

***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 3 Community Consultation Summary Notes

Wednesday, September 1, 2010, 11 am – 9 pm

Culture Centre

Participants:

Collin Bayha, SLUPB Member
Heidi Wiebe, SLUPB
Ida Mak, SLUPB
Michael Neyelle, Translator

Angela Love, SLWB Water Technician
Michelle Swallow, Protected Areas Strategy (PAS)

AJ Kenny, Elder
Alfred Taniton, DRRC Council
Alphonse Takazo, Elder
Andrew Suzie Cho, community member
Dolphus Baton, Charter Community of Deline Council
Fred Kenny, community member
Gary Elenie, community member
Ingeborg Swanee Fink, observer
Jane Quitte, Elder
Jimmy Dillon, Elder
Joe Blondin Jr., DRRC Council
John Ferdinand, Elder

Johnny Vital, DRRC Council
Jonas Modeste, community member
Leon Modeste, Elder
Lorien Nesbitt, Consultant
Morris Neyelle, DLC VP
Paul Modeste, DRRC President
Raymond Taniton, community member
Ronald Beyonne, community member
Russell Kenny, DRRC Council
Tom Nesbitt, Consultant
Trevor Taylor, Charter Community of Deline Council
Walter Bayha, Self-government

Start time: 11:30 am

Leon Modeste Opening Comments: We welcome you as non-Dene to Deline. We hope that we can work well together to create a good future. We want to make a plan together. You are here to help us make one for Dene and non-Dene people, for the future. When we work together we create good solutions.

We know what is on the land and we need to protect it more because we will need it in the future. We depend on the land. Let's not argue. Let's get along and work together for future generations. Let's not say no to one another. Let's try to agree on the things that we will talk about.

Alfred Taniton opening comments: We've been talking about land, waters, everything for years. It is very important to us. Look at how big this lake is. Elders, our parents and our ancestors were raised on this lake. It is like our blood. Nothing on this land can be changed. It was put here for us to use. Everything in the world depends on water. Developers have started working here but we want to make sure that what we do here will help our future generations.

We were raised on a land that is cold. We need everything that we have here to survive. We will never replace any of these things if they are damaged – water, land, animals, etc. Animals and the land are getting concerned too. As Dene people we don't want anything to happen to them. We are doing this for our future generations. Let's not disagree and argue. Let's be thankful that we are doing this work. We were taught to respect the land and the water and that's why we survived. We don't want that to change so let's work together.

Break for lunch: 12:00 noon

Start after lunch: 1:15pm

Collin gave opening remarks on behalf of the SLUPB.

Tom mentioned areas where he would like the SLUPB to provide more information during the presentation. He also summarized a few areas of interest. The sentiment that Tom got from the

community is that they support the Plan. The community would like to work together to truly understand the plan and to work together to get the plan approved.

Heidi then went through the agenda and suggested that since Michelle Swallow from PAS is here only today that we should have the Edailla discussion this afternoon.

Heidi went through the introduction slides.

Tom asked who would be invited to the implementation workshop. Heidi answered that the workshop is open for everyone but the Board has no funding to cover community participation. Perhaps something could be found later on to assist communities. Tom said that the RRCs would probably want to speak to community involvement on implementation.

Heidi started talking about zoning and the zone map.

Michelle: Is it confirmed that all PAS areas will also be protected under the Plan?

Heidi: Under the MVRMA if an area is going to be a National Historic area or National Park, the Plan cannot apply to these areas. SGN, the Ramparts and Edailla are undergoing different protection and so the plan can still apply in those areas. The SLUPB will on a case-by-case basis, decide whether or not the plan will apply to the PAS areas once they are approved. If the sponsoring agency has strong enough legislation to provide subsurface protection then the Plan will not need to apply. Where the legislation is not strong enough to provide subsurface protection, it may be best to have the Plan apply. The SLUPB will also have to decide how it will zone the areas that are left out of the final PAS boundaries.

Tom clarified that the allowed uses in CZs and PCIs are uses that are allowed in the rest of the zones like GUZs and SMZs.

Heidi then talked about zoning changes since Draft 2.

[Horton Lake is now SMZ. Neregah is now a SMZ which can recognize the values that are of interest in the area. All Sentinel Islands that fall under Sahtu lands should be SMZ to allow for development.]

Tom clarified that Neregah was kept separate from the rest of the Great Bear Lake Watershed because the community had wanted increased inspection in the area due to its heritage values. It does not really need to be a separate zone. The community was in agreement that Neregah could be included in the GBLW zone.

Break: 2:15 pm

Return from break: 2:40 pm

Heidi talked about existing rights and pointed people to the map.

She wanted to discuss the following three topics:

- 1) Including Neregah in the GBL SMZ

- 2) Extending the boundary of the GBL SMZ to include Clement Lake
- 3) The different options for Edailla under PAS.

Tom: We can propose that Neregah be included in the SMZ of the GBL provided that there be increased patrolling in the area to protect cultural and heritage values (including archaeological sites, camp sites, etc.). The request is that the inspection be carried out and if need be, that legislation protecting archaeological sites be enforced. Elders and participants agreed by a show of hands that they agreed with Neregah being included in the GBLW SMZ.

Heidi repeated Tulita's request to Deline to include Clement Lake in the GBL SMZ.

Alfred: Clement Lake's Dene name is Solo Tue. Good fish comes from there. It has been used in the past and continues to be used by us and by the people of Tulita. If they are asking us for support to protect that area there should not be an issue. We will work together. We need to protect fish lakes. Let's work together.

Dolphus: Maybe we need to get together and discuss this to know what they are really asking for.

Alfred: They are asking us to help them manage and protect the area. We would like to help them. We just need to get together and have more discussion about this.

Tom: Will you be in Tulita next week for the hand games? If so, Alfred, can you please speak with the Tulita people and get back to us through Raymond next week?

Russell: Is there a percentage of SMZ and CZ vs. GUZs that we need to be aware of?

Heidi answered that we are in a range that the planning partners are happy with. They do not need to be worried about the percentage.

Russell: It's a good idea if they're asking for protection. If it is not an issue with percentages then we should consider the protection.

Frederick: It's important to have someone get their request in writing so we know exactly what they want. Alfred doesn't write so someone who does should work on this arrangement.

Dolphus: Tulita is making a request in our land so maybe we should have it in writing about how they want us to manage these lands.

Walter: Dolphus might be confusing ownership with use. The land use plan does not have anything to do with ownership. The Plan manages use. Even though there are district boundaries there are many overlaps in use. We should work together and support other communities to protect areas that are important. Protecting the lakes does not affect who owns the land.

Tom asked if the community could confirm whether or not the lakes could be included in the GBL SMZ.

Leon: If we continue to talk about this in the future we may delay the plan more. If Tulita is asking for help we can help them. There seems to be agreement to protect those lakes.

AJ: Tulita people and Deline people both use those lakes a lot. We should discuss this face to face.

Walter: What they are asking for now is different than the Bennett Field issue with the boundary. The Sahtu Land Use Plan does not change Sahtu Lands, the transfer of which resulted in the creation of the districts in the land claim. Protecting this area does not affect Sahtu lands.

We have had issues in the Tlicho but this issue does not seem to be as big as the overlap issues that we have there.

Russell: Since we're going to Tulita we should perhaps meet with them. If in the future we realize that there is oil and gas development they may want to develop it. We want to be sure of our agreement with Tulita.

Jimmy: We need to speak with them face-to-face, not through a messenger.

Tulita decided that they will talk to Deline.

Morris: Before Tom leaves we should agree on what we'll do and Tom can help us put a statement together to bring to Deline.

Heidi then moved on to discussing the options for Edailla and invited Michelle to speak about PAS.

Michelle ran through PAS' 8-step process. The new proposal suggests that Edailla:

- 1) Remain a CZ under the Plan,
- 2) Be brought forward as a Critical Wildlife Area under ENR (no land transfer – industrial dev allowed with regulated surface activities and no subsurface protection),
- 3) Be brought forward as a Wilderness Conservation Area under ITI (surface lands transferred from the Fed government to GNWT, subsurface rights are not transferred – protected under GNWT powers – GNWT could request the Fed government for a land withdrawal). This last designation has never been used before in the NWT, or
- 4) Be protected through a combination of the Plan and one of the above options.

Management plans are not requirements for any of these options. Using a combination approach of a CZ under the plan and a Wilderness Conservation Area would provide monitoring through the GNWT legislation that is not included in the Plan and would also provide surface and subsurface protection under the Plan. The DLC and the DRRC are still waiting to approve the draft proposal but it should be done in the next week or so.

Heidi: Would the Federal Government give the GNWT a land withdrawal in a Wilderness Conservation Area if it asked for one?

Michelle: We could ask for one so subsurface protection could be a possibility. The Gwich'in are finding that they could do with more protection than is currently offered to them through CZs.

A lot of good work has been done in Edailla and it would be good to see a proposal go through but there is no guarantee that ITI would accept it. Once a proposal is accepted, it would be reviewed by ENR and ITI. The GNWT would probably want to speak to Deline about it. Then it would go to Cabinet. My guess is that if a proposal was submitted today it would take 6 months to 1 year before Deline had to face a sponsoring decision.

Edailla should continue as a CZ under the plan and if it was sponsored then the government would maybe be interested in giving a combination of protection.

Russell: Instead of going through the GNWT as a territorial park it might be better to protect Edailla through the SLUP as a CZ. If we go through the PAS we have to go through all these steps including a request for a withdrawal. That will take a long time. It might be better to go through the Plan. You also have to look for a sponsor.

Tom: Deline wants Edailla protected because it is a very important area for wildlife and for its cultural resources. Deline has pursued a number of protection measures. Under the Canada Wildlife Act the Canadian Wildlife Service did not accept Deline's request for sponsorship. As a result, Deline is pursuing potential designation for Edailla as a Territorial Park, as a Wilderness Conservation Area or as a Critical Wildlife Area. It is important to know that a Critical Wildlife Area will not protect Edailla.

Deline wants Edailla protected under the Plan as a CZ. Deline will also consider options with ITI and ENR to see if this can be coupled with either a Critical Wildlife Area or Wilderness Conservation Area in some spots. The territorial legislation does not provide for the protection that Deline wants for Edailla but they can enhance the support that Deline gets for managing the area.

Heidi confirmed that she understood the direction properly. She then suggested that perhaps the way to move forward would be to identify Edailla as a CZ under the Plan and then at some point if it looks like a PAS proposal is moving forward, the Plan can reflect those changes in the future.

Michelle recapped the other PAS options.

Russell: We will have the submission in by next week.

Michelle stated that once the GNWT got the application from Deline it would probably take 6 months to 1 year before they responded to the application and started the process because the GNWT has never established this kind of protected area before.

Alfred: We agreed that if we were to be successful with Saoyu & Ehdacho that we would get protection for Edailla too. This area is very important for caribou. They pass through here every year. We never agreed for development to go ahead but without our agreement companies have gotten mineral claims all over the area. Our elders used the area for many years. We did not want any development there and we had many meetings about this. With the support of co-management boards we will continue to work towards its protection.

Leon: We're trying to do something good for our children. As Dene people it's good when we get listened to. We want to protect our food and we need your support. It's hard for us to do what people who are not from here tell us to do so it's good that we're here to talk about this.

Russell: We've been working on Edailla for so long. We've been working on this for 2 years with PAS but it didn't work. So let's move forward with the SLUP as a CZ.

Johnny: It's good to hear this discussion. We live in Deline. People from the outside come onto our lands without consulting us. After they make a discovery – then they tell us. Once they discover something it's hard for us to protect that area. Even though they find oil or gas we don't get a penny from it. In the future it shouldn't be like that. There should be fair sharing involved because this area belongs to us. It doesn't belong to anybody from the outside. We want to benefit from the economy also.

Two years ago they did some exploration. There used to be caribou but now there's nothing. What will happen in the future with other animals and with trapping? Will they disappear too? They should consult with us before they do anything. It's good to sit and talk. Make sure in the future there's consultation.

Break: 4:19 pm

Back from break: 4:45 pm

Heidi recapped the options for Edailla which were for the SLUPB to zone Edailla as a CZ and then to have the community consider other options for added management support through PAS.

Michelle recapped the options for Edailla's protection.

The meeting ended at: 4:52 pm

Deline Draft 3 Community Consultation

Summary Notes

Thursday, September 2, 2010, 9 am – 5 pm

Culture Centre

Participants:

Collin Bayha, SLUPB Member

Heidi Wiebe, SLUPB

Ida Mak, SLUPB

Michael Neyelle, Translator

Angela Love, SLWB Water Technician

AJ Kenny, Elder/self-government
Alfred Taniton, DRRC Council
Alpohnse Takazo, Elder
Andrew Suzie Cho, Elder
Debbie Simmons, community member
Dolphus Baton, CCD
Fred Kenny, Elder/self-government
George Kenny, VP DRRC
Jane Quitte, Elder
Jimmy Dillon, Elder
Joe Blondin Jr., DRRC Council
Johnny Vital, DRRC Council
Jonas Modeste, community member
Leon Modeste, Self-government
Lorien Nesbitt, Consultant
Morris Neyelle, VP DLC
Paul Modeste, DRRC President
Raymond Taniton, Elder
Ronald Beyonne, Local/resident
Russell Kenny, DRRC Council
Tom Nesbitt, Consultant
Trevor Taylor, CCD

Start time: 9:20 am

Opening Prayer by Alfred Taniton

Raymond Taniton: I wanted to discuss Clement Lake. I think that it's a good thing to protect the fish lakes but maybe you can protect them separately as another zone rather than including them in the GBL SMZ. Back in the day when we were discussing the land claim each community decided on the boundaries of the districts. That's where the districts came from. So it's up to Deline to decide whether or not we want the lake in a SMZ.

Tom: I would like Deline to tell me if they've decided to extend the boundary of the GBLW to include Clement Lake or if you are going to consult with Tulita. I need to start working on the written submission to the SLUPB.

Raymond: It's up to Deline to decide whether or not they want to do this. We can hunt, fish and trap anywhere. Don't worry about your harvesting rights. They're already protected under the land claim. Protecting this lake will not affect your rights or land ownership. All of that has been settled.

Raymond then asked for a show of hands for all those who supported extending the SMZ to capture Clement Lake and the other fish lakes. Everyone agreed to protect the area. The SLUPB accepted Deline's request to include Clement Lake in the GBL SMZ.

Heidi continued with the presentation and talked about how the GBLW was integrated into the Plan.

Raymond: Re: Bennett Field – before we started negotiating the land claim all the old buildings on Bennett Field were transferred to us. When G. Washington took over the lands they turned them over to Deline. That's why we drew our District line there. This was agreed upon when we signed the land claim.

Heidi continued to go through GBLW conditions.

Morris Neyelle: When people come to work in the area like prospectors or clean-up crews, they go fishing after hours. I don't think that they should be allowed to do this.

Lorien thanked the Board for integrating statements of ecological and cultural integrity because they set a strong standard. In her opinion the integration was well done.

Tom: The Sentinel Islands in the GBLWMP were originally conservation zones because any development on the islands could run off into GBL. However after the completion of the GBLWMP the Deline Land Corporation reconsidered and asked that the portions of the Sentinel Islands that are Settlement Lands be made into Special Management Zones. So should the installation of infrastructure also be allowed on those Sentinel Islands?

Heidi: When we made the Sahtu Lands portions of Sentinel Islands SMZs, it meant that development is allowed, so the development of infrastructure is already allowed on those islands that are now SMZ. The remaining Sentinel Islands that are Crown Lands are kept as Conservation Zones as they were before and only research and monitoring will be allowed in these areas.

Tom: That is clarified and I have no more concerns.

Raymond: If a lighthouse is needed would we be allowed to put these up? And what if people want to install docks on portions of the Sentinel Islands?

Tom: If the lighthouse is required it should be allowed in both SMZs and CZs because it could be infrastructure for research and monitoring and there are allowances for community infrastructure. As for the docks, the question would go to the SLUPB and the SLWB and the question would be is the construction of those docks consistent with the maintenance of ecological and cultural integrity. If they are, then they would be allowed to be set up.

Heidi: A lighthouse would be infrastructure and if there is demonstration that there is no other place to build it then it would be allowed even in a Conservation Zone as long as you minimize your impacts.

Alfred: There are some islands that are sacred to us like Manitou Island. That island is a wolf which is why we want to protect it. We don't want to bother the islands. Some islands are needed for nesting

birds. Others have history and stories to them. Some islands are spiritual and mystical and they need to be respected. Not all islands are protected for the same reason.

Joe Blondin Jr: This month they will probably do some drilling on Mystery Island.

Joe pointed out some areas where there are mining interests, teepees and archaeological sites.

Break: 10:10 am

Return from break: 10:35 am

Frederick: Re: Bulk water withdrawal – there has to be a strong policy to protect the waters.

Heidi: During the break Fred talked to me. He said that there seems to be protection of the islands but that there does not seem to be protection for the lake. There is a term in the plan that says that you cannot take more than 40 L of water out of any water body in the SSA and take it somewhere else. You can use water in the area for industrial purposes but you can't remove large quantities of water.

Raymond: What if it is for a national purpose?

Heidi: Anything required for an emergency is allowed so if it was required as a national emergency then they would be able to remove water.

Tom: Fred's concern came up early on when we were working on the GBLWMP. The direction came from the elders and so we included it in the GBLWMP. It has now been included in the SLUP so it applies throughout the SSA.

Tom then summarized the number of tools that are used to protect the health of the lake and the watershed.

Leon: What are the little red spots on the significant cultural sites map?

Heidi: Archaeological sites.

Leon: Today people go everywhere with a canoe and they go where there is good fishing. These are the areas where our elders lived also. Can we zone the special sites somehow? How can we protect the archaeological sites where people used to live long ago? If we do that sport fishermen and non-Dene cannot go there and harvest. We know Plummer's lodge have outposts all over and with their planes they fly all over.

Re: bulk water removal – when I fly over the land I can see that there is less water. In the next little while the other lakes are going to be disappearing and GBL will be the only one left. Developers will need water. We're not saying no to them but we need to restrict their water use.

Heidi: Your first question was how can we protect archaeological sites? These areas are already protected through the zoning as SMZs. Then we also have conditions for development. Before a

developer comes into an area they need to come meet with you to discuss important areas. Then once they know where these areas are they need to avoid them by 500 m.

Raymond: I want you to speak about Special Harvesting Areas and restricted access to Sahtu Lands and finally, the overlap issue between the Sahtu and the Tlicho. Can you talk about devolution and how Special Harvesting Areas can continue to be protected? Our legal interpretation on Special Harvesting Areas conflicts with ENR's understanding. They are not being properly managed and enforced.

Heidi: I'm not sure that there is a lot that we can do. Once we restrict use we restrict it for everyone so this might be an issue to discuss with ENR.

Raymond: We have been getting fewer fish over the years. Our ancestors depended on this fishery. They used to catch hundreds of herring here but the last 2 years we set nets and they only caught about 2 fish. This is likely caused by the winter road. We should do something about this.

Tom: The SLUPB does not deal with rights. Other people do. I would also suggest that the concern with the Tlicho is a rights issue. This is not an issue the SLUPB would be involved in. As for the winter road, when the application comes from DOT every year you should bring your concerns forward and get them addressed in setting the road alignment. Once the plan is approved, they would have to demonstrate that they are not impacting key values such as the fish.

Leon: Deer Pass Bay and Macintosh Bay – a lot of outfitters go out there from Trophy/Plummer's lodge. They fly out there and fish. We should address this.

Raymond: The DLC and Métis own about 29% of the lodge. In about 1992-93 we agreed to let Plummer's Lodge use Macintosh Bay and Deer Pass Bay for 2 years. That was a number of years ago and we haven't talked about it since. This has continued without a new agreement. I think if there's a concern about it then the DLC and Métis should be aware of it and should deal with it directly with Plummer's Lodge.

We have constitutional rights in the Sahtu but we don't have the ability to enforce them. We need people to enforce the Wildlife Act. We need legislation with teeth.

Heidi raised discussion about potential duplication between the ecological and cultural integrity CR and the other SMZ conditions.

Tom: The phrases cultural and ecological integrity are a way to reconcile different concepts. The elders talked of the "health of the land" and these terms capture the meaning. That's why we chose the term. It is fundamental to the GBLWMP and I think we need to reconcile different ways of thinking about the land. It is also important for the rest of the Sahtu. In my opinion, to maintain the ecological integrity of a watershed is a very different standard than to minimize impacts to the watershed. This also speaks to the prophecies of the elders.

Lorien: I think one of the key points is that the maintenance of ecological integrity is based on the cumulative impacts on an ecosystem. In minimizing the impacts on a series of activities you risk making your best effort the minimization of your impacts but this doesn't mean that you won't negatively

impact the system. You can minimize your impacts on every project and still negatively impact the ecosystem. Deline has said that the health of GBL is fundamentally important to them and more important than development.

If development is going to create impacts that affect the ecological integrity then maybe it should not occur. If however, we are just looking at minimizing the impacts then every development can go forward as long as it minimizes its impacts to a certain level. Development can continue to occur even as the integrity of the ecosystem is being negatively impacted in a serious way.

It's important to have this standard because of this difference.

Russell: GBL is protected under a SMZ and other districts also have SMZs but they are different. When the elders put the SMZ it was to protect the area from development. So what do the other communities think about the SMZs?

Heidi: We have been to all the other communities except for FGH. The SMZs in the other districts have pretty much stayed the same but some areas have increased in the K'asho Got'ine District.

I understand that ecological integrity is a stronger standard, as Tom and Lorien explained. In the past we had a plan with stronger conditions and industry told us that they cannot work under such conditions. If this is the case, is it acceptable to Deline? The planning board needs to ask this question.

Tom: I think we can all expect that industry, especially smaller companies, want things to stay the way they are. There has not been a land use plan in place even though I think it is the heart of the resource management regime. Industry will say things like that because they will speak in their best interest. I think responsible companies will live with the conditions. Under the land claim agreement under S. 25.2.4.(a) it says that the purpose of the Plan is to protect the well being of present and future residents, having interest to all Canadians. Part of that well being is the maintenance of ecological and cultural integrity.

We shouldn't water down the standard. The people of Deline are happy to have development here but they also want to protect the land. Smaller companies may not be able to do that but larger companies will be able to.

Lorien: Industry may say that they don't want to develop in an SMZ but industry in other areas have taken steps. For example, forestry companies have undergone audits every 3 years to demonstrate that they are maintaining the ecological integrity of the area they operate in. It may be that industry will say that they won't develop here as a bargaining chip but others have done it and they can too. Forestry and some mining industry have taken steps to do this.

Heidi: Can you think about what this might look like on the ground? Can you tell me what they are not doing now that you would like them to do in the future?

Morris: All land is important. It's very difficult for me to tell you which areas should be more protected than others. All conditions should be applied to all areas in case of future development. One of the

prophecies that we were given is that although GBL is huge, one day many people and boats will come to the lake. We need to protect it.

Leon: Even though we settled land claims developers are still doing what they want. Activity is still taking place without proper consultation or authorization. That's why we need to make the conditions stronger. Developers go wherever they want. They know that there is a lot of potential here. We don't want to say no to them but we want them to sit with us and consult with us. We want to make a good agreement with them. We want to work with them because we're talking about our children. Let's have a good talk with them at the public hearing. If they're working we need to talk about all our issues and concerns (eg. how long they will work, where they will work, whether they will be fishing, etc.) so we know what they'll be doing here.

AJ: We all eat from this lake, us and the animals. We want to do this right and put it on paper. If we continue to work together then solutions and answers will come out. Development has cut up our land with seismic lines and camps, all over the place. This plan looks like something that the elders would agree to. We can work together.

Alphonse Takazo: We were raised on the land and knew where everything was. We knew where the fish lakes were and we ate well. This is why land and water is so important to us because we lived off it and everything came from the land. When developers come around you can see signs of where they have been – their impacts. This is why we keep talking about the land – because it's so important to us.

We have fewer fish now because of the winter road but it is still important to us because that's how we get our supplies. I'm sure that when little spills occur they are not reported. There are areas that need to be remediated but they have not yet been fixed. The military also travelled through this area on a Cat train. That's why we need to know ahead of time – before activity occurs.

Alfred: Elders speak passionately about the land because we are often on it and we see these things happen. I have 2 things I want to bring up but I'll speak after lunch.

Lunch break: 12:10 pm

Back from lunch: 1:30 PM

Heidi went through the conditions of the Plan.

Tom: CR#2 asks developers to come meet with the communities in person which I think is a big improvement. Before people work on your land they will have to come speak with you. I am wondering why R#3 is just a recommendation (Project Summary Meeting). Could it be possible to make it necessary for developers to meet with the community both before and after a project?

Russell: Often when they do research a lot of the reports are technical. Could we ask them to do plain language reports of research and monitoring studies?

Heidi: To answer Tom's question, the reason that we had R#3 as a recommendation is because Fort Good Hope had asked us for this and we just never thought to put it in as a CR. We can try that. As for the plain language summaries, we can ask. That seems like a good idea.

Angela Love: We are getting our lawyers to look at the issue of collecting security. The MVRMA states that the SLWB "may" collect security so we are not obliged to collect it.

Tom: The community is very supportive of collecting security. It should be the polluter pays principle.

Joe pointed out some areas where there are contaminated sites to be cleaned up. He mentioned that he thought there are 22 sites around GBL that need to be cleaned up.

Lorien: For CR#9 on climate change you may want to bring in cumulative impacts and ask developers to take extra care to consider the added effects when climate change comes into play.

Leon: There have to be 2-3 people who are involved with cumulative impacts. GNWT and INAC have their own inspectors but who will be our monitors? Their inspectors don't come from here. We should have a few people from Deline to represent us. We say we're going to work together but if we don't have our own inspectors and monitors things will stay the same. In 1978 there were 2-4 Australians visiting and we asked them what they were doing. They said nothing and 2 years ago 2 ladies from Australia came here and went to the North Shore. So we should have monitors because otherwise more people will come here and we will not know what they're doing.

Deb Simmons: Re: GBLW & Special Management slide – Deline has a great concern about having Deline people on the land to make sure that the rules that have been set out by the Plan are being respected. The indicators and methods that CIMP has set out are mainly science-based. I think they're working toward strengthening the TK side of things but they haven't really gotten there yet. I was working with Walter Bayha in a TK practitioner's group that discussed this (Florence Catholic, Alestine Andre and others). I am suggesting that the Plan re-word the text to allow for the community to work on monitoring and cumulative effects protocols or guidelines first to integrate traditional knowledge protocols, not just science-based methods.

Heidi agree that this is a good idea. Heidi then went to the Working Together slide and introduced the Sahtu Working Group Action where people would get together about 3-4 times a year to work to develop a number of guidelines and programs regarding TK, best practices, cumulative effects and monitoring.

Tom summarized to the community representatives the work that the Sahtu Working Group would undertake. Tom then confirmed that the ideas are supported by the communities but if there is no funding for communities to participate then the Working Group will not take off. Communities are limited by money and time. In addition to potentially not being able to afford to participate, this also creates more work for the communities and adds strain to already strained personnel. Priorities need to be set so that communities can work realistically.

Lorien: These Actions are good ideas but they will be a lot of work, especially in 4 years. I would see these guidelines being developed in the first 4 years and then implementation taking place after that. It would be very important for the communities to be involved and funding will be a significant issue.

Heidi: Regarding funding, the Board budget will likely drop and our ability to fund ourselves will be a challenge. That is why we are mentioning this now so that communities can bring this issue to SSI to get funding from elsewhere set up.

Tom: Can we talk about community funding at the public hearing so that we can raise the profile of this issue?

Heidi: The community can talk about it in its presentation and raise it as a possible discussion topic in your comments. Regarding priorities, the expectation is not to have all of these guidelines completed in 4 years. The 4 years would likely give them time to get an action plan together and start some work before the 5 year review.

Leon: We can't put off developing the monitoring program. We need to start it right away and not wait 4 years. We need to address the lack of monitoring now. It will also create employment. There is usually a waiting period between when meetings are held and when things actually start getting done. There is no more time to wait.

Heidi: Under the MVRMA, every 5 years an environmental audit takes place. An audit is being done this year. It would be incorrect to say that there is no monitoring but it might not be what the community wants. The report should be released in the near future.

Alfred: We want to start doing things by ourselves. It's hard to accept that we have to use reports that are done by people who are not from here and who do not know our land. But we do need to work together and we need to get stronger. Now you're saying that we should be hiring communications people, liaisons, monitors, which is good. Raymond was talking about there being fewer fish because of the winter road and there is also climate change. We need to realign our winter road and perhaps somehow make a bridge over Great Bear River. This is something that we want to do in the future and that is important to us. We need to know what will be good for us in the future. The Plan sounds good to us. I am optimistic.

Tom: I believe that the winter road would be a territorial responsibility under DOT. You can ask them to look at the feasibility of continuing to use the ice road. Deline may also want to look at a strategy for approaching DOT and DFO for researching the impacts of the road on fish over time and to consider other options for routing the winter road.

Heidi finished going through the rest of the CRs, As and Rs.

Deb: Re: Gaps – I think that a number of gaps exist still. First, there is a gap in identifying traditional place names. A lot of work was done on place names in the GBLWMP which is why there is a strong presence of place names. Regarding place names I saw 2 reactions: 1) SSI was very happy and wanted it translated right away and 2) the researchers wanted the place names to be verified. The second gap is

the unevenness in integration of stories and Dene concepts into the Plan. English is the main language. I would like to see it be more bilingual so that the Dene could start really working with the Plan. I think it would also be good to integrate things like the translation workshop information that the SLUPB worked on in June 2009.

Leon: We've done some really good work here. I see the SLUPB board members but they all look very young and I don't see a bushman in there. I would like to see an elder there, someone with a lot of knowledge of the land to help the board. We don't see all of their decisions or all of their reports. We have GNWT and INAC representatives but we should have elders be involved to help guide the process. We should see if we could add an elder to the Board.

Alfred: I agree with Leon's recommendation. Youth and elders should be involved everywhere. Maybe SSI, land corporations, First Nations should think about this.

Heidi summarized how Board members are nominated and appointed.

Deb suggested that elders be set up as advisors instead of Board members.

Dolphus: We've given and shared a lot of information that has been used by government, industry and co-management groups so before any decisions will be made by anybody there needs to be consultation with the community.

Leon: Whoever is on the Board should come to the community and give presentations about decisions that were made. Let's have better communication and liaison with the Boards.

Heidi then went over the timeline for plan completion, the public hearing and the implementation workshop.

AJ: We have discussed some very important issues here. All of our elected leaders should have been present. Our leaders are the ones who will be at the public hearing and at the implementation workshop. They should be taking this in. As elders we can't really read or write so it's important to use our staff and boards. When I used to be on council I used to be involved. I like attending meetings because I learn things and I speak when I have a concern. Even though our leaders have not been here the past couple of days we had some good discussions.

AJ thanked Tom, Lorien, everyone who was present, the translator and the staff.

Leon: As a community we need to bring forward the 3 most important topics for the public hearing. We need to work with Tom on this. He thanked everyone for coming to share with us.

Collin thanked everyone for participating and thanked Michael for translating. We have Ida taking everything down so we've got everything that was said these past two days.

Russell: When we're in Tulita for the hand games the chiefs and presidents will be there and so maybe we can discuss with them then.

Tom: When we are in Norman Wells at the Public Hearing, the GNWT and the Federal government will have their professional negotiators and technical people who will talk with community people whose strengths are on the land. The Board needs to make sure that all can participate equally in discussions during the workshops and make sure that the messages of the Dene do not get changed, watered down or misinterpreted in the final stage of planning because discussions get too technical or the community voice is outnumbered by government and industry participation at the workshops.

Tom thanked the elders, the SLUPB and the SLWB for coming and working together.

Closing prayer by Leon Modeste

Meeting ended at: 4:40 pm