

**From:** [Chris Hopkins](#)  
**To:** "[Heidi Wiebe](#)"  
**Subject:** Response to SLUP Draft 3  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 29, 2010 3:29:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [Response to SLUP draft 3.doc](#)

---

Heidi;

Attached find my initial comments regarding the latest, and very good I may add, Draft of the SLUP.

Well done

Chris



Heidi Weibe

Sahtu Land Use Planning Board

Fort Good Hope, NT

RE: Sahtu Land Use Plan Draft 3

Dear Heidi;

I must commend you and your staff on the depth and detail of this draft as you work towards finally getting a Land Use Plan accepted and in place for the SSA.

I do though have some strong concerns with the contents of Chapter 6 which directly effects the Sahtu Renewable Resources Board in the future.

The main point that needs far more work in our eyes is this Sahtu Working Group. The Actions listed for its future work are commendable but the SRRB does not have the resources, either human or financial to participate in its work. I would expect that you are getting the same reaction from our Wildlife and Environmental partners. It is one thing to propose such a group but to also ask for it to be self funded by the organizations you are inviting to the table is unrealistic in these times of increasing costs and open lack of proper Implementation funding from the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

I would expect that the only way this plan for the Sahtu Working will actually come to fruition is if your Board can coerce or get a long-term commitment to properly fund the Working Group. Until such time as funding is made available to all of the members of this proposed group the SRRB will not be a participant, though we certainly want to be in the future.

So Action #2 is a non starter without funding from outside sources.

### **Action #3 Community Engagement Guidelines**

This subject is ever present in the Sahtu and the SRRB has been continually carrying out community engagements on caribou now for several years. We also annually invite and pay travel, accommodation and honoraria to all 5 RRCs to attend our bi-annual Board meetings.

The word “consultation’ is also used but has a completely different meaning here in the Sahtu. I would recommend that you exchange consultation for Community Engagement in every instance throughout Chapter 6 to avoid confusion and to better solidify the meaning and effort that has already been and will be put into the Community Engagement process.

### **Action #4 Best Practices**

Here again a credible plan to establish a working volume of Sahtu ‘Best Practices and we are in full agreement in principle.

### **Action #5 Sahtu Cumulative Effects Management Plan**

The whole idea of monitoring the cumulative effects in the NWT is a noble venture but the federal government through the CIMP initiative has lacked the one ingredient necessary for any credible work to be carried out so to establish some baseline information. Money in the form of proper levels of funding so that organizations like SRRB and SLUP can begin to develop a long-range plan. Literature Reviews are meaningless at this point with the increasing amount of Climate Change effects currently being noted in the Sahtu. The proposed Working Group could eventually take this on in a coordinating role but not without proper, long-term funding allocations available through a revitalized CIMP.

SRRB has all but given up on the current version of CIMP as they are unable to fund actual long-term monitoring, and what they do approve is not what is needed at this time.

My original point above regarding the funding of the Working Group also hinges on this Action becoming reality.

### **Action #6 Sahtu Environmental Monitoring Program**

See Above. As to the accompanying Recommendation #6, SRRB has a dedicated and I don’t use that term loosely, Communications Officer.

### **Action # 9 Traditional Knowledge Guidelines**

As you know SRRB developed our Traditional Knowledge Guideline several years ago and I believe you have a copy of them. We are open to assisting other organizations develop similar policy.

### **Action #10 Access to Wildlife Information**

SRRB has maintained a Harvest Study Data Base since it undertook the Harvest Study in 1997. Funding for this critical information collection ended in 2002 and hence our database is mostly out of date. There has been veiled commitments made to the Advisory Council on Cooperative Wildlife Management (ACCWM) by Environment and Natural Resources (GNWT) to restart these Harvest Studies in the Co-Management areas for large mammals only. Whether or not that funding will ever arrive in the hands of the Wildlife Managers is an unknown.

The distribution of the information in a detailed way is unlikely to ever happen also as the harvesters are protective of their hunting areas and practices and if it was known that the information would be freely distributed to whoever asked then SRRB would not either not get the required information from them or not get the complete information.

We can, as we did with your request, supply overall known species information as to areas of habitat, historical harvest numbers but not broken down in detail.

We, along with our Co-Management partners throughout the NWT pushing to have the resources provided to re-start the Harvest Study in the Sahtu and we will keep you up to date on that front in the future.

That's it for now as I'm sure others have made comments from an editorial perspective. I look forward to participating in the upcoming Public Hearing.

Kind Regards

Chris Hopkins

Executive Director