



Sahtu Land Use Planning Board

Box 235, Fort Good Hope, NT, X0E 0H0

Phone: (867) 598-2055 Fax: (867) 598-2545

Email: slupb@netkaster.ca Website: www.sahtulanduseplan.org

*Disclaimer

These summary notes were recorded by SLUP staff. 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.

SLWB Post-Hearing Follow-up

Date: June 15, 2011, 9 am – 5 pm

Where: SLWB Office

Participants

Heidi Wiebe, SLUPB

Edna Tobac, SLUPB

Paul Dixon, SLWB

Angela Love, SLWB

Notes

1. Review of Agenda

No changes

2. Zoning – Any questions or concerns? Organization of Zone descriptions

The SLWB had no comments or concerns on zoning.

3. General discussion on nature of CRs

a. General Approach – General vs prescriptive

SLWB: It would help to specifically name the regulators involved in the CRs (i.e. instead of "Regulators will..." name which regulators). If you're going to get prescriptive, you need to provide more detail or definition, such as "substantially alter" in CR 5. However, if the onus is on the applicant to build a case that they are not altering, or for the community to say they are altering, then the CR is actually ok as written.

SLWB: RE CR 4, the 500 m is a bit much. You could change that to a goal-based approach such as "protect the cultural integrity of the site".



SLWB: RE CR 9, the SWLB doesn't currently deal with climate change issues in applications. This CR would be too onerous on small projects. Suggest changing it to a recommendation.

b. Timing elements – Up front check and compliance throughout period of authorization / life of activity

SLWB: On CR 2, we have no issue with "and carried out". We're permitting for the life of the project.

c. Applicant vs regulatory roles and responsibilities

SLWB: Agree with splitting roles in the Plan/Implementation Guide to identify applicant and regulator responsibilities.

4. Review of individual CRs

SLWB: RE CR 12, mineral licks and karst seem to be the main concerns there. You should add a goal to protect general ecological integrity and biodiversity in the preamble. Also suggest moving this CR closer to the wildlife CR and running them together.

SLWB: RE CR 7, suggest adding a new condition requiring a habitat assessment if COSEWIC or SARA listed species are known to be in an area. Similar to CR 12, talk about the goal in the preamble.

SLWB: RE CR 13 – Closure and Reclamation, if the approving parties want security collected, we'll comply; we're doing it now anyways. But the system is broken, so add wording that security shall be posted and maintained for the actual cost of cleanup and reclamation and shall be used for the reclamation and cleanup of the affected area. Sometimes inspections are not happening for 5 years after the cleanup is done and the proponent can't get their money back until that's done.

Heidi referred to a report that was developed about 5 years ago by CARC on the reclamation and security regime in the NWT that talked about some of these issues.

Action: Heidi to send CARC report to Paul and Angela.

Heidi asked about the Draft Public Engagement Policy and Guidelines, whether the processes described are a goal or what are currently being done and what the community response was to these docs.

SLWB: They are based on current processes for public engagement. It has not yet gone out for public comment.

Heidi and Paul discussed specific questions in the guidelines.

SLWB: RE CR 2, the current wording is fine in this CR. It reiterates what is already being done. Reference the LWB guidelines and policies in the context section.

SLWB: RE CR 3 – Community Benefits, not everything will be in the community's interest. It's crown lands and might be in the Canadian interest. Is that a fair expectation to place on every application?



SLWB: RE CR 6, take the maps out and just keep the term without referencing the maps. “Assess” is ok. Add definition of “contamination” from Drinking Water Strategy.

SLWB: RE CR 7, no issues. Talked about changes to accommodate GTA for FGH.

Action: Edna to send Paul the legal opinion on the GTA.

RE CR 8, Heidi stated that given the numerous comments that this entirely duplicates existing processes, this CR is likely to be deleted. The SLWB agreed with this approach.

RE CR 14, Heidi stated the suggestion that we move this under CR 1 to help clarify the differences between SMZs and GUZs. The SLWB agreed with this approach.

SLWB: RE CR 15, there are 2 different types of monitoring being discussed – 1) the scientific monitoring you need to watch for impacts, and 2) the community desire for eyes on the land. Keep them separate and take care of both. Suggest you keep CR 15 for the hard monitoring, and develop R 2 for the other monitoring. Make the new CR (R2) appropriate to the size and scope of the project. You might want to add other Actions to develop proper training and consistent protocols for the use of community monitors and their job descriptions.

There was discussion about broadening the wording in R2 from “wildlife monitor” to “community land use monitor” to better capture the broader role of this position.

5. Scope of authorizations subject to the Plan – SSI Proposal

SLWB: No comments at the moment. Will await further discussions in the fall.

6. Exemption of Existing Uses – Board Approach & SSI/GNWT Issues

SLWB: No issues with Board approach.

7. Actions

Heidi said the SLUPB will continue these discussions in the fall at the technical meetings and we would be looking for language that allowed us to keep them in the Plan and give them stronger status than recommendations. Heidi also mentioned that the SLUPB had put together a discussion document with some proposed rewording for discussions with government in February. Paul requested the document. No further comments at this time.

Action: Heidi to send Paul Action Discussion Document.

8. Recommendations – Any questions or concerns?

SLWB: No comments on Recommendations.

9. Next Steps for the Sahtu Land Use Plan

Heidi identified next steps in the process. Paul agreed that it is good to wait till the fall to proceed with any further discussions.