Plan in order to ensure that we have funding to produce such research?

James: Take for example water guidelines. How can we identify standards if there are currently no water quality guidelines in the NWT? We will need money to conduct research in order to determine quality. We currently draw water from the Mackenzie River but we don't know anything about its quality except for Environment Canada telling us that it's safe to drink.

Heidi: In the absence of guidelines most departments will use the CCME standards. There are standards that are being used but they are not used consistently. There are also regulations for mines and tailings to maintain tailings below a certain level when they are being deposited into waterways.

We have 2 terms: 1) developers need to establish a monitoring program 2) get SSI to develop a Sahtu based monitoring program. We are trying to address water quality issues through these terms. We are also asking GNWT to establish water standards.

Edwin: Water will continue to be an issue for us and we rely on boards to keep in mind our best interests. We want to develop something that is unique to this area and I think we need to find the resources that will allow us to exert control over our lands and waters. At the end of the day we want to develop something that will protect us.

Heidi: Has the community considered the CIMP program? It is a cumulative effects program that provides a pot of money to communities to collect data for baseline info. That would allow you to tap into some funds and get help with sampling.

Isidore Manuel: Going back to the transportation and infrastructure term. We're always giving in to industry. If we give in on one area we will be expected to give in to other areas. As George said, once a transportation corridor is set up, it gets used more and more and the effects grow. We're holding a meeting Nov 3 to consult on Ramparts PAS. The meeting is with the Band, Yamoga, the leadership but everyone is welcome.

Bob Overvold: The Board decided that we would send one member along with the staff to consultations. That's why I'm here.

One of the fundamental principles of the land claims is that the Dene and Métis have a say in decision making. The way they have a say is through the co-management boards. In this way, the SLUPB in essence has 3 bosses. At the end of the day you will not have a land use plan that is approved unless it is approved by the 3 parties (SSI, GNWT, INAC). It is my understanding that SSI will do what the districts tell them to do.

If you choose to identify the whole area as SMZ, the two other groups will probably not approve the Plan.

Re: GUZ being wide open, this is not true. The SLWB already place conditions on licences and permits. There are a number of conditions that already apply and that would continue to apply.

Earlier Heidi mentioned that we are pretty close to what INAC and GNWT think is acceptable wrt the proportions of the zones. If we are to now make the whole area SMZ or triple CZ we will be moving farther away from what the parties will agree to. In the Gwich'in it took 2 years of negotiations to get to a Plan that everyone was able to agree on.

All three parties have to agree and as a result we will try to balance the main interests of all three parties.

Regarding water quality, I would agree that there is not enough in or outside of the Plan to address it.

Ending prayer: Lucy Jackson

Meeting adjourned: 5:00pm

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Participants:

Sahtu Land Use Planning Board

Bob Overvold, Board member

Heidi Wiebe, Lead Planner

Ida Mak, Communications Coordinator/Planner

Leadership

Arthur Tobac, Chief, K'ahsho Got'ine Charter Community

Edwin Erutse, President, Yamoga Land Corporation

George Barnaby, Board Member, Yamoga Land Corporation

Isidore Manuel, Yamoga Land Corporation

James Caesar, Self-Government Secretariat

Leianna McNeely, Metis Land Corporation

Community members

Aady Tobac

Alphonsine McNeely, Elder

Aron Ellton

Baptiste Shae, Elder

Dan Masuzumi

Gabriel Tobac

George Grandjambe

George Vondrack, elder

John Grandjambe

John Tobac

Ken Shae

Melanie Tobac

Norman Pierrot Sr.

Thelma Tobac

Thomas Manuel

Wilfred McNeely

Translator: Dora Grandjambe

Meeting start: 10:00am

Opening prayer by Lucy Jackson

TERMS

Traditional Use

George G.: A few years ago I worked with the government and we did surveys of cabins that are used. There should be maps that show us where the cabins are so that people know to avoid them.

Heidi: We will try to get that information but our preference is to put a term in the Plan that asks developers to avoid all cabins and to contact the community when they find something. If we get a map and put it into the Plan, it may become outdated and new cabins will not be included. A blanket term for developers may allow for more protection.

Consultation

George: There is not much consultation in mining and we are concerned about this.

Heidi: The community expectations are different from the legal requirements. Legally companies only have to send a letter and wait 30 days for feedback. But communities expect you to come up and sit with the people and talk things through. So we're trying to clear up what communities expect from consultation.

George B.: Consultation includes accommodation so industry should be discussing all concerns from the community and trying to accommodate them. A letter does not cut it. Neither does just coming up and telling us what they're going to do. They need to be ready to accommodate our interests and concerns.

James: Consultation and accommodations as they are written out in the SLCA should be what companies use as their definition. In the mean time, we should have a right to define how we see consultation and accommodation with both minerals and oil and gas. Oil and gas make the effort to come into the community to discuss projects but mining companies put in an application and give us 7 days to respond. They don't give us a chance to meet with them and as a result we don't know about them and we don't get any economic benefits from their work. We would like to engage the companies and work with them.

Heidi: Mining is a secretive industry. When they believe that there is an area with potential they will go in and try to stake claims. They will keep this quiet though because they don't want other companies to go in and stake a number of other claims.

Selwyn was thinking of working on protocols for consultation. This might be helpful.

Edwin: There is a draft that would be worthwhile getting your hands on and seeing it. The consultation protocols that are being worked out with SSI and Canada – if it is not confidential.

George B.: Some companies do come in and speak with us even though they don't have to. But we need to make sure that we specifically define accommodation because sometimes

companies come in and discuss with us. We may disagree but they'll still go ahead and develop. There needs to be a way to make sure that they are meeting with us to work out potential conflicts and accommodate us with our interests.

Traditional Knowledge

George G.: Has any TK been collected and what are you doing with it?

Heidi: There was an early data collection phase in the SLUPB office but they are confidential. The SLWB always asks for TK on every project when applications come in. The material is confidential but it is used just to identify values and places of interest. What the community can try to do is to build a database of info with these studies.

James: TK has come a long way and is now much better acknowledged. It is up to the community to decide what to do with the data. We should be keeping records of TK that have been collected over the years.

George B.: We need to provide more direction on this term. You should identify a group of elders that can give advice on all issues. The applicant should be told who to speak with and contact so that the right people are used and the info should be reviewed for accuracy.

George G.: There are a number of students that come up here and do studies on the area and then bring their studies down south. We never hear back from these students and don't get the final reports. This might be a place to find a method with which to deal with TK.

Ida: All published thesis can be found in a national thesis library. And all research licences are granted through the Aurora Research Institute. They send the applications out to all affected communities which are given between 30-45 days to respond, should they have any concerns. The issue is that communities often do not have the time to respond.

George B.: All applications go to Inuvik for licence application but they don't come to the community. Maybe we can put something in the LUP that states that permits don't go through until communities are consulted.

Heidi: I hear what you're saying but I believe that we do not have the authority to put in a term that says that we restrict the granting of permits unless there is community agreement. We were told that it is an illegal term that we do not have the authority to include.

Edwin: Traditional Knowledge is not for sale. It is not something that students can come and get. Someone who does not live here and does not understand us cannot explain it to others. It is knowledge that needs to be used with our consent. There is no way that we can talk about TK and not include consent about how it is used.

Heidi: I understand what your concerns are but I do not believe that we have the ability to address them in the Plan. Aurora Research Institute is governed by the GNWT Research Act. We cannot change the way they operate. That will be something that SSI will need to take up with GNWT.

George B.: Students should find a sponsoring agency in the community that will act as a chaperone to their research. That way we can be sure that the knowledge is being used and presented properly.

Break: 10:30am

Resume from break: 10:55am

Isidore: An issue with TK is that elders are not always consulted. We have to make sure that they are consulted. We should set up guidelines, like the Plan has mentioned in its CR.

Aady: The knowledge, TK that has been passed on to us is something that has been banked on for centuries. We didn't just come up with it over the last 10 years. TK is sacred and based on the land and water and nature. Sometimes it is referred to as something that happened in the past but it is alive and continues to exist. It is the way we have existed and continue to exist even though we do not all live on the land now. I really would like that expressed in the LUP.

Jim: We used to bring the kids out to the bush. We would bring them out for 2 weeks and we brought everyone, even the nurse. We brought them there to teach them. Today those children are all grown up and they thank me when they see me.

My kids were raised in the bush and we then sent them to school for higher grades, YK, Edm, Inuvik. They don't drink and they have good jobs. What we teach the children on the land is very important. If you want to be a doctor, RCMP, to be successful, you have to bring them out on the land – it's hard work and there is justice there.

You have to work honestly together with our partners in Ottawa. We need justice and we need to work together. Justice is helping one another, trusting one another and working together. Talk things through and listen to one another. I have a big family that is healthy because I taught them out on the land. If you take your family on the land they will be healthy and will succeed. [Balance and connection to roots, family and values equals healthy people who are balanced and ready for the world and success. Get back to your roots.]

George: We have monitors but they should be trained so they can do their jobs well.

Heidi: If SSI was to develop a monitoring program then communities can pick and chose from the larger program for portions that work and suit their goals.

George B.: Most companies that come on our lands have an agreement to monitor and make sure that there is no impact on the land or people and wildlife, etc. Monitors are hired but I have heard that the monitoring is not stringent enough. We can perhaps increase training. The Inuvialuit seem to have very strict monitoring where they don't let companies get away with anything.

Maybe we can be more specific and add something to this term to make it clearer and more specific.

George G.: What exactly is it that you want? What exactly are the specifics that you are looking for?

Heidi: This is our way to give you control over determining your needs and concerns. Once you have built the list of things that you want, you can then give it to us and we will ask companies to follow the monitoring program.

John: I find it demeaning when people say that monitors are doing nothing. They are hired to monitor the land and it is an important job.

Heidi: I think the issue is with training. I have heard from others that they are not properly trained to do their job and this is demeaning to them because they are either not properly trained or don't have a well enough defined job. If the Sahtu were to identify a number of things that they would like the monitor to do and a list of training that they would like them to have, then the monitors will be able to do their job better and feel more confident as well.

George G.: I think we should recommend that all developers meet with the community at the end of every project so that we can discuss what went well and what didn't. We can also develop a Plan to address concerns. We should put a recommendation that says to companies that we want them to meet with us at the end of their project so we can have a wrap-up discussion.

I worked for oil companies and they were working to make sure that the wildlife don't get injured. I think they're doing some good work.

George B.: Usually there is consultation and companies agree to do things a certain way but nobody is watching them. We can't let them go out on the land by themselves. The inspectors are not out there frequently enough to ensure that they are following their licences. We hire monitors to watch them and they are supposed to look after everything but monitors do not always know what they are responsible for. A few years ago there was a project and a road block was set up so that only our people got through for wood and such. It had been part of our

agreement with the developer but the post at times was left unattended and when it was attended, the people did not know who to let through.

We should work on better determining monitoring expectations and explaining things better because sometimes it is a matter of not knowing or understanding why.

Lucy: Going back to consultation – we need to make it legal. Make it enforceable. We have to have good monitors. Monitoring does not have any legal standing so we need to make it so. It is the same with TK. For the longest time we just gave it away.

Isidore: Monitors need more training. They need a lot of understanding of how companies work and operate on the lands. We need people who are serious about being monitors and who are not intimidated by bosses and companies. We also need people who will create good working relationships with companies and who can work well with them.

Kenny: Suggestion: I hear a lot of complaints that the monitors don't have authority to do anything. We should try to get monitors who are educated in using computers, taking pictures, sending emails and writing reports. These reports need to be given to the governing bodies like Yamoga so that they can see what is going on on the ground. We need to start using our educated people and today's technology. We need to integrate this with our TK and make it work for us.

Break for lunch: 11:53am

Resume from lunch: 1:15pm

Special Management Terms

Reclamation and Abandonment

George B.: re: waste burial. There are companies that truck their waste down to Alberta now as opposed to building sumps where they bury their waste. I think you should keep this term the way it is.

George G.: When we discussed monitoring, someone commented that we need trained monitors that also have the authority to stop development when they become unsafe. They are not properly trained for report writing, Monitoring animal behavior, etc. I think we really need to look at this monitoring discussion and getting more details into the term.

Alphonsine: How do we identify who is taking care of the land around us? There are trees that are being taken from non-beneficiaries. How will we also implement reclamation and abandonment in areas where we have berries, etc.

Heidi: We would ask developers to avoid traditional use areas such as berry patches and where they would come into contact them, they would have to notify the community that there might be an issue.

Alphonsine: How do we protect beneficiaries from non-beneficiaries impacts?

James: What will the Board get feedback on because we would probably want more SMZ in other areas and include more CZs..

Heidi: We could use GUZ terms and apply them to the entire area and modify the SM terms and fit them individually to each of the SM areas. That way each SMZ would have specific terms.

George B.: Our Plan is for all our land and so you should not be doing planning just for certain lands and not others. I don't agree that community lands are not included.

Heidi: The Board operates under the MVRMA and SLCA and we get our direction from these 2 documents. We were not given any authority in community boundaries which is why we don't address community lands.

Arthur: We want to identify the zones and get them on the maps to make sure that all important areas are selected.

ZONING

George B.: Conservation comes from the LUP or PAS?

Heidi: PAS sets up CZs that can be thought of as long term, permanent protection under a sponsoring agency. The LUP sets up other CZs under the Plan that are reviewed every 5 years when the Plan is revisited. You can choose to continue to protect the area every time a review occurs but this is generally shorter term or more flexible protection.

The Ramparts is currently undergoing PAS but generally before protection is reached the total protected area will shrink. When areas successfully go through PAS, the SLUP will no longer apply to the area. It will be like Tuktut Nogait which the Plan does not apply to since it is a National Park.

Group Trapping Area

Heidi: I would suggest that we include a new term that acknowledges the group trapping area without making it a SMZ because that may be an issue for approvability.

Heidi revised all the proposed changes since the last consultation meetings.

Afternoon break: 2:20pm

Resume after break: 2:35pm

Heidi showed a PAS map of important areas for ecological representation and introduced it as a piece of information to consider.

Group broke up into 2 groups to discuss zoning: Heidi had a group with direction coming mostly from the leaders and Ida had a group with direction coming mostly from the elders

Break at 3:50pm

Resume at 4:00pm

Heidi's group requested the following changes:

- 1) Mackenzie River to stay the same with special attention being paid to the water quality - no need to include all Islands as CZ, just leave them as SMZ
- 2) Bring back the Loon Lake Andersen Trail as SMZ and protect trail with buffer due to burial sites
- 3) Special Management buffer around fish lakes N of FGH
- 4) Protection of caribou through terms – mobile caribou measures – protection moves with the caribou, managing lands as caribou move into area
- 5) Group Trapping Area – don't need it to become SMZ, leave it as GUZ but include map in plan and speak to intent of area
- 6) Marion Lake and Lac a Jacques, Sam McCrae, Turon SMZs – leave them as SMZs but extend Lac a Jacques zone to connect with GBL and Mackenzie by picking up Hair Indian
- 7) Giant's Boat – a Mackenzie Island, CZ due to cultural significance – get story
- 8) Little Chicago – no decision on whether the area stays CZ or goes to SMZ, not clear why this area was CZ because many other areas have been used by families but are not CZ
- 9) All of the area W of the Mackenzie River and N of the Mountain River that is currently not included in the Ramparts, and zoned as GUZ to be considered for CZ

Ida's group requested the following changes:

- 1) GTA: Doesn't need to change, identify the area in the plan with a map and talk about why it was established
- 2) Little Chicago: Discussed location and why it's a CZ. It was included in Places We Take Care Of report and was an area where prospectors came over in early 1800s so lots of cabins and archaeological sites. Didn't have any specific direction on current boundaries. Wanted it to stay CZ.
- 3) Marion Lake: Keep as SMZ but put 500m CZ buffers around lakes in the zone on account of them being fish lakes.

- 4) Northern Lakes: Add 500 m for CZ around each because they are all fish lakes
- 5) Loon Lake-Anderson Trail: Bring the trail back as SMZ with 500 m buffer
- 6) Mackenzie Islands: Wanted all islands to be picked up as CZ because of wildlife use (migratory birds and moose) and traditional use
- 7) Rivers: Wanted all big ones and a number of the big creeks to be SMZ – Carcarjou, Hume, Ontaratue, Loon, Hare Indian, Snafu, Bluefish Creek, Chick Lake Creek, Sucker Creek; but those already captured in CZ would stay in CZ
- 8) Unnamed Lakes: Shown on maps – requested 500 m buffer CZ
- 9) Naratin Lake: 500 m CZ because it is a heavily used site by community for recreation and traditional use
- 10) Sam McRae, Turton and Lac a Jacque: Change to CZ because the area has heavy traditional use including grave sites near lakes

Discussion with the whole group to come to a conclusion about the community's recommendations for the SLUPB:

George B.: I think we agree that all large rivers and creeks should be SMZ. As a group we identified 5 miles or 10 miles for the Mackenzie River buffer. 500m around lakes seems quite small. We asked for a 10 km buffer on the Mackenzie River.

Heidi: The reason we have 500 m as the lake buffers is because it usually gets accepted without too much discussion. It is somewhat larger than other buffers generally used. If we were to increase the buffer to 5 km or 10 km we would be asked questions and have to have very good answers. The Board will have to look at the buffers and ask ourselves whether or not we can substantiate the buffer sizes.

George: We can keep the Marion Lake as SMZ and all the fish lakes should have a 500m CZ around them. If we get negotiated down, we can discuss it then.

James: Giant's Boat should be designated a Heritage Zone. All Mackenzie Islands should be CZs unless they are Settlement Lands. If they are Settlement Lands, keep them as SMZ because we can control what happens there.

George: Make sure we have SMZ around all the larger rivers because we need to protect them for the future. We don't know what will happen in the future and we ought to prepare for that. That's how the GBLWMP zoned their lands and we should be able to do it like that too.

Heidi: The GBLWMP has never been scrutinized the way our Plan has been and will continue to be and so although we can look to the GBLWMP as a very protective plan, we don't know if it will be approvable or not because it has never gone through feedback from government

George: Ok. Just make sure you select all of the large rivers and don't leave any out of SMZ. Take Lac a Jacques, Sam McCrae and Turton lake to CZ.

All of the area W of the Mackenzie River and N of Mountain River that is currently not taken up in PAS - Ramparts should go to CZ.

Bob Overvold: As Heidi put it, we may be going too far with CZs because we already had feedback from Parties that we were pretty close to a good balance. Designating all islands on the Mackenzie will be very hard to sell. We need to find balance between all three parties. We'll do research to try to justify what is being suggested. If we can justify it we will run with it but you can't assume that because you are asking for it that you will get it. Some of the requests will appear in Draft 3 and some will not.

You may want to do a peer review of this with the elders. I want to commend you on the hard work. Heidi and Ida have been very happy with the feedback that we have been getting over the last few days.

George G.: I just learned that Edwin the President of Yamoga could not make it for closing address.

Chief Arthur Tobac's closing remarks: We thank the LUP for their cooperation and I'm glad that we discussed a number of issues such as water quality. We will continue to speak about this because water quality is going to continue to be an issue for us. We should also continue to map out caribou migration routes. The numbers have been in decline. Caribou are a big concern and were brought up at the Dene Nation meetings. The Tlicho have agreed to work with the GNWT to focus on caribou. We should keep an eye on caribou work to ensure they have protection here as well.

Heidi gave a wrap up of steps to come and thanked the district for the meeting.

George B.: The food source of caribou should be protected in addition to their calving areas and etc. There should be an identification of their habitat and those areas should be protected so that they are able to come back to them year after year.

Ida: Thanked the District for taking the initiative for setting up the meeting and providing the Board with the feedback that it needs. Thanked James for being the contact/resource person. Thanked the District for taking ownership of the process and for sponsorship.

Closing prayer by Lucy Jackson: 5:00pm

Meeting adjourned: 5:00pm