

***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.

Deline Draft 2 GBLWMP Integration

Community Consultation Minutes

February 4, 2010

Culture Centre

Participants:

SLUPB

Judith Wright-Bird, Chair
Stephen Kakfwi, Board member
Collin Bayha, Board member
Danny Bayha, Board member

Edna Tobac, Executive Director
Heidi Wiebe, Lead Planner
Ida Mak, Communications/Planner

Richard Spaulding, SLUPB Legal council

Michael Neyelle, Translator

Government

Andy Short, GNWT, ITI
Marc Lange, INAC, Environment and Conservation
Arthur Boutilier, INAC, Environment and Conservation

Deline Participants

Alfred Taniton, DRRC Board Member Director
Charlie Neyelle, DFN Sub-Chief
Dolphus Tutcho, Co-Chair for this meeting
Lorien Nesbitt, Ecologist – support for DRRC/DLC
Peter Menacho, DLC
Raymond Taniton, DRRC and DLC
Russell Kenny, DRRC
Tim Tutcho
Tom Nesbitt, Facilitator/Planner Deline RRC

Alphonse Takazo, elder
Andrew Suzie Cho, elder
Ethel Blondin-Andrew, SSI
Freda Taneton, SSI
George Kenny, elder
Hughie Ferdinand, elder
Joe Blondin Jr., DRRC
Marty Ann Kenny, DLC & DRRC Land Manager

Meeting start: 9:15am

Opening prayer: Charlie Neyelle

Introductions and go-around

Agenda was reviewed. DRRC and DLC requested a whole new agenda.

Tom: The revisions will be proposed in the DRRC presentation.

Judith Co-Chair: Let's change the order of the presentations so that Tom can speak first and suggest his changes to the agenda.

Judith gave an opening address that included feedback that we integrate the two plans into one and that the SLUPB will do its best to respect the intent of the GBLWMP.

Tom started the DLC and DRRC presentation. Raymond Taniton and Peter Menacho also spoke in turn.

Tom: The DLC and DRRC are proposing an alternative agenda. There are some main issues for discussion regarding the integration of the 2 plans (see slide 2).

Peter: The SLUPB has done a good job on the SLUP but it has a duty to consult. It needs to work with Deline on integration of the two plans.

Raymond: (slide 4 – Water Heart). The elders did not originally want to show the Water Heart diagram but we told them that it is necessary to share this information so that others

understand. The water is our heart so we need to protect it. A large group worked on the GBLWMP. We have since lost a lot of our elders. We want to keep their stories alive.

Tom: The stories that elders told formed a large part of the GBLWMP but now we perceive that the heart of this plan is being set aside. INAC and GNWT, EC, SRRB, and more, all worked together. We want to see the SLUPB work more with the communities and spend more time in them. At the end of the day you might have a plan but it will not be approved by communities.

Raymond: We do not see the heart of the GBLWMP in the SLUP. We have a lot of our elders' teachings in it. We're losing our elders. If the information is not included in the SLUP we'll lose their teachings.

Peter: GBL is one of a kind. When you protect the watershed you will protect other things like rivers and lakes that also include animal habitat. Our words were passed on to us from our ancestors, our teachers. GBL is very important to us.

We need to look at the integration document. We need more time to review the report before we can comment on it. A lot of work was put into our plan. Many people were involved and it was approved by consensus. We all agreed on the plan but now it is not being integrated into the SLUP.

Raymond: Our issue is that when we look at the SLUP we don't see the heart of the GBLWMP in it.

Tom: We worked with government for 3 years. Now they come back to us and tell us that they want consistent language with the SLUP and that it is not acceptable. We developed this plan with government involvement. The Sahtu is a huge area with different cultures. Why do we have to have 1 plan for the whole area?

Reconciliation is a key concept. It is a way to respect Dene traditions, laws, perspectives and health and well-being of the land and community. If you just bring the GBLWMP into zone descriptions and other parts of the SLUP you will water down the plan.

We want to see ecological integrity as a standard used in the SLUP. We want to see EIA standards used in the SLUP. In environmental assessments it is the proponent's job to identify the values to be protected, not the job of the communities or the Board. The SLUP's job is to evaluate whether the proponent will meet the standards of the Plan.

The SLUP's role is to set general standards (terms and conditions) for proponents and not to set specific standards. That is the job of the SLWB. Some of the CRs in Draft 2 are much too prescriptive. We are suggesting that the SLUP is stepping outside its role.

We want to talk about the role of the Board. Research and monitoring should be included in CRs. If they are beyond the scope of the plan then they should come in the form of recommendations. There are a number of things that we want included in the SLUP:

- grandfathering,

- ecological integrity (EI) and cumulative impact (CI) added as standards

The heart of the management plan should be the elders' teachings. Applicants must demonstrate the maintenance of ecological and cultural integrity as standards. This needs to be brought into the SLUP.

We need to discuss the founding concepts of the GBLWMP so that they can be properly included in the SLUP without being lost.

Peter concluded the presentation with the story of the large stone (that could not be lifted by individuals but could be lifted by the whole group when they worked together). If we all understand the key concepts of the GBLWMP then we can begin to work together.

Break

Judith thanked Tom, Raymond and Peter for the presentation.

Judith: We will go through the morning presentations and then in the afternoon we can talk about priorities and reconsider the agenda.

Heidi gave her presentation that included history and context of the SLUP and timelines that dovetailed with the development of the GBLWMP. She spoke about the changes that will appear in Draft 3.

Marc Lange: I was involved in the GBLWMP process in the past as a member of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). INAC wants to see one integrated plan that is consistent with the government's participation in both plans. This one plan should respect the spirit and heart of the GBLWMP. Ultimately the SLUP has to reflect the same values for all of the people of the Sahtu. We would like to focus on the concept of the waterheart and include the stories of the elders. Our hope is that the SLUP will provide clarity to proponents (clear and consistent language that is effective and enforceable with legislation and regulations).

Government's participation on the GBLWMP since 2003 did not always include advice for a land use plan. We regarded it more as providing advice on the management of GBL. Our understanding is that the Board is fully responsible for finding a way to best integrate the two plans.

INAC likes the integration document and support this approach. The concept of EI is more useful as a goal than as a measure to enforce. We suggest that EI can be further defined in a number of areas (eg. habitat fragmentation, linear disturbances, etc.).

Marc then gave a quick summary of the range of comments that INAC had given the Board (eg. from clarity of terms to zoning and clarity of INAC, and so on).

Andy Short: The GNWT supports incorporating those parts from Ch. 4&5 (SMZ and CZ, respectively) that can be included into the SLUP. There is no enforcement mechanism for the GBLWMP. According to the SDCLCA there will be one land use plan for the SSA. GNWT reviewed both plans and submitted written comments on December 2, 2009.

GNWT is concerned about the prescriptive nature of the terms in the GBLWMP. Regarding the concept of EI, the GNWT would like specific aspects to be identified for EI. The concept without further specification is too general.

Andy gave a general summary of GNWT's comments. (See GNWT letter.)

He thanked the SLUP for inviting the GNWT to participate. Those questions that he cannot answer he will bring back to headquarters.

Ethel spoke on behalf of SSI: The land use plan is one of the most outstanding issues remaining after the settlement of the land claims. Once the plan is complete and approved a number of issues that often surface will no longer come up.

SSI discussed this. The GBLWMP has to be consistent with the regulatory regime but at the same time Deline's views of land management have been passed on from generation to generation and there is a lot of integrity and feeling in the GBLWMP and it is important to keep that.

I understand that for equality of information the Board needs to balance the SLUP. You don't want other communities to see lots of information on GBL and push for the inclusion of significantly more information in their areas. This would delay the SLUP approval process.

SSI sees itself more as a referee. My role is to mediate and accept the results. SSI is obligated to respond to the SLUP and is working on a written response for submission on GBLWMP. Congratulations to the SLUPB. You're dealing with a lot of peoples' interests and values but you're working within specific parameters so you can't do whatever you want.

Scientists may read the waterheart and see it as an interesting story but for us it's knowledge. The federal government put in millions of dollars into the GBLWMP. You can't throw away good money. You supported it. Now you have to make it work.

Judith: There are themes that are repeated in all of the presentations and these are the themes of cultural and ecological integrity. We will review the agenda and come back for 1pm.

Break for lunch: 11:40am

Resumed after lunch: 1:18pm

Revised agenda:

- 1) SLCA Foundation – Deline
- 2) Planning Process and New Plan Concept – SLUPB
- 3) Single SLUP – Discussion
- 4) Reconciliation/Integration of Elders' Stories – Discussion
- 5) Ecological Integrity as a Standard – Discussion
- 6) GBLW – Unique SMZ vs. follow SLUP SMZ rules - Discussion

Judith introduced the new agenda, as agreed upon by all the parties present.

Tom: The concept of well-being needs to be taken into consideration (under the SLCA). The GBLWMP seeks to ensure the well-being of the residents of Deline and others. Communities have the ability to manage Sahtu Lands. Deline's submission of the GBLWMP is intended to manage Sahtu and other lands within the Deline District.

We are trying to reconcile the interests of participants and other Canadians. This includes the reconciliation of concepts and worldviews – to find common ground from which to work from.

Raymond: First Nations and non-first nations have different standards. At the end of the day we have to understand each other.

Peter: Consulting communities is important. We have different plans for different areas, depending on their different uses. An example is Sahoyu & Ehdahcho. We negotiated for these lands in the land claim but now we are giving them back (20% of Deline's District) and will care for them under a co-management agreement.

Alfred: Thank you for this gathering. We must talk straight and tell each other the truth. Our elders have lived off this land since time immemorial. They taught us everything about the land. We know all the places and stories around GBL and we were taught to use and protect the land. The land in this area is so important to us. It has taken care of our elders and us. The elders say take care of the water, take care of the land. We don't want the teachings and the stories to disappear. We need to develop strong standards to protect the lake and the water because impacts are already taking place. All beings that drink water will need this lake one day. We need to watch out for future negative impacts. We need to agree with each other and have a good meeting.

There is one story about a person who really loved Bear Lake. He loved it so much that he was born three times on the shores of the lake. If we could all do this it would be great.

Charlie: I've been sitting with elders for a long time. They are very intelligent and they tell me a lot of things, stories and other knowledge. The elders said that when people work on their own, they hurt each other. When they work together and finally agree they develop one law that all can respect. We need one law for Dene people, Territorial and Federal governments to follow.

There was an area that was wonderful for muskrat. But then government gave a licence to a company to develop there. They built an airport and the company damaged areas. Some spots were no longer good for muskrat (eg. oil spills). When we went out there to hunt we just found some very sick ones. Now there are none left and that hurts us. We need to start working together and stop hurting one another.

Danny: When we use the word consultation what exactly are we speaking of?

Tom: The DLC and DRRC talked about this. We believe that the Board has the duty to consult and work closely with the community of Deline. This is different from the Crown's duty to consult. The Board has a duty to consult with Deline to make sure that the community's interests are strongly considered in the development of the SLUP.

Raymond: As government representatives at the table you need to understand what has been said. As people who live here we based the GBLWMP on what our elders have told us. We can't really change the document because it is based on what our elders have told us (teachings).

We know that the environment is being impacted in other areas (further down south). That is why it is so important to work towards a vision that our elders passed on to us. Hopefully we can come to an agreement.

Peter: We are doing this for future generations.

Heidi: Went through timeframes:

1. End of May 2010 - Draft 3 completed (with 90 days for written comments)
2. September - October 2010 - Community consultations with detailed discussion on Draft 3 (plan explanation and preparation for public hearing)
3. November 2010 - Public hearing everyone gets to give final feedback on the plan
4. March 2011 - Draft 4 barring significant issues, SLUPB will submit for approval

Danny: Once the Plan is submitted for approval, what is the timeline that we are looking at?

Arthur: The Gwich'in LUP is the only approved plan under the MVRMA. It took 3 years for DIAND to approve it due to internal disagreements. For Draft 3 of the SLUPB we are going to make sure that our ADM in Ottawa has our roll-up. This does not ensure a fast-tracked approval but the more communication, the fewer surprises and the better the chances of approval.

Andy: GNWT recognizes that the GBLWMP and SLUP took a lot of work. Whatever we can do to advance the plan, we will do. We have to get the GBLWMP incorporated into the SLUP.

Ethel: What is the difference between the SMZs and the SMZ rules? SMZ rules has been done in the Yukon. Maybe you could see how they did it.

Heidi: There is no issue with SMZs. They have been established in the past. The question is whether we will still have 2 separate plans or whether we will have a more integrated plan.

Tom: I think there is some promise with the SMZ rules. If we do not get through all this in the next 2 days, is there a willingness to provide more funding for Deline to continue this process?

Heidi: The Board does not have any funds in the budget this year. I would not be able to comment further until the Board has a chance to discuss this.

Marc: INAC will not continue to fund such meetings.

Danny: It is not fair to expect communities to be able to provide the Board with the information that it needs without providing any financial assistance. Funding communities to participate in the process would be a great way to support the Board.

Raymond: It will be 15 years since the SLUPB was formed. We need help on the funding level so we can get this done.

Peter: We need more money to make this plan a go. Deline had nearly 5 million for the GBLWMP but we got only about \$30,000 to prepare for this meeting on integrating the two plans.

Tom: I agree with Danny. It takes a lot of work to go through plans. Communities need the technical support to go through these documents.

Judith: We will break now and then move on to item 3 on the agenda (one single SLUP).

Resumed from break: 2:44pm

Judith: We are trying to put together an integrated plan. INAC and GNWT have both put forward the position that they would like one plan so I will let them speak to this.

Marc: An integrated plan is good because it provides clarity to people living and/or wanting to do business in the Sahtu. They only have one place to go. It is also prescribed in the MVRMA (41.6) and the SLCA (25.2.1) that there will be one plan for the SSA. Going forward INAC's goal will be to support the SLUPB to do what it is mandated to do. Requests for funding from communities should go to the SLUPB. The SLUPB can take these into consideration when it develops its funding request to INAC.

Arthur: David Livingstone funded this project by taking money from here and there (\$5 million). This was not done anywhere else. David regarded GBL as one of the remaining enormous and pristine freshwater bodies that had not yet been affected by development so he funded the development of a plan for its management.

One of the important provisions of the plan was that development be allowed provided that water quality remained at background levels. The intention had always been that the GBLWMP would be given force through the SLUP.

We are open to having the elders teaching and stories at the front end of Draft 3 rather than at the end. We had our legal counsel look through the GBLWMP. They told us that it could not be implemented as written. This does not mean that it does not have value. We need to make sure that the meat of the document is included in the SLUP.

Tom: Communities still cannot review planning documents and give feedback to the Board without resources and support.

We can deal with the issue of integrating the stories under agenda point 4.

We are trying to reconcile two very different ways of understanding the world. Elders see the water as a living being. It is not a metaphor. The streams and its tributaries are the veins of the lake. We should not be putting the stories into a background document.

We want the incorporation of the elders stories as law and not as stories. We also want to keep the SMZ as rules and not as goals.

Peter: I agree with Arthur. In order to make progress you need money. We live today based on our elders' teachings. Everywhere water is being affected. Our elders told us this. The GBL needs to be protected for all of the participants in the SSA. Look at the Mackenzie River. It is affected by pollutants that come from elsewhere. We need government support and funding.

Alfred thanked Arthur for his presentation. He then told a story about Johnny Charlie, a chief from Fort McPherson. He was ill and asked Deline to send him some GBL water because it tastes so good and makes beautiful tea. Deline sent him some on a boat. When Johnny Charlie saw the water he had tears in his eyes; he was so happy. They stayed with him for 3 days and before leaving Alfred played the drum for him. Johnny spoke to his people about how nice the water in GBL is and he told Deline to make sure to protect it. When others in Fort McPherson asked him to share his water his reply was, "The water came all the way from GBL. I'm going to drink it all myself."

Charlie: Many of the elders' stories can be used in the plan. The Water Heart is like your own heart. You need to take care of your heart, all the land and its parts. The elders say we all live by and need to respect the universal law of interconnectedness. Elders say that water forms naturally. Don't play around with it. It is what gives you life. There is a lot of meaning behind the elders' stories. The stories never die. They will continue to live on.

Raymond: Our ancestors set nets on the lake and they used to catch a few hundred herring a day. Last year my dad and I set a net and only caught 1 on the first day. The next day we caught 2. This year we set out a net for lake trout and we only caught 2. We are learning every day about changes that are occurring. The winter road is probably scaring the fish but we didn't know this before.

Judith thanked everyone for their comments.

Heidi: I am hearing that we are being asked to integrate the elders' teachings and stories. This should not be an issue. The assumption that all of the GBLWMP information will be put in the background report is not correct. The background report provides general information but all information that sets the context for the plan will be included in the plan itself.

Tom: There seems to be a common understanding of the importance of including the elders' stories. Let's use this as a way to identify multi-directional reconciliation.

Ethel: It seems to me that we are all in agreement that the elders' stories will be included, the issue of where they are included is just an editorial question.

Danny: I would like Tom to clarify what he thinks about Heidi's pyramid diagrams since he said that he saw promise there.

Tom explained that keeping the GBLW as a SMZ with separate rules within the area would allow the plan to move forward.

Arthur: Re: ecological integrity (EI). It is a good concept but needs to be further defined by measurable indicators so that it can be enforceable in the regulatory regime. Arthur made the

comparison to human health. Good health is a concept that is specifically measured through a number of parameters such as cholesterol, blood pressure, physical fitness, etc. Ecological integrity, like good health, needs to be measured by parameters in order to be enforceable. It makes a good goal but needs to be strengthened with specific measures that components will be told to meet. That is the issue with EI.

Judith: Let's take a break and then come back to the discussion on ecological integrity.

Arthur: Re-iterated what he said before the break.

Tom: We do not want ecological integrity to just get included as a goal. EI can be used as a broad CR. EIA processes state that it is the duty of proponents to maintain the ecological and cultural integrity. The MVRMA states that there should be no significant impacts on the environment. Specific measures are sometimes identified but it is up to the proponent to work out how it will meet the requirements of the CR (conformity requirement).

It is not possible for the Board to determine a set of CRs that would apply across the Sahtu. The onus is on the proponent to determine how it will not negatively affect the environment. Marc, you previously suggested that different proponents would come up with different solutions and this would result in a patchwork of different approaches and results. We suggest that in order to avoid this, the Board could work with others in the regulatory regime to identify proper approaches.

Heidi: The Board has the responsibility to determine conformity on our CRs. We and the SLWB need measurable parameters to determine whether or not proponents are conforming to the the plan. We need agreed upon criteria so that everyone will come to the same conclusion on conformity. The concept of EI does not give us the measurable criteria that we need to give clear direction to proponents.

Ethel: We need to be careful when we identify standards because they can often be subjective.

Lorien: EI should be stated as a standard rather than as a goal because we want it to be maintained as opposed to an ideal we hope to one day achieve. If you have a series of CRs but do not have ecological integrity as a standard, EI might not actually be maintained. Guidelines could be developed for the standard later.

Heidi: The standard to achieve ecological integrity seems to be in the policies and in a few of the conditions. I don't see a lot of differences between the GBLWMP and the SLUP. I don't understand the heavy resistance against the SLUP. Our plans are doing the same thing aside from the policy text. Can we replace ecological integrity with another term that is better defined?

Arthur spoke about guidelines in the Gwich'in Plan that do not mention ecological integrity but that protect the ecosystem.

Danny: So you see the role of the Board as giving general guidelines and the SLWB as giving more specific terms and conditions?

Arthur: There can be natural overlap between the SLUPB, proponents and the SLWB but in general yes.

Lorien: It is difficult to protect environmental integrity by managing separate, individual factors through CRs. You can't set standards for everything so something is bound to be left out.

Marc drew a diagram of the regulatory regime and asked where EI would fit in.

Danny: Standards can be very subjective and they depend on who is setting them. It is best to have communities involved in the process.

Tom: Individual CRs lack the overall strength that an ecological integrity standard would have.

Lorien: EI would not limit our evolving understanding of the environment. All of the CRs make sense when they are applied under the EI standard. It is impossible to define all the potential impacts that may take place on the GBLW and as such it would not be possible to protect the environment adequately with just CRs.

Stephen: All of us would love the world to stay the way it is in spite of us. EI could be achieved if you left the Sahtu as a park. I don't know how you could have development and still ensure EI. We still need jobs. Our land corporations want them. We have to balance development with protection. We have to agree on our words and what we're trying to achieve. The Board's job is not to protect everything but to develop a plan that is well understood and accepted by everybody.

If you don't agree with having the two plans integrated then the next step is to take it to the political level. I guess you would go to the regional director.

Peter: Thank you for the discussion. The GBL is an ecosystem. We wanted to come up with some kind of an understanding. We'll break now and reconvene at 9 am tomorrow morning.

February 5, 2010

Culture Centre

Participants:

SLUPB

Judith Wright-Bird, Chair
Collin Bayha, Board member
Danny Bayha, Board member

Edna Tobac, Executive Director
Heidi Wiebe, Lead Planner

Ida Mak, Communications/Planner

Michael Neyelle, Translator

Ethel Blondin, SSI

Andy Short, GNWT rep

Marc Lange, INAC

Arthur Boutilier, INAC

Deline Participants

Dolphus Tutcho, Co-Chair for this meeting

Tom Nesbitt, Facilitator/Planner Deline RRC

Lorien Nesbitt, Ecologist

Raymond Taniton,

Charlie Neyelle, DFN Sub Chief

Peter Menacho, DLC

Russel Kenny, DRRC

Alfred Taniton, Elder

Hughie Ferdinand, Band member

George Kenny

Alphonse Takazo

Joe Blondin, DRRC

Tim Tutcho

Jonas Modeste

Mary Ann Kenny, Deline Land Corp

Debbie Simmons

Tim Tutcho

Prayer by Alfred Taniton

Heidi ran through the regulatory regime so that everyone understands the steps that applications go through when they are submitted.

Marc pointed out where ecological integrity would be assessed in Heidi's diagram.

Danny pointed out that the application is also sent to SSI, the RRCs and the Land Corps. In the absence of a land use plan there is still a chance for communities to give their feedback on the applications.

Marty Ann: If the SLUP is approved then could the SLUPB not work with the SLWB to determine appropriate terms? Would the SLUP's check not move up to happen at the same time as the SLWB's review of an application?

Heidi: We're still working out when we would be doing the review. Currently we are given the applications at the same time as everyone else (after the SLWB reviewed it for completeness).

We need to work with the SLWB to make the process more front-end to ensure that applications conform before they are sent out to referral organizations. That is in progress.

Peter: Proponents are taking TK knowledge from old files and putting it into their applications. This is acceptable to SLWB which we don't think is fair. Is this because there is no SLUP in place?

Heidi: Yes and no. The SLUP wants to get communities to document what they think is an appropriate process and then we can ask all three parties if they agree to this process and if so, it could go in the plan at a later revision.

Peter: Could we put this in the plan so that re-using TK does not happen?

Heidi: We can try to put it in and see if the 3 parties will agree.

Russell: Once the Plan is approved, will the SLWB still exist?

Heidi: Yes because we occupy different levels on the hierarchy of the regulatory system. The Plan is more general for the region and the SLWB works out conditions for specific on the ground work.

Marty Ann: We want to keep the EI term. Come the day that we do not have the ability to review the applications (eg. if we lose our technical person), we still want to know that proponents have to ensure ecological integrity and having them prepare an ecological integrity statement as part of their application gives us comfort that they have fulfilled this requirement.

Arthur: SSI has the first look at the plan and the first go at approval, before GNWT and INAC.

Ethel: You have to work with GNWT now to make sure that there are no issues before the plan goes for approval. SSI does not have an issue with the plan now but we need to make sure that GNWT is on side because we have a number of overlapping issues with them.

Judith: The Board has been meeting with GNWT and INAC every time we make changes. We have been trying to avoid surprises down the road.

Arthur: If we get the Draft 3 roll-up onto our ADM's desk in Ottawa this will hopefully prevent delays.

Ethel: Provided that you've given everyone a chance to see the Drafts of the plan in consultations there will be no excuse to hold up the plan once draft 4 comes out.

Heidi: Andy can you make sure that GNWT gets the Draft 3 roll-up to the appropriate senior people like INAC has promised they would do with their ADM?

Andy: I'm pretty sure that the current Drafts have been seen by those who need to see it. I'll pass the message on.

Alfred: We signed the land claims because we thought it would make things better. Before the claim there was no consultation but development happened. The land was damaged and there

were no standards. It is good that we're all talking. We can come up with rules, procedures, standards.

Break

Charlie: Right now the SLWB gets the application and then they send it off to other agencies. These organizations all have different comments. But when the SLUP is approved, it would be good if the SLUPB and the SLWB can work together to come up with decisions for the applications. Then we may have a better idea of what's going on on our lands.

Judith: Heidi's going to do a comparison of the two documents (GBLWMP and SLUP).

Heidi: Yesterday we had a discussion and it felt like the two plans are very far apart but we think we're actually pretty close. I've put together a presentation so we can get Deline to give us some feedback and help us put together one plan.

Heidi went through her power point presentation which was a comparison of wording differences between both plans.

I heard Martyann's request for proponents to have to write an ecological integrity statement. That sounds like something we can work with. Let's talk about what you want and why you want it.

Marty Ann: I would like to hear what INAC has to say because we have been told that the Board is here to integrate the two documents so that they are acceptable to the 3 parties. If INAC does not have an issue with the term EI, then can't we just keep the wording as is? This is what Deline wants.

Arthur: There has to be something that the component can compare against in order to assess whether they are meeting expectations. EI does not do this.

Tom asked Marc to suggest ways that INAC could resolve this issue.

Marc: We should trust that the Board is taking into account the views and interests of Deline. The Board sits high up so that they are not involved at the level of authorization. The Board needs to give direction to developers so that they can meet broader goals.

I see the community trying to get monitoring included which speaks to cumulative impacts monitoring. We could tie this into CIMP which will hopefully do better at ensuring EI.

Danny: CIMP needs to be heavily involved in the north with all the Boards. It is part of the long term vision of improvement – it would be included in the 5-year reviews.

Going back to responsibility – we need to know who is going to set standards. CIMP is a start but we would all like to see standards.

Marc: We've been told that when we do provide advice that we should be providing standardized advice such as through guidelines.

Tom: We would like you to think about how you could integrate standards into the plan.

Heidi: Standards are really hard to get passed in plans. We tried it in the Dehcho and it didn't work. We'll try to meet Deline's interests by identifying the values to be protected and try our best to get there.

Tom: We hear that the SLUP and INAC find ecological integrity too vague. We look forward to the next draft to see what the SLUPB comes up with to replace this.

Ethel: This disagreement over the EI concept seems to be more than a technical issue. It is a worldview issue. CRs are empirical and the concept of EI is traditional.

Peter: The Board's role is to ensure that the SLUP meets the needs of the people. When we worked on the GBLWMP there was a diversity of collaborators. DFO asked us for funding to do a study even though the elders told them the study was not needed. The elders already knew what kinds of fish were there. At the end of the day the scientists found out that the elders were right. Elders' knowledge should be taken above all other information. We want to see EI in place because it came from our elders. For someone else to make policies and rules for us is not right.

Arthur: The 5 year review allows us to fix things as we learn. We don't get things right the first time. I want to thank Danny for mentioning this because it's an important aspect of the system.

Andy: Thanked Deline for its hospitality and gave GNWT's support for the development of a SLUP that respects the interests and values of the people of Deline.

Break for lunch: 11:55am

Resumed from lunch: 1:25pm

Judith revisited the goals of the meeting and went through some concluding slides. She reiterated that the SLUP deadline for delivery of Draft 3 is May 31, 2010. The SLUPB would be able to revisit Deline after that date.

She stated that the budget is very limited and it would be unrealistic to expect the Board to fund further community participation. The Board is open to accepting comments from Deline within the next 2 weeks.

Marc: The discussion over the last 2 days has been in carrying forward Deline's vision and wisdom that will allow this lake to stay clean, as expressed through the concepts of ecological and cultural integrity. Integrity as it was proposed in the GBLWMP was too amorphous a concept to operationalize for industry.

Over lunch Marc, Lorien and Tom discussed whether valued components could be used as specific measures of EI (as broken down, measureable components of it). It was agreed upon so the issue could be resolved.

Lorien: We can provide further specification and guidance to allow regulators to measure the maintenance of ecological integrity. I like the idea of doing this through valued components. The idea of ecological integrity can also be elaborated upon in the plan (eg. mention the maintenance of biological diversity which would also contribute to EI). We will provide suggestions on how to better integrate ecological integrity into the plan.

Arthur: Guidelines can serve in the discussion about valued components because they do set a bar that can keep getting raised.

Tom: We're trying to find common ground on requirements or guidelines to meet Deline's needs.

Heidi: I think the Board is very close to this because we are already taking into consideration valued components. The issue we had with ecological integrity is that there were no measures. If we can use valued components to set these measures then we are well on our way to agreeing. We have a list of items to consider for valued components and we can send that to Deline so they can tell us whether they want to add more components or not.

Danny: We should have had someone from the SLWB present to reassure Deline of things that are happening on the ground.

Judith: We'll start closing comments if there are no other comments.

Peter: We are coming to an agreement now but we also have funding issues. The government is pushing us to finish the plan to allow for increased development but you're telling us there isn't any funding for community participation. The responsibility is in the hands of the government. In 2005 we completed the plan and celebrated. We thought it was in the hands of the SLUPB. Now government tells us that there are issues but we don't have money for further involvement. I want you to knock on more doors to find us funding so that we can complete this process and get the plan completed.

Alfred: Legend says that this lake supported giant beavers, a talking bear and prehistoric animals. There are names all over this lake, named by our ancestors. We want to protect all these things, our history, our land and the watershed.

Our parents and their parents worked hard and their spiritual beliefs were strong. They taught us the practices of our ancestors. All the shores of GBL have been explored by Sahtu people.

Now our ancestors are not here and I wonder what they think about us arguing about the land. It is hard to accept someone who doesn't live here telling us how we are to live off the land. If something goes wrong and the land is damaged it will be hard to replace. We understand that proponents they live off the resources of our land so we will not deny them access. But we don't want the mistakes that were done in the past (eg. oil and gas and mining) to be repeated.

Charlie: Going back to the one law diagram (triangle), things come in 3s but they become one. We need to build one law together so that we are not doing this on our own. The Deline

government, Territorial and Federal governments need to become one. Thank you. Let's try to build this together and finish it.

Participant: I spent my whole life here and I've travelled around the lake. It is my heart and my home. It is that important to me. It is that important that we protect it.

Marc: Thanked the community for sharing their knowledge.

Arthur: Gave closing address and thanked the community for welcoming us.

Ethel: It sounds like in the next 2 weeks Deline will work on wording for the SLUP. There seem to be some issues with funding for further community involvement. SSI will be supportive for moving forward toward Draft 3.

Russell: Gave his thanks.

Hughie Ferdinand: We have to protect what we think is valuable (including burial sites and traditional use sites) for our children. We were told not to spoil the water or the land because all living things depend on water. Thank you for participating.

Alphonse Takazo: I'm very grateful that everyone is knowledgeable about GBL now. I really want to thank Tom for his work. Thank you very much for letting me participate.

Joe Blondin: This is a really big meeting so all the nations should be here. We're talking about something big. At one point we were all floating around in our mothers' womb so water's really important.

Peter: We don't want the waters to get polluted. If that happens we'll be in trouble. The reason we settle land claims is because we want to guarantee the wellbeing of our future generations. In order to do that we need to make rules to not damage the land.

Danny: The dialogue over the last 2 days has been really good. Our elders encourage us to talk things through and put down paper when things get sticky. I want to emphasize that the land use plan is a living document. It will continue to change for the better of communities. I want to emphasize that we want a plan that everyone can live by so that we can give more information for those who want to do work in the Sahtu. We need to get to the approval stage together.

Alfred: In our culture we talk about things. Sometimes you need to put the paper away and just talk things through.

Alfred then told a story about a game that they used to play with a mooseskin ball. Men would play against women. It was like rugby. The men could tackle the women to get the mooseskin ball. We're playing the same game. It's like government has the ball and we're trying to get it from them.

Peter: We've been discussing this for 2 days and we are looking to government to find funding to allow us to continue to be involved. He thanked all participants and Marty who coordinated the workshop.

Heidi: Thanked everyone for their participant and expressed that now that we are on the same page we can begin to move forward to produce a Draft 3 that hopefully we can all agree on.

Charlie: Many different issues were shared but we still have a ways to go. Thank you.

Judith thanked everyone for meeting with us and for participating. The Board will include the spirit and intent of the GBLWMP to the best of its abilities and will work to integrate it into the SLUP. Judith thanked the elders for sharing their teachings.

Closing prayer

Meeting closed at 2:52pm