

**Subject:** (none)

**Date:** Tuesday, February 28, 2012 6:08:17 PM MT

**From:** Heidi Wiebe

**From:** Tom Nesbitt <[tom.nesbitt@telus.net](mailto:tom.nesbitt@telus.net)>

---

**Date:** Thu, 23 Feb 2012 15:07:21 -0800

**To:** Heidi Wiebe <[heidi.wiebe@shaw.ca](mailto:heidi.wiebe@shaw.ca)>

**Cc:** Gina Dolphus <[gdolphus@hotmail.com](mailto:gdolphus@hotmail.com)>, Gina Dolphus <[DLC\\_President@gov.deline.ca](mailto:DLC_President@gov.deline.ca)>, Richard Spaulding <[rhspa@sympatico.ca](mailto:rhspa@sympatico.ca)>

**Subject:** Re: Topics for Tri-Partite Discussion Document & Mtg Date

Hi Heidi;

I've been hesitant to write you, as it's past the deadline for comments that Danny Bayha announced at the end of the third technical workshop, but I see below that DIAND and the GNWT are both submitting late comments, so I'll include the following relatively small one from the DLC for the SLUPB's consideration:

In line with our workshop 3 discussions of CR16, I'd suggest the following refinement in the wording of CR16:

"Any land use activity in the Great Bear Lake Watershed (GBLW), (zones v, w, x, y and z [to include all conservation zones within the watershed as well as the special management zone, so that grandfathered uses in the conservation zones are subject to CR16]), must be demonstrated to be consistent with the maintenance of the ecological integrity of GBLW ecosystems as well as with the present and future well-being of the residents and community of Deline."

Rationale: More accurate to identify "GBLW ecosystems" than simply "the GBLW": together with the Framework submitted by Deline at the third technical workshop (dated Feb. 3/12: attached), this test gives applicants and the regulators a clearer idea of the test to be met. And better to separate well-being from ecological integrity, so as to allow separate and more accurate future discussions of the two tests. Thanks.

Tom Nesbitt  
Planner and Legal Counsel to Deline on the SLUP