



Sahtu Land Use Planning Board

Box 235, Fort Good Hope, NT, X0E 0H0
Phone: (867) 598-2055 Fax: (867) 598-2545
Email: info@sahtulanduseplan.org; Website: www.sahtulanduseplan.org

SLUP Draft Amendment Application: Ts'udé Nǰlǰné Tuyeta (AM2020-01) Engagement Summary – Public Sessions

March 25th, 2021, 10:00 – 11:00 AM (Via Zoom)

SLUPB Staff

Justin Stoyko, Executive Director
Heidi Wiebe, Planning Support

Participants

Janice Traynor, CIRNAC
Alana Vigna, CIRNAC
Kris Brekke, CPAWS
Stephanie Poole, Akaitcho IMA Implementation Office
Barrett Lenoir, Ducks Unlimited Canada
Michelle-Claire Roy, CIRNAC

Meeting Summary

Stephanie: How many zones are in the SLUP?

Heidi: 69 zones, but only 67 are numbered. General Use Zones (GUZ) and Established Protected Areas (EPA) aren't numbered.

Barrett: Did you get DUC's new wetland mapping from GNWT?

Heidi: No, as the data pertains to the new protected area and the SLUPB won't do any planning in there once it is an EPA.

Kris: CPAWS didn't submit comments earlier in the process. Special Management Zone (SMZ) would be the obvious choice for zoning in both areas. I like the idea of buffer zones to transition from the protected area to SMZ to GUZ. The SLUPB's proposed buffer is an engagement buffer – it creates work for the Management Board – do they want that? That is for them to determine. Our preference would be to have a SMZ buffer around the protected area – that would be best practice in protected area design. We understand that the GNWT has an interest in zoning



consistency. There would be room for a GUZ along the Gwich'in Settlement Area boundary, while allowing SMZ closer to the protected area. I'll be putting comments forward. Also, with respect to the caribou habitat you mapped with Fort Good Hope, the Ecological Assessment done by the prior Working Group mentioned caribou activity there.

Stephanie: Trying to understand who makes the decision on the protected area and zoning. Was it negotiated? Why didn't the board just protect the land?

The protected area boundary was set in 2012. The Board has no say over that. That is the boundary that was established in legislation under the GNWT's *Protected Areas Act*. The SLUPB gets to zone the areas excluded from the protected area. While there are some people in each community who wish the whole area had been protected, the direction we got from community leadership identified a range of zoning requests. Fort Good Hope is the closest community and the one most affected, therefore we give greatest consideration to their feedback. We also look at the information that we've collected on the areas, and the direction we get from the 3 Approving Parties, to make sure that whatever we propose has a good chance of being approved. We try to build consensus with them on the final decisions before we submit the final application. That is the purpose of those Tri-Partite Meetings.

Stephanie: Have you talked to the communities then? How do they feel about this zoning?

Heidi: We held sessions with Fort Good Hope and Tulita last week and both were happy with the SLUPB's proposed zoning amendments. We haven't been able to reach Colville Lake yet.



March 29th, 2020, 2:00 - 3:00 PM (Via Zoom)

SLUPB Staff

Justin Stoyko, Executive Director
Heidi Wiebe, Planning Support

Participants

Catarina Owen, SRRB
Arlene Drake, NRCAN
Ash Varghese, SLWB
Nathalie Lowry, CWS, ECCC (Yukon)
Anita Ogaa GNWT, Lands
Justin Adams, GNWT, Lands
Kim Pawley, CIRNAC
Alyssa Bougie, SRRB

Meeting Summary

Catarina: How long does it usually take for Canada to provide comments or approve amendments?

Justin: For comments, we get those during the process. For approval, it depends. The SLUPB has no control over how long the approving parties take to approve the plan.

Arlene: Historically has there been much mineral exploration in this area?

Justin: Oil and gas yes – back in the '60s through to the '90s. For minerals, we only know the potential, which was documented by the NWT Geoscience Office. There has been little to no mineral exploration in the area.

Nathalie: For the new Fort Good Hope caribou range – is that barren-ground caribou? How does CR 14 cover this?

Justin: No, it's mountain woodland caribou – FGH residents were clear about that and adamant it is mountain woodland caribou.

Heidi: CR #14 points people towards the zone descriptions for SMZs, and particularly the reasons for which a zone is established and the values described for that zone, and tells proponents to demonstrate in their applications how they can carry out their activities without impacting those values. Caribou habitat though is more specifically protected under CR #7, which maps various aspects of important wildlife habitat (annual range, seasonal range) and identifies setbacks and minimum flight altitudes



for work in those ranges, and requires that impacts to wildlife and their habitat be mitigated.

Catarina: Does it matter in terms of level of protection if its barren-ground or boreal or mountain caribou?

Heidi: Not really. They all receive some degree of protection and mitigation of impacts through CR 7. Where we have identified seasonally significant range, they have more rigorous setbacks and minimum flight altitudes. We did a thorough review of CR #7 with ENR's caribou biologist during the 5-Year Review update it and better align the map, table and text.

Ash: You have identified reasons for decision – if you've already made the decision what kind of feedback are you looking for?

Justin: This is just a draft. We still need feedback to make sure the Parties are ok with what we're proposing, or what might need to change before we submit it for approval.

Heidi: Maybe we should have called it "rationale" for this stage in the process.