

***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.

Tulita District Follow-up Meeting

Summary Notes

Thursday, January 6, 2011

Community Arena, Tulita, NT

Participants:

Judith Wright-Bird, Chair SLUPB	Joel Holder, GNWT, ENR
Bob Overvold, SLUPB Member	Lee Montgomery, Parks Canada
Heidi Wiebe, SLUPB Senior Planner	Rita Clair, Eagle Plains Resources Ltd.
Edna Tobac, SLUPB Executive Director	Lindsay Armer, INAC
Joel Ashworth, GIS Analyst	Paul Latour, CWS, EC
Kris Brekke, Canadian Parks & Wilderness Society (CPAWS)	Deborah Archibald, GNWT, ITI
Alison Woodley, CPAWS	Marc Lange, INAC
Miki Ehrlich, GNWT, ENR (PAS Secretariat)	Carl Ozyer, INAC, NTGO
Greg Yeoman, INAC	
Ruby L. McDonald, Norman Wells Land Corp (NWLC)	Debbie Yallee, Tulita
Rhea McDonald, Norman Wells RRC	Stacey Naedzo, Tulita
Janet Bayha, Tulita District Land Corp (TDLC)	William Horrassi, Tulita
Kathleen McDonald, NWLC Youth	
Rick Hardy, Tulita District Naats'ihch'oh Working Group	Cecile MacCauley, Tulita Dene Band
Gordon Yakeleya, TLC President	Doug Yallee, Tulita
Joe Horassi, Tulita	Donna Schear, NWLC
Jess Fortner, NWLC	Frederick Andrew, Tulita RRC
Roger Odgaard, NWLC	Ed McPherson, FNMLC
Wilfred Lennie, FNMLC	Tony Grandjambe, NWLC
Valerie Yakeleya, FNMLC	Andy Short, GNWT, ITI
Maurice Mendo, Tulita	Gabe Horassi, Tulita
John Hotti, Tulita	Norman Andrew, Tulita
Cecil Mathews, Tulita District Land Corp	Arsene Menacho, Tulita
David Yallee Sr., Tulita	Edward MacCauley, Tulita Land Corp
Roderick Yallee, Tulita RRC	Rocky Norwegian, TDLC
Gary Yakeleya, Tulita	

Start Time 9:58 am

Opening prayer by Gordon Yakeleya

Judith Wright-Bird did opening remarks for the SLUPB. She welcomed everyone and explaining the reason for meeting.

Introductions were done by everyone in attendance.

Opening comments by community organizations:

Gordon Yakeleya - TLC: Thanked the SLUPB for delaying the public hearing. It is good to understand what you are doing. We are glad we have more time to do things. I hope that at the end that we have a good productive meeting.

Tony Grandjambe - NWLC: Since we started these parks negotiations, we stressed the fact that we wanted to protect certain areas mentioned in the SLCA. We set up conservations zones, people wanted to turn specific areas into parks, and expand Nahanni Park to protect the water, flora and fauna in the area. This was a strong concern from the elders in both communities. What we wanted was the communities to have exclusive rights for hunting. Perhaps some of the areas were a bit big. We are still negotiating different zones. We have the PAS working group working on the three tongues and they are managed by the two communities, also the Brackett Lake and Lennie Lake areas, and protecting the burial grounds. Some places are extremely sensitive. We are down to the details and it seems that the economics are coming to the forefront of park decisions and how we are managing the benefits. We are on the 3rd or 4th draft of the LUP and all parties are involved now. I guess that is all I have to say at this time.

Rocky Norwegian - TDLC: Glad to see all the right people in the room to answer questions because we have many questions. When we negotiated the claim, I always thought the land use plan would take care of our concerns about protecting certain areas. I've watched the protected areas process since 1993, how hard they've been working to protect our areas. That process is not in our claim. I've never seen the flipside of that coin – a look at the value of our land for other uses. An economic development strategy should be completed first. I would like to see a workshop held so people see what options are out there before making decisions. My job isn't to protect all the land but to ensure economic development. We need to have a balance. I do not want to sit down later and say that we have made a bad deal.

Katherine MacDonald – NWLC Youth: I am here today to listen, look around, and see what we are giving up. As a youth I would like to walk the land and see it for myself. It is our land and not really the elders anymore.

Donna Schear - NLWC: I have been involved in this process for a while. Thinking about the reason why we selected those lands, I think we are going backwards instead of forward. I think that we have to progress forward.

Marc Lange - INAC: Thank you to the Board for having us here. Trish sends her regards. We're here to provide information for the Board and the community. How we achieve the balance between conservation and development is up to the community at this point, to provide that to the Board. Our role is to react to that advice and provide some suggestions.

Chris Brekke - CPAWS: I have been on the PAS Steering Committee since its inception. We're here to help the community make decisions on the protection of the land and the tools available to do that.

Paul Latour – CWS: I am here with CWS. He has been working with the community for a couple of years on Shuhtagot'ine Nene and CWS was asked to sponsor the area. We view this meeting as a very important crossroads given recent developments and discussions on the establishment of this area. He wants to get a good read on where the community sits on the area.

Joel Holder – GNWT, ENR: Thanked the board for creating this opportunity. We are here to listen and participate positively and help.

Bob Overvold – SLUPB: We've been working on this for 12 years. There have been long delays. Part of the problem was inadequate funding. When SSI took INAC to court they demanded that INAC fund the board adequately. The last 3 years we have got the funding we needed. The funding came with conditions to complete the Plan this year. We thought we were going to meet that target. When we discussed the need for further consultations, we thought they were very legitimate. Another community, FGH, asked for further consultations as well and we will hold that meeting next week. As a result, we will not finish the plan by March. How long is this supposed to take? With all due respect to the concerns raised, we have to complete the job.

Lee Montgomery - Parks Canada: It's good to have everyone together in the same room to discuss the process.

Doug Yallee: I would like to hear from everyone in PAS, Parks, and the key industries.

Rita Clair – Eagle Plains Resources: Thank you for the opportunity to be here and answer any questions.

Tony Grandjambe: The points on the agenda are very good. For communities, it would be good to know what is needed to finish the plan. We should have some kind of facilitation between the groups to come up with a plan.

Fred Andrew: In the 1970s, Thomas Berger came to talk about the pipeline. We had concerns but they still built the pipeline. This plan has been under development for 15 years. I want to know if my grandkids have a secure future with the land use plan. How secure is that plan going to be?

Land Use Planning 101

Heidi went over her PowerPoint presentation

Doug Yallee: Asked what happens when the land and water boards get an application.

Heidi: Either the SLWB will check the application to make sure it follows the Plan, or it will be referred to us and we will check to make sure it follows the Plan.

Rhea: If the Plan grandfathers all existing rights, can they be upgraded?

Heidi: The rights will continue to exist, and upon renewal, they will be subject to the other conditions of the Plan. They are only exempt from the zoning restrictions.

Donna Schear: How many will be grandfathered?

Heidi: Pointed Donna to the current map of existing uses on the wall.

Tony: Is Bear Rock protected? How far back from the river?

Heidi: Bear Rock is protected in a Conservation Zone (CZ). We had direction from Tulita to include Trout Lake in that zone so it extends that far. The Smokes is inside community boundaries and is no longer protected under plan.

Rick Hardy: That area is covered under MGM's property.

Rhea: The way it is being presented is not right. If it can be developed then it's not protected.

Roger: Do we have a map of bear rock? Where is the boundary?

Heidi: We will go parcel by parcel with Joel tomorrow who can pull up detailed maps. It is best to park this discussion till then.

Roger: He does not want to see MGM drilling on bear rock with their existing rights.

Heidi: Planning can only direct the future use of the area; it cannot change past use. No new developments are allowed in this area but existing rights can proceed. The Plan is clear on this.

Tony: I thought we had a land withdrawal.

Judith said that the community requested that a few years ago for Bear Rock, the Smokes, Red Dog Mountain, etc through PAS.

Heidi: There was never a land withdrawal for the Tulita Conservation Initiative. Also, the community pulled these areas out of PAS a little over a year ago and directed that these areas be protected through the Plan instead (except for the Smokes which is excluded from the Plan because it is in community boundaries).

Rocky: I asked a year or two ago what happens to lands that may be in limbo when the community boundary changes.

Heidi: The plan allows for changes in community boundaries and will always exempt lands within the boundaries. The Plan allows for expansion of community boundaries and would then exempt the new lands.

Rocky: What if the boundary shrinks? What about the lands left out? It happened when he was mayor.

Heidi: If it shrinks we can come into work with the community to determine how to zone those areas and we'd have to amend the Plan.

Lee: Judith mentioned resolutions that would be needed from the community. What is anticipated?

Heidi: We will discuss that tomorrow following discussions and direction from the community.

Edward: What if the Tulita District wants the Plan approved just the way it is and it is submit it to SSI and they disagree?

Heidi: The SSI is made up of the 3 districts. They will support what the districts want.

Break for lunch

1:00 pm restart meeting

Parks Canada –PowerPoint Presentation on Nááts'ihch'oh

Lee Montgomery went through her presentation on the history and status of Nááts'ihch'oh establishment. The park is ~7600 square km, covering less than 5% of the SSA. Her presentation showed the current land withdrawal boundary and the proposed boundary for the park. She presented a chronology of events and consultations done on the park. In 2008 Parks Canada and the Tulita District Land Corp signed a MOU for a standalone park in Sahtu Settlement Area, with offices in the Tulita district. An Impact and Benefits Plan (IBP) was negotiated. Parks Canada remains committed to the IBP, but it is not signed yet. The District has told them it will have to be signed by end of February.

Joel Holder: Does the boundary have to be determined prior to the IBP being signed?

Lee: It is preferable to have a boundary set first but is not a requirement of the IBP.

Lee continued her presentation. She provided a broad summary of the Impact and Benefits Plan, then described the mineral potential and existing mineral rights in the area. Howards Pass, Mactung and Wilson claim areas were left out of the boundary to allow those properties to continue. Access to Howard's Pass will be provided through the Park. Parks Canada is interested in buying out the Lened claims (Playfair Mining). High mineral potential areas were left out around the peripheral areas including pluton-rich areas in southwest and north-central areas. Deborah Archibald explained that plutons are indicators of high mineral potential as other minerals concentrate around them.

Joel holder asked if the road to Howard's Pass was a year-round road.

Deborah explained that the road is needed to bring in equipment and supplies to build the mine. It will be used heavily during construction but after that only for resupply. They are planning on using a pipeline to transport the minerals out in a slurry.

Rick hardy reminded everyone that no decision to construct the mine has been made yet.

Lee stated that the proposed boundary includes an O'Grady Lake extension that was not in the original boundary options that Parks Canada consulted on. It will provide alternative access to the park via floatplane. An ecotourism lodge could be set up on O'Grady Lake, either in the park or outside the park on the remainder of the lake.

Lee presented maps and information on the key wildlife and conservation values assessed in the study area that were used to delineate the proposed boundary, including range maps for woodland caribou, grizzly bears, and Dall's sheep. Parks Canada wants the watercourses of the South Nahanni River and its two main tributaries (the Little Nahanni and Broken Skull) to be included in the plan. Lee reiterated that the proposed boundary shown is a proposal only and it has not been approved by the Senior MERA Committee.

Rick Hardy: I am Rick Hardy, Chief Negotiator for the last 3-4 years for the Tulita district for the national park. We completed our negotiations in January 2010. Following those negotiations I met with each of the land corporations, RRC's, and general membership where they wanted meetings. As a result, the 5 land corporations passed a resolution to sign the Impact and Benefit Plan (IBP). The expectation was that it would be signed that summer. The Chief Executive Officer of Parks Canada recommended to the Minister that he not sign until boundary was settled. The communities were not happy. Since then we have continued to work with Parks Canada. The 3 land corporations and the RRCs are still willing to work with Parks Canada and remain committed to the establishment of the park and signing of the IBP. I want to emphasize that point, as people in the GNWT seem to believe that people here do not support the park. I want to say that they do. The only remaining issue, which does not have to be resolved to sign the benefits plan, is to complete the boundary. The IBP allows for the boundary to be set after it is signed. In addition to IBP the 3 land corporations, earlier this year, negotiated a cooperation agreement with Selwyn. At the time the land corps approached Selwyn to negotiate this agreement, they approached other mining companies to complete agreements as well. Only Selwyn stepped up to complete an agreement. The communities are hopeful that in a short time, 3 months, Parks Canada will keep its word.

Having said that I would like to take it back to how this affects the plan. At the present time, the Plan has Naats'ihch'oh set up as a PCI. But we all know that once the park is established we will not take up all the land that is set aside as a PCI. One of the issues that was raised in October is how will these areas be zoned? It is important. We cannot support conservation zones in these areas left outside the final park boundaries because it will be impossible for the mining potential to be realized.

Gordon: I have a problem with the O'Grady Lake extension. This was not in the proposal and now it is getting bigger. I guess the other question is where did all these comments to Parks Canada come from - from the communities or other people?

Lee: The comments came from all over.

Gordon: We have the opportunity for development. We have been having a hard time in Tulita. We have to have development in the area. This year we had nothing going on all year. The business arm had little investment. Lots of people went through hard times. We want to make sure that this works. We want a balance.

Heidi: Asked Rick for confirmation that the communities still support Naats'ihch'oh as a PCI. He confirmed this. Heidi asked Lee about the time frame for deciding on the park boundary. This is important for harmonizing the final boundaries in the Plan.

Lee: We were asked to sign the IBP for February. Signing doesn't necessarily require the boundary to be resolved. I do not know exactly where we stand today. The Senior MERA

committee is meeting this month. It is hard to say how quickly that process will resolve the boundary. Maybe we'll reach agreement in February, but that is optimistic. Once the committee puts forth their views, that process can go quickly. But we have a new minister that may complicate things. We can't guess what parliament will do. I think there will have to be some kind of work around.

Deborah: I just thought I would expand on the MERA committee and where things can go in the next while. That is the body that will get together and determine the boundary. The GNWT supports the park. We have been involved in the process. One of the questions is what the community thinks. We want to make sure we have a full understanding of what community thinks of this, that we achieve that balance Gordon talked about. When the MERA Committee met in October there were a number of questions on the boundary that was proposed here. There was a list of questions and we will get back together in a couple of months to get answers to those questions. The community of Tulita asked about potential hydro development. Another consideration that has developed recently is this idea about buying out a mining company. We need to take time to think about that.

Heidi: We have to look at an interim solution on how we can move forward to complete plan if the final boundary will not be known for some time yet. We need to know the maximum size of the park (the current land withdrawal plus the O'Grady Lake extension). Then we can include a default designation to zone any areas left out of the park as Special Management as the Tulita District has requested. That is one way the plan can move forward if we don't have a final boundary in the next couple of months.

Break - Resumed meeting at 2:54 pm.

Heidi summarized on a flip chart the proposed solution presented before the break.

Roger: In regards to areas excluded and zoned as special management, there is hunting in Selwyn's areas. Do we have the right to hunt there and can we exclude the capacity to hunt to people working at Selwyn?

Heidi: The plan does not speak to hunting. You could probably work that out directly with the company through your agreements.

Participant: The community could put this forward for the conditions the land and water boards attach to their authorizations and address it that way.

Tony: The people that work in the mines would not do any hunting. They are restricted on the Yukon side. It is part of the regulations.

Roger: Regarding the caribou, they are on the decline. There are a lot of people from the RRCs and GNWT here. We should not wait for the decline. We should red flag this area. There have been negotiations with the outfitters. Can you tell us what is going on there?

Lee Montgomery: The herds in the national park would not be available for outfitters; that is something that is covered under the land claim. The only that thing that is ongoing is harvesting by land claim beneficiaries.

Roger: Asked about where outfitters are getting the information to value their businesses.

Lee: I have not been working with the outfitters. The process used to evaluate the business is based on things like market share, the value of the land holdings, etc.

Paul Latour: -shuhtagot'ine Nene-Presentation of power point-different kind of land type and protected area, what is national wildlife area? History of process in the Tulita district,

Bob asked for examples like would mining being allowed?

Shuhtagot'ine Nene Presentation

Paul Latour of the Canadian Wildlife Service went through his presentation on the establishment of Shuhtagot'ine Nene (SGN) as a National Wildlife Area (NWA).

Bob: Could activities like mining be allowed in a National Wildlife Area?

Paul: Theoretically mining could be allowed. These areas are managed through a management plan and committee members. It would depend if the management plan provided for it and if it could be carried out without interfering with the protection of wildlife. If you want full protection of the area, you have to get a subsurface withdrawal. INAC will have to remove it through a land withdrawal. Aboriginal hunting rights are retained.

Paul continued presentation. Settlement lands will not be a part of NWA. Your fee simple lands cannot be a part of the NWA.

Rick: The board of directors looked at the proposal to have their settlement lands zoned as a PCI under the Plan and they objected to this. They want their private lands to be SMZ.

Paul: We heard from parks on the scope and scale of economic opportunities in establishing offices, wardens, etc. NWAs are fundamentally different in this area. Offices and staff will not happen for a NWA. A NWA is managed by a management plan set up by a committee. Paul went over the values of Shuhtagot'ine Nene that were assessed. He then spoke about CWS' and INAC's efforts and expenditures to date to establish the NWA.

Paul said they were only recently advised about the Prospecting Permit Protocol. This is an agreement between INAC and Tulita District Land Corporation negotiated as an out of court settlement to address consultation issues for prospecting permits. It outlines an area of high mineral potential and areas where prospecting permits can be issued until the land use plan is approved. This area covers major portions of the existing boundary for SGN. This agreement sends certain messages that they want to keep mineral potential open for development.

Paul asked the community for direction on where they want to go. The options are: 1) pursue the existing area, 2) reshape the area to reflect key values and allow for economic development, or 3) go our separate ways. You have to tell us.

Roger: 5 years ago there was no interest in the Tulita district and it is reflected in the plan. There was no direction in the plan for the mountains. I have to commend the RRC, SSI, PAS

and the GNWT for their efforts. Now we have to decide what is the best avenue - the PAS or the LUP? Some of you people understand where we are coming from. We seem to have confused ourselves. It is up to the community to decide what avenue to take. We have to ask for a subsurface withdrawal. I want to ask the people before we meet by ourselves if they understand the PAS system.

Paul showed a map illustrating different options for reshaping SGN. These are just ideas.

Jess Fortner: What is the advantage to using the pas strategy vs the LUP?

Paul: That depends on your goals. You are using a high level of protection through legislation. LUP zones can come and go, they may shift, they provide flexibility for the future. You have to decide what you want for the future.

Gordon: We can redraw the area and do some different options. Are we part of PAS? Who was involved in setting up the PAS? We want to know what is involved with this group.

Paul explained who was involved in setting up PAS and the process.

Gordon: I think it is important to understand PAS and what you want to do with this. Do you want to pursue PAS or the LUP?

Paul: There is a working group meeting scheduled in Feb where we can discuss this more.

Heidi: I want to interject. We need to make decisions quickly. The LUP has to be completed. This process has taken 12 years. We can't have this as the first of many meetings to come to make a decision. We need to have a decision to finish the plan. We need to all understand how you want the area used. We can help the community to make a decision.

Rocky said that all leaders will have meeting at 5:00pm so we cannot meet this evening. The PAS starting coming up because all these prospecting permits were being issued and people got concerned because the LUP was not in place. We launched a lawsuit against the government. They put in a process, this prospecting permit protocol, to offset a lawsuit.

Bob: Thanked Paul for his presentation. I have no problem with PAS. It all comes down to a balance. My concerns are with this taking more time, and secondly, we are a co-management board. We take direction from communities and government. It is not just the SSI, but also the GNWT and INAC that approve the plan. I have a read on what government will approve and Paul gave some good options to address some of their current concerns with the zoning in the Mackenzie Mountains. We have to do the right thing so that the plan is approved. Leaders should give option 2 that Paul presented some consideration.

Miki Ehrlich of the PAS Secretariat gave a brief presentation on how conservation zones and protected areas differ.

Carl Ozyer of the NWT Geoscience office gave a presentation showing the mineral potential of the area.

Rita Clair, Eagle Plains Resources: I have been involved in the LUP process since 2007. She pointed out to the public where their prospecting permit is. We have worked with the Gwich'in

who has a LUP in place. It gives a company exact information for what they need when they have to apply for a permit. It made it a lot simpler for the company to take a look at. I would like to commend Paul on his out of the box option for what you have. I wanted to let everyone know that all the information we have gathered will be available shortly. The period of confidentiality is almost over. The global financial situation changed on us and we were fighting for our jobs so didn't do any work for a couple of years. But things are looking up again.

Roger: Do you know if Eagle Plains will be starting up again? I have been told nothing but have heard grumblings that they might.

Roger: Is your company interested in signing a cooperation agreement with the community like Selwyn did?

Rita: Yes. We were working on a training program with Aurora College until the plug was pulled. All that information is still available so it does not have to be re-invented.

Tulita District Follow-up Meeting

Summary Notes

Thursday, January 7, 2011

Community Arena, Tulita, NT

Participants:

Judith Wright-Bird, Chair SLUPB
Bob Overvold, SLUPB Member
Heidi Wiebe, SLUPB Senior Planner
Edna Tobac, SLUPB Executive Director
Joel Ashworth, GIS Analyst
Lindsay Armer, INAC,
David Menacho, Tulita RRC
Marc Lange, INAC
Carl Ozyer, INAC, NTGO
Rhea McDonald, Norman Wells RRC
Kathleen McDonald, NWLC Youth
Gordon Yakeleya, TLC President
Joe Horassi, Tulita
Jess Fortner, NWLC
Roger Odgaard, NWLC
Wilfred Lennie, FNMLC
Valerie Yakeleya, FNMLC
Maurice Mendo, Tulita
John Hotti, Tulita
Marjorey Ayha, Tulita
David Yallee Sr., Tulita

Joel Holder, GNWT, ENR
Lee Montgomery, Parks Canada
Rita Clair, Eagle Plains Resources Ltd.
Kris Brekke, CPAWS
Alison Woodley, CPAWS
Paul Latour, CWS, EC
Miki Ehrlich, GNWT, ENR (PAS Secretariat)
Greg Yeoman, INAC
Ruby L. McDonald, NWLC
Janet Bayha, Tulita District Lands
Rick Hardy, TDNWG
Cecile MacCauley, Tulita Band
Doug Yallee, Tulita
Donna Schear, NWLC
Frederick Andrew, Tulita RRC
William Horrassi, Tulita
Debbie Yallee, Tulita
Andy Short, GNWT, ITI
Gabe Horassi, Tulita
Norman Andrew, Tulita
Arsene Menacho, Tulita

Roderick Yallee, Tulita RRC
Gary Yakeleya, Tulita
Joe Bernarde, Tulita

Edward MacCauley, Tulita Land Corp
Rocky Norwegian, TDLC

Started at 9:45 am with opening prayer by Ruby McDonald

Judith welcomed everyone and said that we would start with a roundtable discussion from community members. There seemed to be consensus from yesterday to move forward with Naats'ihch'oh. SGN still needs discussion from the community on the proposed area. Judith opened the floor to community members to provide input. We want to focus on SGN.

Rocky said that we never had time to caucus and as soon as the group comes in from Norman Wells we will caucus so we can move on to something else for now.

Heidi provided map handouts to everyone.

Heidi provided a background on changes to settlement lands that came from Rick Hardy after meetings with the Tulita district organizations. The direction to make all parcels general use, other than specified exceptions, removed significant portions of the Mackenzie River SMZ, as well as smaller portions of the Great Bear River SMZ, the Carcajou River SMZ and the Norman Range SMZ. We want to make sure that that is what the community intended.

Heidi put the first map on screen and pointed out all the changes that would be made according to the direction provided. We had specific direction for some of the changes, while the rest were a result of the broad direction to make all parcels general use. Heidi asked the participants if all these changes were consistent with what they were expecting.

Rick Hardy: I've changed my hat. Yesterday I was speaking in terms of my position as negotiator on the national park. This morning I am speaking on behalf of the work I did for the Planning Board to collect input from the land corporations and other community organizations. Specifically, the issues that we are dealing with now are the result of the review with the District Land Corporation Board of Directors on how the proposed LUP will affect the lands that are owned by the land claims organizations. The general thinking is that it is important that there is a land use plan. This gives control over lands that you don't have control over now. Now you do have more control over lands than you own right now than you have over lands that the government owns. So the thought process is that we do not have to have restrictive control over lands that the district owns. Right now, on lands that you own yourself there are at least 2 steps that a developer has to go through. The first thing is that they need permission to go on lands. That permission is an access agreement. When you negotiate an Access Agreement, you negotiate a benefits agreement. The company also has to get a land use permit and water licence from the land and water board. Through the process of the land and water board, you have more input on the terms and conditions. Because of those tools that are available to you on the access agreement, you have more control. The Board of Directors for the TDLC have more control on lands that you own than the Plan provides in draft three. Those are the reasons that the proposed changes are there. The board of directors has not proposed a complete change to the LUP. There are areas that we want to keep as Conservation Zones or Special Management. The majority of settlement lands are General Use because you have more control. Hopefully that is helpful in explaining why the changes were proposed.

Heidi thanked Rick for the explanation of the proposed changes but would still like to review all the changes to ensure the SLUPB staff have interpreted the direction correctly and to ask a few questions on specific changes for clarification. In some cases, this new direction appears to be a reversal of previous direction provided a few months ago and we need to double check that we got it right.

Miki: Could you explain why there was a buffer around the Mackenzie River to begin with?

Heidi: The Mackenzie River has been a Special Management Zone since the first Preliminary Draft. This area has always been important to people as a travel corridor, a harvesting area, people have camps along the river, there are islands in the river with special significance. Special management allows development but tells applicants that they have to do their work in a way that does not impact the values we've identified. Rick is right in saying that you have more control over your private lands than crown lands. But Special Management still tells others developing in the area that they have to be careful. General use does not do that. I need some indication from the corporation if that is what you need.

Rocky said that this is good time to meet now with our organizations for 15 minutes.

Community organizations caucused at 10:19 am.

Meeting resumed at 1:16 pm.

Rocky said that they had a brief caucus and they will meet in February during the scheduled SGN Working Group meeting and they will have an agreement on PAS, Drum Lake, etc. Before the end of February we will have a clear idea of where we are going with Shuhtagot'ine Nene. In regards to the parcels we own that are under GUZ, we will take one more look at those prior to February.

Gordon: Yesterday on opening remarks I really wanted to understand PAS. Now I know what it means and that we can't put private lands under a National Wildlife Area. I plan to meet and have workshop with elders to go over and reshape SGN with them. I got support to proceed with it from the board. It is good to make the elders understand. If we make a mistake now it will be hard to undo. That is what we have learned with the Inuvialuit. If we have to undo 1 part, we have to undo all of it. I would like to thank the board for having a good meeting.

Heidi: I would still like to run you through the changes to the parcels really quickly because there are a few questions that we need to bring to your attention to get answers on.

Rhea: I don't know if it's a good idea, Heidi.

Gordon: We need to look at it ourselves.

Heidi: If I can give you one example, one change removes a part of the Great Bear Lake Watershed SMZ. This area is very important to Deline. If you take this out, it would create problems for us with Deline. Can I run through these types of questions so you know to consider them and provide us with answers following your review? I can send you a list of questions in writing as well but I think it would be good to see the maps and questions together

once so you understand what I'm asking. We need this clarification so we know what changes to make.

Rhea: Is it a specific lake?

Heidi: It is the edge of the Great Bear Lake Watershed. Deline manages the land according to the watershed boundaries.

Rocky: If Déline has a problem they will come to us.

Heidi: Déline won't see this until the public hearing. There is no other opportunity for them to look at it. Déline agreed to protect Clement Lake at Tulita's request. This question will come up if this change stays so I am raising it now and asking you to reconsider.

Gordon: Ask Déline to come here so that we can discuss it. All these creeks and water areas are dried out.

Rocky asked if Déline has seen this yet.

Heidi: No one has seen it yet.

Gordon said that they will work with Déline on it.

Ruby asked if everyone around the table wanted to take these maps home to look at it.

Judith: I really think you should let Heidi go through the proposed changes if you don't mind because no one has had the opportunity to look at it.

Rhea: Even though you are going through these changes, can you still send us the questions?

Heidi: Yes.

Heidi went through the changes as they have interpreted them from the TDLC's direction.

On Map 13, Donna Schear asked Heidi to explain the question again.

Heidi: On parcel 127 and 129 the direction was to have special management around the mineral licks only. We do not have any records of mineral licks in parcel 127 so we made it all general use. It was an IBP site so we took out the entire IBP area rather than leaving a small Conservation Zone around the parcel. If there is a mineral lick in there, you will have to identify where it is for us. On parcel 129 there is a mineral lick and also an area called Sheep Mountain that you refer to in your direction for parcel 131. We weren't sure if this is just differences between topographical and local names or what we should protect.

Donna: What is an IBP Site?

Heidi: These are sites identified as unique or significant by scientists studying the north in the '70s. They are of ecological or geological interest and include things like hot springs, important wildlife habitat, unique geology, rare plants, etc.

On Map 14, Heidi explained the issue of having a Conservation Zone inside a parcel of General Use, inside a larger PCI. A CZ inside a general use zone is fine, but you wouldn't then keep a larger PCI around that. The key values should already be protected inside the Conservation Zone.

Gordon: The PAS people said that private lands can't go under the NWA. Whose plan is this? Yours or ours? It should be us giving you direction.

Heidi: The issue is not with how you zone the parcel; its with having 3 different zone designations for the same area. If you want the parcel as General Use and you want a Conservation Zone around Drum Lake then you don't need a larger PCI around both of those and when you reshape the boundaries for SGN as is being proposed, you should leave out this area as it is being taken care of already.

Gordon: We don't want to start pointing fingers. That is why we are going to have a meeting with the Elders.

The mapping discussion concluded.

A 10 minute break was called.

Judith: We are not going to continue with the remainder of the agenda. We have heard everything that we need to so we will finish with final comments.

Rocky: I would like to thank the SLUPB, PAS, and other representatives that came here. I think that it was a productive meeting and it gave people a clear idea about PAS. When we meet in February, prior to that we will have meetings. We may request maps from the SLUPB and ask Paul to come in prior to that to assist us. I would like to thank everyone again and to say that we have gone a long ways.

Bob asked if any of the government representatives wanted to make closing statements.

Paul: It's logical that I follow Rocky. I'm really pleased that you are going to seriously think about SGN again. We are happy to hear that. I am happy to say that I can come in 3 days prior to the next meeting. Kris Brekke can come in to work on the mapping with you as well. You know what you want and we can give you a hand on the mapping work on option 2. One thing I need to ask is that you not "Option 2" us to death. What is not going to work for us is several small areas. We need 1 or 2 core manageable areas; good size chunks are needed from a management standpoint. If you are going to have many small areas it would be better to use your LUP for those areas.

Lee Montgomery: I would like to thank the SLUPB for organizing this meeting. It gave us the opportunity to meet with the community. I have handouts for participants. We will be back in the next month. In the mean time there are contribution agreements in place.

Rita: I would like to say thank you to the community for the hospitality. It is just wonderful to see where the LUP is.

Kris Brekke: I will be available to work with Tulita and Norman Wells to answer questions on PAS, and to work to make decisions. I will be able to accommodate my schedule to work with community.

Bob asked Heidi to review briefly what the board expects.

Heidi: First of all, we are working to get community decisions on the record for the public hearing. Our board is meeting in 1 week and following that we will send a letter outlining all our follow-up questions that we need answers to. Regarding SGN, it sounds like you are going for Option 2. We need a confirmation of that decision and the new boundaries you are proposing for that. I will follow up on mapping needs, as you will require more detailed maps than what you have here. We can come in and bring our GIS data if you need additional information to make those decisions. Following your February 23-24th meeting we will be looking for a decision. For our board to move forward we need that information. Six weeks from when we receive the information and get it on the record, we can hold the Public Hearing. Current timelines suggest that it will be held in the next fiscal year. When we set the date, we will let everyone know.

Bob asked if anyone else wanted the opportunity to speak.

Alison Woodley: I really appreciate the opportunity to come up from Ottawa.

Marc Lange: I want to thank the Board for the opportunity to participate. I wanted to respond to the earlier comments yesterday about the economic strategy. If you go back in time 15 years ago, the north was open and we talked about land use planning and what was needed. One of the things that we thought about was an economic strategy. CANNOR is available to help communities to work on economic strategies. We can help to provide contact names for CANNOR to get this moving.

Gordon: You want to do something for your community and youth. How are you going to do it? Working together is hard. The 3 land corps and the band sat together, we worked together. We want to make sure that it will work for the future. I still trap on the land but it is more difficult for me. It is harder now because we don't get anything. One time when I was young I went out with my mom. We did not catch anything and I asked my mom what are we going to do? She said that we have to work hard. My people don't close off yourselves. Look at those areas. With your knowledge we will look at those areas. The Elders said when you go, shake hands.

Joel Holder: I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to participate and say that the GNWT will assist in providing information. The GNWT supports the PAS process. When I go back I will look into budget to see if we can provide some support to this process.

Judith: Thanks to everyone that came to Tulita to participate in this worthwhile meeting to bring us closer to completing the LUP. We have met these past two days. We need to look at the significant areas that were identified by elders that are no longer with us. Some parcels were selected for economic opportunities. We need to come up with a balanced approach. The suggestion from the caucus to meet with the Elders is a good idea. I want to thank you for your participation and hard work. In February we will be closer to a final plan and we will get a decision from the elders to help us move forward. We have commitments as well. The SLUPB has to deliver a final Plan to INAC as part of our funding agreements. We are looking at a board

meeting in Fort Good Hope in a few weeks to review all comments on Draft 3. To move forward to a public hearing we need your decisions. It will probably be held in the early part of the new fiscal year. We will determine that after the meeting occurs in February.

Closing prayer by Maurice.