

**Objet:** GoC Comments on Zone 65 Background Report

**Date:** vendredi 9 octobre 2020 à 11:30:12 heure avancée des Rocheuses

**De:** Vigna, Alana (AADNC/AANDC)

**À:** Chair, Sahtu Land Use Planning Board

**Cc:** Heidi Wiebe, Pawley, Kim (AADNC/AANDC), Hopkins, Mark (AADNC/AANDC), Traynor2, Janice (AADNC/AANDC)

Good afternoon Chair Bourassa,

The Government of Canada is pleased to submit the following comments on the Zone 65 Background Report:

Section, Page #	Issue	Comment
Wildlife and Ecological Importance, Map 13, Pg 20	Boreal Caribou range overlap with Zone 65 and Tuyeta PA information has not been included in the Background Report.	Woodland Boreal Caribou are listed as Threatened on Schedule 1 of the federal Species at Risk Act. Range NT 1, which is mostly within NWT, overlaps with the Sahtu Land Use Planning Region and with Zone 65 and the Tuyeta Protected Area. The range has been designated as Critical Habitat for Boreal Caribou. Although CR #7 under General Conformity Requirements of the Sahtu Land use Plan generally addresses Boreal Caribou concerns, the information should be included in the Background Report for consideration of values in the re-zoning of the zones adjacent to Tuyeta.
Current Status and Next Steps, Pg. 11	That the SLUPB has used, quoted and relied on s. 2.2 of the updated 5-year Review Amendment Application of the SLUP that is still awaiting approval to provide guidance on how the Plan applies to Protected Areas.	<p>The current SLUP, in s. 5.7 Amendments, states that ‘the amendment will come into effect when approved by the federal Minister.’ This in and of itself should have the SLUPB only using and quoting s. 2.2 of the current SLUP to provide guidance on how the Plan applies to Protected Areas until the federal Minister approves the Amendment Application.</p> <p>When looking at s. 2.2 of the Amendment Application, the whole section has been amended in some way and is coloured purple. The instructions of the Amended Application indicate that when text in the Amendment are highlighted in Purple there has been a significant change that relates to the content of the plan. One also sees that the content has changed significantly when one compares the Application and the current SLUP.</p> <p>The use of s. 2.2 of the Amendment Application by the SLUPB wrongly refers to s. 4.7 as the Amendments section, when in fact s. 5.7 of the current SLUP deals with Amendments.</p> <p>The use of the current Amendment Application is</p>

		wrong because:
--	--	----------------

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) It doesn't follow the rules, and</li><li>2) The current Amendment Application is confusing as the changes are hard to follow when referencing between the current SLUP and the Application.</li></ol> |
|--|--|--|

If there are any questions or concerns regarding the information submitted, do not hesitate to get in touch.  
Thank you.

Regards,  
Alana

Alana Vigna  
Environmental Policy Analyst – Environmental Assessment, Land Use Planning and Conservation  
Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada  
15 Eddy St., 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Gatineau, QC K1A 0H4  
Phone #: 873-354-1023  
[Alana.Vigna@canada.ca](mailto:Alana.Vigna@canada.ca)